Review Team Performance Report

Rhode Island School of Design

April 28, 2019 through May 1, 2019

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

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

---

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

4

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 of Design (RISD) must take action to address issues of performance related to all components rated as Approaching Expectations or Does Not Meet Expectations.

Key Terms Used in this Report

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

Report Summary

The educator preparation provider, the Rhode Island School of Design, offers one RIDE-approved teacher preparation program. The All Grades Art program with a concentration in Art Education was opened in 1989. The All Grades Art Education program was last reviewed in 2011 as part of the Rhode Island Program Approval Process. The tables on the following pages list the programs and courses of study reviewed during this visit.

RISD has committed significant thinking and resources to how it can better support arts education in RI. It is working to improve pathways for individuals to become art educators and is committed to promoting diversity in art and art education. Throughout the visit, RISD faculty demonstrated that they are reflective and committed to continuous improvement of the program. Although there are places where the program needs to improve, the review team felt confident that the provider's planned efforts, coupled with a revision of candidate assessments and modification or codification of some practices already in place, would well position RISD and its programs to meet fully the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation.

Teacher Certification Programs

Certification Program	Undergraduate	Graduate	Non-Degree
All Grades Education	-	M.A.T in Art Education	-

The review team conducted the review from April 29, 2019 through May 1, 2019. Review team members were:
- Tricia Chapman, East Providence High School
- Adriane Pereira, Maryland Institute College of Art

Lauren Matlach and Dan Ochs 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. Classification options are Approved with Distinction, Full Approval, Approval with Conditions, Low Performing, and Non-Renewal.

Program	Classification
Teacher Certification Programs	
All Grades Art Education	Approved with Conditions Nearing Full Approval

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. Options are seven years, five years, four years, three years, two years, and non-renewal.

Provider	Rhode Island School of Design
Approval Term	5 years
Conditions	

- RISD and RIDE will meet for a progress check in two years. At this meeting, RISD will report on progress to date addressing performance issues related to components rated Does Not Meet Expectations and Approaching Expectations.
- If RISD demonstrates insufficient progress, the Commissioner of Education reserves the right to establish more specific interim benchmarks.

Component Ratings

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

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

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

Component	Component Ratings
1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Approaching Expectations
1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Meets Expectations
1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations
1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
1.5 Technology	Meets Expectations
1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Approaching Expectations

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

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

Component	Component Ratings
2.1 Clinical Preparation	Meets Expectations
2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Approaching Expectations
2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Meets Expectations
2.4 Clinical Educators	Does Not Meet Expectations

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

Approved programs demonstrate responsibility for the quality of candidates by ensuring that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program- from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences- and in decisions that program completers are prepared to be effective educators and are recommended for certification. (Components 3.1, 3.2, 3.2, and 3.6 are rated at the provider, not the program-level.)

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

Standard 4: Program Impact

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

Component	Component Ratings
4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations
4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations

Standard 5: Program Quality and Improvement

Approved programs collect and analyze data on multiple measures of program and program completer performance and use this data to for continuous improvement. Approved programs and their institutions assure that programs are adequately resourced, including personnel and physical resources, to meet these program standards and to address needs identified to maintain program quality and continuous improvement. (Components 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, and 5.6 are rated at the provider, not the program-level.)

Component	Component Ratings
5.1 Collection of Data to Evaluate Program Quality*	Approaching Expectations

Component	Component Ratings
5.2 Analysis and Use of Data for Continuous Improvement*	Meets Expectations
5.3 Reporting and Sharing of Data*	Meets Expectations
5.4 Stakeholder Engagement*	Meets Expectations
5.5 Diversity and Quality of Faculty*	Meets Expectations
5.6 Other Resources*	Meets Expectations

Findings and Recommendations

RISD's Master of Arts in Teaching program is a one-year

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop proficiency in most Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS).	

- Given the small size and cohort structure of the program, all candidates experience a consistent curriculum. Candidates experience comparable learning opportunities.

- The program provides candidates with opportunities to develop proficiency in the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions encompassed in most of the RIPTS. The program provided a crosswalk that identified which courses address each RIPTS, but the program addresses RIPTS at various depths.

- The program emphasizes the RIPTS at multiple points of the program. For each course, candidates must reflect on how they believe their completed assignments provide evidence for making progress toward meeting one or more of the RIPTS. According to the program, "the candidates' archive of work and RIPTS reflections become a central focus of conversations at various points throughout the year and during capstone degree project conferences." The program rubric states that, at the proficient level, "The student has been able to make appropriate connections between their work and appropriately identified Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards" and "There is evidence in the student's reflections of developing confidence in viewing RIPTS not as something outside of themselves but as essential indicators of knowledge, competencies, and dispositions necessary to their role as an effective educator."

- Reviewers saw evidence of reflections in candidate work samples, but they noted that sometimes the reflections were a stretch. For example, the egg project in TLAD 605G required candidates to create art; it was not a teaching assignment, so instead candidates discussed how this would reflect the RIPTS if they were to turn this assignment into a student project. In this

case, the exercise might have been useful to think about the RIPTS, but it was not a reflection on candidates' actual teaching practice.

- The assessment system includes tools aligned to the RIPTS. The Clinical Educator Mid-Assignment Evaluation includes explicit alignment to RIPTS. The clinical educator completes the form midway through their student teaching assignment. The RISD Supervisor Evaluation used by clinical supervisors is aligned to the RIPTS, but more loosely. Program leadership identified that it would like to improve candidate "orientation at the launch of the program to the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS), their significance and how candidates' performance is assessed using these standards" and to engage "candidates, clinical educators, and program faculty" in that orientation.

- Based on syllabi review, interviews, work samples, and site visits, reviewers noted that the program prepares candidates well in most RIPTS. Clinical educators noted that candidates use feedback to reflect on and improve their own teaching (Standard 10).

- Evidence indicated that candidates have more limited opportunities to develop proficiency in creating instructional opportunities that reflect a respect for the diversity of learners (Standard 4), creating instructional opportunities to encourage all students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, performance skills, and literacy across content areas (Standard 5), and developing classroom management skills (part of Standard 6). Multiple stakeholders noted that candidates would benefit from more preparation in classroom management and accommodating individual differences. In observations, reviewers noted across observations that candidates would have benefitted with additional support on how to use questioning to elicit critical thinking and problem solving.

Recommendations

- Review and revise course assessment criteria or outcomes to connect more explicitly to the RIPTS where appropriate.

- Review and revise syllabi to place greater emphasis on classroom management, questioning and critical thinking, and accommodating individual differences.

- Ensure there is explicit emphasis on higher order thinking in the new curriculum development courses. Consider requiring or encouraging candidates to include key questions in lesson plans to help them develop strong questioning skills and then provide feedback on their use of questioning during teaching.

- Review and review coursework to better address classroom management strategies. Provide additional opportunities for candidates to practice, such as through simulations and rehearsal with peers during coursework and the student teaching seminar.

- Consider how faculty can model for candidates seating arrangement strategies, material management/distribution, and questioning while teaching courses at RISD.

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Meets Expectations

The program curriculum aligns to the professional association standards. Candidates have sufficient opportunity to develop proficiency in the full range of knowledge and skills needed to meet the expectations of the standards.

- Candidates come to the program with a strong knowledge of art. The program requires all candidates to hold a B.A. or a B.F.A. with studio art. Candidates must demonstrate 12 credits in the history of art. Potential candidates must also submit a portfolio of 20 images of their own artwork to demonstrate both depth and breadth—10 images of artwork in a single medium, three drawings, and 7 images of art created using a variety of other media.

- At admissions, the program faculty also conduct a transcript review to ensure that candidates have sufficient content knowledge in other relevant content areas. Candidates must have 12 credits in literacy, 9 credits in humanities/sciences, and 6 credits in the liberal arts.

- Candidates have the opportunity to deepen their art expertise through one elective art course during the winter session. The program encourages candidates to use those classes to address gaps their own art preparation, particularly if it is an area that is likely to be included in a school (e.g. ceramics).

- The National Art Education Association Standards list what the program should do rather than what the candidate should be able to do. Although the overall rating was Meets Expectations, the program should continue working to ensure that art education faculty model appropriate and various assessments of student learning within art education (Standard IV) and enable candidates to understand assessment methods appropriate to the evaluation of student work (Standard II). Faculty should model how to assess students talking about art and making art and also how to offer formative and summative critiques.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations

The program provides candidates with a deep understanding of student standards. The program provides candidates scaffolded opportunities to develop proficiency in developing, implementing, and assessing standards-based lessons.

- The program introduces the National Core Arts Visual Standards early in the program. To help students understand the structure of the standards, candidates align their early lesson plans to the four dimensions of the National Core Visual Arts Standards (i.e. Creating, Producing, Responding, Connecting). Then, later in their program, candidates ensure that their lesson plans include multiple dimensions and align with the specific applicable standards.

- Candidates demonstrated strong knowledge of the National Core Visual Arts standards in interviews. Candidates described how the standards are structured and shared how they use the standards to inform lesson planning. Lesson plans articulated both objectives aligned to specific standards and how the candidate intended to assess the objective. Student work

samples showed that candidates receive feedback on their identification of lesson objectives from clinical supervisors to ensure that objectives are measurable and aligned to standards.

- Clinical educators praised candidates for their preparedness to teach the standards. They noted that they see candidates' lesson plans in advance and they are consistently aligned to standards. Lessons are structured in a way that will help students move toward proficiency toward standards. One clinical educator noted that a student teacher helped district educators rewrite rubrics aligned to the National Core Arts Visual Standards based on the knowledge she brought from the program.

- The program should continue to deepen candidate knowledge and application of assessing student performance in relation to specific standards.

1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
The program provides candidates some opportunities to learn about and practice data-driven instruction but does not include a clear, intentional focus on the use of data to inform instruction. Candidates develop a general understanding of assessment and develop basic skills in using assessment data to inform instruction.	

- Program leadership identified that it would like to devote more curriculum time to "evaluating K-12 student work" and analyze "the data markers representing the arc of student learning." Reviewers agreed that the program would benefit from a stronger emphasis on data-driven instruction. In work samples, the quality of assessments integrated into lesson plans varied.

- During student teaching, candidates are required to gather three work samples from each lesson that represent three levels of student performance (emerging, proficient, and distinguished) and is accompanied by the student teacher's explanation of the evidence in the work that determined its classification.

- During interviews, candidates described how sometimes guidance related to assessment did not seem to align with realistic assessment practices, particularly at the elementary level. Reviewers saw varying quality of assessments integrated into candidate lesson plans, and it was not always clear how candidates would use the data to inform future instruction.

- Candidates practice identifying, gathering, and analyzing data from sources other than assessments to improve student learning and instructional practice through case studies. In TLAD 652G: Context, Content, and Practices in Art & Design Education, candidates prepare a case study that includes information about the school community, the class curriculum, assessment and evaluation, and students' prehistory. As part of this assignment, candidates look at SurveyWorks and InfoWorks data.

Recommendations

- Provide more explicit focus on student assessment, particularly using rubrics alongside student work.

- Ensure that faculty model best practices for assessment by making assessment criteria for their own courses transparent to candidates and aligned to course objectives.

- Consider implementing required assignments during practicum and student teaching where candidates assess student progress and then use that data to inform the next lesson.

- Consider how to leverage the redesigned courses (TLAD 611G Curriculum Development for Elementary Visual Arts Learning and TLAD 612G Curriculum Development for Secondary Visual Arts Learning) to cover grade-appropriate assessment strategies.

- Ensure that clinical educators model best practices for assessing student work and using data to inform progress.

- Moving forward, ensure candidates use the Rhode Island School Report Card data instead of InfoWorks, since RIDE is no longer updating InfoWorks.

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

- The program reported that candidates enter the program already fluent in multiple digital technologies but then learn about the use of digital tools to enhance student learning in their MAT coursework.

- In TLAD-654G: Design Education Workshop 1: Image-Text-Sound, candidates learn about and use a variety of media for student learning. Examples include using iMovie, VoiceThread, Google Classroom, and InDesign. In TLAD 601G: Mapping for Visual Arts Learning, candidates learn about video applications that can be used in the art room.

- Program leadership stated, "Candidates are expected to utilize digital technologies to enhance their students' learning." During site visits, reviewers observed candidates use Google Classroom, PowerPoints, and other media. In a debrief, a candidate received feedback on her use of technology in the debrief session as well as suggestions for improvement.

- Although not called out as a separate indicator, the program assesses candidate use of technology through the Teaching Portfolio. For example, one of the critical attributes of Instructional Content at the Proficient level is "Sample instructional materials—digital presentations, worksheets, and handouts—provide evidence of the candidate's considered development of materials designed to support instruction and engage students in learning."

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum provides candidates limited opportunities to develop proficiency in working with English language learners, students with disabilities, and families.	

- Candidates engage in reflection of their own biases and worldviews through readings and class assignments, particularly in TLAD-605G Lifespan: Human Growth & Development. Course topics include bias, prejudice, poverty, self-concept, identity, motivation, LGBTQI youth, giving feedback to students, peer relationships, and families. In this class, candidates write reaction papers on multiple readings. Through these papers, candidates must "describe [their] equitable classroom," react to a reading focused on social justice and poverty, and describe "topical issues facing a child or adolescent in 2018". For the "My Egg's Journey" project, candidates reflect "on their life's journey thus far and its impact on their own values, beliefs, biases, and attitudes." Candidates develop an original piece of art related to their journey and then write a written reflections.

- In TLAD-606G Lifespan: Exceptionality, candidates learn about the needs of differently abled learners and learn basic practices and strategies for supporting learning. As part of the course, candidates must submit two lesson plans with specific modifications for each lesson for differently abled learners. Students are also required to describe classroom modifications and strategies for the identified disability. However, candidates voiced that there seemed to be a disconnect between learning these strategies in the fall and then student teaching in the spring, and wished they had an opportunity to receive additional feedback and support from the Lifespan course instructor on their work with differently abled students during student teaching.

- Candidates learn about the benefits and impact on learning of working with families in TLAD-605G: Lifespan: Human Growth and Development through some course readings. However, reviewers did not see evidence of candidates learning specific strategies for working with families.

- The program expects candidates to share with families during their field experiences. As part of microteaching in 604G: Lab School – Learning Through Art + Design, candidates are "responsible for sharing the work of students with the larger community" in the form of "student work, a book that is shared with families, an installation in your partner classroom, a presentation to the school community, or something else entirely." The program also expects candidates to participate in parent events, conferences, etc. if they occur during student teaching; however, whether such events occur depends on the placement.

- Reviewers found a limited focus on working with multilingual learners. Program leadership acknowledged that it needs to better prepare students in this area and shared plans for program improvement. Program leadership reported that it intends to replace one of the design workshops with a course that focuses more explicitly on working with multilingual learners; if implemented, this course has the potential to address a current gap in candidate preparation.

Recommendations

- Consider bringing in a practicing art teacher certified in ESOL or an English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Consultant to provide instruction on appropriate strategies candidates can use with multilingual learners. Ensure candidates receive clear, specific instruction and references for strategies that support multilingual learners. Ensure candidates receive feedback on their implementation of strategies.

- Ensure that candidates have access to a special educator and an English to Speakers of Other Languages teacher during student teaching so that they can get feedback, problem solve, or learn additional strategies. During the visit, stakeholders suggested the program ask appropriate TLAD faculty or other educators to join some student teaching seminars to provide support or offer to have appropriate TLAD faculty or others observe candidates and give feedback on instruction of students with disabilities and multilingual learners. Consider whether there are ways to ensure the clinical educator connects the student teacher with special educators and in the school.

- Communicate more explicitly an expectation that candidates during student teaching engage in research-based practices of working with families that impact student learning, and ensure candidates receive feedback on their work with families.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Approaching Expectations
The program provides limited opportunities for candidates to learn about and become proficient in important Rhode Island educational initiatives.	

- Candidates learn about a limited number of initiatives during their program. The program encourages candidates to review Infoworks and SurveyWorks as part of their case studies and in preparation for student teaching. During the student teaching seminar, candidates learn about important RI initiatives that impact art educators, including the Advanced Course Network, the arts pathway endorsement, educator evaluation, and professional development.

- The program does not assess candidate preparedness to implement RI initiatives in a formal way.

Recommendations

- Learn from clinical partners the critical initiatives that art teachers need to know. Brainstorm with clinical partners opportunities to integrate information about specific initiatives into coursework and into activities while on school sites. Identify the knowledge, skills, and practices embedded in those key RI educational initiatives relevant to these certification areas.

- Use the RI Report Card site in the case studies moving forward since RIDE no longer updates InfoWorks.

- Identify and implement assessments of candidate proficiency in Rhode Island educational initiatives.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

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

- Clinical experiences begin during the summer and continue throughout the program. The program reported that candidates complete 81 hours of field experiences and then two six-week student teaching experiences—one at the elementary level and one at the secondary level. Collectively, candidate clinical preparation exceeds the required amount established by Rhode Island certification requirements.

- Most candidates had at least four different placements and had the opportunity to work in a range of grades and environments. All candidates work in districts and charter schools, elementary and secondary schools, and urban settings.

- The practicum experiences align intentionally to specific courses and serve as field settings to observe, implement, and practice skills, strategies, and assessments featured in courses. The first practicum is embedded within TLAD-604G: Lab School Learning through Art & Design. There, candidates work with the host classroom teacher at Highlander Charter to design and deliver instruction connected to the teacher's instructional goals and teach short curricular unit. The second practicum is embedded within TLAD-601G: Mapping for Visual Arts Learning. This experience takes place on RISD's campus in the studio lab.   Candidates teach multiple lessons prior to student teaching and are expected to give feedback to their peers on their lessons as part of practicum.

- The program assigns candidates to their student teaching placements in the fall so that they can become familiar with their school prior to student teaching. As part of TLAD-652G: Context, Content, and Practices in Art & Design, candidates are required to participate in daylong visits to their student teaching placements prior to student teaching so that they are familiar with the school, classroom, and students prior to the official start of their placement. The program encourages candidates to continue their visits during the winter session, though that is not required.

- Per the student teaching handbook, the program expects candidates to take over all but one class by the third week of their student teaching placements. During the one class, the clinical educator continues to teach and model instruction, but the student teacher is expected "to support the Clinical Educator in any way they can." The program should ensure the student teaching handbook also captures an explicit expectation that candidates take over the other roles and responsibilities of the art educator as well, including covering lunch or hallway duty, managing art budgets, engaging in professional learning, etc. Although many stakeholders noted there is an expectation that candidates engage in anything the teacher does, this may not

be consistent in implementation; some program completers reported feeling underprepared to assume the non-teaching responsibilities of an art educator.

- In addition to the required experiences, multiple candidates worked with Project Open Door, RISD's college access program for teens from RI's urban high public high schools. Two candidates taught on Saturdays and another candidate worked in the after school program. These experiences gave candidates additional opportunities to teach and work with students. In interviews, program leadership shared early thinking around how to better use Project Open Door as a clinical site for candidates where they are receiving feedback from a clinical supervisor.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Approaching Expectations
Clinical partners, candidates, and the program have shared expectations for demonstrating impact on student learning, but these expectations are not explicit.	

- The program, clinical partners, and candidates generally understand expectations for demonstrating positive student impact on student learning, but these expectations—including expectations in early clinical experiences—are not explicit.

- Candidates must show evidence of student learning and progress in their capstone project. The Teaching Portfolio Rubric includes a criterion focused on assessment and student learning. At the proficient level: "Samples of assessment tools provide evidence of candidate's concern to record student learning through appropriate means. Samples of the candidate's evaluation of K-12 student work/performance demonstrate the ability to identify evidence in the work that indicate progress in meeting designated student learning outcomes."

- There is no evidence that the program uses early measures of impact on student learning to inform future preparation.

- The program did not mutually design any measures of impact with clinical partners.

Recommendations

- Consider how to integrate early measures of candidate impact on student learning into practicum and the new classes (TLAD 611G: Curriculum Development for Elementary Visual Arts Learning and TLAD: Curriculum Development for Secondary Visual Arts Learning).

- Ensure that candidates learn various ways to not only assess mastery but measures growth in learning over time.

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

- Both clinical educators and clinical partners praised the mutually beneficial aspects of the partnership with RISD, including the opportunities for clinical educator to participate in classes for free and deepen their own knowledge and practice and the benefits for students. One individual described Project Open Door as "life altering for many students" because it helps them develop a portfolio for college. Another said "it's phenomenal how Project Open Door Changes students' lives."

- RISD has co-developed practicum experiences with Highlander Charter and with the MET School. Clinical educators and clinical partners praised the experiences. For example, representatives from the MET School talked about how the practicum experience, which focused on "Who am I?" aligned well with the needs of students, who were thinking about their career pathways at the time.

- The program has an Advisory Council comprised of clinical partners and clinical educators. The program uses this council to inform improvements to partnerships with districts and charter schools. Clinical partners also described having "anecdotal conversations about partnership effectiveness" on a regular basis.

- Prior to certification, the program asks the clinical educator if they would recommend the candidate for certification as part of the Clinical Educator Final Evaluation. At the final conference, the clinical educator, clinical supervisor, and the candidate meet in a three-way conference to review and discuss candidate performance in the program.

- Although the overall rating for this component was Meets Expectations, the program should continue to work to record agreed-upon indicators to serve as a guide for conversation and to formalize how it tracks partnership effectiveness and continuous improvement over time. It was clear from evidence organizers and conversations that program staff, clinical educators, and clinical supervisors have identified indicators of partnership effectiveness and are in regular communication about how to deepen partnerships, but moving forward the program and its partners should document these indicators.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not collaborate with its partners to select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain clinical educators that meet the minimum expectations.	

- The program self-identified—and reviewers agreed—that the program needs to "review its assumptions about a number of its current clinical educators and schools as being effective mentors and sites for candidates" and needs to revisit current processes and tools for choosing clinical educators that model best teaching practices/RIPTS.

- The program does not have clearly identified criteria for both PK-12 and program-based clinical educators. Prior to selecting clinical educators, the program leader observes the clinical educator to ensure that the educator is effective and reflects the same ideology of the program. However, these observations are informal and not based on use of an assessment instrument.

In addition, there currently are not clear criteria around ability to work with adult learners, coaching and supervision skills, and ability to evaluate and provide feedback to candidates.

- The program has self-identified that it wishes to deepen its pool of clinical educators. Currently, the program director primarily recruits and selects clinical educators, rather than in partnership with clinical partners. The program offers an orientation meeting that covers broad expectations but does not help ensure that clinical educators and clinical supervisors have calibrated expectations for candidate performance and for coaching candidates.

- The program reported that it evaluates clinical educator performance based on "evaluative judgments" made through observations of classroom practice and engagement (e.g. attendance at orientation meetings and candidates' graduation receptions). The program also surveys candidates about their student teaching experience, which provides data on the perceived quality of the clinical educator.

Recommendations

- Align minimum requirements for clinical educators with the expectations articulated in Component 2.4 of the PREP-RI rubric.

- Work with partners to identify new ways to identify, train, and support clinical educators who meet and exceed minimum requirements in an effort to expand further the pool of clinical educators to include more educators of color and more educators beyond alumni.

- Collaborate with clinical partners to articulate clearly indicators of partnership effectiveness.

- Establish training opportunities that include calibration activities and practice using the clinical educator selection evaluation tool.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has established an assessment system, but the structure and tools do not ensure that assessments are based on rigorous, clear criteria that are consistently applied across candidates.	

- The program assessment system includes three decision points: readiness for admission, readiness for student teaching and recommendation for certification. Program leadership stated—and reviewers agreed—that "there needs to be greater attention paid to ensuring that its assessment system more fully describes and records levels of candidate performance with a greater degree of specificity."

- During the admissions process, the program faculty first assess each applicant's academic record, statement of purpose, portfolio, and letters of recommendation. Then, some applicants are invited to campus for a full day that includes 30-minute interviews with program faculty. During the interview, faculty asses the candidate's communication/interpersonal skills, content knowledge, and commitment to a teaching career/personal insights. The rubric includes

descriptors for three score ranges (Extremely Competitive, Competitive, and Not Competitive) and a score range of up to 10 for each criterion. The two full-time faculty rate each applicant separately and then determine who to admit. The program does not have an approved conditional acceptance policy.

- In order to proceed to student teaching, candidates must have a B or higher in all courses. Key course assignments include student teaching site case studies, microteaching, a community arts partnership proposal, lesson plans, and curriculum maps, but it is unclear how course instructors use performance on these key assignments to determine the final course grade.

- Candidates teach multiple lessons prior to student teaching, but they do not receive a formal evaluation or formal feedback of their teaching during practicum.

- The program reported having several mechanisms for monitoring candidate progress, including informal communications among faculty and mid-semester conferences with students.

- Work samples demonstrated that candidates receive written feedback on key assignments. Reviewers also saw evidence of candidates needing to redo assignments that did not meet expectations. However, it is unclear how assignment and course grades are determined. Syllabi do not explain how assignments are weighted and not all syllabi have rubrics.

- Program leadership discussed the need for assessment to be more transparent. A memo to faculty documented some early thinking around providing candidates vignettes so that they understand what proficient and distinguished performance looks like for each assignment. If implemented well, the vignettes have the potential to provide models to candidates and to establish more transparency and calibration in the assessment system.

- Multiple stakeholders noted that frequent communication between candidates and faculty enables the program to intervene quickly when candidate performance is below expectations. Program leadership reported that candidates "receive a high level of personalized support from faculty supervisors". If a candidate is struggling, the program provides additional supports or refers the student to other campus supports.

- Although the program provided multiple examples of how they support candidates, the program did not demonstrate a systematic approach to monitoring, supporting, and documenting candidate performance throughout the program. Program faculty engage in multiple conversations about candidate performance but do not document these conversations in a systematic way.

Recommendations

- Work with clinical partners to design and implement performance assessments aligned with RIPTS to use in practicum to ensure candidates are ready for student teaching. Consider adopting or adapting performance assessments that are already used widely in RI and other states.

- Ensure the assessment system prioritizes candidate performance working with PK-12 students during early clinical experiences when considering candidate progression.

- Institute early measures of candidate impact on student learning and use in the information to identify growth for specific candidates and cohorts.

- Revise key assessments to include clear criteria/rubrics for grading. Articulate clearly minimum expectations for candidate performance on each assignment.

- Articulate clearly how course grades are determined in relation to the key assignments. Whenever feasible, ensure that teaching performance is emphasized more than papers, reflections, etc. when determining course grades.

3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Approaching Expectations
The criteria for recommendation for certification align generally to certification requirements and professional association standards. The assessment system as currently implemented does not ensure that the program recommends only candidates who demonstrate proficiency on the full range of competencies for certification.	

- Prior to receiving recommendation for certification, candidates must obtain a grade of B or higher in both student teaching courses and must score at least a B on the degree project.

- The degree project includes a program portfolio, a teaching portfolio, a book, and a conference. The program portfolio includes assignments, evidence of work, and reflections. The teaching portfolio includes a resume, artist's statement, samples of studio work, a teaching philosophy, curriculum maps, four lesson plans from student teaching with supporting instructional materials and student work, and a lesson plan from each practicum experience. Candidates develop a book, or visual essay, that conveys their ideas about teaching to through images and text. A review panel consisting of MAT faculty and at least one external evaluator participate in the conference. The Student Teaching Handbook includes rubrics for the teaching portfolio and the program portfolio, but it is unclear how the degree project grade is determined. In addition, rubric criteria emphasize design and reflection rather than actual teaching performance.

- Clinical educators and clinical supervisors are both responsible for evaluating the performance of candidates during student teaching. Clinical educators complete a mid-assignment and final evaluation of student performance and participate in conferences with students for each. The clinical supervisor conducts at least three site visits at a placement school that include an observation and debrief. The tools used for these assessments are different and do not include clear performance-level descriptors.

- The clinical educator and candidate engage in a mid-assignment conference to discuss performance thus far. At the end of the assignment, the clinical educator, clinical supervisor, and candidate participate in a three-way final conference.

- The RISD supervisor determines the course grade for student teaching, but all clinical educators are required to state whether they think a student teacher should be awarded teacher certification in PK-12 art at the completion of their placement.

- Multiple stakeholders noted a lack of clarity about how to use the assessment instrument and noted that the differences in performance levels are unclear. Reviewers asked multiple stakeholders what the difference between "on track" and "proficient" performance is and received varying answers. Looking at feedback and in talking with stakeholders, at times there are contradictory expectations between clinical educators and clinical supervisors.

- The program offers orientations for all clinical educators, but these are not required. Clinical educators and clinical supervisors use slightly different tools to evaluate candidate performance. The program did not provide evidence of calibration activities to ensure that all use performance assessments consistently.

Recommendations

- Consider whether clinical educators and clinical supervisors would benefit from using the same observation tool to provide feedback to candidates.

- Revise current program assessment tools or adopt or adapt tools the field is already using to ensure that the tool articulates clearly expectations for performance at each level. Provide training or conduct co-observations to ensure that assessment results are valid, fair, accurate, and consistent.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not annually survey employers of recent program completers.	

- The program does not annually survey employers of recent program completers. The program reported that the program is reticent about approaching completers' employers without first securing the permission of completers and noted the challenges of finding contact information for employers since many RISD alumni teach out of state.

- Given the small cohort size of program completers, reviewers were unable to compare the aggregate performance of the program's recent completers working in Rhode Island schools compared to the aggregate performance distribution for all recent completers in RI schools.

Recommendations

- Create and administer a survey of recent program completers aligned to the RIPTS and/or other criteria identified by the program. Include specific questions about completers' readiness and performance as well as their impact on student learning.

- Leverage the relationships that the program maintains with alumni. Share the purposes of the survey and, when needed, ask completers to provide contact information for supervisors so the program can administer the survey.

- Develop a system for analyzing and using the data for program improvement on an annual basis.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program tracks the employment of program completers and has administered surveys to program completers.	

- The program administered two surveys to program completers—an online survey in 2014 for 2000-2013 and another online survey for 2007-2017. The surveys are designed to give actionable feedback, but the program does not administer the survey annually. Program leadership have analyzed the surveys but have not used the data yet to inform program improvements.

- The program maintains a database of its candidates and completers. The program keeps in touch with most program completers and updates the database as employment changes. The program uses the RISD reception at the National Art Education Association (NAEA) Convention, participation in the Rhode Island Art Education Association (RIAEA), and its closed Facebook group as opportunities to remain connected with program completers and learn about their employment and accomplishments.

Recommendations

- Administer the survey annually. Develop a process for reviewing the data, such as sharing it at an Advisory Council meeting for discussion to determine next steps.

- Document changes made to the program based on the feedback.

Provider-Level Findings and Recommendations
Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.1 Diversity of Candidates	Meets Expectations
The provider demonstrates significant efforts to recruit, admit, and support high-quality candidates who reflect the diversity of Rhode Island's PK-12 students. The provider capitalizes on the diversity of students.	

- The Rhode Island School of Design has demonstrated a commitment to increasing the diversity of its campus through the release of the 2017 Social Equity and Inclusion Action Plan and the hiring of an inaugural vice president of Social Equity and Inclusion. In 2017-18, approximately 55 percent of enrolled undergraduate students identified as non-white, with 11 percent identifying as Hispanic/Latino, 6 percent identifying as African American, 26 percent identifying as Asian, and 11 percent identifying as Two or More Races.

- The program reported that making the program accessible is "one of the program's highest priorities" and in doing so will align directly to the "institutional strategic planning for social equity and inclusion." RISD has invested significant resources and demonstrated considerable effort to establish potential pipelines and to support candidates who might not otherwise be able to attend. For example, RISD recently made it possible to continue to offer RISD undergraduates and alumni the same amount of financial aid that they received as undergraduates. Some candidates receive assistantships to work in Project Open Door, which reduces financial burden and gives them more opportunities to work with students. RISD has also been studying whether it can offer loan forgiveness to M.A.T. completers who teach and persist in the profession, and communicated that they think this will be possible in the future.

- The M.A.T. program has used multiple venues to communicate about the program and its candidates: targeted outreach to colleges and universities in New England, its redesigned website which emphasizes storytelling and program completers, and open houses. The program has been relatively successful in recruiting a diverse cohort of candidates. In the past two years, 40 percent of M.A.T candidates have identified as non-white. However, when looking at specific breakdowns by ethnicity, race, and gender, reviewers noted that the program has not recruited and retained sufficient male and Hispanic/Latino candidates to be reflective of RI students. Recently, RISD has begun program-specific recruitment efforts and plans to work closely with the M.A.T. program to do more recruitment moving forward.

- RISD views Project Open Door as a potential pathway for students, not only into a career in the arts but also into art education. Program leadership described their ideal situation where a student participates in Project Open Door as a high school student, attends RISD or another college for undergraduate, and then comes back to RISD for the M.A.T. program. Over time, the program should track whether Project Open Door participants do become teachers, either by completing RISD's M.A.T. program or another teacher preparation programs.

- RISD integrates student backgrounds into different projects and capitalizes on the diversity of the cohort. The program reported two specific examples where candidates learn about and benefit from each other's lived experiences. In TLAD-605G: Lifespan: Human Growth & Development, candidates have a studio-based assignment requiring them to create work that reflects their experiences and then share it with their cohort. In TLAD-654G: Design Education Workshop I, candidates create a video profile of a partner, thus learning about each other as artists and benefiting from learning about different backgrounds, cultures, and experiences. During interviews, clinical educators spoke about ways candidates integrate their heritage and backgrounds into their teaching.

3.2 Response to Employment Needs	Meets Expectations
The provider shares information about employer prospects with candidates and alumni and is responsive to state employment needs.	

- The provider shares employment prospects and profiles of recent alumni during scheduled program orientation meetings for RISD students considering a fith-year masters and profile recent completers on the RISD website.

- The provider has developed a strong, active network from which it learns about current and anticipated job openings as well as the success of alumni. Alumni, district partners, and faculty share current and potential openings with leadership and often post this information on RISD TLAD's closed Facebook group page.

- TLAD maintains an employment database and shares employment records with RISD's Career Center so that the information can be shared with prospective applicants, applicants invited to interviews, and current MAT candidates.

- The program has an advisory council that it uses to get input into programmatic changes that would make graduates more competitive. Clinical educators praised program leadership for remaining constantly aware of changes and needs in the field. They noted that the program is constantly changing and revamping to meet the needs of the field.

3.3 Admissions Standards for Academic Achievement and Ability	Meets Expectations
The provider and program admissions requirements meet Rhode Island Department of Education's expectations for prospective candidates.	

- During the admissions process, the program faculty first assess each applicant's academic record, statement of purpose, portfolio, and letters of recommendation. Then, some applicants are invited to campus for a full day that includes 30-minute interviews with program faculty. During the interview, faculty asses the candidate's communication/interpersonal skills, content knowledge, and commitment to a teaching career/personal insights. The rubric includes descriptors for three score ranges (Extremely Competitive, Competitive, and Not Competitive) and a score range of up to 10 for each criterion. The two full-time faculty rate each applicant separately and then determine who to admit.

- All accepted M.A.T. candidates must have an overall undergraduate GPA of 3.0. The provider chooses to not have a conditional acceptance policy. According to program leadership, "While we recognize that not having a conditional acceptance criteria [*sic*] in place, it's our belief the one-year post-baccalaureate program does not provide any applicant not having met the program's pre-requisites with sufficient programmatic time to develop in those areas considered of concern at the point of application."

3.6 Additional Selectivity Criteria	Approaching Expectations
The provider has not identified clear dispositions and additional selectivity criteria.	

- The program has not formally articulated dispositions other than commitment to teaching that it looks for, but the program director identified multiple dispositions that they look for in

potential and current candidates, including flexibility, adaptability, respect and interest in begin an educator.

- Although the program looks for dispositions through the admissions process, the program does not track performance of candidate dispositions over time, nor does it incorporate instruction and support for developing these dispositions and traits over time.

Recommendations

- Articulate clearly the research-based key dispositions the program values.

- Assess and discuss candidate performance over time, perhaps as part of mid-semester conferences. As needed, support candidates with disposition development.

Standard 5: Program Quality and Improvement

5.1 Collection of Data to Evaluate Program Quality	Approaching Expectations
The program collects feedback and anecdotal data to evaluate program quality.	

- The program uses a variety of sources of data—including candidate performance data, stakeholder feedback, survey data, and employment data—to inform program improvement. The provider shared multiple examples of changes the program has made or intends to make based on information gathered.

- The provider collects surveys after every course, which the program uses to inform program improvements. Given the size of the program, program leadership also gather feedback from multiple stakeholders through conversations; however, these conversations are not formally/strategically documented for systematic program improvements.

- Given the size of the program, the program does not have publically reported educator preparation index data on completer impact on PK-12 students' learning that it can use given n sizes. The program has not gathered evidence of impact in other ways.

Recommendations

- Develop a system for gathering and analyzing data on both candidate progress identified program outcomes (aligned to RIPTS) and program assessment.

- Establish a data sharing agreement with Rhode Island Department of Education and perhaps other states where multiple completers are working and combine multiple cohorts (e.g. past 5 years) in order to increase the sample size.

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

- Program leadership meets at scheduled intervals with provider leadership to discuss syllabi, student performance, and other data that informs continuous improvement efforts. Provider structures are in place, such as curriculum committees and instruction committees, to support continuous improvement.

- The provider shared a program improvement plan with reviewers with clear timelines. In conversations, the provider identified past and future program changes made based on data and feedback. For example, the program is developing a new course focused on multilingual learners based on completer survey data, feedback from candidates, and feedback from the field.

- The provider has established an M.A.T. Advisory Board that has begun meeting to discuss potential program improvements. RISD should ensure it brings data to the conversations for review and discussion.

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

- The provider meets all RIDE data reporting requirements and timelines. The provider includes a link to the Educator Preparation Index on its website and includes completer data and profiles of graduates on the website.

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

- The provider has an M.A.T. Advisory Committee that meets annually. The M.A.T Advisory Board includes a representative group of clinical educators. In Spring 2019, the M.A.T. Advisory Committee met to discuss options for how the program could transition to a residency or equivalent.

- Clinical educators and clinical partners cited multiple examples where program leadership has sought their input into program improvements. As noted above, RISD should ensure it brings data to the conversations for review and discussion, develop systems to document data to guide program improvement, and should continue working to ensure that diverse stakeholders have input into the program.

5.5 Diversity and Quality of Faculty	Meets Expectations
The provider ensures that faculty members have the appropriate qualifications for their role. The university has demonstrated significant efforts to ensure that faculty reflect the diversity of Rhode Island.	

- Multiple stakeholders reported that program faculty are qualified, effective, and supportive of candidates.

- Faculty in the probationary period receive annual evaluations based on four criteria: ability and effectiveness as a teacher, professional status, college service, and community engagement. Other faculty are reviewed in the first and third years of their five-year contracts. Through student evaluations, all candidates provide feedback on courses and course instructors. There currently is no formal evaluation process for adjunct faculty, and the provider should work to ensure that all program faculty, including adjuncts, receive timely and useful evaluations.

- The provider reported that it recently hired an inaugural vice president of Social Equity and Inclusion. The provider shared evidence that this position and other campus efforts have modestly increased faculty diversity at the institution. Between 2015 and 2018, 24 percent of new faculty hires at RISD were people of color. This year (2018-19) more than 50 percent of new hires were people of color. Provider leadership mentioned improved practices related to job postings, inclusive practices, interviewing and evaluating candidates, and search committees in conversations.

- Although clinical educators are not faculty members, both reviewers and program leadership noted the lack of diversity among clinical educators. The program should increase efforts to identify educators of color to serve as clinical educators.

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

- Leadership reported that the MAT program is well-staffed and "extremely well resourced" by RISD. RISD has invested significant resources in the program in terms of space, faculty and staff, and candidate support. In addition, as noted elsewhere in this report, RISD's support of Project Open Door and Early College represents a significant investment in quality programming for urban high school students in RI.

- In addition to supports offered through their program, candidates have access to a variety of resources and supports, including the RISD Museum, the Nature Lab, RISD's Fleet Library, the Counseling Center, and the Career Center.

- As the program moves toward a residency or residency-like model, it will be important for the provider to reconceptualize the staffing and staffing types needed to support the program in order to ensure that candidates receive high quality feedback on their practice.

Appendix A: Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation

STANDARD ONE: PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STANDARD TWO: CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE

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

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

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

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

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

STANDARD THREE: CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STANDARD FOUR: PROGRAM IMPACT

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

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

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

STANDARD FIVE: PROGRAM QUALITY AND IMPROVEMENT

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

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

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

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

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

5.5 Diversity and Quality of Faculty: Approved programs ensure that candidates are prepared by a diverse faculty composed of educators who demonstrate current, exceptional expertise in their respective fields, and model the qualities of effective instruction and leadership. Approved programs

maintain plans, activities, and data on results in the selection of diverse program-based and district-based faculty.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Component: Defines a distinct aspect of standard

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

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

Program completer: See *Completer*

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

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

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

Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS): 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): 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