



PREP-RI Rhode Island
Department
of Education

Review Team Performance Report

Brown University

May 1 to May 4, 2022



Table of Contents

Performance Review of Educator Preparation - Rhode Island 4

Report Purpose and Layout 4

 Key Terms Used in this Report 5

Report Summary 5

 Program Classifications 6

 Provider Approval Term 7

Component Ratings 7

 Standard 1: Professional Knowledge 7

 Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice 8

 Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment 8

 Standard 4: Program Impact 9

 Standard 5: Program Quality and Improvement 9

Teacher Certificate Areas: Findings and Recommendations 10

 Secondary Grades 10

 Standard 1: Professional Knowledge 10

 Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice 14

 Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment 17

 Standard 4: Program Impact 18

Provider-Level Findings and Recommendations 19

 Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment 19

 Standard 5: Program Quality and Improvement 21

Appendix A: Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation 24

 STANDARD ONE: PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE 24

 STANDARD TWO: CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE 24

 STANDARD THREE: CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND ASSESSMENT 25

 STANDARD FOUR: PROGRAM IMPACT 26

 STANDARD FIVE: PROGRAM QUALITY AND IMPROVEMENT 26

Appendix B: Guidance for Program Classification, Provider Approval Term, and Approval Conditions 28

Appendix C: Glossary 30



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 systematically improve program and provider quality. The Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation (Appendix A) articulate the expectations for program and provider performance as well as those for continuous improvement.

As part of the PREP-RI process, a team of independent reviewers evaluate 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](#).

The PREP-RI visit to Brown University was delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Given COVID-related concerns regarding travel during planning for the PREP-RI visit, the composition of the team is atypical. The team included limited representation from educator preparation faculty from out-of-state and instead relied on an additional in-state PK-12 educator. Brown University agreed to this atypical team composition given the challenges of the pandemic.

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-

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



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.

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, Brown 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, Brown University, offers a Master of Arts in Teaching. Brown has been an approved educator preparation provider since 1976. The program is a one-year intensive teacher preparation program leading to Rhode Island certification in the areas of Secondary English, Mathematics, Science (Biology, Chemistry, or Physics), and Social Studies.

The program is designed as a cohort model with all candidates taking a series of common core education courses and specific methods courses designed for each certification area. In 2019 Brown revised the program to include a one-year residency experience, a multilingual learner endorsement for its graduates, and added Mathematics as a new content area. Key features of the program include an overarching focus on culturally responsive teaching and intensive partnerships with urban districts.

The tables on the following pages list the component ratings for the Secondary program reviewed during this visit. The PREP-RI team did not rate Component 1.7 because RIDE did not provide explicit guidance to preparation programs related to RI Initiatives during the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the report includes evidence and recommendations related to Component 1.7



Teacher Certification Programs

Certification Program	Undergraduate	Graduate	Non-Degree
Secondary Grades	-	M.A.T. in Secondary Education (Biology) M.A.T. in Secondary Education (Chemistry) M.A.T. in Secondary Education (English) M.A.T. in Secondary Education (Mathematics) M.A.T. in Secondary Education (Physics) M.A.T. in Secondary Education (Social Studies)	-

The review team conducted the review from May 1, 2022, to May 4, 2022. Review team members were:

- Dr. Chantee Earl, Georgia State University
- Frank Lenox, East Greenwich
- Lisa Leaheey, North Providence
- Areema Sweeney, Trinity Academy for Performing Arts

Lisa Foehr, Joy Souza, and Clayton Ross represented RIDE. Lauren Matlach, a consultant, 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
Secondary Grades	Approved with Distinction



Provider Approval Term

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

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

Provider	Brown University
Approval Term	Seven Years
Conditions	
A newly redesigned program was implemented in 2020-2021. RIDE will do an onsite check-point visit in fall 2024 as the program is still relatively new. During that visit, RIDE will review program completer and employer survey data for the first three years of the redesigned MAT Secondary program and meet with Brown leadership and faculty to understand the successes and challenges.	

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	Secondary
1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Meets Expectations
1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Meets Expectations
1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations
1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations
1.5 Technology	Meets Expectations



1.6 Equity	Meets Expectations
1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	No Rating*

*RIDE acknowledges that it did not update its list of RI initiatives for prep programs during the pandemic. As a result, the review team did not assign ratings for Component 1.7. However, the team provides feedback related to 1.7 in the report.

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	Secondary
2.1 Clinical Preparation	Meets Expectations
2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Meets Expectations
2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Meets Expectations
2.4 Clinical Educators	Approaching 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 making decisions regarding whether program completers are prepared to be effective educators and are recommended for certification. (Components 3.1, 3.2, 3.2, and 3.6 are rated at the provider, not the program-level.)

Component	Secondary
3.1 Diversity of Candidates*	Meets Expectations
3.2 Response to Employment Needs*	Meets Expectations
3.3 Admission Standards for Academic Achievement and Ability*	Approaching Expectations
3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Meets Expectations
3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Meets Expectations
3.6 Additional Selectivity Criteria*	Meets Expectations

*Provider-level rating



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
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 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
5.1 Collection of Data to Evaluate Program Quality	Meets Expectations
5.2 Analysis and Use of Data for Continuous Improvement	Meets Expectations
5.3 Reporting and Sharing of Data	Meets Expectations
5.4 Stakeholder Engagement	Meets Expectations
5.5 Diversity and Quality of Faculty	Meets Expectations
5.6 Other Resources	Meets Expectations



Teacher Certificate Areas: Findings and Recommendations

Secondary Grades

The Brown University M.A.T. is a one-year program leading to Secondary grades certification in Biology, Chemistry, English, Social Studies, Physics, or Math. Candidates must have completed a bachelor’s degree that includes a concentration of coursework in a particular Secondary content area to be admitted into the program.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Meets Expectations
Candidates experience a consistent curriculum and develop proficiency in each of the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS).	

- The Brown Framework for Teaching—adapted from the Danielson Framework—is used throughout the program to provide clarity and consistency in the assessment of candidates’ proficiency in Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS). At the same time, candidates are building familiarity with the Danielson Framework for Teaching, which is the foundation of the Rhode Island Model of Evaluation. In particular, the following RIPTS were strongly addressed throughout programming:
 - RIPTS 6: *Teachers create a supportive learning environment that encourages appropriate standards of behavior, positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.*
 - RIPTS 7: *Teachers work collaboratively with all school personnel, families, and the broader community to create a professional learning community and environment that supports the improvement of teaching, learning and student achievement.*
 - Candidates work closely with educators at their residency site, Brown faculty, and across their cohort to maximize opportunities to learn with and from one another.
 - RIPTS 4: *Teachers create instructional opportunities that reflect an understanding of how children learn and develop.*
- Apart from discipline specific methods courses in the summer, fall, and spring, all candidates experience a consistent curriculum with the same core courses and sequence.
- Candidates and faculty reported that the cohort structure of the program enhances the curriculum and allows for additional learning opportunities across the four content areas.

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Meets Expectations
Candidates demonstrate proficiency in content association standards and the critical pedagogical content concepts and practices within the program area.	

- The admissions process for graduate students includes a transcript review of undergraduate coursework to ensure candidates have the appropriate background knowledge to teach in their content area:



- English candidates must have a degree in English or related field, including a minimum of 8 courses (30 credits) in English.
- Social Studies candidates must have a degree in History, Social Science, or substantial coursework in a related content area. To ensure candidates have the broad knowledge of the full range of Social Studies domains, they must have completed 9 courses (36 credits) covering History, Geography, Political Science, Economics.
- Science candidates must have a degree in science (Biology, Chemistry, Physics) or a related field with a minimum of 8 courses (30 credits) in the content area of the certification sought.
- Mathematics candidates must have a degree in Mathematics or related field, including a minimum of 8 Math courses (30 credits).
- The review team noted that program leadership and faculty provide additional supports for candidates who have content area gaps. The additional supports are personalized to address specific gaps within the content domain. Examples include custom reading lists, regular check ins, and online modules for candidates.
- Candidates demonstrate proficiency in relevant professional association standards and the critical pedagogical practices within the program area. Reviewers found strong evidence of the program’s emphasis on incorporating clear alignment with discipline-based content knowledge in lesson and unit plans.
- Brown faculty demonstrate expertise in their discipline and provide support to candidates that is directly connected to the teaching happening in residency classrooms.
- The program reported that first attempt pass rates for Praxis content tests were high across all four disciplines.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations
The program provides candidates opportunities throughout the program to develop knowledge, understanding, and proficiency in the student content standards.	

- Candidates are introduced to the student standards during the Brown Summer High School and a content-specific methods course during the summer semester (EDUC 2510). Educational Theory and & Practice courses span the entire year and help candidates develop and demonstrate knowledge of RI student standards.
- Candidates and completers reported being well-prepared to design and implement standards-aligned lessons. Candidates underscored the emphasis on student standards from the beginning of the program during Brown Summer High School.
- Reviewers found strong evidence of the program’s emphasis on incorporating clear alignment with Rhode Island student standards. The program design includes method coursework that is aligned to the certification area and provides candidates opportunities to unpack and design lessons.



- Candidate work samples and observations using Cluster 1 of the Brown Framework for Teaching include a focus on developing proficiency in the use of student standards. The Brown framework is used consistently throughout the program.
- The program provides candidates an opportunity to develop familiarity with WIDA ELD standards in the two Literacy and English Learner courses (EDUC 2535 & 2545). Candidate work samples provide evidence that WIDA Standards and ACCESS scores were used to differentiate instruction.

1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations
Candidates to develop proficiency in gathering and analyzing student data to monitor student progress and inform instructional practice.	

- Candidates develop proficiency in using data to evaluate and modify instructional practice. Reviewers found evidence of formative and summative assessment used regularly by candidates in developing and implementing lessons and as a basis for feedback during observation debriefs. The culminating Capstone Project allowed candidates to show evidence of their ability to use data to inform instruction.
- Candidates begin to use diagnostic and summative assessments in the early clinical experiences of Brown Summer High School. Reviewers noted that the program’s course sequence and clinical experience throughout the teacher residency provide structured opportunities for candidates to reflect on and receive feedback on their use of data to inform instruction.
- Candidates take *EDUC 2555: Assessment and Using Data to Support Learning* during the spring semester. This course is taken during the final semester of the program and builds on data-driven instruction found in previous course work. EDUC 2555 directly supports the capstone project.
- Reviewers noted that candidates gather and analyze non-assessment data in the form of student surveys. The survey data is used to inform instructional decisions during clinical experiences, particularly decisions around culturally responsive teaching.
- Candidate work samples provided evidence of the use of ACCESS data to design specific instructional strategies for lesson plans.

1.5 Technology	Meets Expectations
The program integrates instruction about technology and digital age learning experiences throughout.	

- A review of course syllabi indicated that the use of technology to enhance student learning and assessment is a consistent thread throughout coursework, especially in the content specific methods courses. Examples included:
 - The Technological, Pedagogical and Content Knowledge (TPACK) model (Science)
 - Canva, Google Workspace, BlackPast, OutHistory, and Google Maps. (Social Studies)
 - Canva, Loom, Google Suite for Education (English)
 - GeoGebra, Desmos, Nearpod, and Google workspace (Math)



- During the Fall semester, candidates take *EDUC 2525: Instructional Design, Planning, and Integrating Technology*. In this course candidates create an Instructional Design Toolbox that includes technology tools or platforms.
- Candidates develop proficiency in selecting and using technology to support student learning. Candidates shared with reviewers that the program afforded them ample opportunities to explore a variety of tech platforms and resources and to share their discoveries and learnings with one another as well as with teachers at their clinical placements.
- The program reported that observations from the clinical educator and university supervisor focus on the candidates' ability to effectively use technology during instruction.
- The program assesses candidates' use of technology across the program. Artifacts highlighting the use of technology are a required part of the Digital Portfolio Requirement following completion of the Brown Summer High School experience. Cluster 1 of the Brown Adapted Danielson Framework features an indicator that technology is used by the candidate to enhance instruction. The adapted framework is used consistently throughout the program to assess a candidate's growth and proficiency.

1.6 Equity	Meets Expectations
Candidates have multiple opportunities throughout the program to develop cultural competency and dispositions needed to be effective with diverse students. The program curriculum emphasizes Multilingual Learners and culturally responsive teaching.	

- The program reported that equity is a grounding principle and is central to the mission and design of the program. Candidates have multiple opportunities to reflect on their own biases and cultural responsiveness during the program. During an orientation workshop called *Providence is not our playground*, candidates are asked to reflect on and discuss Brown's history and unpack power, privilege, positionality, and their own multifaceted identities. Reviewers noted that the close partnerships with Providence and other districts in the urban core provide candidates the opportunity to develop cultural competency and an asset-based approach when working with diverse student populations.
- There is a focus on culturally responsive teaching that is evident throughout the program. Reviewers heard from candidates that they were often viewed as resources for clinical educators and other teachers at their clinical sites in this area. The addition of the Literacy and English Learners and Learning Theory and Special Populations courses ensures candidates are well-prepared to design, implement, and assess the learning experiences of all students. The focus on urban education provides candidates multiple opportunities to put culturally responsive teaching into practice.
- Reviewers recognize the purposeful addition of the MLL Endorsement and of the Learning Theory and Special Populations course as a result of feedback collected from clinical partners and program completers.
- Reviewers noted the intentional cultivation of a diverse faculty and candidate pool in order to reflect and support the population of their clinical partner schools.



- Although the program meets expectations for this component, reviewers noted that the program should continue to focus on working with families, as this was an area that candidates described as a particular challenge during their residency experience.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	No Rating
The program provides opportunities for candidates to learn about and become proficient in important Rhode Island educational initiatives.	

- This component will not be rated since RIDE has not updated its formal list of initiatives during the pandemic. However, we did see evidence of attention given to the evaluation of curriculum and the sharing of experiences with high-quality curricula as part of coursework. As well, an intentional focus on practices and mindsets to support the needs of multilingual learners was evident in coursework and clinical experiences.
- Consider ways to integrate the RI Multilingual Blueprint into the MLL courses—specifically, the newly released [High Quality Instructional Framework for MLLs to Thrive](#).

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Meets Expectations
Candidates’ clinical preparation is coherent. Clinical experiences build from and continues to link theory to practice. Clinical preparation provides candidates with a range of experiences.	

- The program fully implemented a newly redesigned program in 2020-2021. The redesigned program includes a summer teaching experience followed by a full year teaching residency—a fall practicum and spring student teaching in the same classroom. During Brown Summer High school, candidates are introduced to backwards design lesson planning and gain experience using assessment to inform instruction and provide student feedback. Beginning in the fall, candidates attend professional development with their clinical educator prior to the start of school. During the residency, candidates gradually assume increased responsibilities beginning with getting to know students and supporting the clinical educator during the first semester to taking on .4 to .5 of the clinical educator’s full responsibilities during the spring semester.
- The program reported that candidates are placed in a variety of school settings in the Providence area and that serious consideration is given to each candidate’s assignment. Interviews with candidates and review of submitted evidence revealed that clinical experiences increase in complexity and responsibility over time. Reviewers also noted that candidates reported that they were encouraged to visit the classrooms of peers to gain more perspective from a wider range of educational settings.
- Although the program meets expectations in this component, reviewers noted that besides the number of hours of observations candidates are required to complete, reviewers found some inconsistency in the feedback provided across disciplines. When current candidates were asked about what they feel least prepared for when they become a full-time teacher, full responsibility for a teaching load was cited.
- The reviewers noted that the program has made an intentional tradeoff between assuming the full range of experiences during the residency experience and the .4 to .5 of the clinical educator’s full responsibilities required by the program. The review team recommends that the



program continue to analyze completer and employer surveys to track perception data confirming that candidates are fully prepared and ready on day one of teaching.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Meets Expectations
The program provides coherent clinical experiences that enable candidates to demonstrate an increasingly positive impact on PK-12 students' learning throughout their clinical preparation.	

- The program reports that the main sources of evidence of positive impact on student achievement are through candidate analysis of student assessment(s), clinical educator and faculty supervisor evaluation, and student feedback. The program highlighted five (5) areas where candidate impact on student learning is assessed:
 - Unit or Lesson plans: student assessment is an element of the lesson plan and feedback is provided to the candidate from the Clinical Educator and University Supervisor.
 - End of Summer Presentations: Pre- and post-assessment data from Brown Summer High School is presented to program faculty and candidates.
 - Feedback from student surveys: Student feedback is collected and analyzed during all clinical experiences.
 - EDUC 2555: *Assessment and Using Data to Support Student Learning*: Candidates develop a student learning objective and unpack various approaches to summative and formative assessment.
 - Capstone Project: Student assessment data from the year-long residency along with supporting documentation is presented to faculty and candidates.
- Candidates use diagnostic and summative assessments to measure the impact of their instruction on student learning in Brown Summer High School. Pre-and post-assessment data from Brown Summer High School is analyzed and presented at the end of the summer session.
- During observations, reviewers noted that some candidates collected formative assessment data (e.g., exit tickets) which were later discussed during the debrief with the university supervisor. The use of student assessment during the debrief with the candidate was not observed in all cases, however.
- Student feedback is collected throughout each clinical experience. Student surveys are designed to provide feedback on pedagogical effectiveness, rigorous expectations, teacher-student relationships, and classroom engagement. The data is shared and discussed among the candidate faculty supervisor, clinical educator, and program director.
- Impact on student learning is evident in the abundance of authentic feedback that is shared with candidates in oral and written format via observations and evaluations that are aligned to the Brown Framework for Teaching. The culminating capstone project and survey responses from students provide further evidence of the impact candidates have on student learning.
- During interviews, program faculty often centered the program's mission on student learning. This was evident in multiple interviews and discussions with program leadership during which, on several occasions, it was stressed that candidate quality should be measured by the positive impact on the middle and Secondary students they serve.



2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Meets Expectations
The program has established strong mutually beneficial partnerships with multiple districts and charter schools.	

- Reviewers noted that the close partnerships with Providence and other districts in the urban core provided candidates the opportunity to develop and demonstrate cultural competency and maintain an asset-based approach when working with diverse student populations.
- Reviewers found that candidate placement was a top priority for the program, however, the focus on the urban core posed some challenges to placing candidates. Although the program meets expectations in this component, the reviewers saw this as a potential area for improvement.
- Mutually beneficial school/Brown partnerships with agreed upon indicators of candidate performance emphasize a strong partnership commitment to the middle and Secondary students in the RI schools where candidates engage in their clinical experiences. Reviewers heard from candidates, clinical educators, and clinical partners that school-based staff greatly contribute to the learning and development of candidates. Reviewers also noted that candidates and Brown faculty contribute to professional learning for clinical educators and other school-based staff, especially with regards to culturally responsive pedagogy.
- The Teacher Residency Site Leader supports a cohort of candidates at each residency site and provides support to clinical educators on site as well. During interviews, Residency Site Leaders and faculty described a close relationship where the knowledge of the school structures and educators in the building was important, as they often serve as a liaison between the program and the school/district.
- The program reported that feedback from partner districts, clinical educators, RI K-12 students, alumni, and alumni employers have directly informed the structure of the program redesign. Stakeholder feedback indicated a need for stronger preparation in working with diverse learners, a need for more STEM educators, and a need for a more robust clinical experience—particularly in urban school communities. The program responded by adding a Mathematics program, embedding the Multilingual Learner Endorsement competencies into the course sequence, and shifting to a one-year residency model for clinical experience.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Approaching Expectations
The program’s clinical educators provide coaching, supervision, and support to candidates across a full-year residency. Current practices do not ensure that all clinical educators have the cultural competency aligned with the mission of the program.	

- The program provided evidence of support for clinical educators that prepares them to effectively work with candidates throughout all three stages of clinical experiences. The program reported that the size of the program allows it to remain nimble when it comes to candidate selection. During interviews, the program provided a couple of examples of moving candidates early in placement and providing modeling and support around culturally responsive teaching for clinical educators.



- The Residency Mentor Handbook provides detailed roles, responsibilities, and dispositions required to serve as a clinical educator. Criteria is communicated to schools and districts with regards to clinical educator selection and some training is made available for clinical educators.
- The role of the Teacher Residency Site Leader helps to contribute to meaningful residency experiences for candidates. The Residency Site Leader is site-based and provides support to candidates as well as clinical educators.
- The program acknowledged that restricting the partnerships to Providence and the surrounding areas has limited the pool of potential clinical educators and posed some challenges to recruiting and selecting high-quality clinical educators. Reviewers noted, however, that maintaining more limited partnerships allows for a stronger cohort experience and aligns with Brown’s mission to prepare educators for urban environments.
- The program has been responsive to situations where candidate and clinical educator matches have not been mutually beneficial, but some current candidates and program completers noted that their clinical educators were not a good fit for their growth and learning as a teacher. Reviewers heard from candidates and recent completers that given the structure of the year-long residency, the clinical educator “can make or break your year” and thus a small number of candidates expressed their desire for the program to be more selective when identifying clinical educators.
- Reviewers found that the recruitment of clinical educators relies somewhat on an informal process and relationship. This was confirmed during interviews with clinical partners, clinical educators, candidates, and faculty.

Recommendations

- Create more formal selection criteria and processes to ensure that clinical educators have the cultural competency that aligns to the mission of Brown’s program to prepare teachers to work in diverse urban settings.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Meets Expectations
The program has established an assessment system which is clearly communicated to candidates and is fully aligned to the RIPTS.	

- The program assessment system is based on rigorous criteria that are clearly communicated to candidates. During interviews, candidates indicated that they were aware of and could speak to what they needed to do to advance from one transition point in the program to the next. The Student Teaching Handbook states that to move from one stage of the program to the next, candidates must make progress in meeting the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS) as evaluated by the Brown-Adapted Danielson Framework for Teaching Rubrics.
- Per the student teaching handbook, candidates must attain the level of proficiency in Clusters 2, 3, and 6 of the Brown-Adapted Danielson Framework for Teaching by the end of the Brown Summer High School experience to progress to student teaching. Candidates not meeting the



necessary benchmarks following completion of Brown Summer High School must meet with program leadership and clinical educators to set expectations and supports required to continue in the program. If a candidate’s performance in the program remains insufficient the case is discussed by the Teacher Education Graduate Committee to determine if a candidate may continue and, if so, under what circumstances.

- Candidates reported that faculty know where candidates are in their progression throughout the program and candidates themselves are aware of their strengths and areas for improvement. Multiple sources of evidence confirmed the program has a systematic approach to monitoring and supporting candidate development throughout progression.
- University supervisors specialize in a particular content area and meet regularly with clinical educators. The program reported that this frequent dialogue between university supervisor and clinical educator is a critical element of the evaluation system—particularly for maintaining consistency in the use of the evaluation tools.

3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Meets Expectations
The program assessment system is transparent to candidates and ensures that all candidates recommended for certification demonstrate proficiency in the RIPTS.	

- The Brown Adapted Danielson Framework is used consistently across the program to track the progress of candidates and ensure candidates demonstrate proficiency in the instructional, environment, and professionalism clusters of the RIPTS. Assessments, candidate feedback, and self-reflection are all aligned to the adapted Danielson Framework.
- The program has key assessments in place to assess candidate readiness for day one of teaching with clear criteria for recommendation for certification. Candidates understand the purpose, processes, and expectations for these key assessments. The recommendation for certification comes from assessment that is triangulated by feedback from clinical educators, faculty, and candidates themselves in addition to demonstrating content and pedagogical mastery demonstrated by the Praxis.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program collects employer feedback from program completers and uses this feedback for program improvement. The program does not annually survey employers of recent program completers.	

- The employer survey has relatively high response rates and is constructed to yield actionable information about the impact on student learning. However, an annual survey is needed to meet expectations on this standard.

Recommendations

- Ensure that the program annually administers its feedback surveys to employers of recent program completers.



4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program collects information from recent program completers and uses this feedback for program improvement. The program does not survey program completers annually.	

- The completer survey has relatively high response rates and is constructed to yield actionable information about the impact on student learning. However, an annual survey is needed to meet expectations on this standard.

Recommendations

- Ensure that the program annually administers its feedback surveys to recent program completers.

Provider-Level Findings and Recommendations

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.1 Diversity of Candidates	Meets Expectations
The provider recruits, admits, and supports high-quality candidates who reflect the diversity of Rhode Island’s PK-12 students. The provider capitalizes on the diversity of candidates.	

- The diversity of candidates admitted into the program has reflected the diversity in Rhode Island over the last three years. Attracting diverse candidates is central to the mission and vision of the program. Faculty reported that maintaining a diverse cohort is an indicator of success as a program.
- The program demonstrates significant effort to attract and admit diverse candidates and has put resources in place to that effect. Efforts include the intentional and extensive outreach to HBCUs and racially and ethnically diverse universities in their candidate-recruitment practices.
- The program is designed as a cohort model with opportunities intentionally created to allow candidates to engage with and exchange diverse perspectives around pedagogy, curriculum, and discipline. Candidates are required to observe each other during Brown Summer High School and encouraged to continue to visit the classrooms of peers throughout the program.

3.2 Response to Employment Needs	Meets Expectations
The provider works closely and proactively with its partner districts to understand and be responsive to the employment needs, including hard to staff schools and shortage areas.	

- The Brown programs are responsive to the needs of RI urban schools by focusing on the preparation of culturally responsive Secondary educators committed to social justice and equity who are positioned to impact student learning during their clinical preparation and beyond. Brown collaborates closely with partner schools and districts to understand and address their needs and make programmatic adjustments based on their feedback.
- The program reported that the focus on culturally responsive teaching and Multilingual learners, combined with the year-long residency experience, prepares candidates to be highly



competitive for employment. The reviewers confirmed this through interviews with candidates, clinical educators, and clinical partners.

- The program reported that feedback from LEAs informed specific elements of the program redesign. In 2018-19, Brown applied—and was approved by RIDE—for a Secondary Math pathway to respond to the shortage of Math educators. The program also prioritizes clinical experiences in urban schools to address the need for Culturally Responsive educators who are prepared to successfully teach in racially, ethnically, and linguistically diverse settings.
- Career workshops are provided by the Brown CareerLab to help support networking, resume writing, and interviewing skills. When the program becomes aware of job postings, an email listserv is used to share these openings with candidates.

3.3 Admissions Standards for Academic Achievement and Ability	Approaching Expectations
Provider and program admission requirements meet Rhode Island Department of Education expectations. The provider and its programs have established informal conditional acceptance policies, but RIDE has not approved these policies.	

- Admission materials state that candidates must demonstrate an overall undergraduate GPA of 3.0 or higher. Candidates must also have a minimum GPA of 3.0 in all content coursework related to the certification area sought. Each certification area has specific entrance criteria ranging from 30 to 36 credit hours needed in a specific content area.
- The program requires evidence of a commitment to teaching for admission into the program. This could be letters of recommendation or prior work or success in educational settings as indicated on a resume.
- Admission requirements meet RIDE expectations. However, the admittance of candidates without a minimum of a 3.0 GPA requires a conditional acceptance policy under the [minimum admission requirements](#) established by the Rhode Island Department of Education.
- The program reported that no conditional acceptance policy is currently in place. Admission data revealed that the program conducts a review of candidate transcripts with particular focus on the grades achieved in the content courses, while also looking for potential gaps in content to inform additional supports that may be needed by the candidate. Reviewers noted that specific pathways and courses of study were created for candidates who had potential gaps in content knowledge.

Recommendations

- Ensure that all program leadership and faculty adhere to the [minimum admission requirements](#) established by the Rhode Island Department of Education.
- If the program elects to use a conditional acceptance policy, ensure that the process is formal, clearly communicated to the candidate and program faculty, and tracks the progress of any candidate admitted through conditional acceptance. Once a conditional acceptance policy is created, RIDE approval is needed prior to implementation.



3.6 Additional Selectivity Criteria	Meets Expectations
The provider has established a set of research and practice-based professional dispositions and additional selectivity criteria and integrates these into the assessment system.	

- The admissions process, inclusive of an interview, allows exploration of candidate learner dispositions and mindsets, as well as their commitment to social justice and becoming a culturally responsive educator. The frequency of use of the Brown Frameworks for Teaching rubric ensures the monitoring of continuous candidate growth throughout the program and identifies when supports are needed.

Standard 5: Program Quality and Improvement

5.1 Collection of Data to Evaluate Program Quality	Meets Expectations
There is a process in place to systematically collect candidate data on an annual basis. This data is used for program evaluation and continuous improvement.	

- The program reported that various forms of feedback are collected annually for the purpose of continuous improvement efforts.
- Reviewers noted the alignment between the feedback collected and the resulting programmatic improvements. The program received feedback on the growing Multilingual Learner population and needs—particularly in the RI urban schools and districts. The program reported that 75% of completers reported feeling sufficiently or well-prepared to meet the needs of MLLs; however, this number was 100% when disaggregated by those completers who completed the redesigned program.

5.2 Analysis and Use of Data for Continuous Improvement	Meets Expectations
The provider systematically analyzes and uses data to guide continuous improvement efforts.	

- The collection and analysis of data, including feedback from stakeholders, is used to inform programmatic changes. Examples include the residency design, the addition of a Mathematics certification area, additional coursework in working with MLLs and students with disabilities, and increased focus on culturally responsive teaching throughout the program.
- Reviewers noted the alignment between the feedback collected and the resulting programmatic improvements. The program received feedback on the growing Multilingual Learner population and needs—particularly in the RI urban schools and districts. The program responded by embedding the competencies for the Multilingual Learner Endorsement into the coursework as well as by prioritizing culturally responsive teaching as a pillar of the program. The program reported that 75% of completers reported feeling sufficiently or well-prepared to meet the needs of MLLs; however, this number was 100% when disaggregated by those completers who completed the redesigned program.



- The program has developed an action plan with the purpose of addressing two priority action areas: 1) Developing clinical educators in our schools who can support the development of culturally responsive pedagogy in our MAT candidates and 2) Addressing educator diversity and high need areas.

5.3 Reporting and Sharing of Data	Meets Expectations
The provider and its programs meet all RIDE reporting requirements. The provider reports program outcomes and program completer data publicly.	

- Brown meets all RIDE EPP reporting requirements and links to the Title II reporting and Educator Preparation Index on each program’s website.

5.4 Stakeholder Engagement	Meets Expectations
The provider consistently engages stakeholders in program evaluation and improvement efforts.	

- The review team found that the program engages a diverse group of stakeholders to inform improvement efforts. The program provided evidence of program improvement that resulted from stakeholder feedback. This was also confirmed by reviewers during interviews.
- Stakeholder feedback is solicited on a regular basis, but no less than every year. The feedback is collected through formal processes such as surveys and focus groups, but also collected during group meetings and discussions with administrators.
- The program also considers RI Secondary students as stakeholders. Student survey data is collected during Brown Summer High school and during the school year to inform the structure of the clinical experience and programmatic or pedagogical shifts needed.

5.5 Diversity and Quality of Faculty	Meets Expectations
The provider has demonstrated significant efforts to ensure that candidates are prepared by diverse and qualified faculty.	

- Review of faculty CVs show faculty to be current with respect to research and trends in their practice. During interviews candidates and program completers reported that faculty were qualified for their positions and are highly supportive.
- The program demonstrates significant efforts to recruit diverse faculty and values the contributions of faculty. New job openings are reviewed to ensure that the language is as broad and inclusive as possible before being posted and shared with HBCUs and other diverse institutions. During the process a faculty member serves as a diversity representative taking an active role identifying qualified applicants from underrepresented populations as well as monitoring for bias in the hiring process.



5.6 Other Resources	Meets Expectations
The provider has sufficient resources to deliver effective educator preparation consistent with the expectations of the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation.	

- Valuable financial resources have been allocated to support teacher candidates, diversify the candidate pool, and make the program affordable to candidates who might otherwise not be able to attend. One such example is the Urban Education Fellowship which pays full tuition in return for three years of teaching in a local urban school.
- The strength of the teacher preparation programs at Brown University is partly due to strong and visionary leadership. It will be essential for the program to have continued strong leadership to sustain and further develop the vision to prepare diverse, culturally responsive, and highly effective teachers for RI schools, especially those in our urban communities.



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
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



Provider Approval Term	Description	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

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

