PREP-RI Rhode Island Department of Education

Review Team Performance Report

Rhode Island School for Progressive Education

February 4 to February 7, 2024

Table of Contents

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 term[1]. 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 various stakeholders including the provider, the programs, current and prospective candidates, and the larger education community. The report's purpose 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, the Rhode Island School for Progressive Education (RISPE) must address performance issues 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 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 Rhode Island School for Progressive Education (RISPE) has been an approved educator preparation provider since 2017. The educator preparation provider, RISPE, offers RIDE-approved teacher preparation programs in Elementary Education and English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), both of which lead to teacher certification in the State of Rhode Island. The Elementary program is a one-year, accelerated teacher preparation pathway and is designated as an alternative route to certification. Following a summer intensive, candidates in this program work as teachers-of-record while they complete the program. The ESOL program is designed for currently practicing educators who wish to add an additional certificate in ESOL.

RISPE has created a tight-knit community of candidates, faculty, and program alumni.
The program's small cohorts enable RISPE staff and faculty to develop strong relationships with candidates enrolled in the program. As a result, current students and program completers consistently praised RISPE for its support for candidates. Candidates engage in clinical experiences immediately and work as teachers-of-record throughout programs.

The tables on the following pages list the programs and courses of study reviewed during this visit.

The feedback on the following pages is provided to support programmatic improvement in curriculum, the assessment system, continuous improvement processes, and clinical experiences to ensure all candidates are ready on Day 1 of teaching. To that end, RISPE leadership has begun to plan for improvement. This work is at the nascent stage, and the review team encourages RISPE to continue pursuing this work.

Teacher Certification Programs

Certification Program	Post-Baccalaureate
Elementary Education	Alternative Route to Certification in Elementary Education
All Grades	Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

The review team conducted the review from February 4, 2024, to February 7, 2024. Review team members were:

- Paul Abraham, Professor Emeritus at Simmons University
- Ellen Davidson, Professor Emeritus at Simmons University
- Marissa St. Louis, Third Grade Teacher at Pawtucket Public Schools
- Agnieszka Bourret, Multilingual Learner Specialist at Rhode Island Department of Education

Lisa Foehr, Gina Masiello, Kristin Re, Julie Olobri, and Julian Bessinger represented RIDE. 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
Elementary Education	Approval with Conditions – At Risk of Low Performing
Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)	Low Performing

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

Provider	Rhode Island School for Progressive Education
Approval Term	Two Years
Conditions	

- By July 2024, the Rhode Island School for Progressive Education (RISPE) must establish a plan for program improvement based on the findings and recommendations included in the PREP-RI report and share this plan with the Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education for review.

- RISPE must engage an outside expert to improve programs, particularly in the following areas:
  - Revise coursework and assessments to ensure candidates become proficient in all Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS) and applicable professional association standards.
  - Create observation tools that align to research-based models of teacher evaluation used in RI schools.
  - Establish structures to ensure the TESOL candidates experience the breadth and depth of their certificate area.
  - Collect data to ensure candidates understand their impact on PK-12 students' learning.
  - Ensure all clinical educators are trained in coaching and observation techniques and can frequently observe and provide feedback to candidates to improve their instruction.

- RISPE and the Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) must engage in improvement meetings to understand how the provider and programs have taken action to ensure candidates are prepared for certification. These check-ins will take place in August 2024, December 2024, and May 2025.

- During the 2024-25 school year, RISPE must take high-leverage actions toward program improvement:
  - The provider must develop and pilot measures to assess impact on student learning. The PREP-RI review team will expect to see at least one year of data from impact measures when it returns to RISPE in 2026.
  - The provider must meet with district partners to establish mutually agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness and make a plan for tracking and analyzing data from agreed-upon indicators.
  - Revise coursework to ensure candidates in the TESOL program are proficient in all RIPTS and TESOL standards and are prepared to teach utilizing WIDA standards and technology to enhance student learning.
  - Incorporate HQIM into programs so candidates have opportunities to unpack and learn about the materials they will use in the classroom.

- By December 2024, RISPE must design systems and processes for engaging in continuous improvement. Plans should identify how the provider will collect and analyze program data to inform improvement, how the provider and its programs will prioritize and address recommendations in this report, and how the provider will engage stakeholders in program evaluation and program improvement efforts.
- RISPE may not submit applications for new programs, nor recruit or admit candidates for any new programs currently under review by RIDE.
- If RISPE makes insufficient progress, the Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education reserves the right to establish more specific interim improvement benchmarks or to close 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	Elementary	TESOL
1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Does Not Meet Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations
1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations
1.5 Technology	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations
1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Does Not Meet 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	Elementary	TESOL
2.1 Clinical Preparation	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations
2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations
2.4 Clinical Educators	Approaching Expectations	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.

Component	Elementary	TESOL
3.1 Diversity of Candidates*	Meets Expectations	
3.2 Response to Employment Needs*	Meets Expectations	
3.3 Admission Standards for Academic Achievement and Ability*	Does Not Meet Expectations	
3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Does Not Meet Expectations	Approaching Expectations
3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Does Not Meet Expectations	Approaching Expectations
3.6 Additional Selectivity Criteria*	Does Not Meet Expectations	

**Components 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.6 are rated at the provider-, not the program-level.*

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	Elementary	TESOL
4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
4.2 Employment Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations	Does Not Meet 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	Elementary	TESOL
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	
5.5 Diversity and Quality of Faculty	Does Not Meet Expectations	
5.6 Other Resources	Does Not Meet Expectations	

Teacher Certificate Areas: Findings and Recommendations

Elementary Education Program

The Elementary Accelerated Teacher Certification (ATC) program is an alternative route to certification. The program begins with a summer field experience and a progression of eight courses which take place throughout the summer and the year-long residency where the candidate serves as the teacher-of-record in an elementary classroom.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Does Not Meet Expectations
Candidates experience a consistent curriculum but have limited opportunity to develop proficiency in the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS).	

- Candidates experience a consistent curriculum as they are all in one cohort participating in the same courses with the same faculty.
- While RIPTS are listed on syllabi, feedback on assignments does not utilize the RIPTS as a framework for teaching practice.
- Candidates do not have many opportunities to improve and hone their content knowledge (Standard 2).
- Coursework does not have enough focus on strategies candidates can use to develop students' critical thinking and problem-solving skills (Standard 5).
- While candidates are given an assignment for which they must use data, more instruction on data-driven instruction is needed (Standard 9).
- RIPTS 2, 5, 8, and 9 are not fully incorporated in RISPE's program.

Recommendations

- Provide candidates with greater opportunities to practice and receive feedback on their performance implementing the knowledge, skills, and dispositions captured in the RIPTS. Review course syllabi and field experiences to ensure all candidates receive opportunities to develop proficiency in all RIPTS.
- Provide more opportunities in coursework and field experiences to learn and apply components of RIPTS, specifically content knowledge (Standard 2), critical thinking (Standard 5), using effective communication for students to explore new ideas (Standard 8), and triangulating student data to make instructional decisions (Standard 9).

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum partially aligns to the professional standards and competencies for Elementary Education. Candidates develop proficiency in some but not all the knowledge and skills encompassed in the CAEP standards.	

- Candidates demonstrate some proficiency in the pedagogical-content concepts, principles, and practices for elementary education.
- The Teaching Social Studies and Growing Social Consciousness course prepares candidates to teach social studies content across grade spans. Candidates' reflections demonstrate a connection between concepts learned in coursework and application to their practice.

- The Next Generation Science in the Elementary Classroom course breaks down concepts and skills related to best practice in science instruction in elementary classrooms.
- There is substantial evidence that the reading courses prepare candidates to instruct students within the full span of their certification, although these courses have not been fully approved by RIDE as aligned to the Science of Reading and Structured Literacy.
- The Building a Constructivist Math Community course assignments are aligned to NCTM and current research relevant to a constructivist approach; however, it is unclear whether candidates are able to apply these concepts to their practice.
- Candidates are required to pass the Elementary Praxis examinations prior to entry into the program; however, some candidates were previously admitted having not passed. These candidates demonstrate gaps in their content knowledge and ability to teach content to students. There are concerns about whether the program has a clear plan and process for addressing content errors and gaps. While the virtual coach would be notified immediately of concerns, it is not clear what happens next.
- Candidate observations illustrate some gaps in candidates' content knowledge.

Recommendations

- Continue to develop the Science of Reading courses and resubmit them to RIDE for approval to ensure they fully prepare candidates to teach using the science of reading and structured literacy.
- Ensure all candidates have passed the Elementary Praxis exam before entering the program.
- Consider ways to incorporate pedagogical content knowledge into coursework to ensure candidates have strong content knowledge and content pedagogical skills.
- Create a scope and sequence for coaching to complement methods courses.
- Provide academic support for content areas where candidates demonstrate gaps.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
The program provides candidates with a general understanding of student standards, but does not demonstrate that candidates are able to use standards to guide their practice.	

- The Teaching Social Studies and Growing Social Consciousness course provides candidates with basic skills to teach to the Rhode Island Student Standards.
- The reading courses address student standards and candidates complete multiple activities and projects based on teaching to student standards.
- Candidates complete a Student Impact Project in math and reading which requires them to measure student growth based on student standards.
- In the Next Generation Science in the Elementary Classroom course, candidates are taught to unpack a unit and align it to student standards.
- Candidates do not develop a deep understanding of all student standards across grade levels.
- Evidence does not show feedback from coaching grounded in student standards.
- Coursework does not fully prepare candidates to teach to student standards.
- It is unclear whether candidates can design or use assessments to measure student progress toward proficiency in the standards.

Recommendations

- Ensure coaching is grounded in student standards.
- Ensure coursework provides candidates with many opportunities to learn and engage with student standards, including designing instruction that aligns with standards.

- Provide candidates opportunities to map student standards across units and grade levels to deepen their understanding and ability to use standards to drive their instruction.

1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop basic skills in using data to evaluate and modify instructional practice.	

- Candidates show evidence of being able to collect data, teach, and reassess, but evidence does not demonstrate their capacity for continued use of data and assessment to inform instruction and monitor student progress.
- The Student Impact Projects require candidates to use assessment as a baseline, monitor, and reassess to determine student growth. It is unclear how often candidates do this outside of these two projects.
- Candidates do not develop a deep understanding of the core principles, concepts, forms, and purposes of assessment.
- There is no evidence of candidates' continued intervention with students who have not mastered skills.

Recommendations

- Provide instruction on and opportunities for candidates to utilize formative, summative, and formal assessment data to gather, inform, and modify instruction both throughout a unit and upon completion of the summative assessment.
- Increase formal instruction on assessment, particularly various types of assessment, including their purposes and uses.
- Determine a process for teaching candidates how to inform practice with current and new assessments, grounded in existing resources created for this purpose.
- Ensure candidates learn and practice using assessment to evaluate student progress toward meeting standards.

1.5 Technology	Approaching Expectations
The program provides candidates with some instruction regarding technology and digital-age learning experiences throughout the program.	

- In the Next Generation Science in the Elementary Classroom course, candidates are required to journal about technology. Candidates are required to incorporate technology tools into their lessons and then reflect on those tools' effect on the lesson.
- Candidates use Padlet and Nearpod in courses and have gone on to implement them in their classrooms with students.
- IXL, Illuminations, and the National Library of Virtual Manipulatives were mentioned by candidates as tools they learned about in their courses and have implemented in their practice.
- It is unclear whether candidates are learning to design, implement, and assess student learning opportunities using technology.

Recommendations

- Leverage education technology conferences for RISPE faculty and candidates to ensure up-to-date familiarity with classroom tools that have education applications.
- Connect with other EPPs and partner districts regarding technology instruction.

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
Candidates have multiple opportunities throughout the program to learn about and reflect on issues of diversity, bias, equity, and social justice. However, candidates develop only basic strategies for working with differently-abled students and English Language Learners.	

- Candidates spend time reflecting on their own biases during seminars one and two.
- During the Teaching Social Studies and Growing Social Consciousness course, candidates complete a presentation on a personal bias, review literature, and analyze how their bias can impact students' experiences in their classroom.
- During the second seminar course, candidates participate in the Family Interview Case Study in which they engage two families of students in their classroom. They are also required to reflect and report on how they engage families in their practice and how they demonstrate a dialogical approach to their engagement.
- During the first Science of Reading course, candidates complete the Home Literacy Project during which they design three learning activities that support print concepts or phonological awareness for families to implement at home. It is unclear how this project is implemented with families and how candidates are taught and expected to engage with families to facilitate student learning.
- Candidates take the course, Collaboration, Differentiation, and Intervention Techniques for Children with Special Needs. This course does not provide candidates with enough opportunities to learn about special education techniques or laws in Rhode Island.
- During interviews, a small number of candidates mentioned strategies she uses with multilingual learners in her classroom, but it was unclear to the review team how much instruction candidates receive about working with multilingual learners.

Recommendations

- Ensure candidate proficiency in designing and implementing strategies that are effective when working with students with disabilities.
- Include working with students with disabilities and multilingual learners in coaching plans.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not provide enough opportunities for candidates to learn about and become proficient in important Rhode Island educational initiatives.	

- While RISPE has incorporated coursework as required by the Right to Read Act, the review team saw no evidence from candidate work samples to demonstrate their understanding of teaching using the Science of Reading and Structured Literacy.
- Coursework and coaching do not demonstrate a focus on teaching utilizing high-quality instructional materials (HQIM).
- Methods courses do not include strategies to unpack high-quality instructional materials (units and lessons) used by Rhode Island LEAs.
- Candidates are not exposed to the Rhode Island Blueprint for Multilingual Learners' Success.

Recommendations

- Ensure that candidates are utilizing what they learn in the Science of Reading course in their classrooms. Explicitly aid candidates to navigate the high-quality instructional materials they use in their classrooms and the need to teach science of reading and structured literacy principles.
- As Rhode Island schools and districts adopt high quality curriculum in accordance with curriculum legislation that passed in 2019, it is imperative to prepare teachers to deeply understand content standards and how to be skillful users of HQIM. A shift to using protocols and practices for unpacking units and lessons versus creating units and lessons from scratch is recommended.
- Collaborate with partner districts to learn about intellectual preparation for HQIM and provide professional learning to faculty, coaches, and supervisors.
- Highlight the MLL Blueprint for candidates and ensure they have strategies for working with multilingual learners in their classrooms.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Approaching Expectations
While candidates experience great depth of responsibility as teachers-of-record, they do not have opportunities to experience the breadth of the grade levels for which they will be certified to teach.	

- Candidates are working as teachers-of-record during the school year.
- In the summer, candidates progress from observing mentor teachers to practice and then proficiency.
- Clinical experiences increase in complexity throughout the progression from summer into the full year when they begin as teachers-of-record.
- Candidates' summer experience is done in grades 1-3; however, teacher-of-record positions can range from 1-6 and are not intentionally coordinated for candidates to experience the full range of potential placements.
- Clinical preparation is generally rooted in theory and its link to practice, and emphasizes most of the range of the RIPTS.
- Courses include theories of practice that are expected to be utilized during lesson planning for clinical experience.
- Candidates do not experience the range of educational settings and environments for which they will be certified to teach.
- Certification regulations require that alternative route candidates are provided with a district-assigned mentor to support the development of candidates; this is not part of RISPE's program while candidates serve as teachers-of-record during the school year.

Recommendations

- Candidates need clinical experiences that offer them opportunities to teach at a range of educational settings (e.g., grade level).
- Utilize MOUs to ensure candidates have opportunities to, at minimum, co-teach with teachers at different grade levels.
- RISPE must provide candidates with an in-district mentor per certification regulations.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Approaching Expectations
Candidates demonstrate some impact on student learning throughout the program.	

- The Student Impact Project (SIP) demonstrates candidates' impact on their students' learning.
- The Learner Study Project requires candidates to use assessment tools to determine a baseline for a student's phonetic skills and analyze the assessment to determine a plan for instruction to increase the student's skills. Candidates must teach a series of lessons and reflect on their own implementation and student progress.
- Candidates assess student learning and implement lessons to address needs. It is unclear how candidates reassess and then continue to utilize the data for instructional decision-making.
- The Student Impact Project (SIP) requires candidates to reflect on the progress their students are making and their instructional moves in order to improve student learning. While they do this for this assignment, there is no evidence of this happening regularly and continuously.
- Candidates understand expectations for collecting data that show positive impact on PK-12 students' learning, but it is unclear whether clinical partners understand these expectations and if they are aligned to their own expectations for student learning within the LEA.
- Coaches and Instructional Supervisors provide feedback to candidates, but it is unclear how the feedback is used to inform candidates' impact on student learning.

Recommendations

- Utilize coaching to ensure that candidates consistently use data to inform instructional decisions to impact student learning.
- RISPE should develop clear expectations for candidates to demonstrate impact on student learning. These expectations should be understood by RISPE, the candidate, and district partners.
- Consider how candidates can continually demonstrate their impact on student learning.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has several formal partnerships but does not track and analyze data for agreed-upon measures of partnership effectiveness.	

- RISPE has a documented, ongoing partnership with Central Falls through which RISPE provides summer programming for rising first through third graders in the Central Falls School District. RISPE uses this as their summer clinical experience to prepare candidates prior to their full acceptance into the program. This partnership is mutually beneficial, as the students in Central Falls receive free programming to accelerate their learning, and RISPE can provide their candidates with clinical experiences to prepare them for their year as teachers-of-record.
- RISPE has formal, documented partnerships with seven LEAs.
- During the summer clinical experience, mentor teachers provide weekly summaries to RISPE leadership regarding candidate performance. These summaries are shared with each candidate's future employers for the upcoming school year.
- Candidates work as teachers-of-record for LEAs during the school year. This addresses workforce demand and allows RISPE to provide opportunities for candidates to have a residency-style clinical experience.
- RISPE reports having frequent informal conversations with clinical partners to address needs and make improvements. They have yet to codify a formal process to record, monitor, and analyze data from clinical partners.

- The RISPE observation tool is not fully aligned to the observation evaluation tool used by partner districts.
- There are several checkpoints throughout the program during which Clinical Supervisors evaluate candidate performance and make recommendations for progression in the program. There is no evidence that district partners participate in these decisions.

Recommendations

- Consider how RISPE's observation tools are aligned with those used by partner LEAs.
- Codify a formal process to record, monitor, and analyze data from clinical partners.
- Conduct formal check-ins with partners to assess candidate performance and impact on student learning.
- Include candidate partners in decisions regarding candidate progression in the program.
- Ensure that partnership agreements are mutually beneficial and co-developed with LEAs.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Approaching Expectations
RISPE utilizes Instructional Coaches who meet with candidates virtually and Clinical Supervisors who observe and evaluate candidates' teaching, but candidates do not have a clinical educator within their building.	

- RISPE utilizes Instructional Coaches and Clinical Supervisors. Candidates record lessons and send them to their coaches each week prior to a virtual debrief. Clinical Supervisors conduct three formal observations of candidates' practice.
- RISPE utilizes Edthena as a coaching platform and is able to view coaches' feedback to candidates.
- The Director of Academics meets with coaches monthly to discuss candidate progress and concerns.
- There are criteria by which RISPE evaluates potential clinical educators. Mentor Teachers and Instructional Coaches are observed in their own classrooms by the Director of Academics using the RI Model Professional Practice rubric. Qualified candidates are invited to interview for a position with RISPE. There is no evidence of clear criteria by which Clinical Supervisors are evaluated for employment.
- RISPE provides an orientation for Clinical Supervisors, Mentor Teachers, and Instructional Coaches and holds a norming session on the observation tool for Clinical Supervisors.
- Candidates do not have a clinical educator or mentor from whom they receive feedback within their school building.
- All RISPE clinical educators have attended training prior to beginning, and RISPE reports that they provide professional learning experiences for their clinical educators throughout the year, but do not currently have a systematic way of tracking who has attended which professional learning session and ensuring that they all receive each one.
- Instructional Coaches provide individualized instruction and support, but do not follow a systematic approach to coaching, so candidates experience varying learning opportunities through their coaches.
- Coaches and Instructional Supervisors are not utilizing the RIPTS to demonstrate successful teaching.
- While there is a Transformational Coaching rubric with which to evaluate coaches, RISPE has no systematic way of tracking coaches' effectiveness with candidates. It is unclear how retention decisions are made.

- There is a mid-year survey that candidates utilize to evaluate their clinical coach. This survey provides an opportunity for candidates to rate their experience working with their coach and provide feedback for improvement. It is unclear how RISPE uses this information to analyze, track, and improve coaching for candidates and make retention decisions.

Recommendations

- Ensure all clinical educators attend training on coaching adult learners, providing actionable feedback, and norming on evaluation tools. They should also attend all professional development sessions to stay current on tools and strategies to support candidates.
- Create expectations for coaching and feedback sessions and observe coaches during feedback sessions to ensure fidelity of implementation.
- Explore opportunities to have more supervision and support within candidates' schools.
- Codify a process to make formal decisions about retention of clinical educators.
- Develop criteria to evaluate Clinical Supervisors.
- Create a systematic way to track coaches' impact and effectiveness with candidates.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program has established an assessment system in which transition points are clearly communicated to candidates, but evaluative tools lack alignment to current Rhode Island evaluation models and do not include indicators of success. RISPE does not have a systemic approach to monitoring and supporting candidate development throughout progression.	

- RISPE has an assessment of candidate performance to determine readiness for student teaching.
- There are requirements outlined for admission into the program, readiness for student teaching, and recommendation for certification.
- Candidates must complete a five-week summer school component where they are formally evaluated three times. They must score at least "approaching" for every category on the rubric to proceed in the program. Candidates are allowed one area where they do not score "approaching," but an action plan is required for these candidates to proceed to being teachers-of-record. Evidence shows that RISPE has counseled out candidates who do not meet this requirement.
- Candidates must pass all courses with a B- or better to progress through the program.
- During the summer teaching experience, candidates have a mentor teacher monitoring them. These mentor teachers inform the Director of Academics about candidates who require additional support.
- All feedback from observations is produced within twenty-four hours to provide opportunity for timely intervention and support.
- While candidates work as teachers-of-record, they are required to submit three video recorded lessons each week to their coach, who provides feedback and coaching for the candidate. It is unclear how the feedback impacts teacher effectiveness.
- Clinical Supervisors formally assess the candidate three times during the year. These assessments are used as milestones to determine readiness to continue through the program. Three observations may not be sufficient evidence to support readiness for progression.
- Candidate observation tools are not aligned with those used by LEAs for teacher evaluation and are not fully aligned with the RIPTS.

- The Evidence-Based Standards Matrix tool does not include descriptors or "look fors" to be assessed during observations. Supervisors are meant to provide evidence of candidates meeting RIPTS, but what's included in that column of the tool does not show evidence from lessons.
- While RISPE assesses candidate dispositions in the form of their "CORE Competencies," there are no indicators of success to demonstrate how candidates meet each competency.
- Some systems to monitor and support candidates' progress exist, but may be inconsistent in usage among all stakeholders.
- Scoring sheets, such as for the unit learning plan, are formatted more as checklists than rubrics that provide feedback regarding the quality of each category through description. There are no indicators of success to demonstrate expectations for the performance of candidates.
- Candidates reported feeling that the number of videos they are required to submit is excessive.
- RISPE does not utilize a Learning Management System to track candidate progress.

Recommendations

- Develop a systematic approach to assessing, monitoring, and supporting candidates. Create a process to highlight and address candidates' areas of need.
- Provide indicators of what it looks like to meet RIPTS and CORE Competencies during lesson observations.
- Consider utilizing an observation rubric more aligned to the one used by districts for their educator evaluations.
- Create or adopt a Learning Management System (LMS) to track and be transparent about candidate progress.
- Three formal assessments during the school year are not sufficient given this program's limited timeframe for preparation. Increase the number of formal observations and feedback opportunities.
- Review and/or modify rubrics and scoring sheets to include indicators or "can dos" so they are not just open-ended.
- Consider having coaches in-person as opposed to solely virtual.

3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program has assessments in place to assess candidate readiness, but the tools and their implementation do not ensure that the program recommends only candidates who demonstrate proficiency on the full range of competencies for certification.	

- RISPE communicates expectations for assessment with candidates. Candidates are aware of requirements to pass each assessment milestone.
- RISPE has created criteria for candidates to be recommended for certification.
- The RISPE Candidate Observation Rubric demonstrates basic expectations for teacher candidates, but does not provide the level of detail and rigor found in Rhode Island's teacher evaluation rubrics or expected in a pre-service program.
- Evaluative tools for CORE Competencies and RIPTS do not have descriptions for levels of performance.
- Not all evaluation tools are rigorous and transparent, as they do not all have clear and detailed indicators.
- RISPE evaluates candidates on the RIPTS, but the tool used does not allow for consistent, objective, and transparent assessment.
- Evidence of norming on evaluation tools is limited. RISPE states that they do not currently have protocols for data analysis to identify levels of accuracy and consistency of evaluations.

- RISPE provides some training to faculty and clinical educators to evaluate and norm on candidate assessment, but evidence does not convey how this training is sufficient to prepare all members to consistently evaluate candidate performance.

Recommendations

- Revise observation and candidate assessment tools to ensure expected performance and that all performance levels are clearly developed.
- Conduct more frequent, targeted, evaluated observations to develop a holistic view of the candidate.
- Align the courses, coaching, and evaluative tools to have clear, targeted goals throughout the program.
- Create protocols for data analysis to ensure levels of accuracy and consistency of evaluations.
- Ensure training to faculty and clinical educators effectively prepares them to use and norm on evaluative tools.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program did not provide any evidence to support this standard.	

Recommendations

- Develop a survey to disseminate to employers of recent program completers using a mechanism that is valid and reliable. The survey should be conducted to yield actionable information about candidate impact on student learning and readiness for their role, including the skills and knowledge necessary to work as professionals in school communities.
- Research best practices for survey administration and response rates and seek input from districts about how to best implement survey administration to yield high response rates.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program did not provide any evidence to support this standard.	

Recommendations

- Survey program completers annually using a mechanism to collect data that is reliable and valid. Results should yield significant information that is actionable for program improvement.

English to Speakers of Other Languages

The ESOL program is designed for currently practicing Rhode Island PK-12 educators. The program consists of five required, synchronous virtual courses. Candidates work in LEAs that have partnerships with RISPE, so their current teaching assignments serve as their clinical experiences and their schools ensure that candidates have access to multilingual learners.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Does Not Meet Expectations
Candidates in the program are certified educators, so they enter the program with knowledge of the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS), but the program does not deepen their knowledge as it is not aligned with the RIPTS.	

- A consistent curriculum was observed in the provided evidence and reported by candidates during interviews.

- Course syllabi do not demonstrate an intentional focus on the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS).
- Candidates complete a family interview project as part of their coursework, which demonstrates some coursework dedicated to Standard 7 of the RIPTS.
- Candidates were observed performing much of the cognitive lift for their students and encouraging rote memorization of vocabulary. Standard 5 of the RIPTS should be more thoroughly addressed in coursework so candidates are prepared to design lessons that extend beyond factual recall and challenge students to develop higher level cognitive skills.
- Candidates reflect on their own positionality and the backgrounds of students; however, some observations revealed candidates and clinical educators using deficit-based language regarding their students, which indicates a need for more preparation related to Standard 4 of the RIPTS.
- Observations and interviews revealed a limited capacity to implement lessons that extend beyond factual recall, indicating greater need for preparation related to Standard 5 of the RIPTS.
- Work samples, course syllabi, and candidate interviews highlighted a need for more intentional focus on content knowledge needed to create learning experiences (Standard 2), creating instructional opportunities that reflect an understanding of how children learn and develop (Standard 3) and encourage students' critical thinking (Standard 5), as well as more emphasis on communication modes and methods (Standard 8).
- While candidates may have experience with RIPTS in their own content areas, there is little evidence of these standards being applied in ESOL.

Recommendations

- Provide candidates with greater opportunities to practice and receive feedback on their performance implementing the knowledge, skills, and dispositions captured in the RIPTS. Review course syllabi and field experiences to ensure all candidates receive opportunities to develop proficiency in all RIPTS.
- Apply all RIPTS to the new content area of teaching MLLs.

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program curriculum is not aligned to current TESOL standards.	

- Course syllabi list TESOL standards that are out-of-date. Rhode Island uses TESOL International Association standards, which were updated in 2018.
- Candidates are taught exclusively to utilize the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) for lesson planning. This does not afford them opportunities to learn other MLL methodologies during the program as is required by TESOL standards 3a and 3b.
- During the Literacy Acquisition for MLLs course, readings are differentiated by the grade band candidates currently teach. Candidates working in grades PK-5 read different articles than candidates working in grades 6-12 classrooms. TESOL is a PK-12 certificate, and therefore candidates must be prepared to teach in all grades.
- The Applied Linguistics for Educators of ELs course includes objectives that address PK-12 teaching strategies; however, the culminating project does not fully align to TESOL standard 1.
- Students take the course, Second Language Assessment and Evaluation, in which they complete the Assessment, Research, and Critique project; however, this project requires candidates research assessments, but not necessarily implement the assessments they research.

- Many of the projects and coursework candidates complete are linked to the grade bands they currently teach, but do not assist with candidate preparation beyond their current grade levels.

Recommendations

- Utilize the updated TESOL International Association standards throughout coursework and in syllabi.
- Support candidates in their understanding of different MLL subgroups (e.g., SIFE, newcomer, long-term MLLs, MLLs and students with disabilities) and how to appropriately adapt instruction and assessment for each of the subgroups.
- Incorporate other MLL pedagogies in addition to SIOP in the education and evaluation of candidates to conform to TESOL standard 3b, which calls for candidates to be prepared to deliver evidence-based, student-centered, and developmentally appropriate interactive approaches.
- Extend projects and coursework to focus the full range (PK-12) of the TESOL certification.
- Ensure that candidates have opportunities to implement various assessments they learn about in coursework.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop a general understanding of student standards and demonstrate basic skills in developing, implementing, and assessing standards-based lessons.	

- Candidates must include one lesson for each of the WIDA level clusters when designing their unit for their Literacy Acquisition for MLLs course.
- During the Curriculum, Methods, and Materials for teaching CLD Students course, candidates are required to refer to WIDA standards at several levels and explicitly state how their lessons are specifically developed for students at that WIDA level.
- The Student Impact Project requires candidates to connect their desired student outcomes in literacy and language to WIDA standards.
- WIDA standards are incorporated in course syllabi and some assignments. Student work samples demonstrate that candidates are familiar with WIDA standards and include WIDA levels of their students in submissions; however, there are inconsistencies with how WIDA standards inform lesson planning for instruction of different student levels.
- Faculty and clinical educators did not discuss WIDA standards during interviews.
- During a lesson observation debrief, the candidate was unfamiliar with WIDA Can-Do descriptors.
- In the Second Language Assessment and Evaluation course, WIDA is confined to suggested, not required, readings and additional resources.
- The Sociocultural Foundations of TESOL course uses the CREDE standards. WIDA standards are not included.

Recommendations

- Provide candidates with more opportunities to go beyond classification and levels into the application of the WIDA standards and “Can-Do” descriptors for all candidates.
- Design lessons where skills are used to assess progress to proficiency for students. This should include planning lessons for the students they serve and students outside their own classroom, content, and grade level.

- Ensure that lessons and units candidates create and implement in classrooms are language standards-driven rather than methodology-driven.

1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop basic skills in using data to evaluate and modify instructional practice.	

- The Second Language Assessment and Evaluation course has expectations that candidates develop a general understanding of the core principles, concepts, and purposes of assessment.
- The Student Impact Project requires candidates to conduct a pre-assessment in literacy, utilize the data to teach to specific standards, and finally reassess students.
- Candidates learn about adapting assessments for MLLs; however, most assignments candidates complete, and many student work samples do not demonstrate candidates' ability to use student data to drive instruction.
- PARCC and NAEP are listed as data resources for candidates to analyze in the Sociocultural Foundations of TESOL course. There is no mention of ACCESS data.

Recommendations

- Provide instruction on and opportunities for candidates to utilize formative, summative, and formal assessment data to gather, inform, and modify instruction both throughout a unit and upon completion of the summative assessment.
- The role of formative assessment should be integrated and embedded in all coursework and clinical experiences. Support candidates in utilizing multiple forms of assessment daily (e.g., informally assessing the four domains of reading, writing, listening, and speaking within all lessons through the day).

1.5 Technology	Does Not Meet Expectations
Candidates do not learn to use technology to support student learning or model digital age work.	

- There is no evidence of candidates learning to design, implement, and assess digital age learning and assessment to support student learning through coursework or clinical experiences.

Recommendations

- Faculty, coaches, and/or supervisors should model the use of digital age learning experiences.
- Consider sending faculty to technology conferences to learn about various tools to enhance PK-12 student learning.

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
Candidates have opportunities throughout the program to learn about and reflect on issues of diversity, bias, equity, and social justice. However, candidates develop only basic strategies for working with differently-abled students and with families.	

- The sociocultural project supports candidates in considering how racism, classism, and biases affect student learning.
- Candidates engage in a Family Interview Assignment.
- Program participants said the sociocultural course, and the program as a whole, pushed their thinking and self-conceptions as a teacher.
- Candidate observations and interviews showcased the use of deficit-based language when referring to students.

- Few candidates demonstrated evidence of planning for the various subgroups of MLLs (e.g., SIFE, newcomers, long-term MLLs, and MLLs with disabilities).
- Candidates do not develop skills for working with differently-abled MLL students.

Recommendations

- Support candidates in continuing to reflect on their own biases and how those biases may affect the expectations and rigor of their instruction for MLLs.
- Support candidates in developing an asset-based mindset about how students learn generally and the advantages MLLs bring to the learning experience.
- Provide professional learning for coaches on working with adult learners, providing constructive feedback, comfort with critical conversations, and supporting candidates in the development of an asset-based stance.
- The Foundations and Core Values of Progressive Education course that Elementary candidates take provides an opportunity for students to reflect on their own experiences with race, gender, and class, and how these constructs have impacted their lives. Consider adding assignments that facilitate this reflection to the TESOL program.
- Provide more opportunities for candidates to engage with families of MLL students.
- Although reviewers saw some evidence of candidates working with families, the program should provide students with the opportunity to develop effective strategies in working with diverse families and communities. Building these strategies into coursework or clinical experiences can enable teaching candidates to actively engage diverse families and community members.
- Candidates should learn strategies for working with differently-abled MLLs and have opportunities to implement various strategies during their clinical experience.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program provides limited opportunities for candidates to learn about and become proficient in important Rhode Island educational initiatives.	

- Candidates not already proficient in the Science of Reading and Structured Literacy instruction must participate in training with AIM—a RIDE-approved vendor—to become proficient as required by the Rhode Island Right to Read Act.
- Faculty reported the RISPE has not provided professional learning regarding high-quality instructional materials (HQIM).
- There was no evidence to illustrate how candidates are supported to modify HQIM for MLLs.
- The Rhode Island Blueprint for Multilingual Learners' Success was not evident in any of the coursework or syllabi.

Recommendations

- Include references in courses to the Rhode Island Blueprint for Multilingual Learners' Success and the Instructional Framework for MLLs to Thrive. Provide opportunities for candidates to utilize the Framework during courses and clinical experiences.
- Provide professional learning for faculty, coaches, and clinical supervisors to learn about HQIM and HQIM modifications for MLLs. Incorporate this instruction and coaching for candidates so they can make modifications to their HQIM for MLLs.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Approaching Expectations
Candidates are working educators who teach in their classrooms throughout the year, but they have limited opportunities to experience the breadth of placements for which they will be certified.	

- Candidates are practicing educators working in their own classrooms throughout the program. There is a mix of elementary, middle, and secondary educators in the program.
- RISPE has memoranda of understanding (MOUs) with LEAs stipulating that there must be MLLs in candidates' classrooms or that they will have access to a classroom with MLLs throughout the program.
- Candidates observe an assessment within a classroom that is not their own. They conduct a teacher interview, pre- and post-assessment, and then evaluate the assessment's effectiveness. They must also observe a second class and design an appropriate assessment.
- During an interview, one completer shared that they did thirty hours of work with a different level MLL than was in his class. It is unclear if this is universal throughout the program.
- The centering of the clinical experience being teachers' own classrooms limits their opportunities to experience the breadth of the PK-12 certificate they are earning. Candidates do not experience the breadth of grade levels or types of instruction for which a TESOL educator is certified.

Recommendations

- Strategically ensure candidates experience a breadth of delivery models (e.g., dedicated ELD, co-teaching) and grade span clusters.
- Consider selecting assignments that require various clinical experiences across all coursework to support candidates with breadth and depth of the certification area.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program features a student impact project, but evidence did not illustrate how candidates have a positive impact on PK-12 students' learning.	

- The review team observed strong evidence of data collection, but limited evidence of analysis and modifications to instruction based on the data.
- Candidates complete a Student Impact Project (SIP) during which they design a four- to six-week unit. Some candidates utilized WIDA levels to plan for instruction, while others used formative assessments. Candidates are required to collect data on student progress, but there is no evidence to illustrate how candidate utilized the data to inform their instruction. Post-assessment student data was not included in evidence; therefore, it was not possible for the review team to determine candidates' impact on student learning.
- The SIP assignment requirements state that candidates will regularly examine student data to determine growth and alter instruction to close EL literacy gaps; however, the review team did not see sufficient evidence to confirm this happens.
- LEAs stated that they did not work with RISPE to mutually develop candidate impact measures.

Recommendations

- Provide additional explicit instruction, practice, and assessment in modifying instruction and practice based on the analysis of a variety of data.

- Review course syllabi and all clinical experiences to ensure that candidates experience a coherent approach to using data and assessment to demonstrate positive impact on student learning that extends beyond or expands on the intervention approach of the Student Impact Project.
- Ensure that candidate impact measures are co-developed in partnership with LEAs.
- Evaluate candidates on their ability to utilize assessment data to guide instruction.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has several documented partnerships, but does not have a codified process to collect data and feedback to determine partnership effectiveness.	

- RISPE has several formalized, mutually beneficial partnerships with LEAs. LEAs are financially committed to the partnerships, as they contribute tuition funds for candidates within their districts.
- Interviews demonstrated that RISPE has been responsive to LEAs needs regarding course schedules.
- RISPE has informal conversations with LEA partners but has no codified process for collecting feedback to make programmatic decisions and modifications.
- The MOU between RISPE and Providence Public Schools is current; however, the MOUs between RISPE and other clinical partners are out-of-date.
- RISPE and partner LEAs do not share common assessment tools and measures for candidate performance.

Recommendations

- Collaborate with LEAs to norm systems and structures in which RISPE and LEAs share common assessment tools and measures.
- Codify a system for formalized feedback from LEAs and collaborate on decisions regarding modifications to clinical experiences.
- Ensure MOUs are updated and current.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Does Not Meet Expectations
RISPE assigns candidates a Clinical Coach, Clinical Supervisor, and requires LEAs to provide an on-site mentor. Coaching and supervisor evaluation is limited and no evidence regarding the impact of on-site mentors was provided.	

- LEAs must provide candidates with an on-site mentor, referred to as the supervising practitioner, who is certified in ESOL. LEAs spoke about selecting on-site mentors based on personalities and grade level. It is unclear how often mentors communicate with and observe candidates.
- Candidates are assigned a clinical coach, who creates an individual plan for their candidate. Clinical coaches are only required to observe candidates three times during the fall semester. They use only the SIOP model for these observations. Three observations during a semester are insufficient to effectively coach candidates in a new certificate area.
- RISPE also employs clinical supervisors who are responsible for assessing candidate performance in the classroom three times during the spring semester.
- RISPE has criteria in job postings for clinical coaches and supervisors.

- RISPE states that supervising practitioners will evaluate the candidate using the SIOP three times during the spring semester; however, this was not confirmed by interviews.
- Candidates complete a mid-year feedback survey regarding their experience with their instructional coach; however, it is unclear how RISPE uses this information to analyze, track, and improve coaching for candidates and make retention decisions.
- RISPE does not have a formal process for observing and collecting additional data regarding the effectiveness of clinical coaches and supervisors on candidate growth and performance.
- There is no evidence to demonstrate a structured approach or sequence for coaching candidates.
- RISPE states that all clinical educators have attended training prior to beginning, and RISPE reports that they provide professional learning experiences for their clinical educators throughout the year, but do not currently have a systematic way of tracking who has attended which professional learning session and ensuring that they all receive each one.
- It is unclear how coaches and supervisors are trained to work with adult learners, use effective coaching strategies, and norm on evaluation tools.

Recommendations

- Ensure all clinical educators attend training and norming sessions as well as professional development directed toward coaching adult learners, providing constructive feedback, comfort with critical conversations, and supporting candidates in the development of an asset-based stance.
- Explore opportunities to have more supervision and support within candidates' schools and increase the number of required observations by coaches.
- Create a systematic way to track coaches' impact and effectiveness with candidates.
- Develop clear criteria by which clinical educators will be evaluated and codify a process to make formal decisions about retention.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has established an assessment system which has clearly communicated transition points but lacks a systemic approach to monitoring and supporting candidate development throughout progression.	

- There are clear requirements outlined for admission into the program, readiness for student teaching, and recommendation for certification.
- Candidates have milestones that they need to meet to progress from the fall to the spring semester. Candidates must meet or exceed proficiency on the student impact proposal and all courses. They must also obtain a score of 2.3 or higher on their final pre-practicum SIOP observation. If a candidate scores between a 2.0-2.2 on this SIOP observation, they progress but only with a specific action plan.
- Candidates are only observed by clinical educators six times throughout the school year (3 in the fall and 3 in the spring) and only two observations function as progression milestones.
- Candidates' readiness for progression to the spring semester is determined primarily with the SIOP tool, which is not an instrument based on professional association standards.
- Although there were inconsistencies in the application of standards, processes for assessment were transparent to candidates.
- The program does not have enough focus on assessing candidates' abilities to implement WIDA standards-driven instruction.

- Observations of candidates' lessons and SIOP scores provided by evaluators raised questions for the review team about the rigor of expectations for candidate assessment.

Recommendations

- Review course syllabi, key assessments, and the assessment system to ensure that there is a systemic approach to monitoring and supporting candidate development throughout progression.
- Hold training and calibration sessions to ensure program faculty, coaches, and clinical supervisors have a common understanding of performance expectations and can use the tools with integrity. Share examples of practice with candidates to help them understand what expected performance looks like for each indicator of the rubrics.
- Utilize additional models, aside from the SIOP, to assess candidates' instruction.
- Codify a process to document interventions aligned to a revised process for monitoring and supporting candidates.
- To better align with standards, ensure you evaluate candidate readiness for student teaching/internship based on TESOL and RIPTS.
- Increase the rigor of candidate assessment during all sections of the program.

3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Approaching Expectations
There are assessments in place to assess candidate readiness, but implementation does not ensure that the program recommends only candidates who demonstrate proficiency on the full range of competencies for certification.	

- Candidates have milestones they must meet to progress from internship to be recommended for certification. These milestones include coursework grades, SIP final grade, a final SIOP evaluation score of at least 3.0, and a passing score on the Praxis.
- SIOP evaluation has not been adequately normed for fairness, accuracy, and consistency.
- There is little evidence that assessments demonstrate candidates' performance related to the RIPTS or TESOL standards.

Recommendations

- Institute evaluation systems and practices to ensure candidate assessment addresses the full range of RIPTS and TESOL standards.
- Conduct norming sessions for the SIOP tool to yield valid and reliable assessment.
- Review candidate assessment measures in conjunction with the RIPTS and professional association standards to ensure that measures accurately assess candidate proficiency in all the knowledge, skills, dispositions, content, and content pedagogy needed to be a successful educator. Ensure that all faculty, clinical supervisors, and clinical educators have shared rigorous and clear expectations for candidates.
- Collaborate with partner districts to revise and implement training for both clinical educators and clinical supervisors. During training and subsequent calibration sessions, communicate clear expectations for feedback (when, how, what detail) and ensure that clinical educators, school and district leaders, and clinical supervisors have shared expectations for candidate performance.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program did not provide any evidence to support this standard.	

Recommendations

- Develop a survey to disseminate to employers of recent program completers using a mechanism that is valid and reliable. The survey should be conducted to yield actionable information about candidate impact on student learning and readiness for their role, including the skills and knowledge necessary to work as professionals in school communities.
- Research best practices for survey administration and response rates and seek input from districts about how to best implement survey administration to yield high response rates.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program did not provide any evidence to support this standard.	

Recommendations

- Survey program completers annually using a mechanism to collect data that is reliable and valid. Results should yield significant information that is actionable for program improvement.

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.	

- RISPE reported candidate demographics that match the diversity found in Rhode Island's PK-12 schools. Six out of nine elementary candidates are people of color.
- RISPE makes significant efforts to admit and support a diverse group of candidates, as evidenced by the recruitment flowchart.
- RISPE capitalizes on the diversity of candidates by integrating candidates' backgrounds and experiences into coursework.

Recommendations

- The review team suggests that RISPE inform candidates about the importance of self-identifying race on applications.

3.2 Response to Employment Needs	Meets Expectations
Programs directly address LEAs' employment needs, and most candidates are fully employed at the time of certification.	

- It is rare that candidates must seek employment at the time of certification because they are already employed by districts during the program.
- During the program orientation, elementary candidates are shown job listings for partner districts and RISPE supports candidates in their job search prior to being fully admitted into the program.

- Multiple school districts are beginning to require that all educators become TESOL certified, so the TESOL program and RISPE's partnerships with districts, is a direct benefit to the employment needs of LEAs.

3.3 Admissions Standards for Academic Achievement and Ability	Does Not Meet Expectations
Provider and program admissions requirements meet Rhode Island Department of Education expectations; however, RISPE has not adhered to these requirements.	

- The admissions criteria RISPE provided meets RIDE's expectations for admissions requirements.
- RISPE allows conditional acceptance to candidates who have not secured employment, but does not have a formal way to track conditionally admitted candidates. Although RISPE's RIDE-approved conditional acceptance policy requires candidates to pass the Praxis by July 15, candidates working as teachers-of-record during the school year in the program had yet to pass the Praxis.
- Evidence demonstrated that RISPE admitted candidates who did not meet the minimum requirements for admissions. Candidates were admitted into the elementary program without a 3.0 GPA and without passing scores on the Praxis.

Recommendations

- Ensure that all candidates admitted into programs meet the minimum admissions requirements.
- Develop a formal process for tracking candidates who are conditionally accepted into the program and provide supports for these candidates.

3.6 Additional Selectivity Criteria	Does Not Meet Expectations
The provider has identified a set of professional dispositions and a set of cultural dispositions; however, they did not provide a research base or cite sources to justify their use of these dispositions. Program assessment systems emphasize self-reflection based on these dispositions and candidates receive little, if any, feedback on their dispositions unless there is a significant issue.	

- RISPE stated there is an expectation that coaches and supervisors address professional dispositions—particularly asset-based mindsets for MLLs—but there is no evidence of norming for coaching processes to ensure that individuals enact these expectations and principals.
- There are no formal processes or instruments for tracking selectivity.
- The competencies RISPE highlighted as evidence of dispositions are displayed more as a checklist, without indicators of success.
- The rubric for dispositions/competencies is not research-based.

Recommendations

- Ensure professional and cultural dispositions are aligned with current research regarding effective teacher dispositions.
- Develop norms and procedures to ensure that, while continuing to allow individualization, organization-wide standards for professional dispositions are assured.
- Revise dispositions/competency rubrics to more clearly articulate what performance looks like at each level of the rubric. Provide greater documentation and transparency of the research that informs the criteria for professional dispositions.

Standard 5: Program Quality and Improvement

5.1 Collection of Data to Evaluate Program Quality	Does Not Meet Expectations
RISPE has developed a Continuous Improvement Committee; however, their meetings are not regular and RISPE does not collect all necessary data for making programmatic improvements.	

- Interviews indicated that informal conversations with partners have been used to make programmatic decisions and modifications. For instance, one conversation with a district partner led to RISPE's decision to create a second cohort with a Spring start date.
- RISPE has developed a Continuous Improvement Committee that includes current and past candidates, district- and school-level partners, as well as RISPE staff and faculty; however, leadership referenced that the committee does not meet consistently and is an area in need of improvement for them.
- RISPE states that the committee will review data from course evaluations, clinical staff evaluations, and student impact project scores. There was no mention of a plan to collect information regarding the quality of feedback to candidates or the performance assessment system.
- Structures and processes to collect data on candidate performance are used to improve the performance of candidates but are not used to improve the performance of the program.
- There is no evidence of completer performance collected to determine completer impact on PK-12 students' learning or to evaluate program effectiveness.

Recommendations

- Develop a common, comprehensive program evaluation and improvement process that includes consistent instruments, criteria, and processes to allow for the collection, aggregation, and disaggregation of data for continuous improvement.
- Ensure completer performance data is collected and utilized by the Continuous Improvement Committee.
- Develop a process to collect data about the quality of feedback candidates receive from faculty and clinical educators.
- Collect data to be analyzed by the Continuous Improvement Committee about the performance assessment system.

5.2 Analysis and Use of Data for Continuous Improvement	Does Not Meet Expectations
The provider has not established and implemented systems, structures, and processes to analyze data and use it for continuous improvement.	

- The review team saw no evidence that enough data is collected and analyzed for future improvements and resource allocation.

Recommendations

- Review the expectations of this component. Establish and implement a systematic and annual process to analyze data on program performance, perception data, and candidate outcomes.
- Formalize the collection and analysis of data received from partner LEAs about current candidates and completers.
- Develop and implement a process to analyze data to evaluate the relationships between specific practices, candidate performance, and completer impact.

- Develop and implement a process to collect and analyze data on program improvement efforts to monitor the change's effectiveness.
- Systematize the process for data collection and analysis organization wide.
- Potentially add a data/evaluation team member or engage a consultant to support data analysis.

5.3 Reporting and Sharing of Data	Does Not Meet Expectations
RISPE and its programs do not meet Rhode Island Department of Education reporting requirements or widely share additional information with stakeholders.	

- RISPE shares some data with their Board on an internal data dashboard, but does not make additional efforts to widely share or communicate program and completer performance, impact, and employment.
- RISPE has not yet reported completer data to RIDE to be included on the Educator Preparation Index, nor is a link to the index displayed on RISPE's website.

Recommendations

- Ensure data is reported to RIDE to be included on the Educator Preparation Index.
- Develop and implement a process to share widely program and candidate performance data and outcomes with stakeholders, partners, and the public.

5.4 Stakeholder Engagement	Approaching Expectations
The provider does not have formal processes to engage stakeholders in reviewing program performance.	

- RISPE has communicated a plan to collect and incorporate student feedback, but it has not yet been implemented.
- RISPE has informal conversations with partner LEAs frequently, but these are not clearly documented.
- RISPE reported that two programmatic changes—a schedule change for the TESOL program and the addition of a TESOL winter cohort—were made based on informal conversations with LEA partners.
- There is not a systematic method for collecting partner or other stakeholder feedback.

Recommendations

- Establish a system to regularly engage a representative group of appropriate stakeholders in reviewing program performance and collect and use stakeholder feedback to inform program improvement.
- Reestablish the Continuous Improvement Committee and involve a variety of stakeholders.
- Ensure stakeholder voices are visible in institutional change, public-facing goals, and department initiatives.

5.5 Diversity and Quality of Faculty	Does Not Meet Expectations
Some faculty members have appropriate qualifications; however, the provider and its programs do not sufficiently evaluate faculty.	

- Most faculty engage in professional learning and research to remain current in their field.

- RISPE makes efforts to diversify their faculty and staff. They expanded their search nationwide and now employ virtual coaches from around the country to have more diverse faculty. There is no evidence to demonstrate these efforts were effective in diversifying faculty as they do not collect diversity data on their faculty, though they have stated that they plan to in the future.
- Some faculty are qualified to teach in their positions. The review team raised concerns about the qualifications of recent program completers who have returned to RISPE as faculty.
- RISPE is beginning the process of evaluating faculty and has conducted one review.

Recommendations

- Continue the institutional efforts to recruit, hire, and promote faculty and staff members from diverse backgrounds and collect faculty/staff diversity information. Continue the institutional efforts to create a supportive and inclusive environment for faculty and candidates from diverse backgrounds.
- Use course evaluation to inform continuous improvement efforts.
- Conduct observations and evaluations for all faculty members.
- Ensure faculty are appropriately qualified to teach in their content area.

5.6 Other Resources	Does Not Meet Expectations
The provider does not have sufficient resources, particularly in the form of human capital, to deliver effective educator preparation consistent with most of the expectations of the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation.	

- RISPE maintains a library of required course texts that candidates can borrow if they are unable to purchase them.
- The Elementary program utilizes EdThena to aid virtual coaches and candidates in their work together.
- While new administrative positions have been added to RISPE's full-time team, their limited human capital makes capacity a great challenge. More staff are needed to support programs and candidates, as many staff members' roles involve too many responsibilities.
- No Learning Management System (LMS) is in use. This makes tracking candidate progress a challenge and limits the transparency for candidates.
- The provider does not have a data management system and recognizes their ability to collect and manage data is limited. The provider may need additional staff to support, manage, and coordinate a systematic data collection system. There is a need for a designated data analyst who can support collection and analysis of program data.

Recommendations

- Work with Faculty and Programs to establish a data management system to allow for the collection, aggregation, and disaggregation of data for continuous improvement.
- Establish a data analyst position to coordinate the collection and analysis of data across all programs.
- Implement a learning management system to aid faculty and students in tracking coursework and assessment data.
- Secure funding to establish new positions so that current staff members can focus efforts on fewer responsibilities and ensure quality.

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

Provider Approval Term	Description	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
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