



PREP-RI Rhode Island
Department
of Education

Review Team Performance Report

Roger Williams University

October 28, 2018 through October 31, 2018



Table of Contents

Performance Review of Educator Preparation - Rhode Island 3

Report Purpose and Layout 3

 Key Terms Used in this Report 4

Report Summary 4

 Program Classifications 6

 Provider Approval Term 6

Component Ratings 8

 Standard 1: Professional Knowledge 8

 Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice 9

 Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment 9

 Standard 4: Program Impact 10

 Standard 5: Program Quality and Improvement 10

Teacher Certification Areas: Findings and Recommendations 11

 Elementary Education Program 11

 Standard 1: Professional Knowledge 11

 Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice 19

 Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment 23

 Standard 4: Program Impact 26

 Secondary Education Program 27

 Standard 1: Professional Knowledge 28

 Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice 37

 Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment 41

 Standard 4: Program Impact 44

 All Grades Education Program 45

 Standard 1: Professional Knowledge 46

 Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice 53

 Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment 57

 Standard 4: Program Impact 61

 Middle Grades Extension 62

 Standard 1: Professional Knowledge 62



Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	65
Support Professional Certification Areas: Findings and Recommendations	65
Reading Specialist Program.....	65
Standard 1: Professional Knowledge	65
Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	72
Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment.....	77
Standard 4: Program Impact	79
Provider-Level Findings and Recommendations.....	81
Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment.....	81
Standard 5: Program Quality and Improvement.....	84
Appendix A: Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation.....	90
STANDARD ONE: PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE.....	90
STANDARD TWO: CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE.....	90
STANDARD THREE: CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND ASSESSMENT.....	91
STANDARD FOUR: PROGRAM IMPACT	92
STANDARD FIVE: PROGRAM QUALITY AND IMPROVEMENT.....	92
Appendix B: Guidance for Program Classification, Provider Approval Term, and Approval Conditions	94
Appendix C: Glossary	96



Performance Review of Educator Preparation - Rhode Island

The Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) believes that strong educators are crucial for ensuring that all Rhode Island students are college and career-ready upon graduating from high school. To that end, it is RIDE's expectation that every educator who completes a Rhode Island educator preparation program will:

- Demonstrate positive impact on PK-12 student learning
- Be ready to succeed in Rhode Island schools
- Serve as leaders and professionals

These goals act as the foundation for the Performance Review for Educator Preparation in Rhode Island (PREP-RI). Through the PREP-RI Process, RIDE seeks to provide educator preparation programs and providers with the structure and expectations to improve systematically program and provider quality. The Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation (Appendix A) articulate the expectations for program and provider performance as well as the expectations for continuous improvement.

As part of the PREP-RI process, a team of independent reviewers evaluates program and provider quality. The reviewers base their evaluation on all evidence made available to them by the program and provider: pre-visit evidence, on-site evidence, data, documentation, observations, and interviews with faculty, staff, candidates, completers, and other stakeholders. Based on this evaluation, the review team assesses program and provider performance for each component of the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation, designates a program classification, and assigns a provider approval term¹. To support continuous improvement, the review team also provides specific and actionable recommendations, suggestions, and commendations. Additional information regarding the PREP-RI process is available on the [RIDE website](#).

Report Purpose and Layout

This report serves a variety of stakeholders including the provider, the programs, current and prospective candidates, as well as the larger education community. The purpose of the report is to make public the results of the PREP-RI review including the program classifications, provider approval term, and the component ratings and recommendations. The expectation is that programs and providers use the information contained in the report to support their continuous improvement efforts and alignment to the expectations of the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation.

The report has three sections: Report Summary, Program Components Findings and Recommendations, and Provider Components Findings and Recommendations. The Report Summary provides specific details from the review, the program classifications, provider approval term, and tables of component-level performance ratings for the programs and provider. The program classifications are based on program-level components. Program classifications denote the quality of the certificate area programs that the provider offers. The provider approval term is based on both program classifications and provider-level components and denotes the overall quality of the provider. Certain program classifications and provider approval terms result in approval conditions that the provider and program must address prior to the next PREP-RI review.

¹ Appendix B contains the guidance review teams use to make program classification, approval term, and approval condition decisions.



The Program and Provider Component Findings and Recommendations sections contain specific information regarding provider and program performance for each component. The sections include a summary statement of the current level of performance for the component. The summary statement is followed by a brief list of evidence that details the performance level and where appropriate suggestions for improvement or commendations for notable practice. Components rated either Approaching Expectations or Does Not Meet Expectations also include recommendations for improvement that require necessary changes to ensure programs and providers meet the expectations of the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation. Before the next PREP-RI visit, Roger Williams University must take action to address issues of performance related to all components rated as Approaching Expectations or Does Not Meet Expectations.

Key Terms Used in this Report

This report uses some key terms that are consistent with language within the PREP-RI rubric and the RIDE certification office. For a glossary of key terms, see Appendix C.

Report Summary

The educator preparation provider, the Roger Williams University Department of Education, offers five RIDE-approved educator preparation programs and a middle grades extension program. The Elementary Education program was opened in 1985 and currently has ninety-four candidates. The Secondary Education program was opened in 1998 with concentrations in Biology, Chemistry, English, Mathematics, and Social Studies and currently has thirty-five candidates. The All Grades Education program with a concentration in World Languages (French, German, Italian, Latin, and Spanish) was opened in 2000 and currently has three candidates. The Middle Grades Extension Certification program was opened in 2008 and currently has six candidates. The Elementary, Secondary, and All Grades Education programs and the Middle Grades Extension Certification program are undergraduate programs. The Reading Specialist program is a graduate program that was opened in 2004 and currently has seven candidates. The educator preparation programs at Roger Williams University were last reviewed in 2013 as part of the Rhode Island Program Approval Process. The tables on the following pages list the programs and courses of study reviewed during the 2018 PREP-RI visit.

The Roger Williams University Department of Education is housed within the Feinstein School of Humanities, Arts, and Education. The provider espouses a commitment to social justice, civil discourse, global citizenship and educational excellence for all students. Faculty, staff, and leadership are proud of their programs and develop strong bonds with their candidates. The provider has recently implemented several promising innovations including the elementary education ‘residency’ program, the elementary STEAM initiative, and increased integration of technology in the undergraduate programs. Despite these promising practices, the program assessment systems, clinical partnerships, and data-based improvement processes – keys to effective educator preparation and continuous improvement – have not kept pace with professional standards and expectations. The provider must work with leadership from the School of Humanities, Arts, and Education as well as Roger Williams University institutional leadership to ensure that all programs meet the full expectations of the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation, the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards, professional content standards, and most importantly, that program completers are prepared to meet the learning needs of students on day one.



Educator Certification Programs

Certification Program	Undergraduate	Graduate	Non-Degree
Elementary Education	B.A. in Elementary Education	-	-
Middle Grades Extension: Elementary and Secondary	-	-	English
			Mathematics
			Science
			Social Studies
Secondary Education	B.A./B.S. in Secondary Education (Biology)	-	-
	B.A./B.S. in Secondary Education (Chemistry)	-	-
	B.A. in Secondary Education (English)	-	-
	B.A./B.S. in Secondary Education (Mathematics)	-	-
	B.A. in Secondary Education (Social Studies)	-	-
All Grades Education	B.A. in Secondary Education (World Languages)	-	-
Reading Specialist		M.A. in Literacy	-

The PREP-RI review team conducted the review from October 28, 2018 through October 31, 2018.

Review team members were:

- William Barrass, Social Studies Teacher at Barrington Public Schools
- Dr. Corine Brown, Associate Dean at Rowan University
- Katherine A. Elmes, Director at Worcester Polytechnic Institute
- Dr. Kathleen Headley, Senior Associate Dean at Clemson University
- Janel Paquin, World Language Teacher at Newport Public Schools, retired
- Karen Seitler, Elementary Principal at North Kingstown Public Schools, retired
- Dr. Andrew Smyth, Department Chair at Southern Connecticut State University
- Susan Toohey Kaye, Reading Specialist at Coventry Public Schools
- David Upegui, Science Teacher at Central Falls School District
- Dr. Lynne Weisenbach, Consultant at Weisenbach Consulting and Former Vice Chancellor of the University System of Georgia



Lisa Foehr and Sarah Whiting represented RIDE. Andre Audette from AA Consulting supported the RIDE team. The following tables detail the program classifications, provider approval term, approval conditions, and component ratings that resulted from this review.

Program Classifications

Indicates the quality of the individual certification area programs offered by the provider determined by evidence-based ratings for each program-level component.

- Approved with Distinction
- Full Approval
- Approval with Conditions
- Low Performing
- Non-Renewal

Program	Classification
Teacher Certification Programs	
Elementary Education	Approved with Conditions
Secondary Education	Approved with Conditions
All Grades Education	Approved with Conditions
Middle Grades Extension	Approved with Conditions
Support Professional Certification Programs	
Reading Specialist	Approved with Conditions <i>This program is at risk of being classified as Low Performing.²</i>

Provider Approval Term

Indicates the overall quality of the educator preparation provider based on the classifications for each of the provider’s programs and based on evidence-based ratings for each provider-level component

- Seven years
- Five years
- Four years
- Three years
- Two years
- Non-Renewal

² The Reading Specialist program is at risk of being classified as Low Performing. Programs identified as low performing marginally meet expected performance levels and are identified as “low performing” for Title II federal purposes.



Provider	Roger Williams University
Approval Term	Three Years
Conditions	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Roger Williams University identifies a ‘champion’ with expertise in assessment systems, performance based-assessments, and data-driven improvement systems and process. The individual(s) can be either Roger Williams University staff from outside the Roger Williams University Department of Education or an external resource. The champion will work with leadership from the School of Humanities, Arts, and Education and provider leadership and staff to develop and implement required changes and improvements detailed in the PREP-RI approval report.▪ The provider creates a leadership structure for improvement efforts that includes minimally individuals from the educator preparation programs, the School of Humanities, Arts, and Education, and the champion, and a plan for addressing the recommendations from the PREP-RI approval report. This structure and plan must be submitted to RIDE for approval by May 2019.▪ The provider pilots a performance-based assessment system by the Spring 2020 semester that includes practice-based observation instruments comparable to those being used in Rhode Island PK-12 public schools, aligned to professional standards, and ensure actionable feedback to drive candidate progress. The revised assessment system must be fully implemented by the 2021 PREP-RI review.▪ The provider develops and implements by Spring 2021 an ongoing, annual, systematic and data-based continuous improvement process. The process must collect and analyze data on candidate and completer performance and program quality and outcomes. The process must include and detail specific roles, responsibilities, timelines, and reporting mechanisms.▪ The provider delivers progress updates during bi-annual check-ins with RIDE leadership and staff to report actions taken to address the recommendations from the PREP-RI approval report. The provider annually publishes a public report that documents improvements efforts accomplished to date.▪ The provider may submit new program design application no earlier than spring 2020 and upon demonstration of substantial progress to address the conditions and recommendations in the PREP-RI approval report.▪ Reading Specialist Program: RIDE conducts an interim review of the reading specialist program in Fall 2020. If the program cannot demonstrate substantial progress to address the recommendations in PREP-RI approval report, the program is identified as “Low Performing” and subject to closure at the next PREP-RI review in Fall 2021.	



- RIDE conducts a review of all educator programs in Fall 2021 for progress and continuing approval.
- If Roger Williams University demonstrates insufficient progress towards these conditions and the report recommendations, the Commissioner of Education reserves the right to establish more specific interim improvement benchmarks or to non-renew programs not making sufficient progress.

Component Ratings

The following tables list the ratings for each component, which designate the performance level for the programs and provider based on the PREP-RI Performance Rubric. Asterisks indicate provider level components.

Standard 1: 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.

Component	Component Ratings				
	Elementary Education	All Grades Education	Secondary Education	Middle Grades Extension	Reading Specialist
Teacher Certification Area Programs					
1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Not Applicable
1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations
1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations
1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations
1.5 Technology	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations
1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations
1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations



Standard 2: 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.

Component	Component Ratings				
	Elementary Education	All Grades Education	Secondary Education	Middle Grades Extension	Reading Specialist
Teacher Certification Area Programs					
2.1 Clinical Preparation	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations
2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
2.4 Clinical Educators	Does Not Meet Expectations				

Standard 3: 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. (Components 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.6 are rated at the provider, not the program-level.)

Component	Component Ratings				
	Elementary Education	All Grades Education	Secondary Education	Middle Grades Extension	Reading Specialist
Teacher Certification Area Programs					
3.1 Diversity of Candidates*	Does Not Meet Expectations				
3.2 Response to Employment Needs*	Approaching Expectations				
3.3 Admission Standards for Academic Achievement and Ability*	Approaching Expectations				
3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Does Not Meet Expectations				



Component	Component Ratings				
Teacher Certification Area Programs	Elementary Education	All Grades Education	Secondary Education	Middle Grades Extension	Reading Specialist
3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Does Not Meet Expectations				
3.6 Additional Selectivity Criteria*	Meets Expectations				

Standard 4: 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.

Component	Component Ratings				
Teacher Certification Area Programs	Elementary Education	All Grades Education	Secondary Education	Middle Grades Extension	Reading Specialist
4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations				
4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations				

Standard 5: 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. (Components 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, and 5.6 are rated at the provider, not the program-level.)

Component	Component Ratings				
Teacher Certification Area Programs	Elementary Education	All Grades Education	Secondary Education	Middle Grades Extension	Reading Specialist
5.1 Collection of Data to Evaluate Program Quality*	Does Not Meet Expectations				
5.2 Analysis and Use of Data for Continuous Improvement*	Does Not Meet Expectations				
5.3 Reporting and Sharing of Data*	Does Not Meet Expectations				
5.4 Stakeholder Engagement*	Approaching Expectations				



Component	Component Ratings				
	Elementary Education	All Grades Education	Secondary Education	Middle Grades Extension	Reading Specialist
Teacher Certification Area Programs					
5.5 Diversity and Quality of Faculty*	Approaching Expectations				
5.6 Other Resources*	Meets Expectations				

Teacher Certification Areas: Findings and Recommendations

The provider has selected to use a common approach to the organization and design of several aspects of its three teacher certification programs: elementary education, secondary education, and all grades education. The provider has established a common program structure for clinical partners, clinical educators, assessment, and program outcomes. As such, the ratings, findings, and recommendations for the following components of the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation (RISEP) are identical: *clinical partners (2.3), clinical educators (2.4), recommendation for student teaching (3.4), recommendation for certification (3.5), evaluation outcomes (4.1), and employment outcomes (4.2)*

Elementary Education Program

Overview: The elementary education program is an undergraduate-level program that leads to a Bachelor of Arts degree in Elementary Education. Candidates must earn seventy-five credits from twenty-three courses organized across three elementary education curriculum levels, referred to by the program as Levels I, II, and III. Candidates also complete additional required courses as part of the Roger Williams University Core Concentration. Candidates are required to complete field experiences working with PK-12 students throughout the program.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop a general understanding of and proficiency in the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS) while experiencing a consistent course and field-based curriculum.	

- The program reported that it is “standards-based, all course instruction, field experiences, and the performance assessment system are designed according to the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards and individual content standards. Syllabi are aligned with the RIPTS and in the cases of multiple sections of the same courses, syllabi and aligned with each other.”
- Candidates first complete two introductory courses, typically in their freshmen year, as part of the Level I: EDU 200: Foundations of Education and EDU 202: Psychology of Learning and Development. During sophomore and junior year candidates complete as part of Level II general pedagogical courses focusing on topics such as technology, multicultural education, and diverse learners, as well as content methods courses that focus on literacy, mathematics, and science. During senior year candidates complete a content methods course in social studies as well as practicum and student teaching placements and seminars as part of Level III.



- The program has a recommended course sequence that most candidates follow with exceptions for late admissions, student schedules, and travel-abroad opportunities. Most courses have only one section taught by one faculty member. Some of the introductory courses and general pedagogical courses have multiple sections and may be taught by multiple faculty members.
- Program materials, program syllabi, and particularly the assessment system portfolio process are organized by and aligned to the RIPTS. Candidates often are required to include references to the standards when they complete lesson plans, tasks, and projects. For the portfolios, candidates are required to submit reflective essays in which they assert and justify how completed artifacts demonstrate meeting expectations of the standards.
- Candidates reported that they were generally aware of the RIPTS. They reported that they were introduced to the standards during the admission process and in Level I courses. Candidates reported that they developed a general understanding of the standards through course and field-based learning experiences throughout the program. Candidates also reported that they most frequently worked with the standards while compiling their portfolios. This may explain why candidates in the middle of the program, sophomores and juniors, were less familiar with the standards since they had last completed a portfolio in their freshmen year.
- The review team found that candidates were aware of the standards at the general and familiar level described by candidates. Candidates at all levels of the programs could not name specific standards but were aware of the broad concepts and some specific expectations such as using a variety of assessment practices, meeting the needs of all learners, and understanding developmental continuums. Candidates later in the program who were in practicum placements in PK-12 schools were more confident and aware of the standards as they began to apply these when developing lessons and practices to work with students.
- Candidates were knowledgeable of and their work demonstrated proficiency in several areas of the standards. Creating learning experiences with a broad base of knowledge (RIPTS 1), understanding how children learn and develop (RIPTS 3), creating supportive learning environments (RIPTS 6), working collaboratively with school communities (RIPTS 7), using effective communication (RIPTS 8), and reflecting on practice and professional responsibility (RIPTS 10) were areas of strength. Candidates did not demonstrate proficiency and strong practice in having a deep content knowledge base (RIPTS 2), creating learning opportunities to meet the needs of all learners (RIPTS 4), encouraging students' critical thinking (RIPTS 5), using effective assessment practice and modifying instruction (RIPTS 9), and maintaining professional standards (RIPTS 11).

Recommendations

- Explore and implement methods to communicate better, more purposefully, and more systematically the content and foundations of the RIPTS through courses and field-based learning experiences in addition to the current emphasis in the portfolio process.
- Strengthen aspects of the program of study and curriculum to increase opportunities for candidates to develop deep understanding and demonstrate proficiency in the full range of the RIPTS including RIPTS 2, 4, 5, 9, and 11.



1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Approaching Expectations
---	--------------------------

Candidates develop a general understanding of and proficiency in the professional standards for elementary education through their courses and field-based experiences.	
---	--

- The program reported that courses and field experiences are generally aligned to the professional content standards: National Council for Teachers of English (NCTE), National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), and the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA). The program reported that the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) standards for elementary education are embedded in the program but not featured or prioritized. The program reported that it recognizes the need to further emphasize the professional standards throughout the program.
- Candidates learn about the professional standards primarily through their content courses and content methods courses. In addition to content method courses, candidate also are required to complete a course in United States History, two courses in mathematics for elementary education, and a course in basic musicianship. In these courses, candidate both focus on learning content while also focus on teaching content to PK-12 students. Candidates learn about the expectations for the professional standards in their general pedagogical courses as well as content methods courses.
- The review team found that candidates were aware of the professional standards at the general level described by the program. Candidates reported that they were aware that there are professional standards for their field but not at a depth expected of prospective teachers. Candidates often would name and refer to PK-12 student learning standards such as Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for English language arts and mathematics or Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) for science as the standards for their profession rather than the professional standards which speak to educator knowledge and capacity. Program faculty and course syllabi also regularly confused the two types of standards.
- The review team found that while the professional standards were not identified by name, the underlying concepts and professional expectations are generally present throughout the program of study and that candidates demonstrated proficiency in many of the critical concepts, principles, and practices for the field. Candidate practice was generally strong in the area of development, learning, and motivation (ACEI 1), instruction (ACEI 3), and professionalism (ACEI 5). The review team found that candidates were less well-prepared and proficient in designing and implementing practice with a deep knowledge of content (ACEI 2) as well as assessment practices to understand student learning and modify instruction (ACEI 4).
- The program curriculum requires candidates to complete a one-credit health methods course. Program faculty reported this course was included in the program of study to meet state requirements. Rhode Island does not require this course. Candidates reported that they appreciated and benefited from the social studies content methods course but wish that it occurred earlier in the program consistent with the other content methods courses when they would have more opportunities to integrate this new learning in their practice.



Recommendations

- Work with program faculty to articulate a clear vision of the appropriate professional standards for the elementary program separate from student learning standards and consistently communicate these standards and expectations to program candidates.
- Explore and implement methods to communicate better, more purposefully, and more systematically the content and foundations of the professional standards throughout the program of study.
- Strengthen aspects of the program of study and curriculum to increase opportunities for candidates to develop deep understanding and demonstrate proficiency in the full range of the professional standards including ACEI 2 and 4, including ensuring candidates develop deep content knowledge in all content areas.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Standards
Candidates develop a general understanding of Rhode Island PK-12 student learning standards and demonstrate basic skills in designing and implementing lessons and assessing learning consistent with the standards.	

- Candidates are introduced to the Rhode Island PK-12 student learning standards, particularly the CCSS English language arts and mathematics standards, early in the program during Level I courses. Candidates are presented information about the standards, their expectations for student learning, the organization of instruction, and are encouraged to download and become familiar with the standards.
- Candidates are required to take two literacy courses, EDU 302: Literacy 1 and EDU 303: Literacy II. EDU 302's focusses on best practice literacy instruction and assessment. This course includes sessions for all five components of effective reading instruction with one week focusing on phonological and phonemic awareness. EDU 303's primary focus is writing.
- As part of content methods courses, candidates are introduced to PK-12 student learning in science and social studies while continuing to focus on the CCSS in English language arts and mathematics during Levels II and III. Throughout their preparation, candidates are required to design lessons that include learning goals and objectives organized by specified student learning standards. As candidates progress in the program, they implement these lessons with PK-12 students to develop their understanding and proficiency.
- The review team found that candidates were aware of student learning standards at a general level. Candidates reported that the standards were an important tool to organize instruction and that lessons should include opportunities for students to engage with content necessary for their grade and subject area. Candidates also reported that they were most familiar with the CCSS in English language arts and less confident in standards for other content areas.
- Candidate work products, lesson plans, projects, assessments, and portfolios, showed consistent application and use of student learning standards that increased as candidates progressed in the program. However, there was no evidence that candidates have a deep understanding about



how to design and implement sequential lessons to support long-term objectives, how to design and implement lessons with standards from multiple-content areas, how to assess student progress towards meeting the student learning standards, and how individual student learning standards connect to the larger curriculum sequence and structure.

Recommendations

- Revise the program curriculum to include opportunities for candidates to move beyond developing isolated lessons based on individual student learning standards to a deeper understanding of the role of student learning standards to include designing sequential lessons, integrated lessons, assessing student learning of the standards, and the role of student learning standards in curriculum scope and sequence for elementary teachers.
- Provide additional opportunities, beyond those in content methods courses, for candidates to further understand and develop proficiency in the full-range of student learning standards, including mathematics, science, and social studies. Provide additional opportunities for candidates to deeply engage in all five essential components needed to support early readers.

1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop a general understanding of the core principles and practices of assessment and data-driven instruction and develop basic skills in these areas.	

- Candidates are exposed to the principles and practices of assessment and data-driven instruction early in the program and continuing throughout their preparation. This exposure includes topics such as formal and informal assessments, using multiple sources of data, and modifying practice based on student outcomes.
- Candidates are required to design and implement lessons that include assessment practices and are required to reflect, at a general level, on how well their lessons went and what students learned. Candidates are also required throughout the program to consider as part of “contextual factors” reports, data such as school and student performance and student and community characteristics.
- Candidates in the literacy methods courses (EDU 302 and EDU 303: Literacy in the Elementary Classroom I and II) and EDU 355: Elementary and Middle Grades Special Education Practice are required to explore and implement specific formal and informal assessment practices such as running records, observation protocols, and learner inventories.
- Candidates reported that they understood the importance of assessment, that all instruction should include multiple assessment strategies, and the need to consider assessment outcomes to inform next steps to support student learning. Candidate lesson plans typically included one or more assessment strategies and a discussion of how well they thought the lesson went and what they would do differently the next time they implemented the lesson.
- The review team found candidate knowledge, understanding, and proficiency of assessment and data-driven instruction consistent with the general approach embodied in the program curriculum. The program provides little opportunity for candidates to develop and implement



multiple forms of assessment practices beyond general quizzes, tests, exit tickets, or observation and reflection protocols. Candidates learn about contextual data but do not learn about aggregating and disaggregating student learning data from multiple assessments. Candidates have limited exposure and opportunity to go beyond general reflection on lesson outcomes to concrete, explicit processes to assess student learning to make targeted, data-driven changes in instructional practice and lesson design.

Recommendations

- Examine the full-range of assessment practices and data-driven instruction articulated in the professional standards for elementary education programs and currently in use in Rhode Island elementary schools. Conduct a gap-analysis to identify and close gaps between the current curriculum and these expectations.
- Implement in the program curriculum and courses explicit instruction and practice in the full-range of assessment and data-driven instructional practices expected in elementary schools. Ensure that this instruction ranges from general approaches and practices to more complex and content-specific practices.
- Implement in the program curriculum explicit instruction and practice in how to use student assessment data to evaluate and modify instructional practices.
- Integrate into the program assessment system specific performance-based requirements to ensure that candidates must demonstrate proficiency in the full-range of assessment practices and data-driven instruction to progress in the program.

1.5 Technology	Meets Expectations
Candidates develop and demonstrate proficiency in integrating technology and digital age work, learning, and communication in their practice.	

- Candidates are introduced to multiple technologies and tools, platforms, and hardware for digital age work, learning, and communication early in the program and are expected and required to develop and demonstrate proficiency in these as they progress in the program.
- Candidates participate in EDU 305: Classroom Applications of Technology at the Elementary and Middle School Level early in the program sequence which provides direct and explicit instruction, practice, and assessment in technologies and digital age practices expected of prospective elementary teachers.
- Candidate knowledge, skills, and proficiency in technology and digital age practices are further developed through specific technology instruction and practices integrated throughout the program including communicating and collaborating through online platforms, using multiple technologies for lesson planning and instruction, and exploring online resources for research, data, and tools available to grow their capacity and effectiveness as teachers.



- Candidates learn about content-specific technologies in their content methods courses and assistive technologies, applications, and resources available to support students with special needs in EDU 355: Elementary and Middle School Level Special Education Practice. Candidates, program completers, and clinical educators reported that candidates develop key knowledge and skills in the use of technology and digital age practices throughout the program and strengthen these during their clinical placements.

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop an understanding of issues of bias, diversity, equity, and social justice and demonstrate basic skills in meeting the needs of diverse learners.	

- Candidates are introduced to issues of bias, diversity, equity, and social justice early in the program and these topics remain a curriculum priority throughout the program sequence. Candidates are required to reflect on their own biases, explore different cultures, study issues of social justice, and learn about diverse communities in which they will practice. The program reported and the review team concurs that “equity issues are in the forefront” of the program curriculum and a faculty priority.
- Issues of diversity, bias, equity, and social justice are integrated across all courses and candidates are required to complete projects, assessments, and create lessons based on their developing knowledge. Candidates are also required to complete four courses that focus primarily on issues of diversity and equity: EDU 316: Classrooms as Communities, EDU 330: Issues in Multicultural Education, EDU 332: Responding to Diverse Learners, and EDU 355 Elementary and Middle School Level Special Education Practice.
- Candidates and some program completers reported that while they had knowledge of issues of diversity and equity, they felt least prepared to work with student from diverse backgrounds, English language learners, and families in diverse communities. Some candidates also had limited opportunities to engage in clinical work in diverse settings and communities, further limiting their opportunities to develop capacities in these areas.
- The review team concurs with this assessment and found that while candidates had knowledge and understanding of issues of bias, diversity, equity, and social justice, they did not have deep knowledge or skills to develop and implement instruction that is designed and modified to meet the needs of diverse learners. Candidates knew some limited strategies to help English language learners or students with special needs, but these were at a basic level such as using multiple resources, making cross-cultural connections, and using multicultural literature. Candidates had several sessions in courses that focused on working with families but limited, actual opportunities to learn or practice working with families in diverse communities.
- The program reported that it is working to address these issues and has identified actions such as recent additional course requirements that focus on issues of equity and diversity and increased field experiences. The program also reported that it is seeking to add programs and certification options for special education and English language learners to bolster candidate preparation and capacity. Because of the limited programmatic focus and depth regarding issues of equity and meeting the needs of all learners and families, additional courses and field



experiences, absent specific instruction, practice, and assessment of candidate capacity to address equity issues and meet the needs of diverse learners and their families, is not sufficient or likely to be effective.

Recommendations

- Work with program faculty and field-based partners and practitioners to identify specific and effective instructional practices that are necessary to meet the needs of diverse learners. Integrate these practices and assess candidates’ competence in these practices as part of their general pedagogical and content method courses to ensure that candidates not only develop an awareness of diversity and equity but also specific skills and capacities to meet the needs of all learners.
- Expand candidate theoretical and practical opportunities to learn about and work with families in diverse communities. Integrate both types of practices throughout the program curriculum to provide developmentally appropriate learning and practice experiences that will ensure candidates are ready to work with all families on day one.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop a general understanding of Rhode Island initiatives, educational laws, and policies.	

- Candidates are introduced to Rhode Island initiatives, educational laws, and policies early in the program and throughout the course sequence. All course syllabi list several initiatives that are focus areas for the course, that will serve as the basis for assignments, and that are connected to the professional standards.
- Candidates are required to complete EDU 318: Educational Reform and Policy that addresses historical trends and issues in education as well as legal and policy developments in the United States applicable to public education.
- Candidates reported that they were generally aware of Rhode Island educational initiatives and policies such as bullying, social emotional learning, state assessments, and student learning standards. Candidates were less familiar with critical initiatives for elementary educators such as educator evaluation and student learning objectives, the multi-tiered system of supports, and response to intervention.
- Some candidates also confused previous practices as current initiatives such as identifying the New England Common Assessment Program as the state assessment program instead of the Rhode Island Comprehensive Assessment System and Rhode Island Grade Span Expectations as student learning standards instead of CCSS and NGSS.
- The program listed in course syllabi specific components of the RISEP, particularly student learning standards, assessment, technology, equity, and Rhode Island initiatives, as if these were candidate learning requirements, rather than required design elements for the program of study.



Recommendations

- Work with program faculty and field-based partners and practitioners to identify critical Rhode Island initiatives and educational laws and policies most appropriate for elementary educators. Integrate these in a deliberate, strategic, and developmentally appropriate manner across the program curriculum.
- Conduct an audit of the program curriculum, course syllabi, and course materials to ensure that only current initiatives, policies, and laws are presented to candidates to minimize confusion and ensure currency in candidate knowledge.
- Develop and implement an authentic assessment of Rhode Island initiatives and educational policies and laws and integrate this into the candidate assessment system to ensure candidates develop a deep understanding and demonstrate proficiency of the initiatives.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Meets Expectations
The program ensures that candidates experience wide-ranging, developmentally-appropriate, and coherent clinical experiences.	

- Clinical experiences begin immediately in Level I courses. Candidates are required to conduct targeted observations in school settings to reflect and build upon course learning and to examine contextual data from PK-12 schools and students. Candidates reported that these early clinical experiences are important opportunities to experience school culture and to get early glimpses into the expectations for teachers.
- For the most recent candidates, the program has created a ‘residency-model’ for second year candidates as part of Level II courses. This model requires candidates to spend one day per week in school settings engaging in increasingly complex activities, from observing, to individual tutoring, to small group instruction. Program faculty are justified to be proud of this adjustment and should continue to explore ways to balance this clinical experience with other demands on candidates. Some candidates reported struggling to meet the schedule requirements for the residency experience while also engaging new learning in mathematics and science methods courses. Candidates in year three complete additional field experience as part of content methods and general pedagogical courses.
- During year four as part of Level III courses, candidates complete a practicum placement and a fourteen-week student teaching placement. Candidates and program completers reported that their clinical experiences were critical opportunities to connect what they learned in their courses with the realities of PK-12 schools and students. The review team concurred with this assessment and found the sequence of clinical experiences to reflect and strengthen course content and to support candidate growth and development.
- The program should consider expanding and strengthening the innovative second-year residency model to further capitalize on this learning and practice experience. The program should monitor closely the diversity of field experiences in which candidates participate in to



ensure that all candidates have opportunities, in addition to the Level I experiences, to practice in diverse settings. The program should also look for additional, authentic opportunities for candidates to practice and engage in clinical experiences with families in diverse communities.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Approaching Expectations
The program prioritizes candidate impact on student learning but has not established clear measures of impact on student learning that guide candidate progress in the program.	

- The program reported that candidate impact on student learning is a program priority and that this priority is clearly communicated to program candidates. The program reported that this expectation is articulated in course syllabi, assignments that require candidates to reflect on the efficacy of their lessons, and in reflective essays that candidates complete as part of the portfolio assessment system.
- Candidates and program completers reported that they recognized that having a positive impact on student learning was the essential role of a teacher and they felt the program supported them to develop skills and capacity in this area. Clinical educators also reported that candidates, as early as the second year residency, experience had positive impact on student learning.
- Beyond the general appreciation of the importance of candidate impact on student learning, the program has not built structures and systems to both ensure candidate impact on student learning and to use this impact to guide and inform candidate progress in the program. The program reported that “it is poised to begin systematically collecting and analyzing data on candidate impact on student learning” but has not yet done so or implemented these processes.
- The program provided lists of “useful tools” and “trustworthy assessments” that range from classroom assessments, observation protocols, and teaching strategies as evidence of how it instructs candidates to measure impact on student learning. The program did not provide evidence of any clearly identified measures of candidate impact on student learning that were developed in conjunction with clinical partners, that were clearly understood by candidates, that were used to gather data of candidate impact on student learning, and that guided candidate progress in the program – all expectations of the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation.

Recommendations

- Work with clinical partners to establish clearly articulated and appropriate measures of candidate impact on student learning that progress from early clinical experiences and increase in demand and expectations through student teaching.
- Establish processes to collect and analyze data from candidate impact on student learning to inform candidate progress in the program and to improve candidate ability to impact student learning.



2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has several formal and informal partnerships but has not established methods and processes to ensure the partnerships are mutually beneficial.	

- The program reported that its formal partners are the schools and districts in which it places candidates for clinical experiences, particularly student teaching placements. The program provided signed agreements for student teaching placements as evidence of the partnerships. The program also reported that it has additional informal partnerships with schools and districts based on personal and historical relationships as well as common projects and goal areas.
- The program reported and many clinical partners agreed that the Roger Williams University programs are responsive to the needs of the field and that the sharing and training of candidates, involvement in grant-funded professional development initiatives that arise from faculty interests and initiatives, and access to the university's resources are mutually beneficial to the candidates, programs, and partners.
- The program has shared its expectations for candidate performance with its partners, uses common assessment tools, and integrates PK-12 clinical educator input into decisions regarding candidate progression in the program.
- The program did not provide evidence that it has worked with its partners to establish agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness and that it monitors and analyzes data from the mutually-agreed upon indicators of effectiveness to make improvements to the partnership.

Recommendations

- Work with clinical partners to establish agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness to ensure mutually beneficial partnerships that support program and partnership improvement.
- Work with clinical partners to establish processes to monitor and analyze data from the agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness and use this information to improve both the partnership and program design and implementation.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program has not established processes to ensure that candidates are supervised and supported by clinical educators who meet appropriate, established criteria.	

- The program has established criteria for PK-12 clinical educators. These criteria include possessing a continuing contract, being appropriately certified for their grade level and content area, having a minimum of three years' teaching experience, whose practice is consistent with standards-based education, and who are willing to participate in clinical educator training.
- The program reported that it secures prospective clinical educators by informing partnership districts how many placements are needed and then receiving a list of PK-12 educators who are



willing to serve in the role. The program reported that it does not have the ability to proactively select clinical educators or identify appropriate settings and placements.

- The program recruits, supports, and trains university supervisors who meet established criteria, some of whom also serve as full-time or adjunct faculty. The role of the university supervisors is to serve as a liaison between the program and PK-12 clinical educators. University supervisors also provide on-the-ground support for PK-12 clinical educators and trouble-shoot placement issues and problems that may arise with candidates.
- The program reported that clinical educators are required to attend an annual half-day training in which clinical educators learn about program and course requirements, assessment instruments, and the sequence of clinical experiences. Clinical educators reported that they recognize the importance of their role and appreciate the opportunity to work with the program and help to mold future educators. Program faculty and provider leadership reported that clinical educators are critical to the success of the program and its candidates and that they provide authentic and practitioner-based wisdom on current practice in the field.
- The program shared instruments that are used by university supervisors and candidates to evaluate the effectiveness of clinical educators and their clinical placements. The program also provided evidence that some clinical educators were not retained who received notably poor ratings by university supervisors and candidates.
- The review team found that the criteria for clinical educators and the process used to select clinical educators do not meet the expectation of the RISEP and do not ensure that all candidates are supervised by effective and appropriate clinical educators. The criteria established by the RISEP require that all clinical educators at minimum must be trained in the ability to work with adult learners, coaching, and supervision skills, be able to evaluate performance and provide feedback, and be highly effective educators. These criteria are not included in the program's criteria. The standards also establish that only educators who meet these criteria are to serve in the role of clinical educator. The program allows districts to select clinical educators, regardless of their qualifications.
- The program provided evidence that it conducts an annual, half-day training for PK-12 clinical educators. The program did not provide evidence that attendance is required or that the training is sufficient to ensure that clinical educators are fully-prepared for their roles and fully proficient in the assessment system tools and expectations for candidate feedback.

Recommendations

- Work with program faculty and staff and clinical partners to review the expectations for clinical partnerships and clinical educators articulated in the RISEP. Establish criteria for clinical educators consistent with the expectations of these standards as the minimal requirements for all clinical educators.
- Establish a selection process that is controlled by the provider and its programs that ensures that only clinical educators who meet the established criteria are eligible to serve as clinical educators.



- Work with program faculty and staff, clinical partners, and university supervisors to establish and implement more rigorous and ongoing training and support processes to ensure that PK-12 clinical educators are fully prepared in the assessment system tools, processes, and expectations for candidate feedback.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not have a valid and reliable, performance-based assessment system that is grounded in the RIPTS, based on candidate impact on student learning, and that determines candidate progress throughout the program.	

- The program has an extensive and clearly defined assessment system called by the provider the “Performance Assessment System.” The assessment system has four levels each of which is based on portfolios and timelines that include specified products and assessments that candidates compile and submit for review at designated points in the program – at the completion of Level I, Level II, Level IIIa and Level IIIb courses.
- The requirements for the portfolios vary and increase over time. Level I and II portfolios focus primarily on artifacts and key assessments that candidates complete in their courses. Accompanying the artifacts are reflective essays in which candidates explain and justify knowledge of specified professional standards as evidenced by the artifacts. The Level IIIa and Level IIIb portfolios focus primarily on assessments of candidate performance during practicum and student teaching.
- In order to progress through the program candidates must successfully complete each portfolio review, earn a minimum 2.75 GPA, complete specified clinical experiences, conduct a readiness to student teach presentation, pass disposition assessments, and meet all program and university requirements.
- Candidates receive feedback on their progress through their courses, assignments, and clinical experiences, the portfolio review process, through observations of their practice, through formal and informal advisement and mentoring, and through a student support protocol which is available to candidates who struggle to meet program requirements and expectations. The provider shared evidence that four candidates were involved in the student support protocol process at the time of the review.
- The review team found that the assessment system requires candidates to complete many tasks and assessments which begin early in preparation and continue throughout the program; however, the amount, meaningfulness, and alignment of the broad range of required tasks in the assessment system was not clear. The review team also questioned the practice of allowing candidates to repeatedly revise and resubmit work rather than having established standards for quality and revision.
- Candidates receive varied and inconsistent feedback dependent on the individual providing the feedback, the type of task or assessment completed, and the format in which it was submitted.



Some faculty and clinical educators provide explicit, standards-based feedback whereas others provide limited or global feedback disconnected from the standards without clear paths for improvement. It was not clear to the review team that the amount and quality of feedback that candidates receive on work and tasks submitted through the electronic course management system, Taskstream, was supportive of candidate improvement.

- As constituted, the assessment system does not prioritize candidate performance aligned to the professional standards. The program uses the 2004 Professional Teaching Competencies from the New Teacher Center as the basis for its assessment of candidate performance. The program uses observation tools and assessment instruments that were developed more than ten years ago and retroactively aligned these to the expectations of the RIPTS. The tools and instruments also follow a holistic approach to assessment that is no longer current or consistent with instruments used in Rhode Island schools. The observation instruments include wide error bands between performance levels allowing a candidate who does not meet expectations to still pass the assessment based on the individual judgment of the assessor and their individual interpretation of the instrument.
- The assessment system also does not prioritize candidate impact on student learning. Candidates are assessed using general, holistic instruments on their overall performance in PK-12 classrooms. The assessment instruments contain broad goal statements such as “Engaging and Supporting all Students Learning” and “Assessing Student Learning” and include text boxes for assessors to record observations, areas of strength, and areas for growth. Candidates are assessed across six general competencies, none of which prioritizes or measures how well candidates implement, assess, and modify instruction to ensure PK-12 student proficiency.
- The program did not provide evidence that it uses information from the assessment system to target areas of candidate need and provide supports consistent with the information. Rather, candidates complete the required tasks and assessments and as long as they meet minimal requirements, proceed through the program. The program reported that it has counseled several candidates out of the program resulting from a variety of factors such as poor achievement, dispositional issues, and changing candidate interest.

Recommendations

- Work with School of Humanities, Arts, and Education leadership to identify a person or persons with expertise in performance-based assessment systems. Work with these individuals and provider leadership to develop, pilot, and implement a valid, reliable, and performance-based assessment system that is based on the professional standards for elementary teachers and consistent with the expectations of the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation.
- Ensure that assessment of candidate performance as prospective teachers begins early in the program and continues through recommendation for certification, is based on candidate ability to impact student learning, and that information from the assessment system is used to guide candidate progress in the program.
- Include in the assessment system performance-based observation instruments that are consistent with those used in Rhode Island PK-12 public schools and that include candidate



impact on student learning such as student learning objectives and student outcome objectives as measure of performance.

- Establish clear expectations for feedback to candidates that address issues of quantity, quality, alignment to standards, and that lead to candidate improvement. Establish and implement training and monitoring processes to ensure consistent and effective feedback to all candidates.

3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not have an assessment system that ensures that only candidates who demonstrate proficiency in the RIPTS are recommended for certification.	

- The program recommends candidates for certification based on completion of the Level IIIb portfolio review. The criteria for this review include successful completion of all previous portfolio reviews, successful completion of all courses, a minimum GPA of 2.75, and a minimum score on a weighted scoring scale of four assessments from student teaching: best of three observed lessons, a multi-lesson teaching event, and final evaluations by the PK-12 clinical educator and university clinical supervisor. Candidates are not required to complete state licensure tests to be recommended for certification by the program.
- The program assessment system is generally transparent to candidates. Candidates learn about the system upon admission to the program and throughout their coursework. Candidates also learn about and are supported to meet the expectations of the assessment system through individual advisement and group workshops. Candidates reported that they generally understood the assessment system and were well-supported to complete its requirements, particularly during years when portfolios were required and workshops were held.
- The program reported that it promotes consistent evaluation through admission and portfolio review teams that feature multiple assessors. The program also reported that it promotes consistent evaluation through the annual training of PK-12 clinical educators and through ongoing informal communication. The program provided evidence of a plan to institute training sessions for inter-rater reliability for faculty. Timelines for this process were not provided. The provider reported that the last training for inter-rater reliability was five years prior.
- As constituted, the assessment system does not have rigorous criteria or processes to ensure that candidates demonstrate proficiency in the full range of the RIPTS to receive a recommendation for certification. Candidates are determined to be proficient through general and inexact instruments and assessments that are not aligned to the standards or candidate impact on student learning. The structural inclusion of the error band in the final assessment instrument allows candidates to progress to recommendation for certification based on either proficient or developing scores.
- A review of candidate and program completer work as well as surveys and reports from program completers and employers demonstrated that the current assessment system recommends candidates for certification who are not ready to meet the full expectations of the standards on day one. Gaps between the expectations of the standards and completer readiness were



evident and reported in areas of classroom management, working with diverse students and families, integrating curriculum, using assessment instruments, and meeting professional responsibilities.

- The review team was also concerned about the transparency of the assessment system for candidates in years two and three and the absence of regular and ongoing structures to ensure consistent evaluation. Candidates in years two and three reported that unless they were specifically engaged in preparing a portfolio, the purpose, structure, and importance of the portfolio and assessment system was unclear and confusing. Consistent candidate assessment and feedback are limited by an absence of clear and common understanding of expected performance levels on program assessments and infrequent training of program faculty. PK-12 clinical educators are appropriately empowered to have a role in candidate assessment yet the vague and general assessment instruments, combined with limited training, inhibit their ability to consistently and effectively provide feedback and accurately assess candidate progress.

Recommendations

- Ensure that the recommendation for certification decision point in the new assessment system is grounded upon the RIPTS and that only candidates who demonstrate proficiency in the full range of the standards are recommended for certification.
- Work with district partners to ensure that the recommendation for certification decision point includes authentic assessments that encompass the full range of the RIPTS and professional standards and ensures that all candidates recommended for certification are fully prepared on day one to meet the learning needs of students.
- Work with program faculty and provider leadership to establish and implement processes to more fully communicate the assessment system, its purposes, schedules, and requirements to all candidates throughout the program sequence.
- Work with program faculty and provider leadership to establish and implement processes and structures to ensure consistent evaluation among program faculty, PK-12 clinical educators, and university supervisors.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program surveys employers but the process does not lead to actionable information for program improvement.	

- The program reported that it inconsistently surveys candidate employers and did not organize the survey by program. The surveys generated few responses across all programs and the responses are not sufficient to yield any meaningful assessment of employer satisfaction with program and candidate outcomes.



- An analysis of data from the Educator Preparation Index shows that program completer performance on educator evaluation instruments are comparable to other recent program completers.

Recommendations

- Establish and implement an annual process to survey employers of all program completers. Ensure that this process enables actionable information to support continuous program improvement including identification of the program.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program surveys program completers annually and the surveys generate some actionable information for program improvement.	

- The program surveys program completers annually. This process has evolved over time and the program reported that it is working to institutionalize an electronic and systematic process that will yield more substantial results.
- The surveys ask program completers about their perspectives on their preparation and readiness to serve on day one. The surveys do not track employment outcomes.
- The responses from the last three years generally show that candidates were pleased with their preparation while identifying several gaps in their preparation in which they were not as well-prepared including working with diverse learners and families, classroom management, integrating curriculum, using assessment instruments, and meeting professional responsibilities.
- The program provided evidence of several changes made to the program design based on program completer feedback including additional course and clinical experiences.

Recommendations

- Finalize the process to survey program completers annually on their perspective on their preparation and their employment outcomes and status. Ensure that this process yields sufficient responses by program to generate actionable feedback for program improvement.

Secondary Education Program

Overview: The Secondary Education program is an undergraduate-level program that leads to a combined Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science degree in Secondary Education and either Biology, Chemistry, History, English, or Mathematics. Candidates must earn between forty-five and fifty-four credits, depending on content area, from between thirteen and sixteen education courses organized across three secondary education curriculum levels, Levels I, II, and III. Candidates also must complete major requirements for their content major as well as required courses as part of Roger Williams University Core Concentration. Candidates are required to complete field experiences working with secondary students throughout the program.



Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop a general understanding of and proficiency in the RIPTS while experiencing a consistent course and field-based curriculum.	

- The program reported that it is “standards-based, all course instruction, field experiences, and the performance assessment system are designed according to the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards and individual content standards. Syllabi are aligned with the RIPTS and in the cases of multiple sections of the same courses, syllabi and aligned with each other.”
- Candidates first complete two introductory courses, typically in their freshmen year in Level I: EDU 200: Foundations of Education and EDU 202: Psychology of Learning and Development. During sophomore and junior year candidates complete as part of Level II general pedagogical courses focusing on technology, multicultural education, special education, literacy, and health education as well as three or four methods courses specific to a candidate’s content area. During senior year candidates complete a practicum and student teaching placement and a capstone and student teaching seminar as part of Level III.
- The program has a recommended course sequence that some candidates struggle to follow due to requirements from their content major courses as well as other factors such as late admissions, student schedules, and travel-abroad opportunities. Most general pedagogical and content courses have only one section taught by one faculty member. Some courses have multiple sections and may be taught by multiple faculty members.
- Program materials, program syllabi, and particularly the assessment system portfolio process are organized by and aligned to the RIPTS. Candidates often are required to include references to the standards when they complete lesson plans, tasks, and projects. For the portfolios, candidates are required to submit reflective essays in which they assert and justify how the completed artifacts demonstrate that they meet the expectations of the RIPTS.
- Candidates reported that they were generally aware of the standards. They reported they were introduced to the standards during the admission process and in the Level 1 courses. Candidates reported that they developed a general understanding of the standards through general pedagogical courses, some content methods courses, and their field-based learning experiences. Candidates also reported that they most frequently worked with the standards while compiling their portfolios. This may explain why candidates in the middle of the program, sophomores and juniors, were less familiar with the standards since they had last completed a portfolio in their freshmen year.
- The review team found that candidates were aware of the standards at the general and familiar level described by candidates. Candidates at all levels of the programs could not name specific standards but were aware of the broad concepts and some specific expectations such as using a variety of assessment practices, meeting the needs of all learners, and understanding developmental continuums. Candidates later in the program who were in practicum placements in PK-12 schools reported opportunities to apply expectations from the standards when working



with students such as developing and implementing assessments, integrating technology in lessons, and working on small group instructional strategies.

- Candidates were knowledgeable of and their work demonstrated proficiency in several areas of the standards. Understanding how children learn and develop (RIPTS 3), encouraging students’ critical thinking (RIPTS 5), creating supportive learning environments (RIPTS 6), reflecting on practice and professional responsibility (RIPTS 10), and maintaining professional standards (RIPTS 11) were areas of strength. Candidates did not demonstrate proficiency and strong practice in creating learning experiences with a broad base of knowledge (RIPTS 1), having a deep content base to create learning experiences (RIPTS 2), creating learning opportunities to meet the needs of all learners (RIPTS 4), working collaboratively with school communities (RIPTS 7), using effective communication (RIPTS 8), using effective assessment practice and modifying instruction (RIPTS 9).
- Candidates experience a consistent curriculum within the general pedagogical courses, both those shared with the other teacher preparation programs and those specific to secondary education. Candidates experience a less consistent curriculum within and across the content methods courses. Some content methods courses include a strong emphasis on knowledge and application of the standards whereas this emphasis was less present in others.

Recommendations

- Explore and implement methods to communicate better, more purposefully, and more systematically the content and foundations of the RIPTS through courses and field-based learning experiences in addition to the current emphasis in the portfolio process.
- Strengthen aspects of the program of study and curriculum to increase opportunities for candidates to develop deep understanding and demonstrate proficiency in the full range of the RIPTS including Standards 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, and 9.
- Work with content methods faculty to develop a common and consistent approach to course design and instruction across each secondary content area to ensure that the RIPTS are equally emphasized in all content areas.

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop a general understanding of and proficiency in the content standards for secondary education through their courses and field-based experiences.	

- The program reported that courses and field experiences are generally aligned to the professional standards for each respective content area: National Council for Teachers of English (NCTE), National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), and the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA). The program reported that it recognizes the need to further emphasize the professional content standards throughout the program and consistently across content areas.



- Candidates learn about their content areas primarily through their Arts and Sciences content major courses. Each candidate is required to complete a second major in either biology, chemistry, English, history, or mathematics. These courses focus on the content for the field but do not include or integrate the expectations of the professional content associations or for the associated expectations for teaching content and instructional practices in PK-12 schools. Candidate content knowledge is generally further strengthened within the content methods courses completed for the secondary education program while they also focus on content-specific pedagogical practices.
- Although some content methods course syllabi and materials referenced the professional standards, these were tangential and limited, such as encouragement to join the National Science Teachers Association and using resources from the association in EDU 392: Teaching Secondary Science Through Inquiry. Consistent with the elementary education program, faculty and course materials often confuse professional content standards such as the National Council for Teachers of English preparation standards with PK-12 student learning standard for English language arts embedded in the Common Core State Standards.
- The program reported that a strength of the secondary program is that all candidates complete at least three content methods course in their discipline. Recent changes to the program have combined the third course, a capstone course, so that it no longer is a content-specific course but a combined general methods course taught by faculty with expertise in only one content area. As such, candidates now miss an additional opportunity to develop proficiency in the expectations of their professional standards.
- Candidate knowledge of and proficiency in the expectations of the professional content standards varied considerably across candidates and across content areas. Some candidates reported, and their work confirmed, strong knowledge of their content and proficiency in designing and implementing instruction consistent with the expectations of the professional standards. Some candidates were less knowledgeable and proficient; some were not aware at all, even when prompted, of the professional standards for their content area. This inconsistency in knowledge and proficiency was echoed by clinical educators.
- Candidates were generally proficient in these expectations of the professional standards:
 - English: knowledge of English language arts (NCTE 1), plan instruction and design assessments (NCTE 3), knowledge of social justice, diversity, equity (NCTE 6)
 - History: content knowledge (NCSS 1)
 - Mathematics: mathematical practices (NCTM 2), professional knowledge and skills (NCTM 6), field experiences and practice (NCTM 7)
 - Science: content knowledge (NSTA 1), learning environments (NSTA 2)
- Candidates were less proficient in these expectations of the professional standards:
 - English: knowledge of language and writing (NCTE 2), plan instruction and design assessments for composing texts (NCTE 4), motivation and active student engagement (Standard 5), interactions with students, families, and colleagues (NCTE 7)
 - History: application of content through planning (NCSS 2), data and Implementation of instruction and assessment (NCSS 3), social studies learners and learning (NCSS 4), professional responsibility and informed action (NCSS 5)



- Mathematics: content knowledge (NCTM 1), content pedagogy (NCTM 3), mathematical learning environment (NCTM 4), impact on student learning (NCTM 5)
- Science: content pedagogy (NSTA 3), safety (NSTA 4), impact on student learning (NSTA 5), professional knowledge and skills (NSTA 6)
- The program curriculum requires candidates to complete a one-credit health methods course. Program faculty reported this course was included in the program of study to meet state requirements. Rhode Island does not require this course.

Recommendations

- Work with program faculty to articulate a clear vision of the appropriate professional standards for the secondary program and each content area and consistently communicate these standards and expectations to program candidates.
- Explore and implement methods to communicate better, more purposefully, and more systematically the content and foundations of the professional standards throughout the program of study and how these expectations translate to secondary education instruction beginning in Level I courses and through program completion.
- Strengthen aspects of the program of study and curriculum to increase opportunities for candidates to develop deep understanding and demonstrate proficiency in the full range of the professional standards, particularly the areas cited above as areas of growth for candidates.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Standards
Candidates develop a general understanding of Rhode Island PK-12 student learning standards and demonstrate basic skills in designing and implementing lessons and assessing learning consistent with the standards.	

- Candidates are introduced to PK-12 student learning standards during the Level I courses. Candidates are presented information about the standards, their expectations for student learning, the organization of instruction, and are encouraged to download and become familiar with the standards. The Level I courses as well as the general pedagogical courses prioritize the CCSS for English language arts and mathematics.
- Candidates complete two or more content methods courses during their second and third year in the program. These courses emphasize PK-12 student learning standards to varying degrees and to varying degrees of depth and complexity. The CCSS for English language arts and mathematics as well as the NGSS are referenced in course syllabi. The Rhode Island Grade Span Expectations for social studies were not included or referenced. Course requirements also vary; in some courses candidates must integrate the student standards into lessons they develop, other courses do not require it.



- Although candidates learn about their content areas in the Arts and Science content courses, the courses do not include or focus on PK-12 student learning standards. Because the general pedagogical courses are shared with elementary program candidates as well as candidates from all content areas, the courses tend to have a stronger focus on common areas of PK-12 student learning standards, primarily in the area of literacy. As such, these courses do not support candidates to develop depth and proficiency in the student learning standards for their content area.
- An inherent challenge in the program is that some secondary candidates spend a considerable amount of time in clinical placements at high schools in Massachusetts. While some student learning standards are common across state lines, this is not the same for all content areas, especially social studies. Additionally, emphasis and specific expected instructional practices to design and implement standards-based lesson vary across states, which can present a challenge to developing secondary educators. As reported by a secondary candidate, it was necessary to relearn Rhode Island standards at the conclusion of a Massachusetts placement.
- Candidate knowledge and proficiency in PK-12 student learning standards reflected the inconsistent approach and emphasis evident in the program, courses, and clinical experiences. Most candidates had a general awareness of the student learning standards, but not at a depth or breadth necessary to design, implement, and assess PK-12 student learning to ensure their proficiency in the standards. Candidates typically included student learning standards in their lessons as a requirement, rather than recognizing the organizing structure of the standards and how the standards represented an overarching pathway to student achievement and growth in the content areas.

Recommendations

- Review the structure of the overall secondary program as it relates to PK-12 student learning standards. Revise this structure to ensure that PK-12 student learning standards in all secondary content areas are presented in a coherent and developmentally appropriate manner throughout the program, beginning early in the program and through program completion.
- Work with program faculty to ensure that there is a consistent approach to address PK-12 student learning standards in each content area that ensures depth and breadth of understanding and application.
- Establish and implement common assessment measures in the secondary program to ensure that candidates in all content areas and in all clinical placements are required to demonstrate proficiency in designing, implementing, and assessing student progress towards the student learning standards in order for candidates to progress in the program.



1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Approaching Standards
Candidates develop a general understanding of the core principles and practices of assessment and data-driven instruction and develop basic skills in these areas.	

- Candidates are provided a general understanding of the principles and practices of assessment throughout the program. Common assessment approaches and practices such as informal and formal assessment, standardized assessment, and unit-based assessments are introduced in Level I courses. While these general principles and practices are referenced repeatedly throughout the program, the program and courses do not provide additional opportunities for candidates to develop and apply deeper knowledge and understanding of assessment.
- Candidates complete several “contextual factor reports” in which they explore multiple data sources such as school and student achievement, student and community characteristics, and other factors that help to explain a school and its students. The program does not require candidates to go beyond looking at contextual data to develop general understandings of the contexts of schools. Candidates are not taught or required to analyze school, class, or student learning data, to identify specific learning needs, to design instruction to meet these needs, or to reflect on practice to adjust and modify instruction based on assessment data.
- The content methods courses and the general pedagogical courses do not prioritize assessment practices or focus on any content-specific assessment practices and approaches within a discipline. Candidates are required to design lessons and unit plans and are not provided clear direction as to appropriate and effective assessments consistent with the lessons.
- Candidates reported that they understood the role of assessment and that all instruction should include processes to assess student learning. Candidates generally understood that they should reflect on their lessons, but their emphasis was to focus on how well the lesson went rather than what students actually learned, how this should inform their practice, and how they should make specific changes to instruction based on student data and student learning needs.
- The review team found candidate knowledge, understanding, and proficiency of assessment and data-driven instruction consistent with the general approach embodied in the program curriculum. The program provides little opportunity for candidates to develop and implement multiple forms of assessment practices beyond general quizzes, tests, exit tickets, or observation and reflection protocols. Candidates learn about contextual data but do not learn about aggregating and disaggregating student learning data from multiple assessments. Candidates have limited exposure and opportunity to go beyond general reflection on lesson outcomes to concrete, explicit processes to assess student learning and to make targeted, data-driven changes in instructional practice and lesson design.

Recommendations

- Examine the full-range of assessment practices and data-driven instruction articulated in the professional standards for secondary education programs and currently in use in Rhode Island secondary schools. Conduct a gap-analysis to identify and close gaps between the current curriculum and these expectations. The program should consider if an additional course in assessment and data-driven instruction would best achieve this outcome.



- Integrate, particularly in the content methods courses, explicit instruction and practice in the full-range of assessment and data-driven instructional practices expected in secondary schools and for each content area. Ensure that this instruction ranges from general approaches and practices to more complex and content-specific practices.
- Implement in the program curriculum explicit instruction and practice in how to use student assessment data to evaluate and modify instructional practices.
- Integrate into the program assessment system specific performance-based requirements to ensure that candidates demonstrate proficiency in the full-range of assessment practices and data-driven instruction to progress in the program.

1.5 Technology	Meets Expectations
Candidates develop and demonstrate proficiency in integrating technology and digital age work, learning, and communication in their practice.	

- Candidates are introduced to multiple technologies and tools, platforms, and hardware for digital age work, learning, and communication early in the program and are expected and required to develop and demonstrate proficiency in these as they progress in the program.
- Candidates participate in EDU 306: Classroom Applications of Technology at the Middle and Secondary School Level early in the program sequence, which provides direct and explicit instruction, practice, and assessment in technologies and digital age practices expected of prospective secondary teachers.
- Candidate knowledge, skills, and proficiency in technology and digital age practices are further developed through specific technology instruction and practices integrated throughout the program including communicating and collaborating through online platforms, using multiple technologies for lesson planning and instruction, and exploring online resources for research, data, and tools available to grow their capacity and effectiveness as teachers.
- Candidates learn about content-specific technologies in their content methods courses and assistive technologies, applications, and resources available to support students with special needs in EDU 356: Middle and Secondary Level Special Education Practice. Candidates, program completers, and clinical educators reported that candidates develop key knowledge and skills in the use of technology and digital age practices and strengthen these during their clinical placements.

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop an understanding of issues of bias, diversity, equity, and social justice and demonstrate basic skills in meeting the needs of diverse learners.	

- Candidates are introduced to issues of bias, diversity, equity, and social justice early in the program in Level I courses. This introduction is at a general level and requires candidates to explore how students learn, the goal of meeting the needs of all students, and the need to explore individual backgrounds and biases.



- Candidate theoretical knowledge of issues of equity and diversity are strengthened through EDU 330: Issues in Multicultural Education and EDU 356: Middle and Secondary School Level Special Education Practice. In these courses candidates learn about historical, structural, and current challenges to equity in public schools. Candidates also learn general strategies and approaches that are designed to meet the needs of all learners.
- Beyond these courses, candidates are provided limited opportunities to learn about and practice designing and implementing instruction that meets the needs of English language learners, students with special needs, and students from other identified groups. The content methods courses make general references to modifying instruction and require candidates to identify how they might adapt lesson plans, but explicit instruction in how to do this is largely absent. Throughout the program, candidates are also not required to deeply reflect on their own biases and consider the worldview of others or the potential for implicit bias when working with students from diverse backgrounds.
- Candidates also receive little opportunities to learn about and practice working with families in diverse communities. Candidates receive general instruction in Level I and Level II courses as well as topics of seminar sessions in Level III courses. However, this exposure is at a general level of best practices and does not require actual interaction with families.
- Candidate clinical placements also limit candidate proficiency in working with students and families from diverse backgrounds and communities. While all candidates are required to have clinical placements in diverse settings, for some candidates, their only experience is during Level I courses when they are only required to observe and reflect on what they see in classrooms and schools rather than actually working with students and families from diverse backgrounds and communities.
- The review team found that as a result of the program and course design, candidates only develop basic skills when working with students and families from diverse backgrounds and communities. Candidates and program completers echoed this and reported that they did not feel well-prepared to work with all students and families.

Recommendations

- Work with program faculty and provider leadership to review the secondary program structure and sequence as it pertains to issues of equity. Revise the structure and sequence of the program to ensure that issues of equity and diversity are presented in a coherent and developmentally appropriate manner throughout the program, beginning early in the program and through program completion.
- Work with program faculty and field-based partners and practitioners to identify specific and effective instructional practices that are necessary to meet the needs of diverse learners. Integrate these practices and assess candidates' competence in these practices as part of their general and content method courses to ensure that candidates not only develop an awareness of diversity and equity but also specific skills and capacities to meet the needs of all learners.



- Provide all candidates explicit instruction and practice in how to work with families in diverse communities. Ensure that this instruction and practice moves beyond theoretical course and seminar topics to actual engagement with families in diverse settings.
- Integrate into the program curriculum explicit opportunities, practices, and requirements that candidates engage in purposeful reflection on individual and implicit bias to best prepare candidates to work equitably with all learners.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop a general understanding of Rhode Island initiatives, educational laws, and policies.	

- Candidates are introduced to Rhode Island initiatives, educational laws, and policies early in the program and throughout the course sequence. All course syllabi list several initiatives that are focus areas for the course, that will serve as the basis for assignments, and that are connected to the standards.
- General pedagogical courses such as EDU 306: Classroom Applications of Technology at the Middle and Secondary Level and EDU 356: Middle and Secondary Level Special Education Practice emphasize initiatives that reflect the course focus. Content methods courses also identify specific initiatives that are focus areas for the courses.
- Candidates reported that they were generally aware of initiatives and policies such as bullying, social emotional learning, state assessments, and student learning standards. Candidates were less familiar with critical initiatives for secondary educators such as educator evaluation and student learning objectives, the Rhode Island diploma system, and individual learning plans.
- Some candidates also confused previous practices as current initiatives, such as identifying the New England Common Assessment Program as the state assessment program instead of the Rhode Island Comprehensive Assessment System and Grade Span Expectations as student learning standards instead of Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards.
- The program listed in course syllabi specific components of the RISEP, particularly student learning standards, assessment, technology, equity, and RI initiatives, as if these were candidate learning requirements, rather than required design elements for the program of study.

Recommendations

- Work with program faculty and field-based partners and practitioners to identify critical Rhode Island initiatives and educational laws and policies most appropriate for secondary educators. Integrate these in a deliberate, strategic, and developmentally appropriate manner across the program curriculum.



- Conduct an audit of the program curriculum, course syllabi, and course materials to ensure that only current initiatives, policies, and laws are presented to candidates as current practices to minimize confusion and ensure currency in knowledge.
- Develop and implement an authentic assessment of Rhode Island initiatives and educational policies and laws and integrate this into the candidate assessment system to ensure candidates develop a deep understanding and demonstrate proficiency in integrating these into their practice.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Meets Expectations
The program ensures that candidates experience wide-ranging, developmentally-appropriate, and coherent clinical experiences.	

- Clinical experiences begin immediately in Level I courses. Candidates are required to conduct targeted observations in school settings to reflect and build upon course learning and to examine contextual data from PK-12 schools and students. Candidates reported that these early field experiences are important opportunities to experience school culture and to get early glimpses into the expectations for teachers.
- Candidates complete additional clinical learning and application experiences as part of Level II courses. Each of the courses has requirements that include observations, lesson plan development, small group instruction and tutoring, school and student data analysis, and other activities through which candidates apply and reflect upon course-based learning.
- The secondary program is in the process of trying to create ‘residency-type’ experiences similar to those created for elementary program candidates in year two. As such, some Level II general pedagogical and content methods courses have created structures in which candidates and course faculty are in field sites at the same time to more fully integrate course and field-based learning and to provide real-time supervision. The program reported that these expanded opportunities are a benefit for candidates but also create scheduling and logistical challenges due to candidate responsibilities to both their education and Arts and Sciences majors.
- During year four as part of Level III courses, candidates complete a practicum placement and a fourteen-week student teaching placement. Candidates and program completers reported that their clinical experiences were critical opportunities to connect what they learned in their courses with the realities of PK-12 schools. The review team concurred with this assessment and found the sequence of clinical experiences to reflect course content and to support candidate growth and development.
- The program should continue to find additional ways to increase candidate field experiences during Level II courses while navigating the challenges inherent for secondary candidates who have dual majors. The program should closely monitor and consult with candidates regarding field placements in Massachusetts schools. Some candidates reported that they felt limited in their integration of course content and overall preparation as most of their clinical experiences happened in schools in Massachusetts, which required additional hurdles to navigate two



different contexts. The program also should monitor closely the diversity of field experiences in which candidates participate to ensure that all candidates have opportunities, in addition to the Level I experiences, to practice in diverse settings. The program should also look for additional, authentic opportunities for candidates to practice and engage in clinical experiences with families in diverse communities.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Approaching Expectations
The program prioritizes candidate impact on student learning but has not established clear measures of impact on student learning that guide candidate progress in the program.	

- The program reported that candidate impact on student learning is a program priority and that this priority is clearly communicated to program candidates. The program reported that this expectation is articulated in course syllabi, assignments that require candidates to reflect on the efficacy of their lessons, and in reflective essays that candidates complete as part of the portfolio assessment system.
- Candidates reported that they recognized that having a positive impact on student learning was the essential role of a teacher and they felt the program supported them to develop skills and capacity in this area. Program completers also reported that having an impact on student learning was an emphasis of the program and they felt well-prepared to support students to meet student learning goals and standards.
- Beyond the general appreciation of the importance of candidate impact on student learning, the program has not built structures and systems both to ensure candidate impact on student learning and to use this impact to guide and inform candidate progress in the program. The program reported that “it is poised to begin systematically collecting and analyzing data on candidate impact on student learning” but has not yet done created or implemented these processes.
- The program provided lists of “useful tools” and “trustworthy assessments” that range from classroom assessments, observation protocols, and teaching strategies as evidence of how it instructs candidates to measure impact on student learning. The program did not provide evidence of any clearly identified measures of candidate impact on student learning that were developed in conjunction with clinical partners, that were clearly understood by candidates, and that were used to gather data of candidate impact on student learning to guide progress throughout the program, all expectations of these standards.

Recommendations

- Work with clinical partners to establish clearly articulated and appropriate measures of impact on candidate learning that progress from early clinical experiences and increase in demand and expectations through student teaching.
- Establish processes to collect and analyze data from candidate impact on student learning to inform candidate progress in the program and to improve candidate ability to impact student learning.



2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has several formal and informal partnerships but has not established methods and processes to ensure the partnerships are mutually beneficial.	

- The program reported that its formal partners are the schools and districts in which it places candidates for clinical experiences, particularly student teaching placements. The program provided signed agreements for student teaching placements as evidence of the partnerships. The program also reported that it has additional informal partnerships with schools and districts based on personal and historical relationships as well as common projects and goal areas.
- The program reported and many clinical partners agreed that the Roger Williams University programs are responsive to the needs of the field and that the sharing and training of candidates, involvement in grant-funded professional development initiatives that arise from faculty interests and initiatives, and access to the university’s resources are mutually beneficial to the candidates, programs, and partners.
- The program has shared its expectations for candidate performance with its partners, uses common assessment tools, and integrates PK-12 clinical educator input into decisions regarding candidate progression in the program.
- The program did not provide evidence that it has worked with its partners to establish agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness and that it monitors and analyzes data from the mutually-agreed upon indicators of effectiveness to make improvements to the partnership.

Recommendations

- Work with clinical partners to establish agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness to ensure mutually beneficial partnerships that support program and partnership improvement.
- Work with clinical partners to establish processes to monitor and analyze data from the agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness and use this information to improve both the partnership and program design and implementation.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program has not established processes to ensure that candidates are supervised and supported by clinical educators who meet appropriate, established criteria.	

- The program has established criteria for PK-12 clinical educators. These criteria include possessing a continuing contract, being appropriately certified for their grade level and content area, having a minimum of three years’ teaching experience, whose practice is consistent with standards-based education, and who are willing to participate in clinical educator training.
- The program reported that it secures prospective clinical educators by informing partnership districts how many placements are needed and then receiving a list of PK-12 educators who are willing to serve in the role. The program reported that it does not have the ability to proactively select clinical educators or identify appropriate settings and placements.



- The program recruits, supports, and trains university supervisors who meet established criteria, some of whom also serve as full-time or adjunct faculty. The role of the university supervisor is to serve as a liaison between the program and PK-12 clinical educators. University supervisors also provide on-the-ground support for PK-12 clinical educators and trouble-shoot placement issues and problems that may arise with candidates.
- The program reported that clinical educators are required to attend an annual half-day training in which clinical educators learn about program and course requirements, assessment instruments, and the sequence of clinical experiences. Clinical educators reported that they recognize the importance of their role and appreciate the opportunity to work with the program and help to mold future educators. Program faculty and provider leadership reported that clinical educators are critical to the success of the program and its candidates and that they provide authentic and practitioner-based wisdom on current practice in the field.
- The program shared instruments that are used by university supervisors and candidates to evaluate the effectiveness of clinical educators and their clinical placements. The program also provided evidence that some clinical educators were not retained who received notably poor ratings by university supervisors and candidates.
- The review team found that the criteria for clinical educators and the process used to select clinical educators do not meet the expectation of the RISEP and do not ensure that all candidates are supervised by effective and appropriate clinical educators. The criteria established by the RISEP require that all clinical educators at minimum must be trained in the ability to work with adult learners, coaching, and supervision skills, be able to evaluate performance and provide feedback, and be highly effective educators. These criteria are not included in the program's criteria. The standards also establish that only educators who meet these criteria are to serve in the role of clinical educator. The program allows districts to select clinical educators, regardless of their qualifications.
- The program provided evidence that it conducts an annual, half-day training for PK-12 clinical educators. The program did not provide evidence that attendance is required or that the training is sufficient to ensure that clinical educators are fully-prepared for their roles and fully proficient in the assessment system tools and expectations for candidate feedback.

Recommendations

- Work with program faculty and staff and clinical partners to review the expectations for clinical partnerships and clinical educators articulated in the RISEP. Establish criteria for clinical educators consistent with the expectations of these standards as the minimal requirements for all clinical educators.
- Establish a selection process that is controlled by the provider and its programs that ensures that only clinical educators who meet the established criteria are eligible to serve as clinical educators.



- Work with program faculty and staff, clinical partners, and university supervisors to establish and implement more rigorous and ongoing training and support processes to ensure that PK-12 clinical educators are fully prepared in the assessment system tools, processes, and expectations for candidate feedback.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not have a valid and reliable, performance-based assessment system that is grounded in the RIPTS, based on candidate impact on student learning, and that determines candidate progress throughout the program.	

- The program has an extensive and clearly defined assessment system called by the provider the “Performance Assessment System.” The assessment system has four levels each of which is based on portfolios and timelines that include specified products and assessments that candidates compile and submit for review at designated points in the program – at the completion of Level I, Level II, Level IIIa and Level IIIb courses.
- The requirements for the portfolios vary and increase over time. Level I and II portfolios focus primarily on artifacts and key assessments that candidates complete in their courses. Accompanying the artifacts are reflective essays in which candidates explain and justify knowledge of specified professional standards as evidenced by the artifacts. The Level IIIa and Level IIIb portfolios focus primarily on assessments of candidate performance during practicum and student teaching.
- In order to progress through the program candidates must successfully complete each portfolio review, earn a minimum 2.75 GPA, complete specified clinical experiences, conduct a readiness to student teach presentation, pass disposition assessments, and meet all program and university requirements.
- Candidates receive feedback on their progress through their courses, assignments, and clinical experiences, the portfolio review process, through observations of their practice, through formal and informal advisement and mentoring, and through a student support protocol that is available to candidates who struggle to meet program requirements and expectations. The provider shared evidence that four candidates were involved in the student support protocol process at the time of the review.
- The review team found that the assessment system requires candidates to complete many tasks and assessments which begin early in preparation and continue throughout the program; however, the amount, meaningfulness, and alignment of the broad range of required tasks in the assessment system was not clear. The review team also questioned the practice of allowing candidates to repeatedly revise and resubmit work rather than having established standards for quality and revision.
- Candidates receive varied and inconsistent feedback dependent on the individual providing the feedback, the type of task or assessment completed, and the format in which it was submitted. Some faculty and clinical educators provide explicit, standards-based feedback whereas others



provide limited or global feedback disconnected from the standards without clear paths for improvement. It was not clear to the review team that the amount and quality of feedback that candidates receive on work and tasks submitted through the electronic course management system, Taskstream, was supportive of candidate improvement.

- As constituted, the assessment system does not prioritize candidate performance aligned to the professional standards. The program uses the 2004 Professional Teaching Competencies from the New Teacher Center as the basis for its assessment of candidate performance. The program uses observation tools and assessment instruments that were developed more than ten years ago and retroactively aligned these to the expectations of the RIPTS. The tools and instruments also follow a holistic approach to assessment that is no longer current or consistent with instruments used in Rhode Island schools. The observation instruments include wide error bands between performance levels allowing a candidate who does not meet expectations to still pass the assessment based on the individual judgment of the assessor and their individual interpretation of the instrument.
- The assessment system also does not prioritize candidate impact on student learning. Candidates are assessed using general, holistic instruments on their overall performance in PK-12 classrooms. The assessment instruments contain broad goal statements such as “Engaging and Supporting all Students Learning” and “Assessing Student Learning” and include text boxes for assessors to record observations, areas of strength, and areas for growth. Candidates are assessed across six general competencies, none of which prioritizes or measures how well candidates implement, assess, and modify instruction to ensure PK-12 student proficiency.
- The program did not provide evidence that it uses information from the assessment system to target areas of candidate need and provide supports consistent with the information. Rather, candidates complete the required tasks and assessments and as long as they meet minimal requirements, proceed through the program. The program reported that it has counseled several candidates out of the program resulting from a variety of factors such as poor achievement, dispositional issues, and changing candidate interest.

Recommendations

- Work with School of Humanities, Arts, and Education leadership to identify a person or persons with expertise in performance-based assessment systems. Work with these individuals and provider leadership to develop, pilot, and implement a valid, reliable, and performance-based assessment system that is based on the professional standards for secondary teachers and consistent with the expectations of the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation.
- Ensure that assessment of candidate performance as prospective teachers begins early in the program and continues through recommendation for certification, is based on candidate ability to impact student learning, and that information from the assessment system is used to guide candidate progress in the program.
- Include in the assessment system performance-based observation instruments that are consistent with those used in Rhode Island PK-12 public schools and that include candidate



impact on student learning such as student learning objectives and student outcome objectives as measure of performance.

- Establish clear expectations for feedback to candidates that address issues of quantity, quality, alignment to standards, and that lead to candidate improvement. Establish and implement training and monitoring processes to ensure consistent and effective feedback to all candidates.

3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not have an assessment system that ensures that only candidates who demonstrate proficiency in the RIPTS are recommended for certification.	

- The program recommends candidates for certification based on completion of the Level IIIb portfolio review. The criteria for this review include successful completion of all previous portfolio reviews, successful completion of all courses, a minimum GPA of 2.75, and a minimum score on a weighted scoring scale of four assessments from student teaching: best of three observed lessons, a multi-lesson teaching event, and final evaluations by the PK-12 clinical educator and university clinical supervisor. Candidates are not required to complete state licensure tests to be recommended for certification by the program.
- The program assessment system is generally transparent to candidates. Candidates learn about the system upon admission to the program and throughout their coursework. Candidates also learn about and are supported to meet the expectations of the assessment system through individual advisement and group workshops. Candidates reported that they generally understood the assessment system and were well-supported to complete its requirements, particularly during years when portfolios were required and workshops were held.
- The program reported that it promotes consistent evaluation through admission and portfolio review teams that feature multiple assessors. The program also reported that it promotes consistent evaluation through the annual training of PK-12 clinical educators and through ongoing informal communication. The program provided evidence of a plan to institute training sessions for inter-rater reliability for faculty. Timelines for this process were not provided. The provider reported that the last training for inter-rater reliability was five years prior.
- As constituted, the assessment system does not have rigorous criteria or processes to ensure that candidates demonstrate proficiency in the full range of the RIPTS to receive a recommendation for certification. Candidates are determined to be proficient through general and inexact instruments and assessments that are not aligned to the standards or candidate impact on student learning. The structural inclusion of the error band in the final assessment instrument allows candidates to progress to recommendation for certification based on either proficient or developing scores.
- A review of candidate and program completer work as well as surveys and reports from program completers and employers demonstrated that the current assessment system recommends candidates for certification who are not ready to meet the full expectations of the standards on day one. Gaps between the expectations of the standards and completer readiness were evident and reported in areas of classroom management, working with diverse students and



families, integrating curriculum, using assessment instruments, and meeting professional responsibilities.

- The review team was also concerned about the transparency of the assessment system for candidates in years two and three and the absence of regular and ongoing structures to ensure consistent evaluation. Candidates in years two and three reported that unless they were specifically engaged in preparing a portfolio, the purpose, structure, and importance of the portfolio and assessment system was unclear and confusing. Consistent candidate assessment and feedback are limited by an absence of clear and common understanding of expected performance levels on program assessments and infrequent training of program faculty. PK-12 clinical educators are appropriately empowered to have a role in candidate assessment yet the vague and general assessment instruments, combined with limited training, inhibit their ability to consistently and effectively provide feedback and accurately assess candidate progress.

Recommendations

- Ensure that the recommendation for certification decision point in the new assessment system is grounded upon the RIPTS and that only candidates who demonstrate proficiency in the full range of the standards are recommended for certification.
- Work with district partners to ensure that the recommendation for certification decision point includes authentic assessments that encompass the full range of the RIPTS and professional standards and ensures that all candidates recommended for certification are fully prepared on day one to meet the learning needs of students.
- Work with program faculty and provider leadership to establish and implement processes to more fully communicate the assessment system, its purposes, schedules, and requirements to all candidates throughout the program sequence.
- Work with program faculty and provider leadership to establish and implement processes and structures to ensure consistent evaluation among program faculty, PK-12 clinical educators, and university supervisors.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program surveys employers but the process does not lead to actionable information for program improvement.	

- The program reported that it inconsistently surveys candidate employers and did not organize the survey by program. The surveys generated few responses across all programs and the responses are not sufficient to yield any meaningful assessment of employer satisfaction with program and candidate outcomes.
- An analysis of data from the Educator Preparation Index shows that program completer performance on educator evaluation instruments are comparable to other recent program completers.



Recommendations

- Establish and implement an annual process to survey employers of all program completers. Ensure that this process enables actionable information to support continuous program improvement including identification of the program.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program surveys program completers annually and the surveys generate some actionable information for program improvement.	

- The program surveys program completers annually. This process has evolved over time and the program reported that it is working to institutionalize an electronic and systematic process that will yield more substantial results.
- The surveys ask program completers about their perspectives on their preparation and readiness to serve on day one. The surveys do not track employment outcomes.
- The responses from the last three years generally show that candidates were pleased with their preparation while identifying several gaps in their preparation in which they were not as well-prepared including working with diverse learners and families, classroom management, integrating curriculum, using assessment instruments, and meeting professional responsibilities.
- The program provided evidence of several changes made to the program design based on program completer feedback including additional course and clinical experiences.

Recommendations

- Finalize the process to survey program completers annually on their perspective on their preparation and their employment outcomes and status. Ensure that this process yields sufficient responses by program to generate actionable feedback for program improvement.

All Grades Education Program

Overview: The All Grades Education program is an undergraduate-level program that leads to a combined Bachelor of Arts degree in Secondary Education and World languages, concentrating in either French, German, Italian, Latin, or Spanish. Candidates must earn forty-five credits across three secondary education curriculum levels, Levels I, II, and III. Candidates also must complete Arts and Sciences major requirements for World Languages as well as required courses as part of Roger Williams University Core Concentration. Candidates are required to complete field experiences working with secondary students throughout the program.

The provider has not established an All Grades educator preparation program designed to prepare prospective teachers to teach students from grades PK through grades twelve, the certification range for which candidates recommended for All Grades certification are eligible to teach. The provider’s current structure requires that world language candidates complete their preparation through the secondary education program that is designed to prepare candidates to teach only students in grades seven through twelve.



Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop a general understanding of and proficiency in the RIPTS while experiencing a consistent course and field-based curriculum.	

- The program reported that it is “standards-based, all course instruction, field experiences, and the performance assessment system are designed according to the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards and individual content standards. Syllabi are aligned with the RIPTS and in the cases of multiple sections of the same courses, syllabi are aligned with each other.”
- Candidates first complete two introductory courses, typically in their freshmen year in Level I: EDU 200: Foundations of Education and EDU 202: Psychology of Learning and Development. During sophomore and junior year candidates complete as part of Level II, general pedagogical courses focusing on technology, multicultural education, special education, literacy, and health education as well as three content methods courses for World Languages. During senior year candidates complete a practicum and student teaching placement and a capstone and student teaching seminar as part of Level III.
- The program has a recommended course sequence that some candidates struggle to follow due to requirements from their content major courses as well as other factors such as late admissions, student schedules, and travel-abroad opportunities. Most general pedagogical and content courses have only one section taught by one faculty member. Some of the general pedagogical courses are taught by multiple faculty members.
- Program materials, program syllabi, and particularly the assessment system portfolio process are organized by and aligned to the RIPTS. Candidates often are required to include references to the standards when they complete lesson plans, tasks, and projects. For the portfolios, candidates are required to submit reflective essays in which they assert and justify how completed artifacts demonstrate meeting expectations of the RIPTS.
- Candidates reported that they were generally aware of the RIPTS. They reported that they were introduced to the RIPTS during the admission process and in the Level I courses. Candidates reported that they developed a general understanding of the standards through general pedagogical courses, some content methods courses, and their field-based learning experiences. Candidates also reported that they most frequently worked with the standards while compiling their portfolios. This may explain why candidates in the middle of the program, sophomores and juniors, were less familiar with the standards since they had last completed a portfolio in their freshmen year.
- The review team found that candidates were aware of the standards at the general and familiar level described by candidates. Candidates at all levels of the programs could not name specific standards but were aware of the broad concepts and some specific expectations such as using a variety of assessment practices, meeting the needs of all learners, and understanding developmental continuums. Candidates later in the program who were in practicum placements in PK-12 schools reported opportunities to apply expectations from the RIPTS when working



with students such as developing and implementing assessments, integrating technology in lessons, and working on small group instructional strategies.

- Candidates were knowledgeable of and their work demonstrated proficiency in several areas of the RIPTS. Understanding how children learn and develop (Standard 3), encouraging students’ critical thinking (Standard 5), creating supportive learning environments (Standard 6), reflecting on practice and professional responsibility (Standard 10), and maintaining professional standards (Standard 11) were areas of strength. Candidates did not demonstrate proficiency and strong practice in creating learning experiences with a broad base of knowledge (Standard 1), having a deep content base to create learning experiences (Standard 2), creating learning opportunities to meet the needs of all learners (Standard 4), working collaboratively with school communities (Standards 7), using effective communication (Standard 8), using effective assessment practice and modifying instruction (Standard 9).
- Candidates experience a consistent curriculum within the general pedagogical courses, both those shared with the elementary and the secondary education programs. Candidates experience consistent curriculum in the world language content methods courses as there is one faculty member who teaches all courses.

Recommendations

- Explore and implement methods to communicate better, more purposefully, and more systematically the content and foundations of the RIPTS through courses and field-based learning experiences in addition to the current emphasis in the portfolio process.
- Strengthen aspects of the program of study and curriculum to increase opportunities for candidates to develop deep understanding and demonstrate proficiency in the full range of the RIPTS including Standards 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, and 9.

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Does Not Meet Expectations
Candidates develop a general understanding of and proficiency in the content standards through their courses and field-based experiences but only for a limited grade range of their certification.	

- The program reported that courses and field experiences are generally aligned to the professional standards for the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). Course syllabi, assessments, and candidate lesson plans demonstrate this general alignment through which candidates are introduced to the standards and expectations to demonstrate proficiency in the standards throughout the program of study.
- Candidates complete a major in a world language to develop proficiency in their target language. Candidates are expected to learn to teach their target language through two content-methods courses, EDU 398: Teaching Standards-Based World Languages and Culture and EDU 399: Teaching Literacy to World language Learners. Candidate content knowledge is generally strengthened within their content methods courses while they also focus on content-specific pedagogical practices. Candidates complete a third general methods course, EDU 415: Capstone: Foreign Language Education, as part of the shared secondary education program.



- A significant structural concern with the program is the absence of focus on how to teach elementary and middle grades students consistent with the expectations of the ACTFL standards. The ACTFL standards create clear expectations that include how to teach students from pre-kindergarten through grade twelve. Program candidates focus on secondary candidates in all the general pedagogical secondary education courses. World language methods courses also focus primarily on secondary topics and teaching. Candidate field experiences also occur in secondary placements thus allowing little opportunity to explore teaching the full grade range for the standards.
- Candidates demonstrated a general awareness of the ACTFL standards and their work and performance demonstrated proficiency in some of the expectations of the standards. Because of the design of the program and focus of instruction, candidates did not demonstrate proficiency in meeting the expectations of the standards for students below the secondary grades.
- Candidates were proficient at a general level and for the secondary grades in language proficiency (ACTFL 1), cultures, linguistics, and literature (ACTFL 2), and integration of standards and planning (ACTFL 4). Candidates were less proficient in language acquisition (ACTFL 3), assessment of language (ACTFL 5), and professional development (ACTFL 6).
- The program curriculum requires candidates to complete a one-credit health methods course. Program faculty reported this course was included in the program of study to meet state requirements. Rhode Island does not require this course.

Recommendations

- Work with leadership from the School of Humanities, Arts, and Education and provider leadership to determine the viability for an all grades world language program that focuses on the full-range and expectations for the ACTFL standards and an all grades certification program.
- If the provider wishes to continue to offer an all grades program, the provider must establish a program of study, clinical experiences, and assessment system that addresses the full range of the standards and the full grade range for the standards and certification, including the ACTFL standards identified in this report as lacking in the current program.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations
Candidates develop a strong understanding of Rhode Island student learning standards and demonstrate proficiency in designing and implementing lessons and assessing learning consistent with the standards.	

- Candidates are introduced to PK-12 student learning standards during the Level I courses. Candidates are presented information about the standards, their expectations for student learning and the organization of instruction, and are encouraged to download and become familiar with the standards. The Level I courses as well as the general pedagogical courses prioritize the Common Core State Standards for English language arts and mathematics.



- The content methods courses, EDU 398: Teaching Standards-Based World Languages and Culture and EDU 399: Teaching Literacy to World language Learners as well as the clinical experiences, prioritize the ACTFL PK-12 World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages. Candidates learn about these standards and how to design, implement, and assess student learning consistent with these standards.
- Because of the combined nature of the secondary program, candidates also receive significant focus on the CCSS student learning standards and how to design and implement world language lessons consistent with these standards in the general pedagogy courses. The program reported that it also helps candidates connect the expectations of the CCSS and the world-language readiness standards to take advantage of this aspect of the program through course and field-based learning experiences.
- As a result of this programmatic focus, candidates reported and their work demonstrated proficiency in the knowledge and use of student learning standards for world language teachers.

1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop a general understanding of the core principles and practices of assessment and data-driven instruction and develop basic skills in these areas.	

- Candidates are provided a general understanding of the principles and practices of assessment throughout the program. Common assessment approaches and practices such as informal and formal assessment, standardized assessment, and unit-based assessments are introduced in Level I courses. While these general principles and practices are referenced repeatedly throughout the program, the program and courses do not provide additional opportunities for candidates to develop and apply deeper knowledge and understanding of assessment.
- Candidates complete several “contextual factor reports” in which they explore multiple data sources such as school and student achievement, student and community characteristics, and other factors that help to explain a school and its students. The program does not require candidates to go beyond looking at contextual data to develop general understandings of the contexts of schools. Candidates are not taught or required to analyze school, class, or student learning data, to identify specific learning needs, to design instruction to meet these needs, or to reflect on practice to adjust and modify instruction based on assessment data.
- The content methods courses and the general pedagogical courses do not prioritize assessment practices or focus on any content-specific assessment practices and approaches within a discipline. Candidates are required to design lessons and unit plans and are not provided clear direction as to appropriate and effective assessments consistent with the lessons.
- Candidates reported that they understood the role of assessment and that all instruction should include processes to assess student learning. Candidates generally understood that they should reflect on their lessons, but their emphasis was to focus on how well the lesson went rather than what students actually learned; how this should inform their practice; and how they should make specific changes to instruction based on student data and student learning needs.



- The review team found candidate knowledge, understanding, and proficiency of assessment and data-driven instruction consistent with the general approach embodied in the program curriculum. The program provides little opportunity for candidates to develop and implement multiple forms of assessment practices beyond general quizzes, tests, exit tickets, or observation and reflection protocols. Candidates learn about contextual data but do not learn about aggregating and disaggregating student learning data from multiple assessments. Candidates have limited exposure and opportunity to go beyond general reflection on lesson outcomes to engage in more concrete and explicit processes to assess student learning and make targeted, data-driven changes in instructional practice and lesson design.

Recommendations

- Examine the full-range of assessment practices and data-driven instruction articulated in the professional standards for all grades education programs and currently in use in Rhode Island schools. Conduct a gap-analysis to identify and close gaps between the current curriculum and these expectations. The program should consider if an additional course in assessment and data-driven instruction would best achieve this outcome.
- Integrate, particularly in the content methods courses, explicit instruction and practice in the full-range of assessment and data-driven instructional practices expected in PK-12 grades for world language. Ensure that this instruction ranges from general approaches and practices to more complex and content-specific practices.
- Implement in the program curriculum explicit instruction and practice in how to use student assessment data to evaluate and modify instructional practices based on this analysis.
- Integrate into the program assessment system specific performance-based requirements to ensure that candidates must demonstrate proficiency in the full-range of assessment practices and data-driven instruction to progress in the program.

1.5 Technology	Meets Expectations
Candidates develop and demonstrate proficiency in integrating technology and digital age work, learning, and communication in their practice.	

- Candidates are introduced to multiple technologies and tools, platforms, and hardware for digital age work, learning, and communication early in the program and are expected and required to develop and demonstrate proficiency in these as they progress in the program.
- Candidates participate in EDU 306: Classroom Applications of Technology at the Middle and Secondary School Level early in the program sequence which provides direct and explicit instruction, practice, and assessment in technologies and digital age practices expected of prospective world language teachers.
- Candidate knowledge, skills, and proficiency in technology and digital age practices are further developed through specific technology instruction and practices integrated throughout the program including communicating and collaborating through online platforms, using multiple



technologies for lesson planning and instruction, and exploring online resources for research, data, and tools available to grow their capacity and effectiveness as teachers.

- Candidates learn about world language-specific technologies in their content methods courses and assistive technologies, applications, and resources available to support students with special needs in EDU 356: Middle and Secondary Level Special Education Practice. Candidates, program completers, and clinical educators reported that candidates develop key knowledge and skills in the use of technology and digital age practices and strengthen these during their clinical placements.

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop an understanding of issues of bias, diversity, equity, and social justice and demonstrate basic skills in meeting the needs of diverse learners.	

- Candidates are introduced to issues of bias, diversity, equity, and social justice early in the program in Level I courses. This introduction is at a general level and requires candidates to explore how students learn, the goal of meeting the needs of all students, and the need to explore individual backgrounds and biases.
- Candidate theoretical knowledge of issues of equity and diversity are strengthened through EDU 330: Issues in Multicultural Education and EDU 356: Middle and Secondary School Level Special Education Practice. In these courses candidates learn about historical, structural, and current challenges to equity in public schools. Candidates also learn general strategies and approaches that are designed to meet the needs of all learners.
- Beyond these courses, candidates are provided limited opportunities to learn about and practice designing and implementing instruction that meets the needs of English language learners, students with special needs, and students from other identified groups. The content methods courses make general references to modifying instruction and require candidates to identify how they might adapt lesson plans, but explicit instruction in how to do this is largely absent. Throughout the program, candidates are also not required to deeply reflect on their own biases and consider the worldview of others or the potential for implicit bias when working with students from diverse backgrounds.
- Candidates also receive little opportunities to learn about and practice working with families from diverse communities. Candidates receive general instruction in Level I and Level II courses as well as topics of seminar sessions in Level III courses. However, this exposure is at a general level of best practices and does not require actual interaction with families.
- Candidate clinical placements also limit candidate proficiency in working with students and families from diverse backgrounds and communities. While all candidates are required to have clinical placements in diverse settings, for some candidates their only experience is during Level I courses when they are only required to observe and reflect on what they see in classrooms and schools rather than actually working with students and families from diverse backgrounds and communities.



- The review team found that as a result of the program and course design, candidates only develop basic skills when working with students and families from diverse backgrounds and communities. Candidates and program completers echoed this and reported that they did not feel well-prepared to work with all students and families.

Recommendations

- Work with program faculty and provider leadership to review the program structure and sequence and issues pertaining to equity. Revise the structure and sequence of the program to ensure that issues of equity and diversity are presented in a coherent and developmentally appropriate manner throughout the program, beginning early in the program and through program completion.
- Work with program faculty and field-based partners and practitioners to identify specific and effective instructional practices that are necessary to meet the needs of diverse learners. Integrate these practices and assess candidates’ competence in these practices as part of their general and content method courses to ensure that candidates not only develop an awareness of diversity and equity but also specific skills and capacities to meet the needs of all learners.
- Provide all candidates explicit instruction and practice in how to work with families from diverse communities. Ensure that this instruction and practice moves beyond theoretical course and seminar topics to actual engagement with families in diverse settings.
- Integrate into the program curriculum explicit opportunities, practices, and requirements that candidates engage in purposeful reflection on individual and implicit bias to best prepare candidates to work equitably with all learners.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop a general understanding of Rhode Island initiatives, educational laws, and policies.	

- Candidates are introduced to Rhode Island initiatives, educational laws, and policies early in the program and throughout the course sequence. All course syllabi list several initiatives that are focus areas for the course, that will serve as the basis for assignments, and that are connected to the standards.
- General pedagogical courses such as EDU 306: Classroom Applications of Technology at the Middle and Secondary Level and EDU 356: Middle and Secondary Level Special Education Practice emphasize initiatives that reflect the course focus. World language content methods courses also identified specific initiatives that were focus areas for the courses.
- Candidates reported that they were generally aware of initiatives and policies such as bullying, social emotional learning, state assessments, and student learning standards. Candidates were less familiar with critical initiatives for world language teachers such as educator evaluation and student learning objectives, the Rhode Island diploma system, individual learning plans, the multi-tiered system of supports, and response to intervention.



- Some candidates also confused previous practices as current initiatives such as identifying the New England Common Assessment Program as the state assessment program instead of the Rhode Island Comprehensive Assessment System and Grade Span Expectations as student learning standards instead of Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards.
- The program listed in course syllabi specific components of the RISEP, particularly student learning standards, assessment, technology, equity, and RI initiatives, as if these were candidate learning requirements, rather than required design elements for the program of study.

Recommendations

- Work with program faculty and field-based partners and practitioners to identify critical Rhode Island initiatives and educational laws and policies most appropriate for world language teachers. Integrate these in a deliberate, strategic, and developmentally appropriate manner across the program curriculum.
- Conduct an audit of the program curriculum, course syllabi, and course materials to ensure that only current initiatives, policies, and laws are presented to candidates as current practices to minimize confusion and ensure currency in knowledge.
- Develop and implement an authentic assessment of Rhode Island initiatives and educational policies and laws and integrate this into the candidate assessment system to ensure candidates develop a deep understanding and demonstrate proficiency in integrating these into their practice.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Approaching Expectations
<p>The program design ensures that candidates experience wide-ranging, developmentally-appropriate, and coherent clinical experiences in secondary grade setting. The program does not provide candidates access to clinical preparation for the full grade span for the certification area.</p>	

- Clinical experiences begin immediately in Level I courses. Candidates are required to conduct targeted observations in school settings to reflect and build upon course learning and to examine contextual data from PK-12 schools and students. Candidates reported that these early field experiences are important opportunities to experience school culture and to get early glimpses into the expectations for teachers.
- Candidates complete additional school-based learning and application experiences as part of Level II courses. Each of the courses have requirements that include observations, lesson plan development, small group instruction and tutoring, school and student data analysis, and other activities through which candidates apply and reflect upon course-based learning.
- As part of the secondary program, world language candidates also experience an evolving ‘residency-type’ experience during Level II courses. As such, some Level II general pedagogical and content methods courses have created structures in which candidates and course faculty



are in field sites at the same time to more fully integrate course and field-based learning and to provide real-time supervision. The program reported that these expanded opportunities are a benefit for candidates but also create scheduling and logistical challenges due to candidate responsibilities to both their education and Arts and Sciences majors.

- During year four as part of Level III courses, candidates complete a practicum placement and a fourteen-week student teaching placement. Candidates and program completers reported that their clinical experiences were critical opportunities to connect what they learned in their courses with the realities of PK-12 schools. The review team concurred with this assessment and found the sequence of clinical experiences to reflect course content and to support candidate growth and development.
- The current design of the world language program prevents candidates from engaging in authentic, field-based learning opportunities necessary to prepare them to meet the needs of students for the full range of their certification, from grades pre-kindergarten through grades twelve. The certification requirements for world languages changed from a secondary certification to an all grades certification in 2012, more than six years prior to the current review. The program and provider have made no effort to respond to these changes and to appropriately prepare candidates for the full grade range of their certification.

Recommendations

- Work with leadership from the School of Humanities, Arts, and Education and provider leadership as well as PK-12 schools and districts to establish and implement developmentally-appropriate and coherent clinical experiences that prepare world language candidates to meet the expectations of the full grade range for their certification.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Approaching Expectations
The program prioritizes candidate impact on student learning but has not established clear measures of impact on student learning that guide candidate progress in the program.	

- The program reported that candidate impact on student learning is a program priority and that this priority is clearly communicated to program candidates. The program reported that this expectation is articulated in course syllabi, assignments that require candidates to reflect on the efficacy of their lessons, and in reflective essays that candidates complete as part of the portfolio assessment system.
- Candidates reported that they recognized that having a positive impact on student learning was the essential role of a teacher and they felt the program supported them to develop skills and capacity in this area. Program completers also reported that having an impact on student learning was an emphasis of the program and they felt well-prepared to support students to meet student learning goals and standards.
- Beyond the general appreciation of the importance of candidate impact on student learning, the program has not built structures and systems to both ensure candidate impact on student learning and to use this impact to guide and inform candidate progress in the program. The



program reported that “it is poised to begin systematically collecting and analyzing data on candidate impact on student learning” but has not yet done so or implemented these processes.

- The program provided lists of “useful tools” and “trustworthy assessments” that range from classroom assessments, observation protocols, and teaching strategies as evidence of how it instructs candidates to measure impact on student learning. The program did not provide evidence of any clearly identified measures of candidate impact on student learning that were developed in conjunction with clinical partners, that were clearly understood by candidates, and that were used to gather data of candidate impact on student learning to guide progress throughout the program, all expectations of these standards.

Recommendations

- Work with clinical partners to establish clearly articulated and appropriate measures of impact on candidate learning that progress from early clinical experiences and increase in demand and expectations through student teaching.
- Establish processes to collect and analyze data from candidate impact on student learning to inform candidate progress in the program and to improve candidate ability to impact student learning.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has several formal and informal partnerships but has not established methods and processes to ensure the partnerships are mutually beneficial.	

- The program reported that its formal partners are the schools and districts in which it places candidates for clinical experiences, particularly student teaching placements. The program provided signed agreements for student teaching placements as evidence of the partnerships. The program also reported that it has additional informal partnerships with schools and districts based on personal and historical relationships as well as common projects and goal areas.
- The program reported and many clinical partners agreed that the Roger Williams University programs are responsive to the needs of the field and that the sharing and training of candidates, involvement in grant-funded professional development initiatives that arise from faculty interests and initiatives, and access to the university’s resources are mutually beneficial to the candidates, programs, and partners.
- The program has shared its expectations for candidate performance with its partners, uses common assessment tools, and integrates PK-12 clinical educator input into decisions regarding candidate progression in the program.
- The program did not provide evidence that it has worked with its partners to establish agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness and that it monitors and analyzes data from the mutually-agreed upon indicators of effectiveness to make improvements to the partnership.

Recommendations



- Work with clinical partners to establish agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness to ensure mutually beneficial partnerships that support program and partnership improvement.
- Work with clinical partners to establish processes to monitor and analyze data from the agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness and use this information to improve both the partnership and program design and implementation.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program has not established processes to ensure that candidates are supervised and supported by clinical educators who meet appropriate, established criteria.	

- The program has established criteria for PK-12 clinical educators. These criteria include possessing a continuing contract, being appropriately certified for their grade level and content area, having a minimum of three years' teaching experience, whose practice is consistent with standards-based education, and who are willing to participate in clinical educator training.
- The program reported that it secures prospective clinical educators by informing partnership districts how many placements are needed and then receiving a list of PK-12 educators who are willing to serve in the role. The program reported that it does not have the ability to proactively select clinical educators or identify appropriate settings and placements.
- The program recruits, supports, and trains university supervisors who meet established criteria, some of whom also serve as full-time or adjunct faculty. The role of the university supervisors is to serve as a liaison between the program and PK-12 clinical educators. University supervisors also provide on-the-ground support for PK-12 clinical educators and trouble-shoot placement issues and problems that may arise with candidates.
- The program reported that clinical educators are required to attend an annual half-day training in which clinical educators learn about program and course requirements, assessment instruments, and the sequence of clinical experiences. Clinical educators reported that they recognize the importance of their role and appreciate the opportunity to work with the program and help to mold future educators. Program faculty and provider leadership reported that clinical educators are critical to the success of the program and its candidates and that they provide authentic and practitioner-based wisdom on current practice in the field.
- The program shared instruments that are used by university supervisors and candidates to evaluate the effectiveness of clinical educators and their clinical placements. The program also provided evidence that some clinical educators were not retained who received notably poor ratings by university supervisors and candidates.
- The review team found that the criteria for clinical educators and the process used to select clinical educators do not meet the expectation of the RISEP and do not ensure that all candidates are supervised by effective and appropriate clinical educators. The criteria established by the RISEP require that all clinical educators at minimum must be trained in the ability to work with adult learners, coaching, and supervision skills, be able to evaluate performance and provide feedback, and be highly effective educators. These criteria are not included the program's criteria. The standards also establish that only educators who meet



these criteria are to serve in the role of clinical educator. The program allows districts to select clinical educators, regardless of their qualifications.

- The program provided evidence that it conducts an annual, half-day training for PK-12 clinical educators. The program did not provide evidence that attendance is required or that the training is sufficient to ensure that clinical educators are fully-prepared for their roles and fully proficient in the assessment system tools and expectations for candidate feedback.

Recommendations

- Work with program faculty and staff and clinical partners to review the expectations for clinical partnerships and clinical educators articulated in the RISEP. Establish criteria for clinical educators consistent with the expectations of these standards as the minimal requirements for all clinical educators.
- Establish a selection process that is controlled by the provider and its programs that ensures that only clinical educators who meet the established criteria are eligible to serve as clinical educators.
- Work with program faculty and staff, clinical partners, and university supervisors to establish and implement more rigorous and ongoing training and support processes to ensure that PK-12 clinical educators are fully prepared in the assessment system tools, processes, and expectations for candidate feedback.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not have a valid and reliable, performance-based assessment system that is grounded in the RIPTS, based on candidate impact on student learning, and that determines candidate progress throughout the program.	

- The program has an extensive and clearly defined assessment system called by the provider the “Performance Assessment System.” The assessment system has four levels each of which is based on portfolios and timelines that include specified products and assessments that candidates compile and submit for review at designated points in the program – at the completion of Level I, Level II, Level IIIa and Level IIIb courses.
- The requirements for the portfolios vary and increase over time. Level I and II portfolios focus primarily on artifacts and key assessments that candidates complete in their courses. Accompanying the artifacts are reflective essays in which candidates explain and justify knowledge of specified professional standards as evidenced by the artifacts. The Level IIIa and Level IIIb portfolios focus primarily on assessments of candidate performance during practicum and student teaching.
- In order to progress through the program candidates must successfully complete each portfolio review, earn a minimum 2.75 GPA, complete specified clinical experiences, conduct a readiness to student teach presentation, pass disposition assessments, and meet all program and university requirements.



- Candidates receive feedback on their progress through their courses, assignments, and clinical experiences, the portfolio review process, through observations of their practice, through formal and informal advisement and mentoring, and through a student support protocol which is available to candidates who struggle to meet program requirements and expectations. The provider shared evidence that four candidates were involved in the student support protocol process at the time of the review.
- The review team found that the assessment system requires candidates to complete many tasks and assessments which begin early in preparation and continue throughout the program; however, the amount, meaningfulness, and alignment of the broad range of required tasks in the assessment system was not clear. The review team also questioned the practice of allowing candidates to repeatedly revise and resubmit work rather than having established standards for quality and revision.
- Candidates receive varied and inconsistent feedback dependent on the individual providing the feedback, the type of task or assessment completed, and the format in which it was submitted. Some faculty and clinical educators provide explicit, standards-based feedback whereas others provide limited or global feedback disconnected from the standards without clear paths for improvement. It was not clear to the review team that the amount and quality of feedback that candidates receive on work and tasks submitted through the electronic course management system, Taskstream, was supportive of candidate improvement.
- As constituted, the assessment system does not prioritize candidate performance aligned to the professional standards. The program uses the 2004 Professional Teaching Competencies from the New Teacher Center as the basis for its assessment of candidate performance. The program uses observation tools and assessment instruments that were developed more than ten years ago and retroactively aligned these to the expectations of the RIPTS. The tools and instruments also follow a holistic approach to assessment that is no longer current or consistent with instruments used in Rhode Island schools. The observation instruments include wide error bands between performance levels allowing a candidate who does not meet expectations to still pass the assessment based on the individual judgment of the assessor and their individual interpretation of the instrument.
- The assessment system also does not prioritize candidate impact on student learning. Candidates are assessed using general, holistic instruments on their overall performance in PK-12 classrooms. The assessment instruments contain broad goal statements such as “Engaging and Supporting all Students Learning” and “Assessing Student Learning” and include text boxes for assessors to record observations, areas of strength, and areas for growth. Candidates are assessed across six general competencies, none of which prioritizes or measures how well candidates implement, assess, and modify instruction to ensure PK-12 student proficiency.
- The program did not provide evidence that it uses information from the assessment system to target areas of candidate need and provide supports consistent with the information. Rather, candidates complete the required tasks and assessments and as long as they meet minimal requirements, proceed through the program. The program reported that it has counseled



several candidates out of the program resulting from a variety of factors such as poor achievement, dispositional issues, and changing candidate interest.

Recommendations

- Work with School of Humanities, Arts, and Education leadership to identify a person or persons with expertise in performance-based assessment systems. Work with these individuals and provider leadership to develop, pilot, and implement a valid, reliable, and performance-based assessment system that is based on the professional standards for all grades teachers and consistent with the expectations of the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation.
- Ensure that assessment of candidate performance as prospective teachers begins early in the program and continues through recommendation for certification, is based on candidate ability to impact student learning, and that information from the assessment system is used to guide candidate progress in the program.
- Include in the assessment system performance-based observation instruments that are consistent with those used in Rhode Island PK-12 public schools and that include candidate impact on student learning such as student learning objectives and student outcome objectives as measure of performance.
- Establish clear expectations for feedback to candidates that address issues of quantity, quality, alignment to standards, and that lead to candidate improvement. Establish and implement training and monitoring processes to ensure consistent and effective feedback to all candidates.

3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not have an assessment system that ensures that only candidates who demonstrate proficiency in the RIPTS are recommended for certification.	

- The program recommends candidates for certification based on completion of the Level IIIb portfolio review. The criteria for this review include successful completion of all previous portfolio reviews, successful completion of all courses, a minimum GPA of 2.75, and a minimum score on a weighted scoring scale of four assessments from student teaching: best of three observed lessons, a multi-lesson teaching event, and final evaluations by the PK-12 clinical educator and university clinical supervisor. Candidates are not required to complete state licensure tests to be recommended for certification by the program.
- The program assessment system is generally transparent to candidates. Candidates learn about the system upon admission to the program and throughout their coursework. Candidates also learn about and are supported to meet the expectations of the assessment system through individual advisement and group workshops. Candidates reported that they generally understood the assessment system and were well-supported to complete its requirements, particularly during years when portfolios were required and workshops were held.
- The program reported that it promotes consistent evaluation through admission and portfolio review teams that feature multiple assessors. The program also reported that it promotes



consistent evaluation through the annual training of PK-12 clinical educators and through ongoing informal communication. The program provided evidence of a plan to institute training sessions for inter-rater reliability for faculty. Timelines for this process were not provided. The provider reported that the last training for inter-rater reliability was five years prior.

- As constituted, the assessment system does not have rigorous criteria or processes to ensure that candidates demonstrate proficiency in the full range of the RIPTS to receive a recommendation for certification. Candidates are determined to be proficient through general and inexact instruments and assessments that are not aligned to the standards or candidate impact on student learning. The structural inclusion of the error band in the final assessment instrument allows candidates to progress to recommendation for certification based on either proficient or developing scores.
- A review of candidate and program completer work as well as surveys and reports from program completers and employers demonstrated that the current assessment system recommends candidates for certification who are not ready to meet the full expectations of the standards on day one. Gaps between the expectations of the standards and completer readiness were evident and reported in areas of classroom management, working with diverse students and families, integrating curriculum, using assessment instruments, and meeting professional responsibilities.
- The review team was also concerned about the transparency of the assessment system for candidates in years two and three and the absence of regular and ongoing structures to ensure consistent evaluation. Candidates in years two and three reported that unless they were specifically engaged in preparing a portfolio, the purpose, structure, and importance of the portfolio and assessment system was unclear and confusing. Consistent candidate assessment and feedback are limited by an absence of clear and common understanding of expected performance levels on program assessments and infrequent training of program faculty. PK-12 clinical educators are appropriately empowered to have a role in candidate assessment yet the vague and general assessment instruments, combined with limited training, inhibit their ability to consistently and effectively provide feedback and accurately assess candidate progress.

Recommendations

- Ensure that the recommendation for certification decision point in the new assessment system is grounded upon the RIPTS and that only candidates who demonstrate proficiency in the full range of the standards are recommended for certification.
- Work with district partners to ensure that the recommendation for certification decision point includes authentic assessments that encompass the full range of the RIPTS and professional standards and ensures that all candidates recommended for certification are fully prepared on day one to meet the learning needs of students.
- Work with program faculty and provider leadership to establish and implement processes to more fully communicate the assessment system, its purposes, schedules, and requirements to all candidates throughout the program sequence.



- Work with program faculty and provider leadership to establish and implement processes and structures to ensure consistent evaluation among program faculty, PK-12 clinical educators, and university supervisors.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program surveys employers but the process does not lead to actionable information for program improvement.	

- The program reported that it inconsistently surveys candidate employers and did not organize the survey by program. The surveys generated few responses across all programs and the responses are not sufficient to yield any meaningful assessment of employer satisfaction with program and candidate outcomes.
- An analysis of data from the Educator Preparation Index shows that program completer performance on educator evaluation instruments are comparable to other recent program completers.

Recommendations

- Establish and implement an annual process to survey employers of all program completers. Ensure that this process enables actionable information to support continuous program improvement including identification of the program.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program surveys program completers annually and the surveys generate some actionable information for program improvement.	

- The program surveys program completers annually. This process has evolved over time and the program reported that it is working to institutionalize an electronic and systematic process that will yield more substantial results.
- The surveys ask program completers about their perspectives on their preparation and readiness to serve on day one. The surveys do not track employment outcomes.
- The responses from the last three years generally show that candidates were pleased with their preparation while identifying several gaps in their preparation in which they were not as well-prepared including working with diverse learners and families, classroom management, integrating curriculum, using assessment instruments, and meeting professional responsibilities.
- The program provided evidence of several changes made to the program design based on program completer feedback including additional course and clinical experiences.



Recommendations

- Finalize the process to survey program completers annually on their perspective on their preparation and their employment outcomes and status. Ensure that this process yields sufficient responses by program to generate actionable feedback for program improvement.

Middle Grades Extension

Overview: The provider offers candidates enrolled in the elementary and secondary programs the option to also enroll in a middle grades certification program. This track requires candidates to complete three additional courses as well as a sixty-hour practicum experience. Candidates in the secondary program who complete this track are recommended for middle grades certification in addition to secondary certification in their content area. Elementary candidates who complete this track are recommended for middle grades certification in English, mathematics, science or social studies upon completion of at least twenty-one credits in a content area in addition to their elementary certification.

Because the middle grades certification program is an addition to either the elementary or secondary program, the track does not include a separate program of study, clinical structure, assessment system, or program outcomes. As such, ratings, findings, and recommendations are only provided for those components of the RISEP that are unique to the middle grades certification program or substantially different from the elementary or secondary program: professional standards (1.2), student learning standards (1.3), equity (1.6), Rhode Island educational expectations (1.7), and clinical preparation (2.1).

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Meets Expectations
Candidates develop understanding and proficiency in the professional standards for middle grades education through their courses and field-based experiences.	

- Candidates develop understanding and proficiency in the Association for Middle Level Education (AMLE) standards through three required courses, EDU 381: Young Adolescent Development, EDU 382: Middle School Curriculum and Organization, and EDU 383: Applied Middle School Instruction and Assessment, as well as clinical experiences in which candidates implement instructional practices designed to meet the needs of young adolescents.
- Candidates are required to observe and reflect on middle grades teaching, design and implement lessons with middle grades students, and evaluate the effectiveness of middle grades practices such as meeting the social and emotional needs of middle grades students, effective classroom organization and management, integrated curriculum, and middle grades team structures.
- Candidates reported that they develop knowledge and confidence in how to meet the expectations of the professional standards, specifically as they build upon their developing understanding of the elementary and secondary standards for their primary certification.



1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop a general understanding of PK-12 student learning standards and demonstrate basic skills in designing and implementing lessons and assessing learning consistent with the standards.	

- Candidates in the middle grades certification program build upon their developing understanding of PK-12 student learning standards from their elementary and secondary programs. Candidates learn about how student learning standards should be integrated into lessons appropriate for young adolescents and how student learning should be assessed to ensure mastery of the standards. Candidates are provided feedback on their work and reflect on the effectiveness of their lessons at a general level.
- Course syllabi and materials include references to PK-12 student learning standards such as CCSS in English language arts and mathematics but did not include other student learning standards such as the NGSS or Rhode Island GSE in social studies.
- Despite the additional focus on PK-12 student learning standards in the middle grades certification courses, candidate knowledge of the standards and proficiency in developing lessons consistent with the standards was at a general level and not sufficient to ensure that candidates can support students to meet the expectations of the student learning standards.

Recommendations

- Establish clear expectations for middle grades teaching that emphasizes PK-12 student learning standards and ensure that student learning standards are the organizing structure for effective lessons when working with young adolescents.
- Require candidates to demonstrate deep understanding of PK-12 student learning standards and to demonstrate proficiency in designing and implementing instruction that ensures young adolescents meet these expectations in order to progress in the program.
- Review course materials to ensure that only current student learning standards are included and communicated to candidates.

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop an understanding of issues of bias, diversity, equity, and social justice and demonstrate basic skills in meeting the needs of diverse learners.	

- Candidates build upon their general understanding of issues of bias, diversity, equity and social justice emphasized in the elementary and secondary programs. Middle grades candidates also learn about issues specific to young adolescents such as developmental stages, the growth of identity, and challenges that this age group confront such as changing families, learning environments, and technology.
- As with the focus in the elementary and secondary programs, the focus remains at the awareness and general understanding level. Candidates in the middle grades certification program do not learn specific strategies for meeting the needs of all learners, including English



language learners and students with special needs or working with families in diverse communities.

Recommendations

- Work with the elementary and secondary programs to identify and implement specific instructional practices in the middle grades curriculum that are effective when working with students from all backgrounds, including English language learners and students with special needs.
- Work with the elementary and secondary programs to identify and implement the middle grades curriculum specific practices and strategies that are effective when working with families in diverse communities.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop a general understanding of Rhode Island initiatives, educational laws, and policies.	

- Candidates learn about several Rhode Island initiatives that are applicable to middle grades certification through course-based learning, observations in the field, and through their prior knowledge from their elementary and secondary preparation.
- Course materials indicated and faculty reported that candidates learning about bullying, social emotional learning, student learning standards, and state assessments. Evidence was not provided that candidates learn about other initiatives applicable to middle grades certification including career and technical education, the multi-tiered system of support, the Rhode Island Diploma system, and educator evaluation.
- Candidates reported and their work demonstrated only a general understanding and awareness of Rhode Island initiatives. Course materials indicated an inconsistent knowledge by course designers of current initiatives as several outdated standards and assessments are included in course syllabi.

Recommendations

- Work with program faculty and field-based partners and practitioners to identify critical Rhode Island initiatives and educational laws and policies most appropriate for middle grades educators. Integrate these in a deliberate, strategic, and developmentally appropriate manner across the curriculum.
- Conduct an audit of the course materials to ensure that only current education initiatives, policies, and laws are presented to candidates as current practices most applicable for middle grades educators.



Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Meets Expectations
The program ensures that candidates experience wide-ranging, developmentally-appropriate, and coherent clinical experiences.	

- Candidates are required to complete clinical experiences in each of the three middle grades certification courses. In EDU 381: Young Adolescent Development and EDU 382: Middle School Curriculum and School Organization, candidates are required to observe and reflect upon effective instructional practices and to conduct interviews with middle grades educators to better understand middle school practices.
- As part of EDU 383: Applied Middle Grades Instruction and Assessment, candidates are required to spend sixty-hours observing instruction and designing and implementing lessons with young adolescents. Elementary candidates typically complete the required hours in middle grades levels in the same schools in which they complete student teaching. Secondary candidates and some elementary candidates complete these hours in a different school setting.
- Collectively the clinical experience exceed to minimum hours requirements for this certification area. The provider could strengthen the candidate experience by requiring middle grades candidates to complete some additional targeted learning experiences in middle grades settings as part of the general pedagogical courses in the elementary and secondary programs.

Support Professional Certification Areas: Findings and Recommendations

Reading Specialist Program

The Reading Specialist Program is a graduate-level program that leads to a Master of Arts in Literacy. Candidates complete the program in two years on a part-time basis as part of a cohort group. Candidates must earn thirty-one credits from nine courses organized across three curriculum strands. Candidates also must complete internship experiences working with PK-12 students and colleagues.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Not Applicable
Rhode Island does not have state-specific standards for support professionals.	

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop a general understanding of the professional standards and implement practices consistent with some of the expectations of the standards.	

- The Reading Specialist program requires candidates to complete nine courses organized into three curriculum levels – Investigation of Best Practices, Application of Best Practices, and Professional Practices. Candidates complete the courses in a prescribed sequence and as part of a cohort group. The courses include face-to-face, online, and hybrid learning experiences.
- In addition to course-based learning, candidates are required to complete field experiences through which they are expected to apply course-based learning when working with PK-12



students and colleagues. Candidates complete two types of field experiences: self-selected experiences and internship experiences.

- The program reported and provided evidence asserting that the overall program of study, course syllabi, key assessments, and the assessment system are aligned to and grounded in the 2010 International Reading Association (IRA) standards. Furthermore, the program reported that by the end of the program, “candidates meet the IRA standards and are confident to assume the job of reading specialist/consultant.”
- The review team found that the IRA standards are prominently shared and communicated to program candidates. Program materials, course syllabi, and key assessments typically include lists of the standards and components detailed in each course. As part of the assessment system, candidates are required to write “metacognitive essays” reflecting on how their work demonstrates meeting the IRA standards.
- Despite their prominence throughout the program, the expectations for demonstration of knowledge and proficiency in the IRA standards is at a general and superficial level. Candidates were familiar with general pedagogical practices such as exit tickets, KWL charts, and read-alouds consistent with expectations for general education teachers. Candidates did not demonstrate knowledge and application of in-depth, technical skills and practices expected of reading specialist in areas such as language acquisition (IRA 1), integrated literacy curricula (IRA 2), data interpretation and analysis to systematically monitor student performance at the classroom, school, and system wide level (IRA 3), meeting the needs of diverse learners (IRA 4), and the effective use of physical space, instructional materials and technology (IRA 5).
- The review team also found that the design of the program’s clinical experiences limited and hindered candidate acquisition and demonstration of proficiency in the breadth and depth of the IRA standards. With the exception of the internship experience, candidates are not required to actually implement lessons or practices that they design and study in courses. Candidates are only required to log hours in PK-12 schools for their self-selected experiences rather than conduct specific tasks, and these hours can include general practices such as attending faculty meetings or professional development sessions.
- Candidate knowledge, proficiency, and access to deep engagement and understanding of the professional standards is further limited by several programmatic and course design decisions. The program relies heavily on faculty-authored textbooks that limit access to broad knowledge in the field – these are required in four of the seven courses that have required texts. Many texts and course resources are dated despite not being canons for the field, particularly those for EDU 620: Research-Based Literacy Practices II, EDU 622: Research-Based Literacy Practices III, and EDU 634: Assessment of Reading and Writing Difficulties. The program combines course meeting sessions for four program courses potentially limiting candidate opportunity to engage with new and deeper learning. Candidates reported that the program uses to varying degree of effectiveness multiple course models, face-to-face, online, and a hybrid. Candidates particularly questioned the design and effectiveness of EDU 618: Literature for Children and Young Adults which is taught as an online course. The program has not made any effort to integrate the more current 2017 International Literacy standards, despite these being endorsed as more reflective of the current state of the field.



Recommendations

- Review the current curriculum, program and course design to identify gaps between the full expectations, both breadth and depth, of the professional standards and ensure that these gaps are addressed and candidates are provided the opportunity to develop proficiency in the standards prior to program completion.
- Revise the clinical experience structure to ensure that candidates can develop, implement, and receive feedback on lessons, interventions, and practices throughout their program of study to develop ongoing and authentic learning experiences consistent with the expectations of the professional standards.
- Review and revise required and supplemental texts and resources to ensure that candidates are exposed to current information that represents the full spectrum of the reading specialist field.
- Evaluate the current combined course meeting structure to examine if this structure inappropriately limits candidate learning opportunities in pursuit of scheduling convenience.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop a general understanding of the full range of PK-12 student learning standards appropriate for the role of reading specialists.	

- Candidates in the program are required to be certified teachers and as such enter the program with an understanding of PK-12 student learning standards consistent with the role of a general education teacher.
- Candidates focus on student learning standards, particularly the CCSS English language arts standards, throughout the program and are required to develop lessons and interventions to support PK-12 students to meet the expectations of the standards. Candidates may choose to develop lessons and interventions focusing on CCSS mathematics standards or science and social studies standards, but the optional nature of these assignments does not ensure all candidates explore the full-range of student learning standards.
- Due to the structure of the clinical experiences, candidates are not required to implement the lessons and interventions they develop, receive feedback on their performance, and modify their practices to ensure students can meet the expectations of student learning standards until the summer reading clinic which takes place late in the program sequence.
- Candidates reported and their work demonstrated that they had knowledge of student learning standards, but this was at a general level, consistent with the expectations for a general education teacher without precise understanding and experience in adapting lessons, designing and implementing interventions, and using assessments to support students to meet the full range of student learning standards.



Recommendations

- Design and implement learning experiences to ensure that all candidates receive instruction, practice, and feedback in how to support students to meet the full range of student learning standards.
- Revise the program requirements and clinical experience process to ensure that throughout the program candidates are required to design and implement lessons and interventions, receive feedback on their work, and modify their instruction to ensure that candidates are proficient in helping students meet the expectations of student learning standards.
- Revise the program and course design to ensure that all candidates are required to develop, implement, and receive feedback on lessons and interventions in the full range of student learning standards including literacy, mathematics, science, and social studies.

1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations
Candidates demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the principles and purposes of assessment and integrate these into their practice.	

- The program curriculum integrates issues of assessment practices and principles throughout the candidate learning experience. Candidates learn about the theoretical foundations of assessment and data-driven instruction in EDU 610: Introduction to Literacy Research. Candidates develop their proficiency through course and field-based learning experiences during the remainder of the program, particularly in EDU 634: Assessment of Reading and Writing Difficulties and EDU 638: Clinical Experiences in Literacy Education.
- Candidates learn about a variety of informal and formal assessment strategies and practices throughout the program. These include observation practices, survey instruments, teacher-designed, and published assessments. Candidates reported that while they value the opportunity to learn about and present information on different assessment strategies, they also believe they would benefit from further explicit instruction and demonstration from faculty. Candidates also learn about and use multiple sources of data to identify individual student needs such as reading inventories, running records, and student contextual data.
- Although candidates learn about a variety of published assessments, the program does not expose candidates to the most current versions. For example, in EDU 634: Assessment of Reading and Writing Difficulties, candidates are required to research and present information on the Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI) 4 and the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) 6th edition. However, neither are current. QRI 4 was published in 2005, the current version, QRI 6, was published in 2016 and QRI 5 was published in 2010. DIBELS 6th edition was published in 2007, DIBELS Next (7th edition) was published in 2010 and DIBELS 8th edition was published in 2018.
- Candidates complete three case studies as part of their coursework that require candidates to assess learning challenges using several sources of data, develop and implement practices and interventions based on their diagnosis, and then modify and reflect on practice based on these experiences. Candidates reported that the case studies were authentic opportunities to apply



course-based learning. Although candidate work did not demonstrate candidates selecting this option, it was not clear to the review team why the syllabus for EDU 634: Assessment of Reading and Writing Difficulties allows candidates the option to choose adults as a subject for a case study when candidates are seeking a PK-12 certification.

- The review team observed that most course learning requirements and candidate work focused on the assessment of reading difficulties. The review team understands this focus and prioritization. However, candidates should also have opportunities to learn about and practice assessing and responding to student writing difficulties. The program should expand learning opportunities and assessments of candidate practice to include an increased focus in this area of literacy as per current research.

1.5 Technology	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop general knowledge and skills to use some technological tools and digital practices expected of general education teachers and reading specialists.	

- When prompted to describe how the program ensures that candidates are taught key practices related to digital age learning and how its assesses candidate proficiency in this area, the program’s response was confusing and did not address directly the topic: “Before we can expect the Candidates to be proficient in designing, implementing, and assessing digital age learning experiences and assessment, faculty must develop proficiency in modeling digital age work and learning through fluency in technology systems, collaborating using digital tools and resources, and communicating information and ideas using a variety of digital age media and formats in order to model their own proficiency.” The program then reported actions faculty had taken in the “past several years” to model “new technologies to enhance student learning and enrich professional practice.”
- The program reported that candidates learn about technology platforms, software and applications, and information and resource sites such as data-bases and websites throughout program courses. These include platforms such as the program’s course management system Bridges, Google Drive, and Google classroom.
- Candidates demonstrated that they are familiar with and use basic and general software and applications such as the Office Suite, including Excel and Power Point, Flipgrid, and other multimedia sites and tools. Candidates use a variety of data sources and websites to conduct research and develop presentations both those shared by the program and those that candidates explore on their own.
- Candidates did not report and their work samples did not demonstrate that they were proficient in applying specialized instructional technology tools consistent with the role of reading specialists and necessary to help close learning gaps. Candidates also did not report or demonstrate proficiency in the use of assistive technology necessary to support students who struggle with literacy and have special needs.



Recommendations

- Work with PK-12 reading specialists who are representatives of the field and not only Roger William University program graduates as well as other individuals with appropriate expertise to identify the current and expected range of technology, technological tools, platforms, software applications, and hardware necessary to meet the needs of PK-12 students and the professional standards.
- Work with PK-12 reading specialists, individuals with expertise in assistive technology, and other professionals in the field to identify the current and expected range of assistive technology necessary to meet the needs of PK-12 students and the professional standards,
- Conduct an analysis of the current program curriculum and candidate learning experiences to identify gaps between the needs of the field and the professional standards as it relates to technology and digital age learning. Develop and implement a plan to close these gaps.
- Integrate in the program assessment system specific learning experiences, benchmarks, and performance levels relating to technology and digital age learning that must be met by candidates to progress through the program and to be recommended for certification.

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop basic skills and knowledge in how to meet the needs of diverse learners, English language learners, students with special needs, and families in diverse communities.	

- The reading specialist program reported that social justice and equity are hallmarks of the program and foundational to their approach to educator preparation. Consistent with this assertion, issues of equity and social justice, reflecting on individual biases, and understanding the needs of diverse learners are referenced throughout the program and in course syllabi.
- Course syllabi often include statements such as a goal of the course is “to learn about diverse people and communities... to learn and experience culturally responsive pedagogy... to understand how instructional opportunities exist so that all children can learn.” Program and course content however focus on general approaches to teaching and basic strategies to meet the needs of diverse learners and English language learners.
- Candidates are required in several courses, including EDU 616: Research-Based Practices Literacy I, EDU 620: Research-Based Practices Literacy II, and EDU 622: Research-Based Best Practices Literacy III, to include in their lessons modifications to meet the needs of English language learners and students with special needs.
- The program does not provide explicit instruction or assess candidate ability to design lessons that directly connect individual student needs and best practices for reading specialists such as using a multiple types of resources, technological tools and blended learning, and data-based interventions connected to student learning targets. Candidates, for example, may know about specialized programs to meet individual student needs such as the Wilson Language program, the Orton-Gillingham approach, or dyslexia training, but this knowledge often emerges from candidates’ previous experience as classroom teachers.



- Candidates have limited opportunity to work with students and families from diverse background thus hindering their proficiency to meet the needs of all learners. Candidates only work directly with PK-12 students through the summer reading clinic. The program acknowledges that it struggles to include students from diverse background in this setting. Candidates are required to complete a ‘families project’ as part of EDU 650: Leadership for Literacy Professionals, but the topic of working with families is the focus of only one course session. Candidates, completers, and employers reported that candidates would benefit from additional opportunities to work with students and families from diverse backgrounds.
- The review team found that the program’s emphasis on general and basic approaches to meeting the needs of diverse learners and families in diverse communities was confirmed and echoed in the resources the program shares with candidates. Many of the resources are websites, videos, and readings that are intended for general audiences, no longer current, and include basic approaches such as ‘honoring the silent period,’ selecting multicultural children’s books, and having positive perspectives on parents and families.

Recommendations

- Work with PK-12 reading specialists who are representatives of the field and not only Roger William University program graduates as well as other individuals with appropriate expertise to identify current best practices for meeting the needs of diverse students and families in diverse communities. Integrate these practices into the program of study, including explicit instruction of specialized practices and interventions expected for the role of reading specialists.
- Review and revise the program design and clinical experience process to ensure that all candidates have multiple opportunities to work as aspiring reading specialists with PK-12 students from diverse backgrounds, English language learners, students with special needs, and families in diverse communities.
- Revise the assessment system to ensure that candidate proficiency in meeting the needs of diverse learners and families in diverse communities is assessed and that candidate progress in the program is based in part on their ability to meet these expectations.
- Conduct an audit of resources that are shared with candidates regarding meeting the needs of diverse learners and families in diverse communities. Ensure that only current, high-quality, and specialized resources are provided that communicate programmatic goals and expectations consistent with the professional standards.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop general knowledge and understanding of Rhode Island educational initiatives and policies that are consistent with the expectations for reading specialists.	

- When prompted to describe how the program ensures that all candidates develop a deep understanding of Rhode Island educational initiatives that are applicable for the role of reading specialist, the program’s response was that “almost all Candidates are practicing Rhode Island teachers.” The program also reported that “Candidates are pre-assessed about their knowledge



(of RI educational initiatives), and information they need to fill in the gaps is provided during EDU 650.” The review team was unclear of the purpose of this response and the program did not provide evidence of how it pre-assesses candidates of this knowledge in EDU 650, which occurs late in the program sequence during the last semester.

- Most course syllabi list several Rhode Island initiatives and education policies that are appropriate for the role of reading specialist including personal literacy plans, Rhode Island PK-12 Literacy Policy, Common Core State Standards, Rhode Island Code of Professional Responsibility, and Response to Intervention. Also included in several course syllabi are initiatives that are outdated and no longer current including the New England Common Assessment Program, the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers, and Grade Span Expectations in reading and writing.
- The program did not provide evidence how it supports candidates to develop deep knowledge of other Rhode Island initiatives important to the role of reading specialist including the Multi-Tiered System of Support, Title I, dyslexia, and social emotional learning.
- Despite the prominence with which the Rhode Island initiatives and educational policies are identified in program materials and course syllabi, these did not appear to be a programmatic priority. Candidate knowledge of these initiatives was consistent with that of a general education teacher and not someone prepared for an advanced and specialized certification.

Recommendations

- Work with PK-12 reading specialists who are representatives of the field and not only Roger William University program graduates as well as other individuals with appropriate expertise to identify the full range of current Rhode Island initiatives and educational policies consistent with the role of reading specialist.
- Conduct a gap-analysis of the current program curriculum and related learning experience and integrate additional opportunities for explicit instruction and practice in the knowledge and skills inherent in the appropriate Rhode Island educational initiatives and policies.
- Revise the assessment system to include specific assessment opportunities to monitor and provide feedback to candidates regarding their developing knowledge and skills of Rhode Island initiatives and educational policies consistent with the role of reading specialists.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Approaching Expectations
Clinical preparation experiences are limited and do not provide candidates authentic and diverse opportunities to practice, be assessed, and receive feedback on performance.	

- The program reported that clinical preparation occurs at two levels: self-study in the field and an internship experience. The program described these as “extensive field experiences that include



self-study in candidates' schools and districts as well as directed internship experiences embedded in coursework.”

- The self-study experience entails forty hours that candidates must complete over the course of the program, record on a log sheet, and submit as course requirement for EDU 650: Leadership for Literacy Professionals. The program provides candidates examples of possible experiences including participating in professional development, working with small groups of students, working with reading specialists, and the like. The field experience log is assessed using a scoring scale based on completion and the variety of experiences.
- The internship experience entails 375 hours embedded in coursework across four different courses, EDU 634: Assessment of Reading and Writing Difficulties, EDU 638: Clinical Experiences in Literacy Education, EDU 650: Leadership for Literacy Professionals, and EDU 654: Advanced Literacy Research Seminar. The program reports that these experiences require candidates to engage in a wide-range of activities necessary for the role of reading specialists including working with students, shadowing reading specialists, designing intervention plans, and delivering professional development.
- Program candidates and program completers reported that the clinical experiences are essential part of their preparation and are important opportunities to practice serving as reading specialists with students and their professional colleagues.
- The review team’s concerns with clinical experiences are both the structure and design of these experiences. Structurally, while clinical experiences begin early in the program, these experiences are optional in nature – candidate select what they do. As such, candidates are not required to complete specific activities, implement lesson plans or interventions, and receive feedback on their progress. The structure of these experiences hinders the opportunity for the program to ensure experiences that increase in complexity and promote coherence across course-based and field-based learning. A second structural concern is that candidates are not required to experience field setting in a variety of placements. The program encourages candidates to observe practice, shadow reading specialists, and complete tasks in multiple settings, but the program does not require it.
- The concerns with the design of the clinical experience are two-fold. The current design of the clinical experience do not represent a substantial opportunity to experience the range and intensity of the full responsibility for reading specialist. Isolated hours calculated across several courses allow the program to meet minimal required internship hours, but this does not reflect a quality, rich, professional learning experience. Candidate opportunity to practice working with PK-12 students and professional colleagues is limited and inauthentic. Furthermore, as the program struggles to include students from the full PK-12 grade span in the reading clinic, candidates do not experience working with students in the lower elementary and upper secondary grades. The second design concern is the absence of supervision and feedback for most clinical experiences. Candidates are only supervised during their work with PK-12 students in the summer reading clinic. Candidate work in other experiences identified as internship experiences such as developing case studies, working with colleagues, and completing comprehensive tasks are not supervised by clinical educators. As such, candidates are not



provided the opportunity to practice, receive feedback, and demonstrate progress based on their performance as reading specialists throughout their internship.

Recommendations

- Revise the clinical experience structure and design to prioritize quality, authentic, developmentally appropriate experiences that ensure candidates practice and develop proficiency in the full range of the professional standards.
- Recognize that the required 300 hour internship experience is a minimum requirement, that counting hours across multiple courses may not comprise a valid internship experience, and that the completion of individual course-based assignments in clinical settings does not equate to a comprehensive and developmentally appropriate internship.
- Revise the structure of the clinical experiences to ensure that all candidates are required to complete clinical experiences in a variety of developmentally appropriate settings and settings that require candidates to work with diverse learners and families in diverse communities.
- Revise the design of the clinical experiences to ensure that all candidates are required to work with the full grade span of PK-12 students in clinical settings and that candidates are supervised in all aspects of their clinical settings, working with PK-12 students and their professional colleagues.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Does Not Meet Expectations
Clinical experiences do not ensure that candidates have an impact on student learning and the program does not use data from impact on student learning to guide candidate progress.	

- When prompted to describe how the program ensures that coherent clinical experiences enable candidates to demonstrate impact on student learning and that data collected from early clinical measures of impact on student learning is used to inform and improve candidate preparation, the program’s response was that “the Candidates are practicing teachers. Tools and guidance are woven into their classroom practice as they learn new and more effective ways to assess their impact on student learning.” This response may address potential impact the program may have on general education classroom teachers and their students, it does not respond to the expectations of this component or the expectations for the reading specialist program.
- Early in the program, candidates design but are not required to implement lessons, interventions, and projects they complete in their courses, thus precluding the opportunity to determine candidate impact on PK-12 student learning. Candidates are only required to design and implement lessons and interventions during the clinical experience in EDU 638: Clinical Experience in Literacy Education which occurs midway through their preparation. As such, the program structurally cannot use measures of impact on student learning from early in the program to inform candidate progress throughout the program.



- The program uses the Bristol-Warren School District from which to recruit PK-12 students to participate in the summer reading clinic. The program did not provide any evidence that it works with this district as a partner to identify expected measures of candidate impact on student learning or that it works together to collect and analyze this data to inform candidate progress and improve candidate’s ability to impact student learning, expectations of the RISEP.
- Candidates complete three case studies during the program, one in EDU 634: Assessment of Reading and Writing Difficulties and two in the summer reading clinic as part of EDU 638: Clinical Experiences in Literacy Education. In each case study, candidates assess student learning needs and then design and implement lessons and interventions. Candidates then reflect on the interventions and propose next steps for students. These are important learning opportunities for candidates to develop their capacity and to impact student learning. Since these case studies are conducted in different courses and because the program does not monitor candidate progress and outcomes across these case studies, the program misses an opportunity to use candidate impact data to guide candidate progress.
- The review team also noted that impact on PK-12 student learning is not prioritized in the program assessment system. Candidates are required to complete a series of projects and assessments, none of which require candidates to demonstrate increased impact on student learning to progress in the program.

Recommendations

- Establish a role for local schools and districts to serve as partners in the recruitment of PK-12 students for the reading clinic and to mutually design agreed-upon measures of candidate impact on PK-12 student learning. Expand this partnership beyond the current partnership with Bristol-Warren if necessary to meet the needs of candidates and the expectations of the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation.
- Work with clinical partners to identify expected measures of candidate impact on PK-12 student learning from early in the program through later clinical experiences. Clearly communicate these expected measures of impact on student learning to the program, its partners, and candidates.
- Develop and implement a system to collect, analyze, and use data from candidate impact on student learning throughout the program’s clinical experiences to inform candidate progress in the program.
- Revise the assessment system to prioritize candidate impact on student learning as an essential component of the assessment system.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not have clinical partnerships or engage with partners to evaluate candidate progress or guide program and partnership improvement.	

- The program identified its partners as its adjunct faculty members who also teach in local PK-12 school districts. However, adjunct faculty members do not meet the expectations of the RISEP



which require that approved educator preparation programs establish mutually beneficial partnerships with PK-12 schools and districts.

- As identified above, the program recruits PK-12 students from the Bristol-Warren School District. The program does not otherwise view the district as a partner and engage with the district to establish a mutually beneficial partnership with shared responsibility to design and refine clinical partnerships and practice, agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness, and making partnership decisions.
- The program reported that it makes all decisions about candidate progress and program improvement through annual faculty retreats and does not engage PK-12 school and districts in the design and improvement process. The program reported that the programs and its candidates have a good reputation in the field but did not offer an explanation as to why it chooses not to establish mutually beneficial partnerships that could support program improvement.

Recommendations

- Establish mutually beneficial partnerships with local PK-12 schools and districts that are consistent with the expectations of the RISEP and that can play a critical role in the design and guidance of program improvement efforts.
- In conjunction with PK-12 partners, establish agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness. In conjunction with PK-12 partners, track and monitor data to analyze and refine partnerships based upon data from the agreed-upon indicators.
- Establish and share common expectations for candidate performance with PK-12 partners and work with partners to make collaborative decisions about candidate progress.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program has not established criteria for clinical educators, does not recruit PK-12 educators to serve as clinical educators, and does not evaluate clinical educators for their role.	

- The program identified its two full-time faculty members as the program’s clinical educators. In this role, the full-time faculty members are responsible for providing supervision and feedback to candidates in the summer reading clinic – the only aspect of candidate clinical experiences that are supervised.
- The program has not established criteria for clinical educators that include at a minimum designation as highly qualified educators, the ability to work with adult learners, coaching and supervision skills, and the ability to evaluate and provide feedback consistent with established expectations in the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation.
- The program does not systematically analyze and make decisions on the effectiveness of the clinical educators as the faculty members are not evaluated for their performance in this role.



- The review team found that while the summer reading clinic is a valuable opportunity for candidates to practice working with PK-12 students, the absence of certified and current practicing reading specialist serving as clinical educators and who meet expected criteria for the role may limit the effectiveness of the clinic and prevent candidates from receiving authentic and appropriate feedback on their performance.

Recommendations

- Establish criteria for clinical educators consistent with the expectations of the RISEP. Ensure that candidate clinical experiences are supervised by PK-12 clinical educators who meet these criteria.
- Work with PK-12 partners to recruit, select, support and evaluate PK-12 clinical educators who meet the established criteria and who are effective in supervising and supporting candidate growth to meet the full expectations of the professional standards.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not have a performance-based assessment system that is based on candidate impact on student learning and that generates data to guide candidate performance and progress.	

- The program assessment system begins with candidate admission and includes three portfolio reviews at designated points in the program. Each portfolio review requires that candidates submit artifacts aligned to specified IRA standards, a metacognitive essay asserting and justifying alignment between the standards and artifacts, and additional items specific to the portfolio review. Candidates are recommended for certification at program completion based on grades of B or higher in all courses, successful pass rates on the portfolio reviews and three comprehensive tasks, and a self-assessment of candidate dispositions.
- Candidates must provide evidence of meeting four criteria for program admission: minimum undergraduate GPA of 3.0, a personal essay, professional recommendations, and an interview. The program reported that it uses the essay, recommendations, and interview to identify candidates who are likely to succeed as reading specialists. In pre-visit evidence, the program reported that candidates are not admitted conditionally. Onsite evidence and interviews with program faculty indicated that candidates may be admitted conditionally if they do not meet GPA or other criteria.
- The assessment system has clear criteria that are communicated to prospective and current candidates through program and course materials, information and course sessions, and through ongoing informal advising. The program also conducts several portfolio development and information workshops to ensure candidates are aware of and on-track to meet assessment system requirements and schedules. Candidates and program completers reported that they were aware of the assessment system requirements and found the portfolio process to be a valuable learning experience.
- Candidates are recommended for internship by the completion of the second portfolio review. This review takes places immediately after the summer reading clinic. As with the other two



portfolio reviews, candidates must complete a portfolio that contains artifacts and a metacognitive essay. The second portfolio review also includes a candidate presentation explaining their growth in the program and progress towards meeting the IRA standards.

- The program assessment system requires candidates to complete many tasks, it does not require candidates to demonstrate successful performance as reading specialists working with PK-12 students and professional colleagues. Candidates are not formally observed using standards-based performance instruments such as those used in Rhode Island PK-12 schools to evaluate performance and provide actionable feedback. Candidates are not assessed and their progress in the program is not based on how well they impact student learning. The program does not use assessment information to target specific areas of candidate need or to counsel candidates out of the program who do not demonstrate proficiency.
- Some of the tasks such as the teacher intervention project and reading specialist shadowing are meaningful and authentic. The portfolio reviews as constituted do not represent meaningful and authentic assessments of practice or performance – all of the artifacts are previously completed and assessed as part of course grades, the metacognitive essays are typically superficial, brief restatements of completed work, and the comprehensive tasks are counted for both course completion as well as portfolio review. Program tasks require candidates to describe, discuss, and reflect what they have done and what they might do, rather than serve as opportunities to assess candidate performance working as PK-12 reading specialists.
- The concern with the assessment system is magnified due to the program’s assertion that the program has “exemplary assessment materials” and that the program “knows it turns out exemplary reading specialists” despite not having performance and standards-based measures to support this assertion. When prompted to describe assessment systems areas of strength and areas in need of improvement, the program listed six strengths, including “methods to evaluate the assessment system” despite showing no evidence of evaluation methods or processes. The program did not report any areas in need of improvement for the assessment system.

Recommendations

- Work with School of Humanities, Arts, and Education leadership to identify individuals with expertise in performance-based assessment systems. Work with these individuals and provider leadership, to develop, pilot, and implement a valid, reliable, and performance-based assessment system that is based on the professional standards for reading specialists and consistent with the expectations of the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation.
- Ensure that assessment of candidate performance as prospective reading specialists begins early in the program and continues through recommendation for certification, is based on candidate ability to impact student learning, and that information from the assessment system is used to guide candidate progress in the program.
- Include in the assessment system performance-based observation instruments that are consistent with those used in Rhode Island PK-12 public schools and that include candidate impact on student learning such as student learning objectives and student outcome objectives as measure of performance.



3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program assessment system does not ensure that only candidates who meet the full range of the professional standards are recommended for certification.	

- The program reported that once a candidate completes the final portfolio review, the program recommends the candidate for certification. The program has clear criteria necessary for recommendation for certification: minimum GPA of 3.0, a minimum grade of B in all literacy courses, successful passage of three portfolio reviews and four comprehensive tasks, and a 3.0 on a dispositions self-evaluation. The program does not require candidates to pass the Rhode Island certification licensure tests for reading specialists to be recommended for certification.
- The program clearly communicates the criteria for recommendation for certification as well as the other assessment decision points to candidates. The program reported that it promotes consistent evaluation and feedback through ongoing discussions and sharing of candidate work, common assessment instruments, consistent faculty, and annual faculty retreats to review candidate progress and assessment practices.
- The program reported great confidence in their candidates and that the program ensures only fully prepared candidates are recommended for certification. However, candidates and some program completers reported that they were not fully prepared for day one in the full range of the professional standards, including gaps with instructional materials and technology, working with diverse learners and families, and serving as school leaders.
- Consistent with the overall assessment system, candidates are recommended for certification based on their ability to write about, reflect upon, and present information on the professional standards. The criteria that comprise the recommendation for certification do not ensure that candidates are proficient in the professional standards, can serve effectively as reading specialists, or are prepared on day one to demonstrate proficiency in the full range of the pedagogical, content, and field of study competencies for their field.

Recommendations

- Ensure that the recommendation for certification decision point in the new assessment system is grounded upon the professional standards and that only candidates who demonstrate proficiency in the full range of the standards are recommended for certification.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program surveys employers occasionally, but the process does not yield actionable information for continuous improvement.	

- The program reported that it surveyed employers of candidate from the previous two candidate cohorts in fall 2018. The survey instrument included seven questions with a five-point rating scale and two open-ended questions. The survey focused on issues such as candidate preparation, integration of technology, knowledge of standards-based instruction and differentiated instruction, impact on learning, and areas for program improvement.



- The program received ten responses and provided aggregate numerical data for the closed questions as well as several comments from the open-ended questions. The responses to the closed items were positive, all responses were in the two highest scales. The open-ended responses were also positive complimenting the program and lauding the qualities of their staff members who had recently completed the program.
- Employers in this survey reported two areas for improvement: increased opportunities for parent outreach and increased practice with instructional technology.
- The program reported that it values employer feedback and uses it as a source of informal data to integrate into the program improvement process.

Recommendations

- Establish a system to annually survey employers. Ensure that the survey content and process yield actionable feedback that is integrated into a systematic program improvement process.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program surveys candidates through an exit survey which generates limited information that can be used for program improvement.	

- The program surveys candidates through an exit survey process in the final semester of the program, not program completers who have graduated from the program and are practicing in the field, as is required by the RISEP. The survey includes eleven open-ended questions.
- The survey questions could be construed as being leading as many questions seem designed to generate positive responses: “What was your most valuable experience?” “What was the most valuable project?” “Do you feel like you spent enough time in the field and clinical settings?” “Would you recommend RWU Masters in Literacy program?”
- Candidate responses were generally positive complimenting the program, faculty, clinical experiences, and their overall preparation. A few responses indicated ideas for improvement such as increased focus on phonics, vocabulary, and root words.
- The program reported that it views positive responses from candidates and employers as well as positive responses from parents and teachers in the summer clinic as affirmation of program and candidate quality.

Recommendations

- Establish a system to survey program completers annually in addition to the current candidate exit survey. Ensure that an annual completer survey yields actionable information for program improvement.



- Include in the survey instrument non-biased questions that probe for completer level of preparedness on day one consistent with the expectations of the professional standards.

Provider-Level Findings and Recommendations

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.1 Diversity of Candidates	Does not Meet Expectation
The provider does not recruit, admit, support, and graduate candidates who reflect the diversity of Rhode Island.	

- Roger Williams University has established at the institution level, leadership positions and recruitment processes that are designed to increase candidate diversity campus-wide across undergraduate and graduate programs. Institutional leadership reported that it has worked to improve marketing and communications efforts to expand outreach to prospective candidates from diverse backgrounds. Evidence was provided that financial support has increased across the institution to meet the demonstrated need for 85% of its student population.
- Roger Williams University leadership also reported that it is beginning to work with programs such as those in the Roger Williams University Department of Education to increase candidate diversity across the university. Current focus areas include common application and financial aid workshops at Hope High School in Providence, Rhode Island and better connecting education majors with Arts and Sciences majors. The institution also plans to launch a new partnership with Rogers High School in Newport, Rhode Island to support high school achievement and to encourage interest in post-secondary education.
- The provider reported that its recruitment efforts include tours for prospective candidates, shadowing days for individuals interested in education, and informal outreach efforts through its partners and local networks to encourage candidates to apply to education programs.
- Enrollment in the education programs does not reflect the diversity of Rhode Island schools, in which 59% of students are white and 41% are from diverse backgrounds. The provider shared contradictory evidence regarding the current profile of candidates at the institution and the education programs. One document indicated that the institutional undergraduate enrollment was 23% diverse and the education program enrollment was 11% diverse. A different document indicated that institutional enrollment for diverse candidates was 18%. The provider shared evidence that the enrollment in the reading specialist program for the last three years has had no gender diversity and was 96% white.
- The provider reported that both the education programs and the institution provide periodic campus-wide events that focus on issues of social justice, current events, and meeting the needs of new candidates. These events were episodic in nature and do not reflect an intentional and strategic effort to capitalize on the diversity of candidates in the education programs.

Recommendations

- Work with institutional leadership to identify and implement formal and strategic recruitment practices that hold promise for success to recruit, admit, and graduate high-quality candidates in the educator preparation programs who reflect the diversity of Rhode Island.



- Explore additional opportunities to leverage the Providence campus as well as strengthened partnerships in diverse communities to communicate the accessibility and potential opportunities of the education programs for candidates from diverse backgrounds.
- Work with institutional leadership to identify and implement practices that capitalize on the diverse experiences of candidates from different backgrounds in the educator preparation programs to strengthen the overall cohort of education candidates.

3.2 Response to Employment Needs	Approaching Expectations
The provider shares general employment data informally with program candidates.	

- The provider reported that it shares employment information with current candidates formally and informally through message boards, email blasts, and career fairs. The provider also reported that it has formed a senior mentor program to help graduating seniors prepare for job-seeking activities, interviews, and possible graduate study.
- As part of the assessment system, candidates are required to develop and update portfolios that include resumes, cover letters, public-speaking presentations, and artifacts that they can use as evidence of their readiness for employment.
- The provider has recently launched a STEAM certificate program that candidates can complete to increase their marketability upon program completion. The provider offers candidates learning opportunities for sheltered English instruction required for state licensure in Massachusetts. The provider also reported that it encourages candidates in the elementary program to pursue middle grades certification as an additional means to increase their employment prospects.
- Provider faculty and staff reported strong interest in program graduates and that employers often reach out directly to request Roger Williams University completers for interviews. Candidates expressed some concerns about their readiness to seek employment upon program completion. Some candidates reported that they lacked information about required state certification tests, how to get certified in Rhode Island, and how to secure teaching positions in their field. Some other candidates reported that they were directed to apply for early childhood positions, daycare, or afterschool programs despite having completed a four-year degree program in elementary education.
- The provider did not submit evidence that it formally and proactively shares employment data with prospective candidates prior to admission and program selection. The provider also did not provide evidence that it encourages candidates to pursue shortage fields such as secondary mathematics and science or all grades world language, the smallest educator preparation programs based on enrollment at the institution.

Recommendations

- Establish and implement a formal process to share employment data with prospective candidates prior to admission and program selection. Ensure that this data includes information



regarding hard-to-staff fields and surplus fields such as elementary education, secondary English and social studies.

- Access and use available resources on the current hiring landscape both regionally and in Rhode Island provided by RIDE and other agencies to provide a more clear picture of employment prospects to current and future candidates.
- Explore additional communication strategies and processes to prepare candidates for successful transition to attaining state certification and seeking employment in their certification field.

3.3 Admissions Standards for Academic Achievement and Ability	Approaching Expectations
The provider admits candidates who meet Rhode Island Department of Education minimum requirements but uses an unapproved conditional acceptance policy.	

- The provider has established undergraduate admission requirements that meet the minimum requirements for academic achievement indicated by candidate GPA and scores on standardized assessments such as the American College Test, the Scholastic Aptitude Test, and Praxis Core Assessment on Mathematics, Reading, and Writing.
- The provider has established a conditional acceptance policy that delays formal admittance into the program until candidates can demonstrate evidence of meeting the minimum requirements. During this time, candidates are able to enroll in education courses during their freshman and sophomore year.
- The provider has created a student support protocol as part of its conditional acceptance program. The protocol establishes a contract indicating actions the candidates must take to address areas of concern and identifies monitoring practices to ensure candidates progress.
- The Reading Specialist program provided contradictory evidence regarding a conditional acceptance policy. In narrative documents prepared for the review team, the program reported that it does not accept candidates conditionally. However, program materials describe a conditional acceptance policy that allows candidate to gain admittance without meeting the established minimum GPA with “submission of other evidence of academic potential.”
- During summer 2017, provider staff members reached out to the Rhode Island Department of Education with questions about a conditional acceptance policy but never submitted a proposal for review and approval. It has since implemented a conditional acceptance policy without approval by the Rhode Island Department of Education.

Recommendations

- Determine if the provider will use a conditional acceptance policy based on multiple measures, consistent with the minimum requirements established by the Rhode Island Department of Education, that includes a formal process to monitor candidate progress, and that provides sufficient supports to ensure candidate success.



- If the provider determines it will use a conditional acceptance policy, submit this policy to the Rhode Island Department of Education for review and approval as stated in established policy.

3.6 Additional Selectivity Criteria	Meets Expectation
The provider has established a set of professional dispositions for educator effectiveness and monitors candidate performance against these dispositions throughout the assessment system.	

- The provider reported that it established the current set of required candidate dispositions based on research of educator effectiveness. These dispositions include for teacher programs traits such as effective communication, empathy, open-mindedness, respect for diversity, and the like, and for the reading specialist program, leadership qualities and commitment to working with students and diverse learners.
- The dispositions are assessed throughout the program beginning at admissions and are included as part of the portfolio reviews for teacher and reading specialist candidates. Faculty and candidates report that the dispositions are an important part of candidate preparation and are indicators of effective and professional practice.
- The provider and its programs should continue to monitor both the content of the dispositions and information from the disposition assessments to inform future updates to the dispositions, how they are integrated into the assessment system, and how this information should guide program improvement.

Standard 5: Program Quality and Improvement

5.1 Collection of Data to Evaluate Program Quality	Does Not Meet Expectations
The provider does not use a systematic process to collect data to monitor and improve program quality and candidate and completer performance.	

- Roger Williams University institutional leadership reported that it recognizes the importance of data systems and data-driven improvement efforts and cited the institutional use of the Civitas Learning system and the Academic Strategic Enrollment Plan to monitor program performance and enrollment as evidence of this commitment.
- The educator preparation programs, with the exception of the Reading Specialist program, use the Taskstream platform as its current course management system through which candidates upload completed work and receive feedback. The provider also uses the system to record and track candidate assessment information including course grades, portfolio completion, and progress towards program and clinical requirements.
- The provider does not currently use either institutional data systems or Taskstream as data collection systems for systematic program improvement. The provider reported that its improvement process is based on completer surveys, feedback from faculty retreats, research, requests from candidates, and anecdotal information from partners, schools, and school districts.
- The provider does not have a process to systematically collect data on coursework, the assessment system, the quality of feedback to candidates, or candidate and completer



performance, all expectations of the RISEP and necessary to guide and inform effective improvement processes.

Recommendations

- Work with Roger Williams University and School of Humanities, Arts, and Education leadership to implement systematic data collection processes to guide program evaluation and improvement on an annual basis.
- Identify which data sources and variables are necessary to collect and monitor coursework, the assessment systems, the quality of feedback to candidates, and candidate and completer performance.
- Establish specific roles and responsibilities for the collection of data, the quality of data, and its availability for program evaluation and improvement.

5.2 Analysis and Use of Data for Continuous Improvement	Does Not Meet Expectations
The provider does not use a systematic process to analyze and use data to evaluate program, candidate, and completer performance, track results over time, or guide continuous improvement.	

- The provider does not use systematic processes to analyze data to inform improvement efforts. The provider reported that it relies on informal and anecdotal information to guide changes to programs and candidate experiences. For example, the provider reported that it added new coursework and clinical experiences in response to candidate testimonials, survey responses, and formal and informal research.
- The provider also reported that faculty retreats and advisory board meetings serve as a vehicle to analyze program performance and make recommendations for improvement. Evidence provided to the review team indicated that the advisory board has not met regularly and that faculty retreats do not include a process for the systematic analysis of data to track and inform program improvement efforts.
- Absent processes to systematically collect and analyze data, the provider relies primarily on the faculty’s collective thoughts and beliefs of what constitutes effective educator preparation to guide program improvement. The review team observed that an inherent limitation in this approach is to confirm biases, such as the preference for a holistic, open-ended assessment system grounded in reflection, rather than a performance-based assessment system grounded in standards-based, actionable feedback. Another observed limitation of this approach is to allow established precedents to stand without examination – such as inaccurately assuming all teacher candidates must complete a health education course or that providers can delegate responsibility for clinical educator selection to district partners.
- The reading specialist program has undergone significant changes in recent years involving the length of the program, the sequence and design of courses, and the structure of the clinical experiences. The program and provider did not share any evidence that these changes were based on systematic data collection or analysis to ensure an effective program design and



candidates outcomes. Rather, the program reported that the changes were made based on informal analysis, scheduling convenience, and efforts to attract candidates.

Recommendations

- Work with Roger Williams University and School of Humanities, Arts, and Education leadership to implement systematic structures and processes to analyze data to guide program design, evaluation, and improvement on an annual basis.
- Establish specific roles and responsibilities for the analysis of data, to track programmatic changes to specific data analysis processes, and to monitor program, candidate, and completer performance over time to allow for data-informed changes.

5.3 Reporting and Sharing of Data	Does Not Meet Expectations
The provider does not publicly and clearly report information on program and candidate outcomes or supplement this information with data collected by the provider and its programs.	

- The provider meets Rhode Island Department of Education Educator Preparation Index reporting requirements. However, the provider does not share publicly Educator Preparation Index data or supplement it with additional information collected by the provider.
- As part of evidence for the review team, the provider shared a web link to access Educator Preparation Index data on its website; this link led only to the Department of Education main landing page. The review team was not able to locate any material online or in other public-facing spaces that communicated program and candidate outcomes. The provider reported that Roger Williams University was undergoing a major rebuild of the program websites and could not respond to its requests to include additional information.
- The provider’s website contains several articles and links that describe individual candidate’s stories and successes in the programs and in the field. Although these provide information about the provider and its programs, these are primarily marketing efforts and do not meet the expectations for providers to publicly share information about completer outcomes and employment status, candidate and completer impact on PK-12 student performance, or data that benchmarks the provider’s outcomes against similar providers.

Recommendations

- Recognize the requirements of this component that obligate Rhode Island Department of Education approved educator preparation providers to prominently share with the public and their stakeholders Educator Preparation Index data and to use this data to engage with stakeholders to inform program changes.
- Communicate the importance of this requirement to Roger Williams University leadership and establish a process to ensure that Educator Preparation Index data is prominently displayed on the provider’s website and updated annually based on provider and program outcomes.



- Work with provider and program leadership and key stakeholders to identify additional data that should be used to supplement Educator Preparation Index data to provide a more clear picture of provider and program outcomes. Prominently and publicly share this data alongside annual Educator Preparation Index data.

5.4 Stakeholder Engagement	Approaching Expectations
The provider and its programs engage stakeholders through informal methods and use anecdotal feedback to guide program improvement.	

- The provider identified its stakeholders as “alumni, employers, practitioners, and school and community partners.” The provider reported that it meets with these stakeholders through formal and informal means. Formally, the provider shared evidence of an advisory board, although this board has not met during the previous two years and only resumed meetings in fall 2018. Informally, the provider and its programs meet with its stakeholders during school walk-throughs, conferences, networking opportunities, and through individual communications such as phone calls and emails.
- Clinical partners, including school and district leaders, reported that the provider and its programs are responsive to their needs and open to their feedback. Partners cited instances in which they expressed concerns about specific candidate placements and suggestions for additional clinical experiences and felt that they were heard and their concerns addressed.
- The provider has surveyed employers as a means to get additional stakeholder feedback. With the exception of employers for Reading Specialist program, these surveys did not result in a meaningful response, yielding only two responses. The provider reported that an annual newsletter was sent to partners providing updates on the programs; these newsletters were not shared with the review team.

Recommendations

- Establish and implement a systematic process to regularly involve stakeholders in the review of program and candidate performance in an ongoing basis.
- Establish and implement a systematic process to integrate stakeholder feedback into the continuous review of provider and program outcomes and performance.
- Establish and implement a system to regularly communicate to stakeholders provider and program outcomes, changes based on stakeholder feedback, and opportunities for stakeholders to engage in the improvement process.

5.5 Diversity and Quality of Faculty	Approaching Expectations
Provider faculty are qualified for their roles but do not reflect the diversity of Rhode Island and as such the programs are not able to capitalize upon faculty diversity.	

- Faculty in the educator preparation programs are qualified for their roles; they model teaching practices consistent with the expectations of the professional standards; and they are deeply



committed to their programs and candidates. Candidates and program completers reported that their faculty are critical supports in their success and tireless advocates on their behalf. Many candidates and completers described faculty as being like a family who were vested in their success and outcomes.

- Roger Williams University has an evaluation system that begins upon appointment, continues through the tenure process, and includes post-tenure review. The evaluation process includes criteria for research, scholarship, teaching, and service and includes reviews at designated schedules based on faculty status. The evaluation process acknowledges service in PK-12 schools as a criteria for faculty review. Adjunct faculty are evaluated annually by provider leadership based on their performance in courses. All faculty are evaluated by candidates as part of course completion. The provider did not make available university evaluation information although it did share candidate course evaluations.
- Roger Williams University leadership reported that all faculty hires are conducted through an institutional search process and that all search committees engage in bias training. University leadership also reported that faculty diversity and equity issues are priorities for the institution and that strategies such as faculty equity fellows, the creation of a Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, and support systems for faculty and candidates from diverse backgrounds are evidence of this commitment.
- The review team recognized this commitment to diversity, equity, and faculty members from diverse backgrounds at the institutional level. This commitment to diversity has not been manifested among the educator preparation programs. Little turnover among full-time faculty and the practice of hiring adjuncts and university supervisors from non-diverse backgrounds has ensured that faculty and staff in the education program do not reflect the diversity of Rhode Island. The review team was also very concerned that some faculty members communicate personal biases when talking to candidates about the perceived inherent difficulty to practice teaching in urban schools and the goal to seek “good jobs” in suburban schools.

Recommendations

- Continue the institutional efforts to recruit, hire, and promote faculty and staff members from diverse backgrounds. Continue the institutional efforts to create a supportive and inclusive environment for faculty and candidates from diverse backgrounds.
- Work with Roger Williams University and the School of Health, Education, and the Arts leadership to develop and implement a plan to increase diversity among faculty, staff, adjunct faculty, and university supervisors in the educator preparation programs.
- Establish and implement a process for provider leadership and staff to examine and address potential bias and messaging when discussing school and community contexts and negative stereotypes that may emerge in daily discourse among faculty, staff, and candidates.

5.6 Other Resources	Meets Expectations
The provider reported that it has adequate and sufficient resources to deliver quality programs.	



- The provider reported that it has “ample resources” to meet the needs of its programs, faculty, and candidates. These resources include more than twenty faculty, staff, and administrative support personnel, a recently dedicated space for the educator preparation programs, three technologically equipped classrooms, and additional curriculum and material supports.
- Roger Williams University has recently appointed a new dean of the School of Humanities, Education, and the Arts. This position will serve as an important resource to the educator preparation programs. As has been identified throughout this report, substantial programmatic revisions are necessary throughout the education programs to ensure alignment to the expectations of the RISEP, the RIPTS, and the full range of professional standards. New and focused leadership will be essential to the success of this process to lead, direct, and supervise the program improvement process.
- The review team observed that the position of Director of Partnerships and Placements is necessary to ensure that appropriate partnerships and placement structures are available for programs and candidates. The provider should maintain this position as a dedicated, full-time position without additional operational responsibilities to manage or lead the educator preparation programs.
- The provider and its programs require a data system, processes, and personnel to systematically collect and analyze data for program evaluation and improvement. The review team found this to be a significant resource deficit and addressing this deficit will be essential for meaningful and substantial improvement efforts.
- An additional resource issue for the provider and its programs to address with necessary and potentially creative solutions is candidate access to clinical and off-campus learning experiences. For some candidates, the lack of access to transportation to field sites meant that candidates could only engage in field sites in nearby locations such as Bristol-Warren, thus limiting their opportunity for diverse field experiences. For other candidates, particularly those in the secondary and all grades programs, carrying double majors between education and content areas severely limited their ability to engage in clinical experiences, conferences, field trips, and other activities associated with aspiring educators. Education faculty and members of the Arts and Science programs should collaboratively seek solutions to these challenges.



Appendix A: 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.



Appendix B: Guidance for Program Classification, Provider Approval Term, and Approval Conditions

Review teams use the following guidance to make program classification, provider approval term, and approval condition decisions. Note: Review teams may use professional judgment and discretion when making these decisions based on the overall performance of the program and provider.

Program Classification	Description	Conditions
Approval with Distinction	Overall program performance is at the highest level with most components rated at Meets Expectations. If there are a small number of Approaching Expectations, a team is not precluded from assigning this classification.	No conditions
Full Approval	Overall program performance is consistently strong. The program is predominantly meeting standards for performance with some that are Approaching Expectations. If there are Does Not Meets Expectations in a small number of components, a team is not precluded from assigning this classification.	Action Plan for improvement areas with possible interim visit
Approval with Conditions	Program performance is predominantly Approaching Expectations or a mix of Approaching Expectations and Meets Expectations. There may be a small number of Does Not Meet Expectations. Programs considered for this classification may also be considered as Low Performing or Non-Renewal.	Action Plan and interim visit
Low Performing	Overall program performance is weak, but may also be varied across components. There may be some Meets Expectations, but components are predominantly Approaching Expectations and Does Not Meet Expectations. Programs considered for this classification are also considered for Non-Renewal.	Action Plan and interim visit
Non-Renewal	Overall program performance is low and is predominantly not meeting expectations. There are many components at Does Not Meet Expectations, though there may be a small number of components at Meets Expectations or Approaching Expectations.	No subsequent visit

Provider Approval Term	Description	Conditions
7 Years	All programs have classifications of Approval with Distinction or Full Approval. Most provider components are rated Meets Expectations.	No conditions
5 Years	Most programs have classifications of Approval with Distinction or Full Approval, although there may be a small number of programs classified as Approved with Conditions. Most provider components are rated Meets Expectations.	No conditions



Provider Approval Term	Description	Conditions
4 or 3 Years	Program performance is varied. A number of programs are Approved with Conditions. Many provider components are rated Approaching Expectations.	No conditions
2 Years	Program performance is varied. Some programs have classifications of Approved with Conditions, and others are classified as Low Performing or Non-Renewal. Many provider components are rated Approaching Expectations.	Action Plan and interim visit
Non-Renewal	Overall program performance is low. All programs are Low Performing or Non-Renewal. Most provider components are rated Does Not Meet Expectations.	No subsequent visit



Appendix C: Glossary

Candidate: A person currently enrolled in educator preparation program; student

Clinical educator: A PK-12 educator who oversees a candidate's clinical experiences; clinical educator or mentor teacher

Clinical partner: District, charter, or private school where a candidate is placed during clinical experiences

Clinical preparation: A series of supervised field experiences (including student teaching) within a PreK-12 setting that occur as a sequenced, integral part of the preparation program prior to the candidate

Clinical supervisor: A provider staff member responsible for oversight of practicum, student teaching, and/or internship; clinical supervisor

Completer: A person who has successfully finished an educator preparation program; alumnus; graduate

Component: Defines a distinct aspect of standard

Program approval: State authorization of an educator preparation program to endorse program completers prepared in Rhode Island for educator licensure in Rhode Island

Program classification: Denotes the quality of a specific certificate area or grade span preparation program based on the performance of program-level components; may be Approval with Distinction, Full Approval, Approval with Conditions, Low Performing, or Non-Renewal

Program completer: See *Completer*

Program: A state-approved sequence of courses and experiences that, if completed, meets preparation requirements for certification in Rhode Island

Provider approval term: The length of time for which the provider's programs will continue to have approval as determined by the review team based on program classifications and provider-level components; varies from non-renewal to seven years

Reviewer: A person identified by RIDE as someone with the necessary knowledge, experience, training and dispositions required to evaluate evidence of how programs meet criteria

Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS): Content standards approved by the Board of Regents in 2007 that outline what every teacher should know and be able to do

Rhode Island Standards for Educational Leadership (RISEL): Content standards approved by the Board of Regents in 2008 that outline the knowledge, skills, and dispositions for educators who assume leadership responsibilities

Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation: A set of five standards developed by RIDE in collaboration with Rhode Island PK-12 educators and educator preparation faculty that communicate expectations for what constitutes high-quality educator preparation in Rhode Island