



PREP-RI Rhode Island
Department
of Education

Review Team Performance Report

Rhode Island College

Rhode Island Department of Education
October 23, 2016 to October 26, 2016



Table of Contents

Performance Review of Educator Preparation - Rhode Island	4
Report Purpose and Layout	4
Key Terms Used in this Report	5
Report Summary	5
Program Classifications	9
Provider Approval Term	10
Component Ratings.....	13
Standard 1: Professional Knowledge	13
Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	14
Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment	15
Standard 4: Program Impact	16
Standard 5: Program Quality and Improvement	17
Teacher Certificate Areas: Findings and Recommendations	18
All Grades Education Program	18
Standard 1: Professional Knowledge	18
Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	25
Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment	29
Standard 4: Program Impact	31
Early Childhood Education Program	33
Standard 1: Professional Knowledge	33
Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	38
Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment	41
Standard 4: Program Impact	44
Elementary Education Program	45
Standard 1: Professional Knowledge	45
Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	51
Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment	55
Standard 4: Program Impact	58
Middle Grades Education Program	59
Standard 1: Professional Knowledge	59



Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	65
Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment	68
Standard 4: Program Impact	71
Secondary Grades Education Program	72
Standard 1: Professional Knowledge	72
Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	77
Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment	82
Standard 4: Program Impact	85
Special Education Program	86
Standard 1: Professional Knowledge	86
Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	92
Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment	96
Standard 4: Program Impact	99
Administrator Certification Areas: Findings and Recommendations	100
Building Level Administrator Program	100
Standard 1: Professional Knowledge	100
Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	104
Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment	107
Standard 4: Program Impact	108
Support Professional Certification Areas: Findings and Recommendations	109
Reading Specialist Program	109
Standard 1: Professional Knowledge	109
Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	115
Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment	118
Standard 4: Program Impact	119
School Counselor Program	121
Standard 1: Professional Knowledge	121
Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	124
Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment	126
Standard 4: Program Impact	128
School Psychologist Program	129
Standard 1: Professional Knowledge	129



Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	132
Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment	134
Standard 4: Program Impact	136
Provider-Level Findings and Recommendations.....	137
Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment	137
Standard 5: Program Quality and Improvement.....	141
Appendix A: Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation.....	148
Appendix B: Guidance for Program Classification, Provider Approval Term, and Approval Conditions..	151
Appendix C: Glossary	152



Performance Review of Educator Preparation - Rhode Island

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

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

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

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

Report Purpose and Layout

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

The report has three sections: Report Summary, Program Components Findings and Recommendations, and Provider Components Findings and Recommendations. The Report Summary provides specific details from the review, the program classifications, provider approval term, and tables of component performance level ratings for the programs and provider. The program classifications are based on program-level components and 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 must be addressed 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. Except when programs are recommended for non-renewals, components that are 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, RIC must take action to address issues of performance related to all components that were not assessed as Meets 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, Rhode Island College (RIC), offers nine RIDE-approved teacher, building administrator, and support professional programs. RIC has been a RIDE-approved educator preparation provider since 1972. The educator preparation programs at RIC were last reviewed in 2011 as part of the Rhode Island Program Approval Process (RIPA). The tables on the following pages list the programs and courses of study reviewed during this visit. Please note that the review team did not review any courses of study not listed in the tables, either because they are not RIDE-approved programs or because RIC did not submit any evidence for them (i.e. M.A.T. in Biology and M.A.T. in History/Social Studies).

Teacher Certification Programs

Certification Program	Undergraduate	Graduate	Non-Degree
All Grades Education	B.S. in Art Education	M.A.T in Art Education	-
	B.M. in Music Education	M.A.T. in Music Education	-
	B.S. in Secondary Education (World Languages) ²	M.A.T. in Secondary Education (World Languages)	-
	B.S. in Health Education	-	-
	B.S. in Physical Education	-	-
	B.S. in Technology Education	-	-
Early Childhood Education	B.S. in Early Childhood	-	-

² Languages are French, German, Portuguese, Spanish.



Certification Program	Undergraduate	Graduate	Non-Degree
Elementary Education	B.A. in Elementary Education	M.A.T. in Elementary Education	-
Middle Grades – Elementary Extension			English
			Mathematics
			Science
			Social Studies
Middle Grades – Secondary Extension			English
			Mathematics
			Science
			Social Studies
Secondary Education	B.A. in Secondary Education (Biology)	-	RITE in Biology
	B.A. in Secondary Education (Chemistry)	-	RITE in Chemistry
	B.A. in Secondary Education (English)	M.A.T. in Secondary Education (English)	RITE in English
	B.A. in Secondary Education (General Science)	-	RITE in General Science
	B.A. in Secondary Education (History)	-	RITE in History
	B.A. in Secondary Education (Mathematics)	M.A.T in Secondary Education (Mathematics)	RITE in Mathematics
	B.A. in Secondary Education (Physics)	-	RITE in Physics
	B.A. in Secondary Education (Social Studies)	-	RITE in Social Studies
Special Education Program		M.Ed. in Special Education with a concentration in Early Childhood	-
	B.S. in Elementary and Special Education with a concentration in Mild/Moderate Disabilities	M.Ed. in Special Education with Concentration in Special Education Certification	-
	B.S. in Secondary Education with a concentration in Mild/Moderate Disabilities	M.Ed. in Special Education with Concentration in Special Education Certification	-



Certification Program	Undergraduate	Graduate	Non-Degree
	B.S. in Special Education with a concentration in Severe Intellectual Disabilities	M.Ed. in Special Education with Concentration in Severe Intellectual Disabilities	-

Administrator Certification Programs

Certification Program	Undergraduate	Graduate	Non-Degree
Building Administrator Program	-	M.Ed. in Educational Leadership	-

Support Professional Certification Programs

Certification Program	Undergraduate	Graduate	Non-Degree
Reading Specialist	-	M.Ed. in Reading	-
School Counselor	-	M.A. in School Counseling	-
School Psychologist	-	M.A. in Educational Psychology	C.A.G.S. in School Psychology

The current review was conducted from October 23, 2016 through the October 26, 2016. Review team members were:

- Dr. Marie Ahern, Director of Curriculum at Exeter/West Greenwich Regional School District
- Fatima Barbosa, Special Education Teacher at West Warwick Public Schools
- William Barrass, Social Studies Teacher at Barrington Public Schools
- Melissa Denton, Director of Pupil Personnel at Westerly Public Schools
- Dr. Chandra Foote, Professor and Dean at Niagara University
- Stacy Haines-Mayne, Guidance Chair at Chariho Public Schools
- Dr. Arthur Hernandez, Visiting Professor at University of the Incarnate World
- Dr. Craig Hochbein, Assistant Professor at Lehigh University
- Dr. Nancy Hoffman, Professor at Central Connecticut State University
- Dr. Anne Howard, Professor at Fitchburg State University
- Melissa Labossiere, Talent Development Specialist at Pawtucket School Department
- Michael Medeiros, Former Physical Education Teacher at Portsmouth High School
- Crystal Monteiro, Elementary Teacher at East Providence School Department
- Dr. Cheryl Moore-Thomas, Associate Professor at Loyola University Maryland
- Dr. Therese Quinn, Associate Professor at University of Illinois at Chicago
- Berkis Rodriguez, Dual Language Teacher at Central Falls School District



- David Upegui, Science Teacher at Central Falls School District
- Dr. William Weber, Former Associate Professor at The University of Toledo
- Dr. Lynne Weisenbach, Consultant at Weisenbach Consulting and Former Vice Chancellor of University System of Georgia

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



Program Classifications

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

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

Program	Classification
Teacher Certification Programs	
All Grades Education	Approved with Conditions
Early Childhood	Approved with Conditions
Elementary Education	Approved with Conditions
Middle Grades Education	Approved with Conditions
Secondary Grades Education	Approved with Conditions
Special Education	Approved with Conditions
Administrator Certification Programs	
Building Level Administrator	Non-Renewal
Support Professional Certification Programs	
Reading Specialist	Approved with Conditions <i>This program is at risk of being classified as Low Performing.³</i>
School Counselor	Non-Renewal
School Psychologist	Approved with Distinction

³ The Reading Specialist program is at risk of being classified as Low Performing. Programs identified as low performing marginally meet expected performance levels and are identified as “low performing” for Title II federal purposes.



Provider 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 College
Approval Term	3 years
Conditions	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The President of Rhode Island College will consult with the Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education to identify and appoint a change mentor that will have full access to the Feinstein School of Education leadership and staff as needed. RIC will develop an action plan with the change mentor that prioritizes improvements and will share the action plan with the Commissioner for approval. The Commissioner will also identify an appropriate timeframe to conduct an interim progress visit. Lack of meaningful progress could result in additional program closures. ▪ Within the next two years, RIC will need to engage in intensive work to reform and improve programs. RIC has significant work to do. RIC needs to meet the improvements identified below in addition to others it may additionally identify in the action planning process. Evidence of change will be submitted to the Commissioner: Summer 2017 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Work with the change mentor to establish practitioner advisory councils to inform program improvements. ○ Review program completion data and prioritize programs to improve. Identify whether RIC will voluntarily close programs given low enrollment numbers and resource availability while considering high need certification areas and candidate employment rates. Complete the RIDE-provided Demonstration of Need Form for each program and submit it to RIDE by September 1, 2017. The Commissioner will review all forms and, based on his review, may recommend closing programs with low enrollment. ○ Develop an action plan specific to the Reading Specialist program that addresses components rated <i>Does Not Meet Expectations</i> and <i>Approaching Expectations</i>. This plan should immediately address technology, equity, clinical partnerships, and employment outcomes. 	



Fall 2017

- Conduct an analysis of the candidate assessment system to understand where the system can be strengthened and to ensure teaching performance serves as the basis for candidate progression and recommendation for certification. This analysis should include reviewing key assessment checkpoints—admission, recommendation for practicum, recommendation for student teaching, and recommendation for certification—with input from K-12 practitioners and ensure that they address the competencies outlined in the RIPTS, professional organization standards, and PREP-RI standards. Based on this analysis, redesign the assessment system. These efforts should include revising the Observation Progress Report (OPR), the Professional Behavioral Indicators (PBIS), and the Teacher Candidate Work Sample (TCWS). Calibrate expectations for candidate performance across faculty members, clinical educators, and students. Establish systems to monitor implementation of assessments and candidate performance.
- Consult with Chalk and Wire to fully understand the system’s data and reporting capacity and begin to implement data review practices.
- Increase program faculty’s proficiency in student learning standards and integrate more opportunities for candidates to deepen their understanding of the standards and standards-based instruction. Ensure candidate proficiency in student standards is addressed in the candidate assessment system.
- Ensure all programs include instruction in working with students with disabilities and English learners, instruction in strategies for working with families, and opportunities to practice working with a diverse range of learners and families. Ensure candidate proficiency in issues of equity is addressed in the candidate assessment system.
- Improve communication with districts regarding candidate placements, district hiring needs, and essential practices for candidates to know. Begin working to establish mutually beneficial partnerships.
- Identify new criteria for clinical educators and require partners to attend a training that addresses expectations for assessing candidate performance and includes calibration activities.

Spring 2018

- Increase program faculty’s proficiency in using technology to enhance instruction and support student learning. Integrate opportunities for candidates to learn and practice using technology for instructional and assessment purposes throughout their program. Ensure that candidates’ proficiency in designing and implementing digital age learning experiences is integrated into the candidate assessment system.
- Establish a cycle of assessment system improvement that includes data collection, analysis, action, and re-calibration.
- Deepen emphasis on data-driven instruction within programs, especially focusing on the



use of data to measure impact on student learning and improve instruction.

Summer 2018

- Demonstrate progress in improving the Reading Specialist program, especially in components rated *Does Not Meet Expectations* and *Approaching Expectations*.
- Share an analysis of data from Chalk and Wire with practitioner advisory councils. Over the next year, work with practitioner advisory councils to improve alignment with preparation program curriculum and practices with district expectations for knowledge and skills.

Fall 2018

- Review program expectations for clinical experiences. Significantly increase opportunities for candidates to apply their learning and practice teaching in PK-12 schools under supervision of expert teachers from the beginning of programs.
 - Improve systems at RIC for ensuring program quality and improvement. These systems should address the following: data collection, monitoring, and review; faculty quality and diversity; stakeholder engagement; and internal processes for reviewing program performance.
- RIC cannot submit applications for new programs until it meets the improvement benchmarks listed. RIDE will identify which already-submitted program applications it will continue to review and which ones will be returned to RIC.
 - RIC cannot accept new candidates into non-renewed programs (school counselor and building administrator). In addition, RIC may not admit candidates to its M.A.T in Secondary Education (Biology) and M.A.T. in Secondary Education (History/Social Studies) programs because it did not submit evidence for these programs during the PREP-RI visit. RIC must submit a new program application to RIDE if it wishes to continue offering these programs.
 - RIC will need to participate in RIDE-offered technical assistance activities and must report on changes made as a result of technical assistance activities to RIDE and the Commissioner.



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- Rhode Island Performance Rubric. Provider level components are indicated with an asterisk.

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



Component	Component Ratings			
Administrator and Support Professional Certification Area Programs	Building Level Administrator	Reading Specialist	School Counselor	School Psychologist
1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Approaching Expectations	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Does Not Meet Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations
1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations
1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Does Not Meet Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations
1.5 Technology	Does Not Meet Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations
1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations
1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets 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					
Teacher Certification Area Programs	All Grades	Early Childhood	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	Special Education
2.1 Clinical Preparation	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations
2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations
2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations					
2.4 Clinical Educators	Does Not Meet Expectations					



Component	Component Ratings			
Administrator and Support Professional Certification Area Programs	Building Level Administrator	Reading Specialist	School Counselor	School Psychologist
2.1 Clinical Preparation	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations
2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Does Not Meet Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations
2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Does Not Meet Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations
2.4 Clinical Educators	Does Not Meet Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets 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					
Teacher Certification Area Programs	All Grades	Early Childhood	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	Special Education
3.1 Diversity of Candidates*	Does Not Meet Expectations					
3.2 Response to Employment Needs*	Approaching Expectations					
3.3 Admission Standards for Academic Achievement and Ability*	Approaching Expectations					
3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations
3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations
3.6 Additional Selectivity Criteria*	Approaching Expectations					



Component	Component Ratings			
Administrator and Support Professional Certification Area Programs	Building Level Administrator	Reading Specialist	School Counselor	School Psychologist
3.1 Diversity of Candidates*	Does Not Meet Expectations			
3.2 Response to Employment Needs*	Approaching Expectations			
3.3 Admission Standards for Academic Achievement and Ability*	Approaching Expectations			
3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations
3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Does Not Meet Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets 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					
Teacher Certification Area Programs	All Grades	Early Childhood	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	Special Education
4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations					
4.2 Employment Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations					

Component	Component Ratings			
Administrator and Support Professional Certification Area Programs	Building Level Administrator	Reading Specialist	School Counselor	School Psychologist
4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations
4.2 Employment Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations



Standard 5: Program Quality and Improvement

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

Component	Component Ratings					
Teacher Certification Area Programs	All Grades	Early Childhood	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	Special Education
5.1 Collection of Data to Evaluate Program Quality*	Approaching 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*	Does Not Meet Expectations					
5.5 Diversity and Quality of Faculty*	Does Not Meet Expectations					
5.6 Other Resources*	Approaching Expectations					

Component	Component Ratings			
Administrator and Support Professional Certification Area Programs	Building Level Administrator	Reading Specialist	School Counselor	School Psychologist
5.1 Collection of Data to Evaluate Program Quality*	Approaching 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*	Does Not Meet Expectations			
5.5 Diversity and Quality of Faculty*	Does Not Meet Expectations			
5.6 Other Resources*	Approaching Expectations			



Teacher Certificate Areas: Findings and Recommendations

All Grades Education Program

The All Grades Education Program includes undergraduate courses of study in art education (B.S.), health education (B.S.), music education (B.M.), physical education (B.S), technology education (B.S.), and world languages (B.A.). The program also includes graduate courses of study in art education (M.A.T.), music education (M.A.T.), and world languages (M.A.T.).

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop proficiency in most Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS), but they do not experience a consistent curriculum.	

- The specific set of courses taken by candidates varies by pathway and content area. However, all candidates must take a foundational education course and an educational psychology course. All candidates must complete at least one practicum, student teaching, and a student teaching seminar.
- The program assesses candidates’ professionalism through the Disposition Reference Form.
- The program reported that all courses of study align to the RIPTS. The program provided an analysis of the program courses showing that the program addresses all RIPTS. However, during interviews, candidates did not demonstrate a thorough knowledge of the RIPTS.
- Candidates do not experience a consistent curriculum. Emphasis on key skills like using data to inform instruction, working with a variety of learners, and working with families varies across content areas and pathways.

Art, Music, Technology, and World Languages Education:

- Candidates develop proficiency in some but not all RIPTS. During site visits to technology education and physical education placements, reviewers saw evidence that candidates had strong content knowledge (Standard 2), were able to create a supportive learning environment for students (Standard 6), and used effective communication (Standard 8). Reviewers noted that the art course of study did not adequately address classroom management (Standard 6) and developing relationships with students and families (Standard 7).
- In interviews, candidates shared feeling less prepared to create and implement instructional opportunities that reflect a respect for the diversity of learners. In addition, during site visits to technology education and physical education placements, reviewers did not observe candidates accommodating individual differences in approaches to learning.

Health and Physical Education:

- Candidates enrolled in physical education and health demonstrated strong awareness of and greater proficiency in the RIPTS as documented in student work, student portfolios, site visits



and interviews. For example, during interviews, candidates spoke to specific RIPTS and reflected on their current performance in the RIPTS.

- The Health and Physical Education (HPE) department reported that they recently began requiring candidates to reflect on his or her proficiency in relation to the RIPTS on the first day of Seminar in Physical Education. Candidates then create and implement goals and action steps to include the RIPTS during student teaching to help candidates become proficient in all of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions captured within the RIPTS.

Recommendations:

- Review the course of study in each content area to ensure candidates have opportunities to practice and receive feedback on performance in relationship to the RIPTS. The program should address the RIPTS at similar levels of depth across all content areas.
- Consider whether the HPE department’s approach to having candidates reflect on their proficiency in each standard and develop an action plan for improvement could be adopted within other courses of study to help ensure all candidates are not only familiar with the RIPTS but are also proficient in the knowledge, skills, and dispositions captured by the RIPTS.

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Meets Expectations
The program curriculum provides opportunities for candidates to develop proficiencies in the full depth, breadth, and range of the content competencies.	

- The program includes content courses, education courses, and clinical experiences. Programs ensure that candidates take a range of courses in their content area prior to practicum. Candidates, program completers, and clinical educators noted that candidates develop a strong content base through the program.
- Candidates develop proficiency in the critical pedagogical-content concepts, principles, and practices within the content area. Candidate portfolios and lesson plans reflected best pedagogical practices in their specific fields.
- While overall the program meets expectations for this component, reviewers noted room for improvement within the art education program. A review of art and art education syllabi suggested a limited focus on ensuring candidates understand a wide range of cultures and their art forms. The program should review art and art education syllabi to ensure that candidates learn about arts that include diversity in gender, ethnicity, sexual identity, social class, and other dimensions of identity. The program should also review the National Art Education Association Standards and identify ways to strengthen candidate knowledge of content and content pedagogy.



1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop a general understanding of applicable Rhode Island student standards and develop basic skills in designing lessons that will help students progress towards proficiency in the standards.	

- The program is designed to provide candidates with basic awareness and understanding of student standards. Some course syllabi referenced student standards and provided some introductory activities and assignments for candidates to develop familiarity with the standards. Examples of class assignments included written tests assessing student recall and understanding of national standards and the Rhode Island Framework (HPE 202: Principles of Health Education) and writing a two-page paper that articulates how the candidate intends to use standards to guide his or her development of teaching skills.
- During interviews, clinical educators noted that candidates were knowledgeable of student standards prior to student teaching. Candidates demonstrated familiarity with standards but did not demonstrate a deep understanding of the standards and their importance in designing lessons.

Recommendations:

- Provide increased and earlier opportunities for candidates to learn about the importance of student standards and about how to use student standards to plan lessons and units purposefully.
- Build more opportunities into coursework prior to practicum for students to unpack student standards and develop an understanding of the standards’ expectations of students and progression of expectations across grade levels/bands.

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

Art, Music, Technology Education, and World Languages

- Candidates complete an Infoworks research assignment in a foundations course. The Infoworks assignment asks students to research the school where they will be tutoring and identify the factors that may influence student achievement.
- The Teacher Candidate Mini Work Sample (TCMWS) and Teacher Candidate Work Sample (TCWS) require candidates to develop student learning objectives, assess student progress towards those objectives, and reflect on how they would modify their instruction in response to the data. The review team found little evidence of how candidates actually apply data to improve their teaching.
- Candidates receive instruction on data-based instruction through coursework and have opportunities to practice using assessments. These opportunities, however, tend to focus on the use of formative assessments and do not emphasize how candidates can use assessments and data to inform their teaching.



- Program leaders acknowledged data-driven instruction as an area for improvement. For example, in an evidence organizer, art education leadership reported, “faculty research time is needed to gain further strategies for data collection, in relation to the visual arts, and use of data to inform PK-12 instruction and assessment strategies, to enable further strengthening of this aspect of our program’s preparation of candidates.”
- Other than the Infoworks assignment, reviewers did not find evidence of candidates learning how to use data or practicing using data from sources other than assessments to improve student learning and instructional practice.

Health and Physical Education:

- The review team noted that the physical education and health programs provide clear and extensive training in the use of data as an essential practice. During their coursework, candidates develop formative assessments and gain familiarity with commonly used assessments during their coursework. In an assessment course specific to the health and physical education fields, candidates design, administer, and analyze results of skills-based performance assessments. Physical education candidates also take a course focused on teaching and assessment in adapted physical education, where they are introduced to diagnostic tools.
- Student projects and student interviews confirmed that candidates gain a variety of experiences collecting and using data and can share how they use data to inform lesson plans. During student teaching, candidates research their placement school and community, converse with multiple educators in the building to learn about students, complete an Accessibility Planner and develop profiles for each student, and interview the principal and school counselor to gain additional information and context to inform unit and lesson planning.

Recommendations:

- Provide opportunities for faculty to deepen their knowledge and proficiency in using technology to assess and enhance student learning. Develop a plan for how faculty and candidates may fully engage in these practices and systems that extend beyond the mastery of one system or product.
- Revise the current program curriculum, courses, assessments, and clinical experiences to include greater emphasis on assessment. Include additional opportunities for candidates to learn about the types and purposes of assessment. Ensure candidates have opportunities throughout their course of study to practice collecting, analyzing, and using data to inform instruction. During trainings, emphasize that faculty, clinical educators, and clinical supervisors should be providing feedback on candidate use of data and assessment.
- Consult district partners to determine if there are particular assessments specific to the content area that are essential for candidates to be able to implement and use to inform instruction. Find opportunities for candidates to learn about, practice, and receive feedback on how they collect, analyze, and use data to inform instruction.



1.5 Technology	Approaching Expectations
Candidates use a variety of technology systems and tools students at Rhode Island College, but they have limited opportunities to develop proficiency in designing, implementing, and assessing digital age learning experiences and assessments to support student learning.	

- The program reported that candidates are required to use technology throughout their coursework. The program expects candidates to use technology to access and present information for course assignments (e.g. Infoworks, Chalk and Wire, Blackboard, and Google Classroom). With few exceptions, candidate coursework emphasizes using technology as a user rather than the application of technology in lessons with students.
- Candidates do not receive sufficient instruction about how to use technology to enhance student learning. The program provided limited if any direct instruction in how candidates could establish a digital age learning environment. Candidate interviews and a review of syllabi show that most candidate exposure to using technology for instructional and assessment purposes occurs during practicum and student teaching. Candidate experiences vary based on the availability of technology in their placements and the skills of the clinical educator.
- Program leadership self-identified technology as an area for improvement. Clinical partners also shared that candidates would benefit from additional instruction in and experience implementing blended learning, Google classroom, SchoolSpring, and student management systems used by districts.

Recommendations:

- Review all grades programs that are national models of excellence to identify the technology expectations, course integration, instructional practices, and clinical supports that are effective and successful in preparing teachers to use current and varied technology enhance student learning and outcomes.
- Revise the current program curriculum, course instruction, assessments, and clinical experiences to ensure that candidates have sufficient opportunities to learn about varied and effective technology. Ensure candidates have opportunities to practice and receive feedback on designing and implementing digital age learning experiences throughout their preparation.
- Provide faculty opportunities professional learning or seek outside expertise regarding best practices for using technology in instruction and assessment to support student learning.



1.6 Equity	Does Not Meet Expectations
Candidates have opportunities to reflect on their own biases but have few if any opportunities to develop proficiency in designing and implementing strategies for working with diverse learners and families in diverse communities.	

Art, Technology Education, Music, and World Language:

- Candidates reflect on their own biases in their foundational education courses through service learning. A review of syllabi and submitted evidence indicated that culturally responsive practice is addressed primarily in this foundational course and is not a consistent thread throughout courses.
- Candidates receive little instruction on strategies that are effective when working with students with disabilities and English language learners. Candidates studying world languages, physical education, and health take a course in special education, but candidates studying technology education, art, and music do not. Syllabi reviews indicated that candidates have few opportunities to learn strategies for working with English language learners; this information was limited to two class periods within CEP 315: Educational Psychology that focus on language development, language diversity, and immigrant education. Although candidates may have had the opportunity to work with students with diverse backgrounds and needs during practicum and student teaching experiences, candidates and program completers reported not feeling comfortable teaching English learners and students with disabilities.
- There was no evidence that candidates learn specific strategies that are effective with working with families.
- Program leadership self-identified equity as an area of improvement and noted that the program needs to improve candidate preparation to work with English learners and students with disabilities within their specific contexts, and helping students understand how socio-cultural factors may affect learning.

Health and Physical Education

- The review team noted that the PE and health programs are closer to approaching expectations related to equity. Candidates in both areas take a special education course and candidates studying physical education focused on adapted physical education. In Introduction to Movement Sciences (HPE 140), students attend a local recreational or competitive youth sporting event and analyze how interactions, internal factors, and external factors affect teaching and learning through a written response and reflection.
- Candidates use an Accessibility Planner in multiple courses to identify each individual student’s hobbies/activities, strengths, potential barriers in the classroom/learning, and accessibility strategies.



- Reviewers did not find evidence that candidates learn specific strategies that are effective with working with families. Program leadership also self-identified working with families as area for improvement.

Recommendations:

- Incorporate a more consistent emphasis on research-based strategies and best practices related to working with students with disabilities and English learners within each content area. Provide candidates feedback on the effectiveness of their implementation of these strategies and offer opportunities for growth and refinement.
- Teach candidates strategies for working with families in diverse communities and provide systematic opportunities for students to implement these strategies throughout their preparation.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Approaching Expectations
Candidates do not develop a general understanding of Rhode island educational initiatives, laws, and policies and do not develop the knowledge, skills, and practices embedded in key Rhode Island initiatives.	

- Candidates receive introductory information about some educational initiatives, laws, and policies through coursework, but they do not develop a general understanding of the initiatives. Candidates are encouraged to learn about the educator evaluation system when working in the field and they write Student Learning Objectives as part of their Teacher Candidate Work Sample. However, the SLOs submitted to the review team did not reflect guidance and best practice related to SLO writing as articulated in RIDE educator evaluation systems.
- In their educational foundations course, candidates use InfoWorks to gain background about the school in which they are volunteering. In their educational psychology course, candidates are introduced to multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS), social and emotional learning, and bullying and violence prevention. In MUSE 260: Seminar in Music Education, candidates complete weekly research assignments on relevant education initiatives and topics.
- In an evidence organizer, technology program leadership self-identified that embedding Rhode Island initiatives earlier in the program is an area of improvement.
- Although candidates are exposed to several Rhode Island initiatives and policies, candidates do not have sufficient opportunities or support to develop, apply, and build proficiency with the Rhode Island initiatives.

Art, Health, and Physical Education

- Candidates studying art, health, and physical education develop a general understanding of Rhode Island educational initiatives, laws and policies and develop some of the knowledge, skills, and practices embedded in such initiatives. Program leadership in health and physical



education reported how multiple Rhode Island Initiatives are introduced in coursework. These initiatives include bullying reduction, social and emotional learning, multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS), violence prevention, InfoWorks, HIV/AIDS and Sexuality Frameworks, educator evaluation, and PARCC.

Recommendations:

- Work with clinical partners to review the list of Rhode Island initiatives and identify any other key initiatives, laws, and policies that are relevant to all grades teachers. Identify ways to integrate meaningful application of initiatives, systems, and policies that facilitate supporting candidates in demonstrating a working knowledge of critical aspects of performing the work of a Rhode Island educator on day one.
- Please note that student and professional standards are not Rhode Island initiatives.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Meets Expectations
The depth, breadth, diversity, and coherence of clinical experiences provide candidates opportunities to experience the full range of responsibilities of an all grades educator.	

- Clinical preparation depth, breadth, and diversity align with the requirements of the certificate area. Candidates and clinical educators spoke to the range of placements in both practicum and student teaching as a specific strength of the program. The required practicum experiences vary by content area but were designed with intention. For example, candidates studying music take three practica at different grade levels and programs (one in an elementary school general music program, one in a high school choral program, and one in a middle school band program) while candidates studying physical education take three practicum experiences organized by activity type (team activities, creative movement and dance, and individual dual activities). The clinical preparation for All Grades meets the number of weeks of student teaching required by Rhode Island regulations governing the certification of educators.
- Candidates’ clinical preparation generally builds from and links to theory and research from prior preparation and emphasizes most of the range of the RIPTS. Clinical experiences during practicum are paired with pedagogical instruction in the course, but coherence between clinical and non-clinical preparation could be stronger.
- Candidates’ clinical preparation includes student teaching experiences that simulate the range and intensity of responsibilities of the position for which they will be certified. The review team heard and saw that clinical educators gradually released responsibility to candidates and did so based on the professional judgment of the faculty and clinical educator based on candidate readiness. The student teaching experience length meets requirements articulated in Rhode Island regulations.



2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Approaching Expectations
The program has not fully structured coherent clinical experiences that enable candidates to increasingly demonstrate positive impact on PK-12 students' learning.	

- Candidate impact on student learning is primarily addressed through the Teacher Candidate Mini Work Sample (TCMWS), Teacher Candidate Work Sample (TCWS), and the Observation and Progress Report (OPR). These measures provide candidates some but insufficient opportunities to demonstrate impact on student learning.
- Candidates write a student learning objective (SLO) as part of the TCMWS and the TCWS. The SLO is not developed in partnership with districts. The SLOs written by candidates and the feedback to candidates on their SLOs do not reflect guidance and best practice related to SLO writing as articulated in RIDE educator evaluation systems.
- Rubrics for the TCMWS and TCWS focus on the quality of the SLO and analysis of data rather than the results of the SLO. The SLO is not scored based on candidate ability to demonstrate student learning.
- The OPR includes expectations that candidates use assessments and engage in reflection after the lesson, but there is no specific indicator focused on whether students achieved the lesson objective or demonstrated growth.
- Feedback to candidates does not focus on measuring student growth. It was not evident in work samples, interviews, or other documents that candidates are expected to systematically grow in their ability to impact student learning.
- There was no evidence of analysis of candidate impact on student learning at the program level or when interviewing clinical educators.

Recommendations:

- Review the expectations for partnership, including that preparation programs consult with their partners to design coherent clinical experiences that positively affect student learning. Collaborate with partners to establish measures of student learning that are reflective and consistent with what districts use.
- Establish a process to collect data on candidate impact on student learning. Work with clinical educators to review and use the data to help develop the skills of individual candidates and inform program improvement.



2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program shares some common expectations for performance and uses a single tool for student teaching observations. The program does not have established indicators for partnership effectiveness nor does the program utilize data from those indicators to make partnership decisions to benefit the program or the partner.	

- The Office of Partnerships and Placements (OPP) primarily leads the outreach and organization of student teaching placements. Partnerships across Rhode Island exist among both LEA leadership and with specific clinical educators. In interviews, reviewers heard that there is a poorly articulated, informal system in place to recruit clinical educators. Recruitment mechanisms included approaching program graduates, using the state music educators association to help recruit, and posting a survey of interest on the RIC website. Although some districts have proactively systematized the placement of student teachers, other clinical partners described the placement process as disjointed.
- Clinical partners and the program do not have clear agreed-upon indicators of their partnerships' effectiveness. RIC submitted a variety of partnership agreement documents to the review team. Among the documentation were both expired agreements and agreements that did not identify specific benefits or outcomes. In interviews, district partners did not identify annual opportunities to provide input that could help shape and refine their partnership.
- The program and clinical educators use a common assessment tool to evaluate and provide feedback on candidate performance. Clinical educators utilize the OPR to evaluate candidate performance during practicum and student teaching. Clinical educator OPR data is used to inform candidate progression to student teaching and certification, thus providing clinical educators some input into the decision making process regarding the progression of candidates to certification.
- Analysis of submitted OPR forms revealed minimal, if any, written feedback to candidates. Program leadership self-identified that further written feedback from clinical educators is needed.

Recommendations:

- Collaborate with district partners to strengthen partnerships so that they are mutually designed and mutually beneficial. Adopt agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness and analyze data from those indicators.
- Work collaboratively with current and future partners to assume joint responsibility to establish clinical experiences, measure impact on student learning, and establish processes to monitor outcomes and drive program improvement. Calibrate expectations regularly. Adopt or adapt educator performance assessment tools used in districts.
- Identify additional opportunities for clinical educators to have input into decisions about candidate progression within the program.



2.4 Clinical Educators	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not systematically share responsibility with its partners to select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain clinical educators that demonstrate effectiveness and have coaching ability to support the development of candidate knowledge and skills.	

- Programs and clinical partners do not identify clear quality criteria for both PK-12 and program-based clinical educators that include at a minimum: demonstration of effectiveness in skills or best practice in the certification area; evidence of positive impact on student learning; ability to work with adult learners; coaching and supervision skills and ability to evaluate and provide feedback to candidates using program and partner assessments. Evidence regarding criteria for clinical educator selection pointed in many different directions. The FSEHD clinical educator description, FSEHD partnership agreements from 2008-13, and the FSEHD partnership agreements sent on 2016 all articulated different criteria for clinical educators, and no description fully met the minimum criteria articulated in Standard 2.4 For example, the clinical educator description emphasizes highly qualified status rather than educator performance; the 2008-13 partnership agreement states clinical educators should have “above average” evaluation scores; and the 2015-16 partnership agreement says that clinical educators should “qualify as effective educators”. As evidenced in interviews, clinical educators were unaware of how they were selected to work with student teachers.
- Programs and clinical partners do not collaboratively recruit primarily educators who demonstrate effectiveness as teachers, administrators, or support professionals to serve as clinical educators; do not generally prepare them to work with adult learners, in coaching and supervision skills, and in the use of common assessment tools and measures. Programs and clinical partners do not select primarily educators who meet these criteria to serve as PK-12 and program-based clinical educators. RIC invites clinical educators to attend a single three hour training session by the OPP that provides an overview of FSEHD expectations. Specific topics include the OPR, Professional Behavior Indicators, TCWS, and Chalk and Wire. The training introduces attendees to the responsibility of the clinical educator and does not include coaching or supervision training. There was no evidence that the training provided opportunities to practice to use the tool or calibration activities to ensure that all clinical educators had shared understanding of the tool. Despite documentation of the training, there was no evidence regarding the overall participation in the training session.
- Programs and clinical partners do not systematically collect and analyze data on the effectiveness of PK-12 and program-based clinical educators and do not make retention decisions based on the evaluation data. The OPP shared a survey for college supervisors that began this academic year. The survey is designed to be completed by the college supervisor about the clinical educator’s collaboration with FSEHD and the all grades candidate.

Recommendations:

- Collaborate with district partners to establish a clear system for placing candidates that includes the following: notifying districts of upcoming placement needs; recruiting, selecting, training,



supporting, and evaluating clinical educators; and using multiple sources of data to inform future placement decisions and changes to clinical experiences.

- With district partners, review the expectations for component 2.4 of the PREP-RI rubric. Revise partnership agreements to include criteria for clinical educators that include the following: attainment of Highly Effective on the most recent educator evaluation, ability to work with adult learners, coaching and supervision skills, and ability to evaluate and provide feedback to candidates using program and partner assessments. As needed, include additional mutually agreed upon criteria.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Approaching Expectations
Candidate progression in the program is guided by a performance system, but the system lacks rigorous criteria, systemic implementation, and emphasis on the ability of the candidate to impact student learning.	

- The program assessment system has three major decision points: readiness for admission, readiness for student teaching/internship, and readiness for recommendation for certification.
- When candidates do not meet expectations, the program counsels them out or denies them progression. Program faculty shared anecdotes of what they have done when candidates have not met expectations, but there is a lack of evidence of a systemic approach to monitoring and supporting candidate development throughout preparation.
- The assessment system includes several assessments that candidates must complete during the program such as a content portfolio, the Teacher Candidate Mini Work Sample, the Teacher Candidate Work Sample, and Praxis tests.
- The program assesses candidates' teaching performance using the OPR. All teacher preparation programs at RIC use the OPR. Provider leadership acknowledged that multiple versions of the same tool exist, which has created confusion about expectations. The scoring scale on the most commonly submitted OPR ranges from zero to six and has general performance descriptions for 0 Unacceptable, 1-2 Developing, 3-4 Acceptable, and 5-6 Target. The descriptions are of poor quality and do not help readers understand what expected performance looks like. For example, the description for 3-4 Acceptable is "Effective performance. Meets expectations this [*sic*] level of TC development." In interviews, candidates and clinical educators noted that the difference between a 3 and 4 are unclear. After reviewing evidence and conducting interviews, it was not clear to the team if and how a summative score is calculated in a meaningful way. Overall, the OPR used in the All Grades program is a poorly designed tool that does not reflect best assessment practices.
- Expectations for candidate performance on the OPR vary and are unclear. For example, candidates in the M.A.T in Music must score a 3 or better on a *majority* of indicators but candidates in the B.A. in Health program must score a 3 or better on *all* indicators in order to progress. In addition, program faculty noted that they often have a conversation with a



candidate who is only scoring threes, thus suggesting that setting a minimum expectation of 3 or better may be too low.

- The Teacher Candidate Mini-Work Sample (required prior to student teaching) and the Teacher Candidate Work Sample (required prior to certification) assess candidate’s ability to design standards-based instruction, implement assessments, and document impact on student learning. However, the rubrics focus on goal writing and data analysis rather than actual impact on student learning.
- Although there is some evidence that candidate assessment includes written and oral feedback, the quantity and quality of feedback is inconsistent. Work samples prior to and during practicum and student teaching included rubric scores but did not always include written feedback or included feedback that was perfunctory in nature.

Recommendations:

- Adopt or adapt performance assessments already used in Rhode Island and other states. Seek feedback on the selected tools and work with clinical partners to clarify expectations and performance. Hold trainings and calibration sessions to ensure clinical educators and clinical supervisors have a common understanding of performance expectations and can use the tools with fidelity. Share examples of practice with candidates to help them understand what expected performance looks like for each indicator of rubrics.
- Work with clinical partners to find additional opportunities for candidates to demonstrate proficiency in standards-based instruction, implementing assessments and using data, and documenting impact on student learning.
- Ensure that candidates receive specific and actionable written and oral feedback throughout their program connected to the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards.

3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Approaching Expectations
The recommendation for certification assessment point aligns generally to certification regulations and professional organization standards but as implemented does not ensure that only candidates who demonstrate proficiency on the full range of competencies are recommended for certification.	

- The program recommends candidates for certification based on candidate performance on the TCWS, OPR, and Professional Behavior Indicators (PBIs). These assessments align to most of the range of pedagogical competencies, content competencies, and field competencies identified in certification regulations. Candidates studying health education, physical education, and art education at the undergraduate level must earn a B- or better in their student teaching seminar. Candidates in the M.A.T. in art education program must score a B- or better on their Art Education Master’s Thesis project.
- Course syllabi communicate performance expectations on the TCWS, OPR, and PBIs.
- Clinical educators and clinical supervisors are both responsible for evaluating the performance of candidates. All candidates except art education candidates must be formally observed thrice



by clinical educators and thrice by clinical supervisors using the OPR; art education candidates must be observed a total of 12 times—six in an elementary placement and six in a secondary placement. Programs identified performance on the OPRs as requirements for recommendation for certification, but it was not clear to the team how candidate performance on the OPRs was monitored.

- Beyond noting that training is offered (but not required) for clinical educators, the program did not provide evidence of how it trains and monitors program faculty to ensure consistent, fair, and accurate assessment decisions. In an evidence organizer, music program leadership reported that, prior to conducting an analysis of clinical educator and clinical supervisor scores on the final OPR-ST, “clinical educator scores were adjusted as several clinical educators had reported they typically score higher to boost teacher candidate confidence.”
- While the design of the recommendation for certification assessment point generally aligns to certification requirements and professional organization expectations, actual implementation of the assessment point does not ensure that only candidates who are recommended for certification meet the full range of the standards. Cut scores on performance measures may be too low to ensure that certification is based on the candidate’s demonstrated performance of readiness for day one. Minimum expected performance is a three out of six on each indicator of the TCWS, PBIs, and OPRs. Program candidates and completers reported and demonstrated gaps in their knowledge and skills yet progressed through their program.

Recommendations:

- Review candidate assessment measures in conjunction with the RIPTS and professional association standards to ensure that measures accurately assess candidate proficiency in all of the knowledge, skills, dispositions, content, and content pedagogy needed to be a successful educator.
- With district partners, collaboratively assess the authenticity of measures used and the minimum expectations for performance. Adopt tools that the field uses or revise current tools to better align with what the field uses. Provide training, facilitate calibration opportunities, and monitor assessment implementation to ensure that assessment results are fair, accurate, and consistent across candidates.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program does not survey employers annually. Because of low response rates, data from the most recent survey did not produce actionable information.	

- The FSEHD surveys employers approximately once every four years, with the most recent administration being 2016. Although the survey is constructed to yield actionable information, response rates were too low to produce generalizable results. The program randomly selects half of school and district administrators in RI schools to receive the survey and uses the RIDE School Directory as the source for obtaining e-mail addresses. According to the program, 40 percent of the e-mail addresses were incorrect or out of date and, after adjusting numbers to include only working/correct e-mail addresses, response rates were 19 percent for school administrators and 24 percent for district administrators. Program leadership identified the



need for stronger return rates on surveys, but did not articulate a plan for improving response rates in the future. Rhode Island College collects feedback approximately once every four years.

- In the 2015-16 school year, the aggregate performance of Rhode Island College program completers working in Rhode Island schools was comparable to the aggregate performance distribution for all recent completers in Rhode Island schools. However, this data is shown at the *provider* level instead of the *program* level. Therefore, few conclusions about the effectiveness of completers from the all grades program can be made.

Recommendations:

- Research best practices for survey administration and response rates, and seek feedback from districts about how to improve survey administration and response. Recognize that Component 4.1 is a program-level responsibility.
- Determine if there is additional program-level information that the program can gather to provide actionable information even if survey response rates are low.
- Develop a plan for annually administering surveys, analyzing the data in a timely manner, and using the data to improve program performance.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not survey program completers annually. Because of low response rates, the most recent survey did not produce actionable data.	

- The FSEHD surveys program completers approximately once every four years, with the most recent administration being 2016. The survey included information regarding completers' employment outcomes and questions about their perceptions of whether their preparation enabled them to become effective educators. Program leadership identified the need for stronger return rates on surveys, but did not articulate a plan for improving response rates in the future.
- Program leadership in physical education reported that they take all program completers out to dinner at the end of the school year to celebrate their accomplishment and to ask for informal feedback on the program. Leadership did not share data from these dinners but reported that this has been a beneficial way to collect additional information from candidates.

Recommendations:

- Recognize that Component 4.2 is a program-level responsibility. The program should view recent graduates as strong sources of information for program improvement. As such, programs should work more closely with completers to maintain lines of communication.
- Research best practices for survey administration and response rates, and seek feedback from districts about how to improve survey administration and response.



- Determine if there is additional program-level information that the program can gather to provide actionable information even if survey response rates are low.
- Develop a plan for annually administering surveys, analyzing the data in a timely manner, and using the data to improve program performance.

Early Childhood Education Program

The Early Childhood Education Program is a Bachelor of Science program with a concentration in teaching.

Note: The review team did not review the M.Ed. in Early Childhood Education program because the program does not lead to certification. RIDE also did not review the TEACH program, which is a pilot program.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop proficiency in most Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS) and generally experience a consistent program of study through a cohort model approach.	

- The program is cohort-based and includes 78 credit hours separate from general education courses. Candidates are required to take a series of general education, cognate, professional, and major courses.
- The program reports that all courses of study align to the standards within the RIPTS. The program provided an analysis of the program courses showing that the program addresses all standards.
- Candidates are exposed to the RIPTS throughout their course of study. Syllabi identify RIPTS addressed in coursework. The program assesses candidates' professionalism through the Disposition Reference Form.
- Candidates have opportunities to develop proficiency in some but not all RIPTS. Areas in need of improvement include the following: creating instructional opportunities that reflect a respect for the diversity of learners (Standard 4); using technological advances in communication (Standard 8); systematically using assessments to improve student achievement and provide students feedback on their progress (Standard 9); developing relationships with students and their families (Standard 7); exploring and evaluating the application of current research, instructional approaches and strategies, and technologies to improve student learning (Standard 10); and interacting with school community members in a professional manner that is fair and equitable (Standard 11).

Recommendations:

- Strengthen candidate proficiency on the following RIPTS: 4, 8.3, 9.3, 9.5, 9.5, 7.2, 10.2, and 11.4.
- Develop well-planned experiences for students that will help them develop a deep understanding of the RIPTS beginning early in the program and ensure that candidates have an



opportunity to practice and receive feedback on their performance implementing the knowledge, skills, and dispositions captured in the RIPTS.

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop proficiency in most of the critical concepts, principles, and practices within their area of certification.	

- The program reports that the course of study aligns to the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) standards. The program requires candidates to include references to the NAEYC Standards in multiple assignments. In interviews, some candidates cited specific standards.
- In an evidence organizer, program leadership reported, “key program assessments are aligned with the NAEYC standards.” Despite this alignment, the review team did not see full demonstration of candidate proficiency through data or other evidence.

Recommendations:

- Unpack specific candidate data related to each NAEYC Standard and examine the level of proficiency of candidates at an aggregate level to understand the impact of the exposure to the NAEYC Standards. Collect and analyze data on candidate application of these standards to understand program strengths and areas to improve.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop a general understanding of applicable student standards. Candidates demonstrate basic skill in implementing standards-driven lessons and assessment to identify student progress toward standards.	

- Coursework includes exposure to the full range of standards needed within an early childhood setting. These include Rhode Island’s Early Learning and Development Standards (RIELDS), CCSS in Mathematics, CCSS in English Language Arts, Social Studies GSEs, and the Next Generation Science Standards. Candidates have specific courses in mathematics and literacy that further support their general understanding of these student standards.
- During interviews, candidates reported being familiar with applicable Rhode Island student standards and how to use them. However, candidates varied in their proficiency in implementing standards-based lessons. Candidates mentioned designing a lesson and then selecting a standard after they completed the plan rather than using standards to inform planning.

Recommendations:

- Provide increased and earlier opportunities for candidates to learn about the importance of student standards and about how to use student standards to plan lessons and units.
- Build more opportunities into coursework prior to practicum for students to unpack student standards and develop an understanding of the standards’ expectations of students and progression of expectations across grade levels/bands.



1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
Candidates demonstrate general understanding of how to collect, analyze, and use data to inform their practice.	

- The program reported that candidates have multiple opportunities to develop proficiency in data-driven instruction through coursework and clinical experiences. According to the program, candidates are assessed on their ability to implement data-driven instruction through key assessments, including the Infant/Toddler Learning and Development Plan, Assessment Task, and TCWS.
- Candidates develop a general understanding of the core principles, concepts, and purposes of assessment. Candidates develop basic skills in selecting and implementing assessments to monitor student progress. In interviews, candidates identified various types of assessments but noted an emphasis on formal assessment data.
- In an evidence organizer, program leadership noted, “teacher candidates would benefit from more opportunities to work with student data to develop stronger skills in utilizing data-driven instruction.” At the time of the visit, the program was piloting a new assessment course.
- The student learning objective within the TCMWS and TCWS provides a structure for candidates to demonstrate their ability to use data to assess students and inform instruction.

Recommendations:

- Revise the current program curriculum, courses, assessments, and clinical experiences to include greater emphasis on assessment. Include additional opportunities for candidates to learn about the types and purposes of assessment. Ensure candidates have opportunities throughout their course of study to practice collecting, analyzing, and using data to inform instruction. During trainings, emphasize that faculty, clinical educators, and clinical supervisors should be providing feedback on candidate use of data and assessment.
- Consult district partners to determine if there are particular assessments specific to early childhood education (such as observation reports) that are essential for candidates to be able to implement and use to inform instruction. Find opportunities for candidates to learn about, practice, and receive feedback on how they collect, analyze, and use data to inform instruction.

1.5 Technology	Approaching Expectations
Candidates use a variety of technology systems and tools as a student at Rhode Island College, but they have limited opportunities to develop proficiency in designing, implementing, and assessing digital age learning experiences and assessment to support student learning.	

- The program reports that candidates are required to use technology throughout their coursework. The program expects candidates to use technology to access and present information for course assignments (e.g. Infoworks, Chalk and Wire, Blackboard, and Google Classroom). With a few exceptions, candidate coursework emphasizes using technology as a



user rather than the application of technology to enhance student learning or insist with instruction.

- Candidates do not receive sufficient instruction about how to use technology to enhance student learning. The program does not provide direct specific instruction in how candidates could establish a digital age learning environment. Candidate interviews and a review of syllabi show that most candidate exposure to using technology for instructional and assessment purposes occurs during practicum and student teaching. Candidate experiences vary based on the availability of technology in their placements and the skills of the clinical educator.

Recommendations:

- Review early childhood programs that are national models of excellence to identify the technology expectations, course integration, instructional practices, and clinical supports that are effective and successful in preparing teachers to use current and varied technology enhance student learning and outcomes.
- Revise the current program curriculum, course instruction, assessments, and clinical experiences to ensure that candidates have sufficient opportunities to learn about varied and effective technology. Ensure candidates have opportunities to practice and receive feedback on designing and implementing digital age learning experiences throughout their preparation.
- Provide faculty with professional learning or seek outside expertise regarding best practices for using technology in instruction and assessment to support student learning.

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
Candidates take a series of courses that intentionally focus on working in diverse settings and purposefully collaborating with families and community partners. Candidates also take the common FSEHD course that requires candidate reflection on their own biases and worldviews.	

- Candidate coursework includes an early-childhood-focused special education class and a class focused on early childhood dual language development.
- Candidate exposure to issues of equity, cultural competence, and the importance of partnering with families begins early. The program requires potential candidates to take a course on social work prior to entering the early childhood program. The course includes the Family Resource Project and creates a strong starting point for future early childhood educators.
- Other early childhood courses integrate the expectation that candidates plan for and think through various needs of their future students and families. Integration of this strand of learning is visible through lesson plan expectations, course discussion topics, and some assignments. For example, in ECED 332: Building Family, School, and Community Partnerships, candidates include an examination of their own philosophy, beliefs, values, and abilities relating to diverse family characteristics and the importance of partnerships in their Research of An Article assignment.



- The candidate experience includes more extensive exposure to productive engagement and understanding of communities than other programs, candidates did not demonstrate or articulate specific strategies for community engagement.

Recommendation:

- Integrate the equity strand in a performance-based way to ensure proficiency and not just basic skill. By supporting candidate application of what they learn in their courses, the program will better be able to direct and coach candidates to proficiency. Current methods of assessing application of this component do not yield data that would aid in systematically strengthening this strand.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Approaching Expectations
The early childhood program exposes candidates to a variety of initiatives, systems, and policies. Through this exposure, candidates develop a general understanding of a few key Rhode Island initiatives.	

- Course syllabi referenced some key initiatives, including the Multi-Tiered System of Support, Social and Emotional Learning, and Response to Intervention. In interviews, candidates demonstrated awareness of Response to Intervention as well as anti-bullying and social emotional learning initiatives.
- Evidence of candidate engagement with specific Rhode Island expectations included the development of a student learning objectives as part of their Teacher Candidate Work Sample and the use InfoWorks in an assignment required of all FSEHD candidates.
- Although the program introduces several Rhode Island initiatives and policies to candidates, candidates do not have sufficient opportunities or support to develop, apply, and build proficiency with the Rhode Island initiatives.

Recommendation:

- Work with clinical partners to review the list of Rhode Island initiatives and identify any other key initiatives, laws, and policies that are relevant to early childhood teachers. Determine the depth of knowledge needed for candidates to be successful in the classroom.
- Integrate meaningful application of initiatives, systems, and policies that facilitate supporting candidates in demonstrating a working knowledge of critical aspects of performing the work of a Rhode Island educator on day one.
- Please note that student and professional standards are not Rhode Island initiatives.



Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Meets Expectations
The depth, breadth, diversity, and coherence of clinical experiences provide candidates opportunities to experience the full range of responsibilities of an early childhood educator.	

- Candidates spoke to the range of placements in both practicum and student teaching as a specific strength of the program. Experiences include observing teaching and working with a small group of children in afterschool child care, observing and teaching within an infant/toddler community program, and teaching lessons in preschool and early elementary classrooms. During their clinical experiences, candidates teach lessons in multiple content areas, including literacy, science, social studies, and mathematics.
- Candidates’ clinical preparation generally builds from and links to theory and research from prior preparation. It emphasizes most of the range of the RIPTS. Lecture courses and practicum courses are intentionally paired. In an evidence organizer, the program leadership noted that the cohort design “allows course instructors to know what content has been covered previously in order to build on previous ideas and understandings as candidates develop progress [sic] through the program.” Candidates take part in a series of practicum experiences including specific courses in early childhood mathematics and developmental literacy.
- Candidates’ clinical preparation includes student teaching that simulates the range and intensity of responsibilities of the position for which they will be certified. Candidates noted that their clinical educator gradually released responsibility to them. The early childhood clinical preparation meets the number of weeks of student teaching required by Rhode Island Regulations Governing the Certification of Educators.
- Although candidates are placed in a range of early childhood settings, the program leadership identified all placements as Urban Core in submitted evidence. The program should continue to work to ensure that candidates have clinical experiences in a variety of geographic and socio-economically diverse settings.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Approaching Expectations
The program has not fully structured coherent clinical experiences that enable candidates to demonstrate increasingly positive impact on PK-12 students’ learning.	

- In interviews, candidates acknowledged the importance of understanding impact on student learning and shared a few examples of how they know if students are learning. However, assessments used throughout clinical experiences do not emphasize student learning.
- Candidate impact on student learning is primarily addressed through the Teacher Candidate Mini Work Sample (TCMWS), Teacher Candidate Work Sample (TCWS), and the Observation and Progress Report (OPR). These measures provide candidates some but insufficient opportunities to demonstrate impact on student learning.
- Candidates write a student learning objective (SLO) as part of the TCMWS and the TCWS. The SLO is not developed in partnership with districts. The SLOs written by candidates and the



feedback to candidates on their SLOs do not reflect guidance and best practice related to SLO writing as articulated in RIDE educator evaluation systems.

- Rubrics for the TCMWS and TCWS focus on the quality of the SLO and analysis of data rather than the results of the SLO. The SLO is not scored based on candidate ability to demonstrate student learning.
- The OPR includes expectations that candidates use assessments and engage in reflection after the lesson, but there is no specific indicator focused on whether students achieved the lesson objective or demonstrated growth.

Recommendations:

- Review the expectations for partnership including that preparation programs consult with their partners to design coherent clinical experiences that positively impact student learning. Collaborate with partners to establish measures of student learning that are reflective and consistent with what districts use.
- Establish a process to collect data on candidate impact on student learning. Work with clinical educators to review and use the data to help develop the skills of individual candidates and inform program improvement.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations
<p>The program shares some common expectations for performance and uses a single tool for student teaching observations. The program does not have established indicators for partnership effectiveness nor does the program utilize data from those indicators to make partnership decisions to benefit the program or the partner.</p>	

- The Office of Partnerships and Placements (OPP) primarily leads the outreach and organization of student teaching placements. Partnerships across Rhode Island exist among both LEA leadership and with specific clinical educators. Although some districts have proactively systematized the placement of student teachers, other clinical partners described the placement process as disjointed.
- Clinical partners and the program do not have clear agreed-upon indicators of their partnerships' effectiveness. RIC submitted a variety of partnership agreement documents to the review team. Among the documentation were both expired agreements and agreements that did not identify specific benefits or outcomes. District partners interviewed did not identify annual opportunities to provide input that could help shape and refine their partnership.
- Similar to other teacher education programs at RIC, the program and clinical educators, use a common assessment tool to evaluate and provide feedback on candidate performance. Clinical educators utilize the OPR to evaluate candidate performance during student teaching. Clinical educator OPR data is used to inform candidate progression to certification and therefore the clinical educators do have input into the decision making process regarding the progression of candidates to certification.



- The early childhood program, in collaboration with the OPP, has also identified BrightStars partners and conducted additional outreach to ensure that early childhood candidates have access to the full range of placements.

Recommendations:

- Collaborate with district partners to strengthen partnerships so that they are mutually designed and mutually beneficial. Adopt agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness and analyze data from those indicators.
- Work collaboratively with current and future partners to assume joint responsibility to establish clinical experiences, measure impact on student learning, and establish processes to monitor outcomes and drive program improvement. Calibrate expectations regularly. Adopt or adapt educator performance assessment tools used in districts.
- Identify additional opportunities for clinical educators to have input into decisions about candidate progression within the program.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not systematically share responsibility with its partners to select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain clinical educators that demonstrate effectiveness and have coaching ability to support the development of candidate knowledge and skills.	

- Programs and clinical partners do not identify clear quality criteria for both PK-12 and program-based clinical educators that include the following: demonstration of effectiveness in skills or best practice in the certification area; evidence of positive impact on student learning; ability to work with adult learners; coaching and supervision skills and ability to evaluate and provide feedback to candidates using program and partner assessments. Evidence regarding criteria for clinical educator selection pointed in many different directions. When the review team looked at this component, it received a variety of documents and responses. FSEHD partnership documents noted some criteria for selection of clinical educators, while clinical educators mentioned in interviews that they were unaware of how they were selected to work with student teachers.
- Programs and clinical partners do not collaboratively recruit primarily educators who demonstrate effectiveness as teachers, administrators, or support professionals to serve as clinical educators; do not generally prepare them to work with adult learners, in coaching and supervision skills, and in the use of common assessment tools and measures. Programs and clinical partners do not select primarily educators who meet these criteria to serve as PK-12 and program-based clinical educators. RIC invites clinical educators to attend a single three hour training session by the OPP that provides an overview of FSEHD expectations. Specific topics include the OPR, Professional Behavior Indicators, TCWS, and Chalk and Wire. The training reviewed the responsibility of the clinical educator and did not include coaching or supervision



training. Despite documentation of the training, there was no evidence regarding the overall participation in the training session.

- Programs and Clinical Partners do not systematically collect and analyze data on the effectiveness of PK-12 and program-based clinical educators and do not make retention decisions based on the evaluation data. The OPP shared a survey for college supervisors that began this academic year. The survey is designed to be completed by the college supervisor about the clinical educator’s collaboration with FSEHD and the early childhood candidate.

Recommendations:

- Collaborate with district partners to establish a clear system for placing candidates that includes: notifying districts of upcoming placement needs; recruiting, selecting, training, supporting, and evaluating clinical educators; and using multiple sources of data to inform future placement decisions and changes to clinical experiences.
- With district partners, review the expectations for component 2.4 of the PREP-RI rubric. Revise partnership agreements to include criteria for clinical educators that include the following: attainment of Highly Effective on the most recent educator evaluation, ability to work with adult learners, coaching and supervision skills, and ability to evaluate and provide feedback to candidates using program and partner assessments. As needed, include additional mutually agreed upon criteria.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Approaching Expectations
Candidate progression in the program is guided by a performance system, but the system lacks rigorous criteria, systemic implementation, and emphasis on the ability of the candidate to impact student learning.	

- The program assessment system has three major decision points: readiness for admission, readiness for student teaching/internship, and readiness for recommendation for certification.
- Candidates are admitted based on candidate GPA, completion of college math and writing requirements, basic skills assessments, successful completion of prerequisite coursework by scoring a B- or higher, and faculty reference forms.
- In order to progress to student teaching, all candidates must do the following: complete all program courses with a score of B- or better, score a rating of Acceptable on all key assessments (an assessment task, I/T development and learning plan, OPR-PR, and TCMWS) , and pass two Praxis II tests.
- The program assesses candidates’ teaching performance using the OPR, which all RIC teacher preparation programs use. Provider leadership acknowledged that multiple versions of the same tool exist, which leads to confusion about expectations. The scoring scale on the most commonly submitted OPR ranges from zero to six and has general performance descriptions for 0 Unacceptable, 1-2 Developing, 3-4 Acceptable, and 5-6 Target. The descriptions are of poor quality and do not help readers understand what expected performance looks like. For example,



the description for 3-4 Acceptable is “Effective performance. Meets expectations this [*sic*] level of TC development.” In interviews, candidates and clinical educators noted that the difference between a 3 and 4 are unclear. After reviewing evidence and conducting interviews, it was not clear to the team if and how a summative score is calculated in a meaningful way. Overall, the OPR used in the early childhood program is a poorly designed tool that does not reflect best assessment practices.

- Candidates are recommended for certification if they meet all program requirements, achieve a minimum of an Acceptable rating (3) on six OPRs and the TCWS, and have passed the two Praxis tests required for certification.
- When candidates do not meet expectations, the program counsels them out or requires them to complete additional action steps prior to progression. Program faculty shared anecdotes of what they have done when candidates have not met expectations, but there is a lack of evidence of a systemic approach to monitoring and supporting candidate development throughout preparation. It was unclear how programs target areas where candidates need additional support and document candidates who meet and do not meet program requirements.
- Stakeholders do not clearly understand and do not consistently use candidate performance assessments. In interviews and documentation, it was not clear how clinical educators and clinical supervisors meaningfully differentiated between ratings and scores.
- The primary assessment for a measuring candidate impact on student learning is the TCMWS and TCWS. These assignments assess the candidate’s ability to design standards-based instruction, implement assessments, and document impact on student learning. However, the rubrics focus on goal writing and data analysis rather than actual impact on student learning.
- Although there is some evidence that candidate assessment includes written and oral feedback, the quantity and quality of feedback is inconsistent. Work samples prior to and during practicum and student teaching included rubric scores but did not always include written feedback or included feedback that was perfunctory in nature.

Recommendations:

- Adopt or adapt performance assessments that are already widely used in Rhode Island and other states. Seek feedback on the selected tool and work with clinical partners to clarify expectations and performance. Hold trainings and calibration sessions to ensure clinical educators and clinical supervisors have a common understanding of performance expectations and can use the tool with fidelity. Share examples of practice with candidates to help them understand what expected performance looks like for each indicator of rubrics.
- Work with clinical partners to find additional opportunities for candidates to demonstrate proficiency in standards-based instruction, implementing assessments and using data, and documenting impact on student learning.



- Ensure that candidates receive specific and actionable written and oral feedback throughout their program connected to the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards.

3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Approaching Expectations
The recommendation for certification assessment point aligns generally to certification regulations and professional organization standards but as implemented does not ensure that only candidates who demonstrate proficiency on the full range of competencies are recommended for certification.	

- Candidates are recommended for certification if they meet all program requirements, achieve a minimum of an Acceptable rating (3) on six OPRs and the TCWS, and have passed the two Praxis tests required for certification in early childhood.
- Clinical educators and clinical supervisors are both responsible for evaluating the performance of candidates. All candidates must be formally observed thrice by clinical educators and thrice by clinical supervisors using the OPR.
- Beyond noting that training is offered (but not required) for clinical educators, the program did not provide evidence of how it trains and monitors program faculty to ensure consistent, fair, and accurate assessment decisions. In an evidence organizer, program leadership noted that evaluator reliability is an area that the program needs to address.
- While the design of the recommendation for certification assessment points generally aligns to certification requirements and professional organization expectations, actual implementation of the assessment point does not ensure that only candidates who meet the full range of standards are recommended for certification. Cut scores on performance measures may be too low to ensure that certification is based on the candidate’s demonstrated performance of readiness for day one. Minimum expected performance is a three out of six on each indicator of the TCWS, PBIs, and OPRs. Program candidates and completers reported and demonstrated gaps in their knowledge and skills yet progressed through the assessment system.

Recommendations:

- Review candidate assessment measures in conjunction with the RIPTS and professional association standards to ensure that measures accurately assess candidate proficiency in all of the knowledge, skills, dispositions, content, and content pedagogy needed to be a successful educator. Make sure that all candidates demonstrate proficiency at the level of rigor needed to be classroom and school ready on day 1.
- With district partners, collaboratively assess the authenticity of measures used and the minimum expectations for performance. Adopt or adapt tools that the field is already using or revise current tools to better align with what the field uses. Provide training, facilitate calibration opportunities, and monitor assessment implementation to ensure that assessment results are fair, accurate, and consistent across candidates.



Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program does not survey employers annually. Because of low response rates, data from the most recent survey did not produce actionable information.	

- The FSEHD surveys employers approximately once every four years, with the most recent administration being 2016. Although the survey is constructed to yield actionable information, response rates were too low to produce generalizable results. Program leadership identified the need for stronger return rates on surveys, but did not articulate a plan for improving response rates in the future. Rhode Island College collects feedback approximately once every four years instead of annually.
- In the 2015-16 school year, the aggregate performance of Rhode Island College program completers working in Rhode Island schools was comparable to the aggregate performance distribution for all recent completers in Rhode Island schools. However, this data is shown at the *provider* level instead of the *program* level. Therefore, few conclusions about the effectiveness of completers from the secondary program can be made.

Recommendations:

- Research best practices for survey administration and response rates, and seek feedback from districts about how to improve survey administration and response.
- Determine if there is additional program-level information that the program can gather to provide actionable information even if survey response rates are low.
- Develop a plan for annually administering surveys, analyzing the data in a timely manner, and using the data to improve program performance.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not survey program completers annually. Because of low response rates, the most recent survey did not produce actionable data.	

- The FSEHD surveys program completers approximately once every four years, with the most recent administration being 2016. The survey included information regarding completers' employment outcomes and questions about their perceptions of whether their preparation enabled them to become effective educators. Program leadership identified the need for stronger return rates on surveys, but did not articulate a plan for improving response rates in the future.
- Of the nineteen 2015-2016 early childhood completers, only one completer, or 5%, held a position in Rhode Island the following school year that required their early childhood certificate.



Recommendations:

- Recognize that Component 4.2 is a program-level responsibility. The program should view recent graduates as strong sources of information for program improvement. As such, programs should work more closely with completers to maintain lines of communication.
- Research best practices for survey administration and response rates, and seek feedback from districts about how to improve survey administration and response.
- Determine if there is additional program-level information that the program can gather to provide actionable information even if survey response rates are low.
- Develop a plan for annually administering surveys, analyzing the data in a timely manner, and using the data to improve program performance.
- Review program completer employment data to understand where and why Rhode Island schools hire candidates. Unpack how dual certification, partnerships, and student teacher placements may support an increase in completer employment rates.

Elementary Education Program

The Elementary Education Program includes two pathways: an undergraduate course of study (B.A.) and a graduate course of study (M.A.T).

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

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

- The undergraduate program of study includes 13 professional courses for a total of 46 credit hours. The graduate course of study consists of 12 courses for a total of 36-37 credits. Candidates within the graduate course of study experience a more consistent curriculum than those in the undergraduate program.
- The program reported that coursework aligns to the RIPTS and submitted a crosswalk that shows alignment between the RIPTS clusters and courses. During coursework, candidates must connect their reflections to RIPTS standards. The program assesses candidates’ professionalism through the Disposition Reference Form.
- Reviewers noted that, compared to other RIPTS, the following were more evident in coursework: creating instructional opportunities that reflect an understanding of how children learn and develop (Standard 3); creating instructional opportunities to encourage all students’ development of critical thinking, problem solving, performance skills, and literacy across content areas (Standard 5); using effective communication strategies (Standard 8); reflecting on one’s own practice and growing as professionals (Standard 10); and maintaining professional standards guided by legal and ethical principles (Standard 11).



- The curriculum does not include a focus on creating instructional opportunities that reflect a respect for the diversity of learners and an understanding of how students differ in their approaches to learning (Standard 4). In various interviews, participants voiced concern regarding candidate preparedness to accommodate students with disabilities as well as English language learners.
- The curriculum provides only a basic overview of classroom management (Standard 6). During syllabi reviews, reviewers found classroom management explicitly addressed within one course. In interviews, candidates and clinical educators reporting that candidates needed more training in behavior management.
- The curriculum does not address strategies for developing relationships with students and their families (Standard 7). There are also no constructed opportunities for candidates to understand the role of community agencies in supporting schools.

Recommendations:

- Develop well-planned experiences for students that will help them develop a deep understanding of the RIPTS beginning early in the program and ensure that candidates have an opportunity to practice and receive feedback on their performance implementing the knowledge, skills, and dispositions captured in the RIPTS.
- Provide candidates with more instruction in best practices related to classroom management, instructional planning for diverse learners, and working with families. Incorporate more opportunities for candidates to apply their learning.

1.2 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum provides candidates opportunities to develop proficiency in most, but not all the critical concepts, skills, and proficiencies expected of elementary teachers.	

- The program reports that the course of study aligns to Association for Childhood Education International standards. The program provided an analysis showing that all standards were addressed, but reviewers noted that standards were addressed to varying degrees. As noted above, candidates do not receive sufficient preparation to work with diverse learners (Standard 3.2), foster active engagement (Standard 3.4), or work with families (Standard 5.2).
- The program seeks to ensure basic content knowledge through admission and course requirements. Prior to admission at the undergraduate level, candidates are required to meet college mathematics and writing courses and score a C or higher on three introductory content courses: BIOL 100, MATH 143, and POL 201. Once admitted, education coursework includes a series of content-specific methods classes that address the four major content areas.
- As articulated in the program guide, M.A.T. candidates must complete or agree to complete the following prior to admission: a minimum of 60 semester hours of liberal arts courses; at least



two science courses; at least two mathematics courses; at least two humanities course; at least two social science courses; and an art education, music education, or fine/performing arts course. The candidate must score a C or higher in each course. The course of study includes a social studies methods course and content-specific practicum experiences in reading, language arts, science, and mathematics.

- The current course requirements do not ensure that all candidates have sufficient knowledge and competence in elementary subject areas (Standard 2). In interviews, program completers demonstrated a lack of content knowledge, particularly in mathematics. Clinical partners voiced concern that elementary candidates do not receive enough instruction in mathematics and therefore lack the content and pedagogical proficiency needed to teach to rigorous standards.

Recommendations:

- Review required content course syllabi in conjunction with state student standards to ensure that all candidates will have sufficient depth of content knowledge to teach student standards and situate content within a larger profession of learning.
- Engage district partners in additional conversations about potential gaps in candidate content knowledge and pedagogy and implement changes to the course of study that aim to address such gaps.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop a general understanding of applicable Rhode Island student standards and develop basic skills in designing lessons that will help students progress towards proficiency in the standards.	

- During their coursework, candidates have opportunities to review the Next Generation Science Standards, Common Core State Standards in Mathematics and English Language Arts, and the Grade Span Expectations for Social Studies. However, candidates have few opportunities to fully unpack the standards and develop understanding of the progression of expectations within the standards.
- Candidates cited the Common Core State Standards in lesson plans but demonstrated varying levels of knowledge and experience with the standards during interviews and site visits. In interviews, some candidates were able to speak in depth about the standards while others could not; candidates in the M.A.T. program were generally more enthusiastic and knowledgeable about student standards.
- Candidates demonstrated varying understanding of the importance of developing and implementing standards-based lesson planning. In debriefs with candidates, clinical supervisors and clinical educators did not discuss whether the teacher met the lesson objective in relation to student standards.



Recommendations:

- Ensure faculty and staff have a full understanding of the implications of changes to various Rhode Island student standards. Adjust the course of study for candidates based on these implications.
- Provide opportunities for candidates to deepen their understanding of applicable Rhode Island standards.

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

- During interviews, candidates talked to the importance of assessments of instruction for the students. In lesson plans and during site visits, the review team saw candidates plan and use formative assessments. However, the review team saw little evidence of how candidates use data to drive instruction and inform modifications to instructional practice.
- Program leadership noted that student assessment was an area in need of improvement and noted that the department recently added ELED 400: Curriculum and Assessment with Instructional Technology to address this need though the primary focus of the course is health and physical education.
- Candidates complete an Infoworks assignment in FNED 346: Schooling in a Democratic Society where they research the school where they will be tutoring and identify the factors that may influence student achievement. Other than this assignment, reviewers did not find evidence of candidates learning how to use data or practicing using data from sources other than assessments to improve student learning and instructional practice.

Recommendations:

- Revise the curriculum, courses, assessments, and clinical experiences to include greater emphasis on assessment. Include additional opportunities for candidates to learn about the types and purposes of assessment. Ensure candidates have opportunities throughout their course of study to practice collecting, analyzing, and using data to inform instruction. During trainings, emphasize that faculty, clinical educators, and clinical supervisors should be providing feedback on candidate use of data and assessment.
- Consult district partners to determine if there are particular assessments specific to elementary education that are essential for candidates to be able to implement and use to inform instruction. Find opportunities for candidates to learn about, practice, and receive feedback on how they collect, analyze, and use data to inform instruction.



1.5 Technology	Does Not Meet Expectations
Candidates use a variety of technology systems and tools as a student at Rhode Island College, but they do not have opportunities to develop proficiency in designing, implementing, and assessing digital age learning experiences and assessment to support student learning.	

- Candidates do not receive sufficient instruction about how to use technology to enhance student learning. In an evidence organizer, program leadership reported, “ELED program faculty provide teacher candidates with a rich array of opportunities to use technology in the college classroom and the elementary school classroom”; this was not evident to reviewers based on other evidence. The program expects candidates to use technology during coursework, but the purpose is mostly to access and present information for course assignments (e.g. Infoworks, Chalk and Wire, and Blackboard). When reviewing course syllabi, reviewers found only one assignment that explicitly focuses on candidate use of technology within lessons. The course of study lacks explicit instruction on digital age learning models and experiences and relies on the practicum and student teaching experiences to provide candidates exposure to using technology for instructional and assessment purposes.
- Candidates report using technology but describe the role of technology as more of an accessory than a way to support student learning. In interviews, candidates talked about basic technologies like the Smartboard and overhead projector.
- Program leadership and candidates noted that candidates do not consistently have opportunities to use instructional technology in elementary school classrooms in their practicum and student teaching experiences. Candidate experiences vary based on the availability of technology and the skills of the clinical educator. In an evidence organizer, program leadership of the M.A.T. pathway noted that faculty members are “looking at more standardization of experiences in which teacher candidates use technology in their instruction with students.”

Recommendations:

- Review elementary education programs that are national models of excellence to identify the technology expectations, course integration, instructional practices, and clinical supports that are effective and successful in preparing teachers to use current and varied technology enhance student learning and outcomes.
- Revise the current program curriculum, course instruction, assessments, and clinical experiences to ensure that candidates have sufficient opportunities to learn about varied and effective technology. Ensure candidates have opportunities to practice and receive feedback on designing and implementing digital age learning experiences throughout their preparation.
- Provide faculty opportunities for professional learning or seek outside expertise regarding best practices for using technology in instruction and assessment to support student learning.



1.6 Equity	Does Not Meet Expectations
Candidates have opportunities to reflect on their own biases but have few if any opportunities to develop proficiency in designing and implementing strategies for working with diverse learners and families in diverse communities.	

- Candidates reflect on their own biases in a foundational course through service learning reflections. As part of the Teacher Candidate Work Sample during student teaching, candidates are asked to describe their school community; however, in interviews, candidates shared they did not see the value in this exercise.
- In an evidence organizer, program leadership reported, “ELED program courses prepare candidates to implement effective strategies for working with students/families with disabilities and English language learners.” Program leadership submitted examples of courses that support candidates in developing proficiency in equity. However, current efforts to address equity are insufficient. Candidates and district partners noted that working with English learners and students with disabilities is an area where the program needs to improve.
- Reviewers did not find evidence that candidates learn specific strategies that are effective with working with families. Candidates corroborated that they did not learn strategies for working with families.

Recommendations:

- Incorporate a more consistent emphasis on research-based strategies and best practices related to working with students with disabilities and English learners within each content area. Provide candidates feedback on the effectiveness of their implementation of these strategies and offer opportunities for growth and refinement.
- Teach candidates strategies for working with families in diverse communities and provide systematic opportunities for students to implement these strategies throughout their preparation.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Approaching Expectations
Rhode Island initiatives are somewhat integrated into coursework and candidates develop a general understanding of a few key initiatives.	

- Candidates use InfoWorks in an assignment for a foundational course and write student learning objectives as part of their Teacher Candidate Work Sample. However, the format of the SLO is not fully aligned to the SLO template used in educator evaluation models in RI.
- Although the program exposes candidates to a few Rhode Island initiatives and policies during their clinical experiences, candidates reported learning about Rhode Island initiatives mostly from their clinical educators.



Recommendations:

- Review coursework to identify specific laws, policies, and systems that candidates should become familiar with prior to exposure in the field. Collaborate with clinical educators and partners to prioritize expectations and ways to integrate them into the coursework.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Approaching Expectations
Candidate preparation includes a series of clinical experiences that inconsistently provide candidates sufficient opportunities to develop proficiency as elementary teachers.	

- Candidate clinical preparation includes a service learning experience, multiple course-embedded clinical experiences, two practica (MAT only), and student teaching. Early clinical experiences include planning instruction for an afterschool program as well as writing and implementing lessons in various content areas. Candidates’ clinical preparation meets the minimum hours of field experience prior to student teaching as required by Rhode Island certification regulations.
- During student teaching, candidates spend 14 weeks in an elementary placement, which meets the expectations required by Rhode Island certifications. The extent to which student teaching simulates the range and intensity of responsibilities of an elementary educator is inconsistent. The review team observed, and candidates described, both a co-teaching and traditional approach to student teaching. In the co-teaching model, candidates work alongside another educator throughout their student teaching; in the traditional model, candidates gradually assume additional responsibility and assume full responsibility of the class for four of the 14 weeks.
- Undergraduate elementary candidates who are also seeking a middle grades extension split their student teaching time between an elementary and middle grades placement, with middle grades placements serving double duty as elementary student teaching and a middle grades practicum. This practice does not comply with state requirements.
- Although candidates have multiple placements, they are not always placed in a range of environments. Most candidate placements are urban schools. In addition, there was no evidence of a systemic and intentional approach to placing and tracking candidates.

Recommendations:

- Structure requirements and experiences to ensure that candidates in student teaching experience the full range and intensity of responsibilities of an elementary teacher for sufficient duration. Establish a system for monitoring implementation of clinical experiences to ensure candidates experience consistent experiences of sufficient intensity.
- Develop a system to track clinical placement and ensure that candidates experience a range of educational environments that capture the diversity of educational settings in Rhode Island.
- Work with middle grades program leadership to revise program requirements and ensure that undergraduate elementary candidates seeking an elementary school extension complete a full



student teaching experience within grades 1-6 and then have a separate middle grades practicum.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Approaching Expectations
The program has not fully structured coherent clinical experiences that enable candidates to increasingly demonstrate positive impact on PK-12 students' learning.	

- Candidate impact on student learning is primarily addressed through the Teacher Candidate Mini Work Sample (TCMWS), Teacher Candidate Work Sample (TCWS), and the Observation and Progress Report (OPR).
- Candidates write a student learning objective as part of the TCMWS and the TCWS. The SLO is not developed in partnership with districts. Candidate SLOs and feedback to candidates on their SLOs do not reflect guidance and best practice related to SLO writing as articulated in RIDE educator evaluation systems.
- Rubrics for the TCMWS and TCWS focus on the quality of the SLO and analysis of data rather than the results of the SLO. The SLO is not scored based on candidate ability to demonstrate student learning.
- The OPR includes expectations that candidates use assessments and engage in reflection after the lesson, but there is no specific indicator focused on whether students achieved the lesson objective or demonstrated growth.
- Feedback to candidates does not focus on measuring student growth. It was not evident in work samples, interviews or other documents that the program expects candidates to systematically grow in their ability to affect student learning.
- There was no evidence of analysis of candidate impact on student learning at the program level or when interviewing clinical educators.

Recommendations:

- Review the expectations for partnership including that preparation programs consult with their partners to design coherent clinical experiences that positively impact student learning. Collaborate with partners to establish measures of student learning that are reflective and consistent with what districts use.
- Establish a process to collect data on candidate impact on student learning. Work with clinical educators to review and use the data to help develop the skills of individual candidates and inform program improvement.



2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program shares some common expectations for performance and uses a single tool for student teaching observations. The program does not have established indicators for partnership effectiveness nor does the program utilize data from those indicators to make partnership decisions to benefit the program or the partner.	

- The Office of Partnerships and Placements (OPP) primarily leads the outreach and organization of student teaching placements. Partnerships across Rhode Island exist among both LEA leadership and with specific clinical educators. In interviews, reviewers heard that there is a poorly articulated, informal system in place to recruit clinical educators.
- Clinical partners and the program do not have clear agreed-upon indicators of their partnerships' effectiveness. RIC submitted a variety of partnership documents to the review team. Among the documentation were both expired agreements and agreements that did not identify specific benefits or outcomes. In interviews, district partners did not identify annual opportunities to provide input that could help shape and refine their partnership. Clinical partners interviewed ranged in their perspective of the placement process. Some districts had proactively systematized the placement on student teachers.
- The program and clinical educators use a common assessment tool to evaluate and provide feedback on candidate performance. Clinical educators utilize the OPR to evaluate candidate performance during practicum and student teaching. Clinical educator OPR data is used to inform candidate progression to student teaching and certification, thus providing clinical educators some input into the decision making process regarding the progression of candidates to certification.
- Analysis of submitted OPR forms revealed minimal, if any, written feedback to candidates. Program leadership self-identified that candidates need additional written feedback from clinical educators.

Recommendations:

- Collaborate with district partners to strengthen partnerships so that they are mutually designed and mutually beneficial. Adopt agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness and analyze data from those indicators.
- Work collaboratively with current and future partners to assume joint responsibility to establish clinical experiences, measure impact on student learning, and establish processes to monitor outcomes and drive program improvement. Calibrate expectations regularly. Adopt or adapt educator performance assessment tools used in districts.
- Identify additional opportunities for clinical educators to have input into decisions about candidate progression within the program.



2.4 Clinical Educators	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not systematically share responsibility with its partner to select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain clinical educators that demonstrate effectiveness and have coaching ability to support the development of candidate knowledge and skills.	

- Programs and clinical partners do not identify clear quality criteria for both PK-12 and program-based clinical educators that include the following: demonstration of effectiveness in skills or best practice in the certification area; evidence of positive impact on student learning; ability to work with adult learners; coaching and supervision skills and ability to evaluate and provide feedback to candidates using program and partner assessments. Evidence regarding criteria for clinical educator selection pointed in many different directions. The FSEHD clinical educator description, FSEHD partnership agreements from 2008-13, and the FSEHD partnership agreements sent on 2016 all articulated different criteria for clinical educators, and no description fully met the minimum criteria articulated in Standard 2.4 For example, the clinical educator description emphasizes highly qualified status rather than educator performance; the 2008-13 partnership agreement states clinical educators should have “above average” evaluation scores; and the 2015-16 partnership agreement says that clinical educators should “qualify as effective educators”. As evidenced in interviews, clinical educators were unaware of how they were selected to work with student teachers.
- Programs and clinical partners do not collaboratively recruit primarily educators who demonstrate effectiveness as teachers, administrators, or support professionals to serve as clinical educators; do not generally prepare them to work with adult learners, in coaching and supervision skills, and in the use of common assessment tools and measures. Programs and clinical partners do not select primarily educators who meet these criteria to serve as PK-12 and program-based clinical educators. RIC invites clinical educators to attend a single three hour training session by the OPP that provides an overview of FSEHD expectations. Specific topics include the OPR, Professional Behavior Indicators, TCWS, and Chalk and Wire. The training introduces the responsibility of the clinical educator and does not include coaching, data collection, or supervision training. There was no evidence that the training provided opportunities to practice to use the tool or calibration activities to ensure that all clinical educators had shared understanding of the tool. Despite documentation of the training, there was no evidence regarding the overall participation in the training session.
- Programs and Clinical Partners do not systematically collect and analyze data on the effectiveness of PK-12 and program-based clinical educators and do not make retention decisions based on the evaluation data. The OPP shared a survey for college supervisors that began this academic year. The survey is designed to be completed by the college supervisor about the clinical educator’s collaboration with FSEHD and the early childhood candidate. Program leadership of the B.A. pathway self-identified a need for a systemic approach to identifying and evaluating clinical educators to ensure that candidates’ clinical experiences are varied and high quality.



Recommendations:

- Collaborate with district partners to establish a clear system for placing candidates that includes: notifying districts of upcoming placement needs; recruiting, selecting, training, supporting, and evaluating clinical educators; and using multiple sources of data to inform future placement decisions and changes to clinical experiences.
- With district partners, review the expectations for component 2.4 of the PREP-RI rubric. Revise partnership agreements to include criteria for clinical educators that include the following: attainment of Highly Effective on the most recent educator evaluation, ability to work with adult learners, coaching and supervision skills, and ability to evaluate and provide feedback to candidates using program and partner assessments. As needed, include additional mutually agreed upon criteria.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Approaching Expectations
Candidate progression in the program is guided by a performance system, but the system lacks rigor, clear criteria, systemic implementation, and emphasis on the ability of the candidate to impact student learning.	

- The program assessment system has three major decision points: readiness for admission, readiness for student teaching/internship, and readiness for recommendation for certification.
- The program admits undergraduate candidates based on GPA, completed faculty disposition reference forms, completion of minimum course requirements, a B- or better in FNED 346, and Core/SAT/ACT test scores. Candidates must also score a C or higher in three content courses: POL 201, BIOL 100, and MATH 143. The program admits graduate candidates based on GPA, course grades in undergraduate content areas, PRAXIS II scores, candidate reference forms and letters of recommendation, and a statement of philosophy essay.
- In order to progress to student teaching, all candidates must do the following: demonstrate coursework proficiency via GPA and individual course grades, score three or higher on all criteria in the TCMWS and OPR-PR, and pass the Praxis certification tests.
- The program recommends candidates for certification if they meet expectations on six OPRs and meet expectations on the TCWS. Candidates pursuing an M.A.T. must also earn Acceptable or Target ratings on all rubric indicators of the FSEHD Professional Behaviors Indicators Rubric.
- When candidates do not meet expectations, they are counseled out or must complete additional action steps prior to progression. Program faculty shared anecdotes of what they have done when candidates have not met expectations, but there is a lack of evidence of a systemic approach to monitoring and supporting candidate development throughout preparation. It was unclear how programs target areas where candidates need additional support and document candidates who meet and do not meet program requirements.
- The program assesses candidates' teaching performance using the OPR, which all RIC teacher preparation programs use. Provider leadership acknowledged that multiple versions of the same



tool exist, which leads to confusion about expectations. The scoring scale on the most commonly submitted OPR ranges from zero to six and has general performance descriptions for 0 Unacceptable, 1-2 Developing, 3-4 Acceptable, and 5-6 Target. The descriptions are of poor quality and do not help readers understand what expected performance looks like. For example, the description for 3-4 Acceptable is “Effective performance. Meets expectations this [*sic*] level of TC development.” In interviews, candidates and clinical educators noted that the difference between a 3 and 4 are unclear. After reviewing evidence and conducting interviews, it was not clear to the team if and how a summative score is calculated in a meaningful way. Overall, the OPR used in the elementary program is a poorly designed tool that does not reflect best assessment practices.

- The OPR expects candidates to use assessment and reflect on their practice, but positive impact on student learning is not an explicit expectation.
- Stakeholders do not clearly understand candidate performance assessments nor do they consistently apply assessments across candidates. In interviews and documentation, it was not clear how clinical educators and clinical supervisors meaningfully differentiated between ratings and scores.
- The primary assessment for a measuring candidate impact on student learning is the TCMWS and TCWS. These assignments assess the candidate’s ability to design standards-based instruction, implement assessments, and document impact on student learning. However, the rubrics focus on goal writing and data analysis rather than actual impact on student learning.
- Although there is some evidence that candidate assessment includes written and oral feedback, the quantity and quality of feedback is inconsistent. Work samples prior to and during practicum and student teaching included rubric scores but did not always include written feedback or included feedback that was perfunctory in nature.

Recommendations:

- Adopt performance assessments that are already widely used in Rhode Island and other states. Create tools for collecting evidence of practice for formative purposes. Seek feedback on the selected tool and work with clinical partners to clarify expectations and performance. Hold trainings and calibration sessions to ensure clinical educators and clinical supervisors have a common understanding of performance expectations and can use the tool and collect evidence of practice with fidelity. Share examples of practice with candidates to help them understand what expected performance looks like for each indicator of rubrics.
- Work with clinical partners to find additional opportunities for candidates to demonstrate proficiency in standards-based instruction, implementing assessments and using data, and documenting impact on student learning.
- Ensure that candidates receive specific and actionable written and oral feedback throughout their program connected to the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards.



3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Approaching Expectations
<p>The recommendation for certification assessment point generally aligns to certification regulations and professional organization standards but as implemented does not ensure that only candidates who demonstrate proficiency on the full range of competencies are recommended for certification.</p>	

- The program recommends candidates for certification based on acceptable performance on the TCWS, OPR, and, for MAT candidates only, Professional Behavior Indicators. These assessments align to most of the range of pedagogical competencies, content competencies, and field competencies identified in certification regulations.
- The program communicates cut scores on assessments required to be recommended for certification, but it is not always clear what performance at that cut score looks like.
- Clinical educators and clinical supervisors are both responsible for evaluating the performance of candidates. All candidates must be formally observed thrice by clinical educators and thrice by clinical supervisors using the OPR, and one of those observations must be a joint observation. In pre-visit evidence, program leadership identified successful performance on the OPR as a requirement for recommendation for certification, but it was not evident to reviewers how the program monitors candidate performance.
- Beyond noting that training is offered (but not required) for clinical educators, the program did not provide evidence of how it trains and monitors program faculty to ensure consistent, fair, and accurate assessment decisions.
- While the design of the recommendation for certification assessment points aligns to certification requirements and professional organization expectations, actual implementation of the assessment point does not ensure that only candidates who are recommended for certification meet the full range of the standards. Cut scores on performance measures may be too low to ensure that certification is based on the candidate’s demonstrated performance of readiness for day one. Minimum expected is a three out of six on each indicator of the TCWS, PBIs, and OPRs. Program candidates and completers reported and demonstrated gaps in their knowledge and skills yet progressed through the assessment system.

Recommendations:

- Review candidate assessment measures in conjunction with the RIPTS and professional association standards to ensure that measures accurately assess candidate proficiency in all of the knowledge, skills, dispositions, content, and content pedagogy needed to be a successful educator.
- With district partners, collaboratively assess the authenticity of measures used and the minimum expectations for performance. Adopt or adapt tools that the field is already using or revise the TCWS and OPR to better align with what the field uses. Provide training, facilitate calibration opportunities, and monitor assessment implementation to ensure that assessment results are fair, accurate, and consistent across candidates.



Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program does not survey employers annually. Because of low response rates, data from the most recent survey did not produce actionable information.	

- The FSEHD surveys employers approximately once every four years, with the most recent administration being 2016. Although the survey is constructed to yield actionable information, response rates were too low to produce generalizable results. Program leadership identified the need for stronger return rates on surveys, but did not articulate a plan for improving response rates in the future. Rhode Island College collects feedback approximately once every four years instead of annually.
- In the 2015-16 school year, the aggregate performance of Rhode Island College program completers working in Rhode Island schools was comparable to the aggregate performance distribution for all recent completers in Rhode Island schools. However, this data is shown at the *provider* level instead of the *program* level. Therefore, few conclusions about the effectiveness of completers from the elementary program can be made.

Recommendations:

- Research best practices for survey administration and response rates, and seek feedback from districts about how to improve survey administration and response.
- Determine if there is additional information that the program can gather to provide actionable information even if survey response rates are low.
- Develop a plan for annually administering surveys, analyzing the data in a timely manner, and using the data to improve program performance.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Does Not Meets Expectations
The program does not survey program completers annually. Because of low response rates, the most recent survey did not produce actionable data.	

- The FSEHD surveys program completers approximately once every four years, with the most recent administration being 2016. The survey included information regarding completers' employment outcomes and questions about their perceptions of whether their preparation enabled them to become effective educators. Program leadership identified the need for stronger return rates on surveys, but did not articulate a plan for improving response rates in the future.
- The elementary education program recommended 236 completers for certification over the course of three years (2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16). 35 completers, or 14 percent, did not apply for Rhode Island certification. Of the 236 completers, 14 percent, or 35 educators, were employed in a Rhode Island school that required their elementary education certificate.



Recommendations:

- Recognize that Component 4.2 is a program-level responsibility. The program should view recent graduates should as strong sources of information for program improvement. As such, programs should work more closely with completers to maintain lines of communication.
- Research best practices for survey administration and response rates, and seek feedback from districts about how to improve survey administration and response.
- Determine if there is additional program-level information that the program can gather to provide actionable information even if survey response rates are low.
- Develop a plan for annually administering surveys, analyzing the data in a timely manner, and using the data to improve program performance.
- Review program completer employment data to understand where and why Rhode Island schools hire completers. Unpack how dual certification, partnerships, and student teacher placements may support an increase in completer employment rates.

Middle Grades Education Program

The Middle Grades Education Program is an extension program. Candidates must either be concurrently pursuing or already hold a teaching certificate in Elementary Grades or Secondary Grades. The program includes two pathways: undergraduate (taken concurrently with other undergraduate coursework) and graduate (Certificate of Graduate Studies, or C.G.S.). Content areas are English, mathematics, science, and social studies.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

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

- Candidates take a series of four courses (12-13 credits) as part of the middle grades extension focused on teaching the early adolescent, middle school organization and curriculum, interdisciplinary reading and writing in the middle schools, and strategies to meet the needs of diverse learners at the middle school level. In interviews, candidates reported having consistent experiences within the middle grades program, which is partly due to the small size of faculty. Candidates also noted that the program’s coursework and field experiences were valuable experiences.
- The program reports that all courses of study align to the RIPS. The program provided an analysis of the program courses showing that the program addresses all standards within the RIPS, but noted, “teacher candidates learn about the RIPS in their elementary and secondary programs.” The bulk of candidates’ preparation in the essential knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions occurs outside of the program. Candidates are either concurrently enrolled in an elementary or secondary program, or they already hold a valid elementary and secondary teaching license.



- The program relies on previous and concurrent coursework to ensure knowledge of and proficiency in the RIPTS. The program does not have a system in place to ensure that candidates do not have gaps in their knowledge of and proficiency in the RIPTS.

Recommendations:

- Collaborate with the elementary education and secondary programs to identify potential gaps in curriculum and opportunities to develop proficiency in the knowledge, skills, and dispositions captured within the RIPTS.
- Develop a system to assess candidate proficiency in the knowledge, skills, and dispositions embedded in the RIPTS and provide differentiated support to candidates who may need additional coaching in specific standards. This practice is especially important for candidates enrolled in the C.G.S. program who may have completed their initial preparation in other states.

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Approaching Expectations
Candidates experience a curriculum designed to address the five Association for Middle Level Educators (AMLE) standards, but the program relies on prior experience and concurrent coursework to address content and content pedagogy.	

- In evidence organizers, program leadership reported that coursework aligns to the AMLE standards. The program provided an analysis of the program courses showing that the program addresses all standards, but the review team noted that the program addresses standards to varying degrees.
- Content course requirements for undergraduate middle grades candidates are not consistent across documents. The RIC website states, “Content preparation is based on a state-established minimum of 30 hours distributed by topic in a subject taught in middle schools.”⁴ Submitted evidence suggests that middle grades candidates at the undergraduate level must have a content major and that the number of required content courses varies based on the content area.
- Per the RIC website, candidates applying for a C.G.S. in middle grades must demonstrate they have a minimum of 21 undergraduate hours in their subject content area.
- Because this is an extension program, the program expects candidates to learn pedagogy elsewhere. Undergraduate candidates receive instruction on content pedagogy in their concurrent elementary education and secondary education programs. In the C.G.S. program, candidates already hold a full certificate.
- Reviewers did not see evidence of a system to identify and address any gaps in candidates’ knowledge of content and content pedagogy beyond an initial review of coursework. Reviewers

⁴ This statement is inaccurate because certification requirements specify that candidates “have a major or equivalent in the content area or closely related field” and do not specify a minimum number of course hours.



did not see evidence of instruction of content-specific teaching and assessment strategies in middle grades candidate coursework.

Recommendations:

- Review middle grades certification requirements on the RIDE website and seek stakeholder feedback to identify which content is essential for each middle grades subject. Engage stakeholders in the revision of requirements and courses to ensure that candidates have the content knowledge and the content pedagogy needed to teach middle grades.
- Collaborate with the elementary education and secondary programs to identify potential gaps in content and content pedagogy and develop a plan to address those gaps
- Develop a system to evaluate whether students in the C.G.S. program need additional support to address candidates’ knowledge of content and content pedagogy.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop a general understanding of applicable Rhode Island student standards and develop basic skills in designing lessons that will help students progress towards proficiency in the standards.	

- The program provides candidates with a general understanding of student standards. In interviews, clinical educators noted that candidates were knowledgeable of student standards before student teaching, and candidates cited examples of how they were introduced to standards through coursework. Candidates reported familiarity with appropriate student standards (i.e.the Common Core State Standards, the Next Generation Science Standards, and the Rhode Island Grade Span Expectations for Social Studies), but they did not demonstrate a deep understanding during interviews.
- Candidates are required to identify standards as part of lesson planning and as part of their Team Integrated Curriculum Unit. However, during interviews, candidates demonstrated varied understanding of the importance of using standards to drive lesson planning. Some students discussed a backwards design approach, while others noted that they first designed a lesson and then identified the standards that aligned to the lesson.
- In submitted evidence, program leadership did not discuss student content standards and did not submit a crosswalk of courses and student content standards. The program relies on student standards being addressed in previous or concurrent coursework. The middle grades curriculum does not emphasize deep learning of student standards in middle grades. When reviewing syllabi, the review team did not find evidence of experiences that will help candidates develop understanding of student standards or of how to design lessons to help students progress toward proficiency.

Recommendations:

- Provide opportunities within middle grades coursework to focus on middle grades content standards and unpack student standards. Candidates should have a deep understanding of each standard and should be able to articulate how expectations for student performance progress over time and across grade levels/bands.



- Collaborate with leadership of elementary and secondary programs to ensure that all candidates have a common understanding of the importance of student standards and their role in lesson planning. Ensure all candidates have multiple opportunities in the elementary, middle, and secondary programs to deepen their understanding of standards and to develop the proficiency needed to implement effective standards-based lessons.

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

- The program includes some but insufficient opportunities for candidates to develop understanding and skills in data-driven instruction. Students access and interpret InfoWorks data through a shadow study, advocacy project, and teaching rubric. Candidates also complete an integrated unit based on data. Candidates also reported using learning profiles to inform lesson planning.
- Candidates pursuing a C.G.S. in middle grades complete an inquiry study where they collect data, analyze data, and use their findings to improve their teaching. However, it is unclear whether candidates complete this study in a middle grades classroom since many C.G.S. candidates teach in elementary or secondary classrooms.
- Candidates reported that the miscue analysis assignment was particularly helpful. For the miscue analysis in MLED330/MLED530, students work one-on-one with a middle grades student to conduct a miscue analysis and then write a detailed analysis of the experience that includes planning instructional literacy strategies.

Recommendations:

- Review and revise the curriculum and clinical experiences to ensure that candidates have multiple opportunities to collect, analyze, and use data to inform their instruction of middle school students.
- During trainings, emphasize that faculty, clinical educators, and clinical supervisors should be providing feedback on candidate use of data and assessment.
- Consult district partners to determine if there are particular assessments specific to middle school that are essential for candidates to be able to implement and use to inform instruction. Find opportunities for candidates to learn about, practice, and receive feedback on how they collect, analyze, and use data to inform instruction.



1.5 Technology	Approaching Expectations
Candidates use a variety of technology systems and tools as a student at Rhode Island College, but they have limited opportunities to develop proficiency in designing, implementing, and assessing digital age learning experiences and assessment to support student learning.	

- The program expects candidates to use technology to access and present information for course assignments (e.g. Infoworks, Chalk and Wire, presentation software, blogs, and Google Classroom). Some courses are paperless and require candidates to use candidates. However, course syllabi do not address the application of technology in lessons to support middle grades student learning.
- Candidates do not receive sufficient instruction and feedback about how to use technology to enhance student learning. Most candidate exposure to using technology occurs during practicum. However, candidate experiences can vary based on the availability of technology in their placements and the skills of the clinical educator. There is little evidence that candidates received feedback on their use of technology in designing and implementing lessons.

Recommendations:

- Review programs that are national models of excellence to identify the technology expectations, course integration, instructional practices, and clinical supports that are effective and successful in preparing teachers to use current and varied technology enhance student learning and outcomes. Review the technology-related indicators of the AMLE and content-specific professional organization standards.
- Revise program curriculum, course instruction, assessments, and clinical experiences to ensure that candidates have sufficient opportunities to learn about varied and effective technology. Ensure candidates have opportunities to practice and receive feedback on designing and implementing digital age learning experiences throughout their preparation.
- Provide faculty professional learning or seek outside expertise regarding best practices for using technology in instruction and assessment to support student learning.

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
Candidates have opportunities to reflect on their own biases and develop basic skills in designing and implementing strategies that are effective when working with English language learners and students with disabilities.	

- The program reported that each course has an advisory component that prompts students to reflect on their own biases and beliefs. Candidates must also submit reflection papers for each course.
- In submitted evidence, program leadership noted that undergraduate candidates develop basic skills for working with English language learners and students with disabilities through educational psychology and a special education courses that are required at the elementary and



secondary levels. However, it is unclear how the program ensures C.G.S. candidates also have this same level of foundational knowledge.

- There was no evidence that candidates learn specific strategies that are effective with working with families, and there is limited evidence that candidates are required to interact with families. Professional experiences checklists provided in biology and English evidence suggest that teacher candidates are required to call parents or conduct a parent/teacher conference, but candidates reported few if any opportunities to work with parents during student teaching and noted that experiences varied by clinical educator.

Recommendations:

- Incorporate a more consistent emphasis on learning and using effective, research-based strategies for working with English language learners and disabilities. Provide candidates feedback on the effectiveness of their implementation of these strategies and offer opportunities for growth and refinement.
- Teach candidates strategies for working with families in diverse communities and provide systematic opportunities for students to implement these strategies throughout their preparation.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Approaching Expectations
Rhode Island initiatives are somewhat integrated into coursework and candidates develop a general understanding of a few key initiatives	

- In evidence organizers, program leadership noted that courses are based on the Middle Level Model, which addresses social and emotional learning and models middle level practices. The program also emphasizes the advisory structure present in Rhode Island middle schools.
- The program exposes candidates to several Rhode Island initiatives and policies during their clinical experiences, but candidates do not have sufficient opportunities or support to develop, apply, and build proficiency with the Rhode Island initiatives.

Recommendations:

- Work with clinical partners to identify key Rhode Island educational initiatives, laws, and policies. Review course syllabi and systematically infuse Rhode Island initiatives in more than one course to ensure that all candidates, including those from other states, are prepared to teach in Rhode Island.



Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Does Not Meet Expectations
The depth, breadth, and coherence of clinical experiences do not provide candidates sufficient opportunities to experience the full range of responsibilities of a middle grades educator.	

- Rather than complete a separate practicum, undergraduate candidates split their student teaching so that half is in an elementary or secondary placement and then half is in the middle grades. Both versions of the student teaching handbook on the website (2010-11 and 2016-17) note that candidates who split their 14 weeks of student teaching will have complete responsibility for day-to-day operations of the classroom for a minimum of two weeks at each placement. This practice does not meet certification requirements, which requires that candidates concurrently enrolled complete a 12-week student teaching assignment in their initial certification area and then an additional practicum of 45 hours in the middle grades. Clinical partners also noted that splitting the time between middle and secondary did not give candidates enough time in each setting.
- At the graduate level, each course includes a field experience component ranging from 5 to 30 hours. Assignments include an inquiry study, teaming observations, teaching two disciplinary literacy lessons, conducting a miscue analysis, and developing, implementing, and assessing a unit based on differentiated middle level instruction. Assignments have limited focus on teaching middle grades content.
- Candidates pursuing a C.G.S. complete their field experiences in their own classrooms, which may or may not be middle grades classrooms. Candidates reported being observed by their course instructor, but there was little evidence that these candidates had opportunities to observe, work with, and receive support from highly effective middle grades educators as part of their preparation.

Recommendations:

- Revise the course of study to include a 45-hour middle grades practicum experience that is separate from any concurrent program. Ensure that all candidates complete their field experiences in middle grades classrooms.
- Embed more unit planning and teaching middle grades content into the C.G.S. program.
- Work with candidates enrolled in the C.G.S. program and district leadership to ensure all candidates have opportunities to observe, work with, and receive support from highly effective middle grades educators. All assignments and clinical experiences should be in middle grades settings.



2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not include coherent clinical experiences that enable candidates to demonstrate increasingly positive impact on student learning.	

- The syllabi of required courses do not emphasize student learning. According to program leadership in submitted evidence, “The MLED program depends on the specific content area supervisors in practicum and student teaching to address the impact on student learning.” Candidates do not need to demonstrate impact on student learning as a requirement for progression.
- Program leadership noted that undergraduate candidates complete the Teacher Candidate Mini-Work Sample and Teacher Candidate Work Sample as part of their requirements for their elementary or secondary courses of study. However, these assessments are not part of the middle grades course of study.
- Candidates pursuing a C.G.S. in middle grades complete an inquiry study where they collect data, analyze data, and use their findings to improve their teaching. However, it is unclear whether candidates complete this assessment in a middle grades classroom since many C.G.S. candidates do all clinical experiences in their own classroom.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program shares some common expectations for performance and uses a single tool for student teaching observations. The program does not have established indicators for partnership effectiveness nor does the program utilize data from those indicators to make partnership decisions to benefit the program or the partner.	

- The Office of Partnerships and Placements (OPP) primarily leads the outreach and organization of student teaching placements. Partnerships across Rhode Island exist among both LEA leadership and with specific clinical educators. In interviews, reviewers heard that there is a poorly articulated, informal system in place to recruit clinical educators.
- Clinical partners and the program do not have clear agreed-upon indicators of their partnerships’ effectiveness. RIC submitted a variety of partnership documents to the review team. Among the documentation were both expired agreements and agreements that did not identify specific benefits or outcomes. In interviews, district partners did not identify annual opportunities to provide input that could help shape and refine their partnership. Clinical partners interviewed ranged in their perspective of the placement process. Some districts had proactively systematized the placement on student teachers.
- The program and clinical educators use a common assessment tool to evaluate and provide feedback on candidate performance. Clinical educators utilize the OPR to evaluate candidate performance during practicum and student teaching. Clinical educator OPR data is used to inform candidate progression to certification.
- Analysis of submitted OPR forms revealed minimal, if any, written feedback to candidates. Program leadership self-identified that candidates need further written feedback from clinical educators.



Recommendations:

- Collaborate with district partners to strengthen partnerships so that they are mutually designed and mutually beneficial. Adopt agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness and analyze data from those indicators.
- Work collaboratively with current and future partners to assume joint responsibility to establish clinical experiences, measure impact on student learning, and establish processes to monitor outcomes and drive program improvement. Calibrate expectations regularly. Adopt or adapt educator performance assessment tools used in districts.
- Identify additional opportunities for clinical educators to have input into decisions about candidate progression within the program.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not systematically share responsibility with its partner to select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain clinical educators that demonstrate effectiveness and have coaching ability to support the development of candidate knowledge and skills.	

- Programs and clinical partners do not identify clear quality criteria for both PK-12 and program-based clinical educators that include the following: demonstration of effectiveness in skills or best practice in the certification area; evidence of positive impact on student learning; ability to work with adult learners; coaching and supervision skills and ability to evaluate and provide feedback to candidates using program and partner assessments. Evidence regarding criteria for clinical educator selection pointed in many different directions. A variety of documents and responses were elicited when the review team looked into this component. The FSEHD clinical educator description, FSEHD partnership agreements from 2008-13, and the FSEHD partnership agreements sent on 2016 all articulated different criteria for clinical educators, and no description fully met the minimum criteria articulated in Standard 2.4 For example, the clinical educator description emphasizes highly qualified status rather than educator performance; the 2008-13 partnership agreement states clinical educators should have “above average” evaluation scores; and the 2015-16 partnership agreement says that clinical educators should “qualify as effective educators”. As evidenced in interviews, clinical educators were unaware of how they were selected to work with student teachers.
- Programs and clinical partners do not collaboratively recruit primarily educators who demonstrate effectiveness as teachers, administrators, or support professionals to serve as clinical educators; do not generally prepare them to work with adult learners, in coaching and supervision skills, and in the use of common assessment tools and measures. Programs and clinical partners do not select primarily educators who meet these criteria to serve as PK-12 and program-based clinical educators. RIC invites clinical educators to attend a single three hour training session by the OPP that provides an overview of FSEHD expectations. Specific topics include the OPR, Professional Behavior Indicators, TCWS, and Chalk and Wire. The training introduces the responsibility of the clinical educator and does not include coaching or supervision training. There was no evidence that the training provided opportunities to practice to use the tool or calibration activities to ensure that all clinical educators had shared



understanding of the tool. Despite documentation of the training, there was no evidence regarding the overall participation in the training session.

- Programs and Clinical Partners do not systematically collect and analyze data on the effectiveness of PK-12 and program-based clinical educators and do not make retention decisions based on the evaluation data. The OPP shared a survey for college supervisors that began this academic year. The survey is designed to be completed by the college supervisor about the clinical educator’s collaboration with FSEHD and the middle grades candidate.

Recommendations:

- Collaborate with district partners to establish a clear system for placing candidates that includes the following: notifying districts of upcoming placement needs; recruiting, selecting, training, supporting, and evaluating clinical educators; and using multiple sources of data to inform future placement decisions and changes to clinical experiences.
- With district partners, review the expectations for component 2.4 of the PREP-RI rubric. Revise partnership agreements to include criteria for clinical educators that include the following: attainment of Highly Effective on the most recent educator evaluation, ability to work with adult learners, coaching and supervision skills, and ability to evaluate and provide feedback to candidates using program and partner assessments. As needed, include additional mutually agreed upon criteria.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Approaching Expectations
Candidate performance guides candidate progression in the program, but not all candidates have opportunities to work in middle grades classrooms. The system lacks rigor, clear criteria, systemic implementation, and emphasis on the ability of the candidate to impact student learning.	

- The program assessment system includes three decision points: readiness for admission, readiness for practicum, and readiness for recommendation for certification. In interviews, candidates voiced concern that elements of the assessment system are not clearly articulated. In particular, candidates noted that locating the requirements for admissions into the program was challenging and that early candidate advising was not useful.
- Undergraduate candidates must meet the admissions requirements for the elementary or secondary program. C.G.S. candidates must provide a copy of their teaching certificate, official transcripts demonstrating at least 21 undergraduate hours in their subject content area, and three levels of recommendation.
- Candidates must complete key assessments for each course, including an inquiry study, teaming observations, teaching two literacy lessons based on a miscue analysis, and design a unit that includes differentiated middle level instruction. For the unit plan assignment, candidates were required to share their unit plan with classmates, but they did not need to implement the unit with students. Because candidates pursuing a C.G.S. may implement these assignments with their current classroom, there is insufficient focus on working with middle grades students.



- The program assesses candidates' teaching performance using the OPR, which is used across all RIC teacher preparation programs at RIC. Provider leadership acknowledged that multiple versions of the same tool exist, which leads to confusion about expectations. The scoring scale on the most commonly submitted OPR ranges from zero to six and has general performance descriptions for 0 Unacceptable, 1-2 Developing, 3-4 Acceptable, and 5-6 Target. The descriptions are of poor quality and do not help readers understand what expected performance looks like. For example, the description for 3-4 Acceptable is "Effective performance. Meets expectations this [sic] level of TC development." In interviews, candidates and clinical educators noted that the difference between a 3 and 4 are unclear. After reviewing evidence and conducting interviews, it was not clear to the team if and how a summative score is calculated in a meaningful way. Overall, the OPR used in the middle grades program is a poorly designed tool that does not reflect best assessment practices.
- Program faculty shared anecdotes of what they have done when candidates have not met expectations, but there is a lack of evidence of a systemic approach to monitoring and supporting candidate development throughout preparation. It was unclear how the program targets areas where candidates need targeted support and document candidates who meet and do not meet program requirements.
- Although there is some evidence that candidate assessment includes written and oral feedback, the quantity and quality of feedback is inconsistent. Work samples prior to and during practicum included rubric scores but did not always include written feedback or included feedback that was perfunctory in nature.

Recommendations:

- Articulate a clear assessment system that is specific to candidates pursuing a middle grades extension.
- Adopt or adapt performance assessments that are already widely used in Rhode Island and other states. Seek feedback on the selected tool and work with clinical partners to clarify expectations and performance. Hold trainings and calibration sessions to ensure clinical educators and clinical supervisors have a common understanding of performance expectations and can use the tool with fidelity. Share examples of practice with candidates to help them understand what expected performance looks like for each indicator of rubrics.
- Work with clinical partners to find additional opportunities for all candidates to demonstrate proficiency in standards-based instruction, implementing assessments and using data, and documenting impact on student learning within middle grades classrooms.
- Ensure that candidates receive specific and actionable written and oral feedback throughout their program connected to the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards.



3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Approaching Expectations
Candidate performance informs recommendation for certification, but the assessment system is unclear. The recommendation for certification assessment point as implemented does not ensure that only candidates who demonstrate proficiency on the full range of competencies are recommended for certification.	

- Performance-based requirements for candidate progression to certification are unclear; reviewers received conflicting information from different sources. In evidence organizers, program leadership stated that graduate candidates needed to complete the four courses in order to progress to certification and that undergraduate candidates needed to meet expectations on six formal observations, Professional Behavior Indicators, pass the Praxis endorsement test and score a B- or higher on the four middle level courses. During interviews, candidates stated that they needed to meet expectations on four formal observations and score a B- or higher in order to progress to certification.
- The program assesses undergraduate candidate performance prior to certification during their seven-week student teaching in a middle school classroom. C.G.S. candidates complete all clinical experiences in their own classroom, meaning the performance used to inform a programs' recommendation of a candidate for certification is not necessarily based on the candidates' experience working within the middle grades certification area.
- Cut scores on performance measures may be too low to ensure that certification is based on the candidate's demonstrated performance of readiness for day one. The minimum score is a three out of six on each indicator of the OPRs. Program candidates and completers reported and demonstrated gaps in their knowledge and skills yet advanced through the assessment system.

Recommendations:

- Review candidate assessment measures in conjunction with the RIPTS and professional association standards to ensure that measures accurately assess candidate proficiency in all of the knowledge, skills, dispositions, content, and content pedagogy needed to be a successful educator.
- Ensure that the program assesses candidate teaching with middle grades students.
- With district partners, collaboratively assess the authenticity of measures used and the minimum expectations for performance. Adopt or adapt tools that the field is already using or revise the TCWS and OPR to better align with what the field uses. Provide training, facilitate calibration opportunities, and monitor assessment implementation to ensure that assessment results are fair, accurate, and consistent across candidates.



Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program does not survey employers annually. Because of low response rates, data from the most recent survey did not produce actionable information.	

- The FSEHD surveys employers approximately once every four years, with the most recent administration being 2016. Although the survey is constructed to yield actionable information, response rates were too low to produce generalizable results. Program leadership identified the need for stronger return rates on surveys, but did not articulate a plan for improving response rates in the future. Rhode Island College collects feedback approximately once every four years instead of annually.
- In the 2015-16 school year, the aggregate performance of Rhode Island College program completers working in Rhode Island schools was comparable to the aggregate performance distribution for all recent completers in Rhode Island schools. However, this data is shown at the *provider* level instead of the *program* level. Therefore, few conclusions about the effectiveness of completers from the secondary program can be made.

Recommendations:

- Research best practices for survey administration and response rates, and seek feedback from districts about how to improve survey administration and response.
- Determine if there is additional program-level information that the program can gather to provide actionable information even if survey response rates are low.
- Develop a plan for annually administering surveys, analyzing the data in a timely manner, and using the data to improve program performance.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not survey program completers annually. Because of low response rates, the most recent survey did not produce actionable data.	

- The FSEHD surveys program completers approximately once every four years, with the most recent administration being 2016. The survey included information regarding completers' employment outcomes and questions about their perceptions of whether their preparation enabled them to become effective educators. Program leadership identified the need for stronger return rates on surveys, but did not articulate a plan for improving response rates in the future.
- The program did not report any completers for 2014-15 and 2015-16. The program reported four elementary extension completers in 2013-14. One 2013-14 elementary extension completer has gained employment in Rhode Island as a Middle Grades Science Teacher. The program reported three secondary extension completers in 2013-14. Two of the secondary extension completers gained employment in Rhode Island as Middle Grades Science Teachers.



Recommendations:

- Recognize that Component 4.2 is a program-level responsibility. Recent graduates should be viewed as strong sources of information for program improvement. As such, programs should work more closely with completers to maintain lines of communication.
- Research best practices for survey administration and response rates, and seek feedback from districts about how to improve survey administration and response.
- Determine if there is additional program-level information that the program can gather to provide actionable information even if survey response rates are low.
- Develop a plan for annually administering surveys, analyzing the data in a timely manner, and using the data to improve program performance.

Secondary Grades Education Program

The Secondary Grades Education Program includes three pathways: undergraduate (B.A.), graduate (M.A.T.), and the Rhode Island Teacher Education (RITE) Program, which is a teacher licensure non-degree program. Candidates in the undergraduate and RITE pathways may specialize in physics, biology, chemistry, general science, social studies mathematics, or English. Candidates pursuing an M.A.T. may specialize in biology, English, mathematics, or history.

Note: The review team reviewed neither the M.A.T. in history nor the M.A.T. in biology courses of study offered by RIC. RIC did not submit evidence for these courses of study. There are currently no students enrolled in the M.A.T in history program and there has only been one completer in the last three years. As such, the M.A.T. in history and M.A.T in biology do not currently have RIDE approval and may not admit new candidates.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop proficiency in most Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS). Candidates do not always experience a consistent curriculum.	

- At the undergraduate level, all candidates take a common set of 6 education courses that include foundations of education, special education, instructional methods, educational psychology, and content pedagogy. The program culminates with the field practicum in secondary education, student teaching in the secondary school, and the student teaching seminar, all of which are differentiated by content area. Undergraduate candidates studying English take an additional course, SED 445: Methods of Teaching Writing in Secondary Schools.
- Candidates develop proficiency in the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions in most R IPTS. The program expects candidates to apply the R IPTS, at least implicitly, when planning lessons and units during practicum and student teaching. The OPR contains indicators within instruction and environment clusters of the R IPTS. The program assesses candidates’ professionalism through the Disposition Reference Form.



- Candidates studying mathematics develop a deep content knowledge in mathematics as evidenced through syllabi review and interviews (Standard 2).
- Candidates do not experience a consistent curriculum that provides comparable learning opportunities. Secondary education students take a similar sequence of courses but the quality of courses and the placements and practicum differ based on the instructor and the content area. During interviews, candidates shared differing experiences within the same courses and noted that experiences and opportunities to learn varied based on the course instructor and the clinical educator.

Recommendations:

- Review and, as needed, improve candidate experiences across secondary programs to ensure that candidates experience comparable learning opportunities within and across content areas. Create opportunities for faculty teaching different sections of the same course to meet and calibrate syllabi and expectations for students. Develop common syllabi and ensure that course instructors use these syllabi.
- Develop well-planned experiences for students that will help them develop a deep understanding of the RIPTS beginning early in the program and ensure that candidates have an opportunity to practice and receive feedback on their performance implementing the knowledge, skills, and dispositions captured in the RIPTS.

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Approaching Expectations
Candidates take extensive coursework in their field of study but have limited opportunities to develop pedagogical-content knowledge and skills prior to practicum.	

Evidence:

- Programs ensure that candidates take a range of content courses prior to practicum through content class requirements and, at the Master’s level, a transcript analysis. For example, students studying secondary English must take coursework in general literary study, British literature, Shakespeare, American literature, non-western literature, adolescent literature, linguistics/language study, writing theory, and non-print media.
- Candidates studying social studies must take 10 courses including historical methods and United States, Western, and non-Western history. Candidates also take an additional six courses covering political science, geography, anthropology, and economics. However, candidates do not receive sufficient instruction in pedagogy nor experience the range of clinical experiences needed to teach the many subjects addressed in secondary social studies.
- All secondary education candidates submit a content portfolio prior to student teaching as evidence of content proficiency. This portfolio includes original papers as returned by the instructor with instructor’s comments that demonstrate candidate’s best work in the areas covered in the portfolio rubric.
- Secondary education candidates take most of their content courses before taking education courses and do not take content-specific pedagogy courses. Syllabi suggested, and candidates



confirmed, that the content of the courses prior to practicum are not differentiated based on content area. Candidates reported that learning pedagogy with candidates in different content areas was challenging at times, especially when seeking feedback from peers on their instruction. Another interview participant described a “wall before practicum” dividing the six common secondary education courses and the more content-specific learning experiences.

Recommendations:

- Develop earlier and more consistent opportunities to develop proficiency in pedagogical content earlier in the program and prior to practicum.
- When appropriate, differentiate content within the common set of secondary education courses to ensure candidates are proficient in all critical concepts, principles, and practices identified as content competencies for the certification area.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop a general understanding of applicable Rhode Island student standards and develop basic skills in designing lessons that will help students progress towards proficiency in the standards.	

- Candidates develop a general understanding of applicable standards. Course syllabi reference student standards, candidates cited examples of where they learned about the standards and coursework, and clinical educators noted that candidates were knowledgeable of student standards before student teaching. During interviews, candidates reported familiarity with applicable standards (i.e. the Common Core State Standards, the Next Generation Science Standards, and the Rhode Island Grade Span Expectations for Social Studies), but they did not demonstrate a deep understanding of the standards.
- Candidates are required to identify standards as part of lesson planning and as part of their Team Integrated Curriculum Unit. During interviews, candidates demonstrated varied understanding of the importance of using standards to drive lesson planning. However, in practice, some candidates reported using backwards design during lesson planning while others reported that they plan the activities they would like to do and then align it to a standard afterwards.

Recommendations:

- Provide increased and earlier opportunities for candidates to develop an earlier and more consistent understanding of the importance of student standards and how to use student standards to purposefully plan lessons and units.
- Build more opportunities into coursework prior to practicum for students to unpack student standards and develop an understanding of the standards’ expectations of students and progression of expectations across grade levels/bands.



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

- Candidates complete an Infoworks research assignment in a foundational course and complete the Teacher Candidate Work Sample during student teaching. The Infoworks assignment asks students to research the school where they will be tutoring and identify the factors that may influence student achievement. The TCWS and TCMWS require candidates to develop student learning objectives, assess student progress towards those objectives, and reflect on how they would modify their instruction in response to the data.
- Program faculty and candidates reported few other opportunities for candidates to learn about and practice using data. These opportunities seemed inconsistent across pathways and content areas. Examples included a reading miscue analysis and the use of student science notebooks. According to program leadership, candidate performance on assessment-related indicators on the OPR suggest that some candidates are having difficulty incorporating formal and informal assessments into lessons that support lesson objectives.
- Other than the Infoworks assignment, reviewers did not find evidence of candidates learning how to use data or practicing using data from sources other than assessments to improve student learning and instructional practice.

Recommendations:

- Review and revise course syllabi and candidate experiences to ensure that candidates have opportunities prior to practicum and student teaching to develop an understanding of assessment and to learn how to use data to inform instruction. Candidates should have opportunities to gather, analyze, and use data throughout their program.
- Incorporate multiple types and purposes of assessment into coursework across all content areas. Teach candidates how to identify, gather, and analyze data from sources other than assessments to inform student learning and instructional purposes, and provide opportunities for practice beyond the Infoworks assignment.

1.5 Technology	Approaching Expectations
Candidates use a variety of technology systems and tools as a student at Rhode Island College, but they have limited opportunities to develop proficiency in designing, implementing, and assessing digital age learning experiences and assessment to support student learning.	

- The program expects candidates to use technology to access and present information for course assignments (e.g. Infoworks, Chalk and Wire, Blackboard, and Google Classroom). They also use audio and videorecording technology during their microteaching assignment. Course syllabi do not address the application of technology in lessons to support student learning.
- Candidates do not receive sufficient instruction about how to use technology to enhance student learning. Most candidate exposure to using technology occurs during practicum and



student teaching. However, candidate experiences can vary based on the availability of technology in their placements and the skills of the clinical educator. During site visits, reviewers observed candidates using the Smartboard to present information with little actual use of technology of students to learn content. Candidates received perfunctory feedback on their use of technology.

Recommendations:

- Review secondary grades programs that are national models of excellence to identify the technology expectations, course integration, instructional practices, and clinical supports that are effective and successful in preparing teachers to use current and varied technology enhance student learning and outcomes. Review the technology-related indicators of professional organization standards and ensure that course curriculum addresses these indicators.
- Revise the current program curriculum, course instruction, assessments, and clinical experiences to ensure that candidates have sufficient opportunities to learn about varied and effective technology to enhance student learning. Ensure candidates have opportunities to practice and receive feedback on designing and implementing digital age learning experiences throughout their preparation.
- Provide faculty with professional learning or seek outside expertise regarding best practices for using technology in instruction and assessment to support student learning.

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
Candidates have opportunities to reflect on their own biases and develop their own biases and develop basic skills in designing and implementing strategies that are effective when working with English language learners and students with disabilities.	

- Candidates reflect on their own biases in a foundations course through service learning reflections. Candidates also reported learning about what diversity means and how to support diverse learners in FNED 406: instructional Methods, Design, and Technology. One candidate described an exercise when a professor spoke in French the whole class to give candidates an understanding of what it is like to be an English learner and to demonstrate how teachers can use body language and other techniques to communicate with English learners; however, not all candidates reported having the same experience. Candidates also noted that the first month of practicum addresses social justice issues.
- Candidates develop basic skills for working with English language learners and students with disabilities through required educational psychology and a special education courses. In lesson plans, candidates are required to identify accommodations and modifications for students when appropriate. Program leadership identified equity as an area of growth for the program based on employer survey results and faculty input. In an evidence organizer, program leadership noted, “Instruction specifically related to teaching English language learners has also been lacking. Due to the content and teaching requirements of the program, it is not possible to add an ELL methods course.”



- Reviewers did not find evidence that candidates learn specific strategies that are effective with working with families, and they found limited evidence that candidates are required to interact with families. Professional experiences checklists provided in biology and English evidence suggest that teacher candidates are required to call parents or conduct a parent/teacher conference, but candidates reported few if any opportunities to work with parents during student teaching and noted that experiences varied by clinical educator.

Recommendations:

- Incorporate a more consistent emphasis on learning and using effective, research-based strategies for working with English language learners and disabilities. Provide candidates feedback on the effectiveness of their implementation of these strategies and offer opportunities for growth and refinement.
- Teach candidates strategies for working with families in diverse communities and provide systematic opportunities for students to implement these strategies throughout their preparation.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Approaching Expectations
Rhode Island initiatives are somewhat integrated into coursework and candidates develop a general understanding of a few key initiatives	

- Candidates write Student Learning Objectives as part of their Teacher Candidate Work Sample and use InfoWorks in an assignment for a foundational course. However, the SLOs produced by candidates do not reflect RIDE guidance and best practices related to writing SLOs.
- Candidates do not have sufficient opportunities or support to develop, apply, and build proficiency with the Rhode Island initiatives. Although the sample size was very small, employers noted that candidates were not prepared or only somewhat prepared to implement Rhode Island initiatives. Program leadership also noted that candidates need a better understanding of Rhode Island initiatives.

Recommendations:

- Work with clinical partners to review the list of Rhode Island initiatives and identify any other key initiatives, laws, and policies that are relevant to secondary teachers. Review course syllabi and systematically infuse Rhode Island initiatives throughout a candidate’s preparation.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Approaching Expectations
Candidate preparation includes a series of clinical experiences that provide candidates limited opportunities to develop proficiency as secondary teachers.	

- Candidates’ clinical experiences prior to student teaching include a service learning experience, two course-embedded clinical experiences, and a practicum. Candidate activities include tutoring and teaching small groups, observing educators, and teaching a reading or writing lesson. During the practicum, candidates spend time in both middle and high school classes.



Candidates’ clinical preparation meets the minimum hours of field experience prior to student teaching as required by Rhode Island certification regulations.

- During student teaching, candidates spend 14 weeks in a high school placement, which meets the expectations required by Rhode Island certifications. Candidates are required to assume full responsibility of at least three classes for at least four weeks of student teaching. This minimal requirement does not ensure that student teaching simulates the range and intensity of responsibilities of the position for which they are certified.
- Undergraduate secondary candidates who are also seeking a middle grades extension split their student teaching time between a middle grades and secondary placement, with middle grades placements serving double duty as secondary student teaching and a middle grades practicum. Clinical educators reported that this practice did not give candidates sufficient time in either placement. In addition, this practice does not comply with state requirements.
- Interviews with candidates and review of submitted evidence revealed that clinical experiences do not systematically increase in complexity over time. Expectations for candidates during practicum vary based on content area and, in some cases, by course instructor. For example, candidates studying secondary English are required to implement two lessons during practicum but candidates studying secondary science are required to implement eight.
- Reviewers did not find evidence of a system to ensure that candidates experience a range of educational environments that capture the diversity of educational settings for which they will be certified. When asked how candidates are placed, candidates described placement as random and based on which schools are willing to take candidates. Reviewers also expressed concern about whether some of the urban placements (e.g. Classical High School) accurately represented what it is like to teach in an urban school.

Recommendations:

- Collaborate with clinical partners and program completers to revise the progression of clinical experiences and to reset minimum expectations for clinical experiences. Include additional opportunities for candidates to teach in clinical experiences. Structure requirements and experiences to ensure that candidates in student teaching experience the full range and intensity of responsibilities of a secondary teacher for sufficient duration.
- Work with middle grades program leadership to revise program requirements and ensure that undergraduate secondary candidates seeking an extension complete a full student teaching experience within grades 7-12 and then have a separate middle grades practicum.
- Develop a system to track clinical placement and ensure that candidates experience a range of educational environments that capture the diversity of educational settings in Rhode Island.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Approaching Expectations
The program has not fully structured coherent clinical experiences that enable candidates to increasingly demonstrate positive impact on PK-12 students’ learning.	



- Candidate impact on student learning is primarily addressed through the Teacher Candidate Mini Work Sample (TCMWS), Teacher Candidate Work Sample (TCWS), and the Observation and Progress Report (OPR).
- Candidates write a student learning objective as part of the TCMWS and the TCWS. The SLO is not developed in partnership with districts. Candidate SLOs and feedback to candidates on their SLOs do not reflect guidance and best practice related to SLO writing as articulated in RIDE educator evaluation systems.
- Rubrics for the TCMWS and TCWS focus on the quality of the SLO and analysis of data rather than the results of the SLO. The SLO is not scored based on candidate ability to demonstrate student learning.
- The OPR includes expectations that candidates use assessments and engage in reflection after the lesson, but there is no specific indicator focused on whether students achieved the lesson objective or demonstrated growth.
- Feedback to candidates does not focus on measuring student growth. It was not evident in work samples, interviews or other documents that candidates are expected to systematically grow in their ability to impact student learning.
- There was no evidence of analysis of candidate impact on student learning at the program level or when interviewing clinical educators.

Recommendations:

- Review the expectations for partnership including that preparation programs consult with their partners to design coherent clinical experiences that positively impact student learning. Collaborate with partners to establish measures of student learning that are reflective and consistent with what districts use.
- Establish a process to collect data on candidate impact on student learning at multiple points during preparation. Work with clinical educators to review and use the data to help develop the skills of individual candidates and inform program improvement.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program shares some common expectations for performance and uses a single tool for student teaching observations. The program does not have established indicators for partnership effectiveness nor does the program utilize data from those indicators to make partnership decisions to benefit the program or the partner.	

- The Office of Partnerships and Placements primarily leads the outreach and organization of student teaching placements. Partnerships across Rhode Island exist among both LEA leadership and with specific clinical educators. In interviews, reviewers heard that there is a poorly articulated, informal system in place to recruit clinical educators. Recruitment



mechanisms included approaching program graduates and posting a survey of interest on the RIC website.

- Clinical partners and the program do not have clear agreed-upon indicators of their partnerships’ effectiveness. RIC submitted a variety of partnership documents to the review team. Among the documentation were both expired agreements and agreements that did not identify specific benefits or outcomes. In interviews, district partners did not identify annual opportunities to provide input that could help shape and refine their partnership.
- Clinical partners interviewed ranged in their perspective of the placement process. Some districts had proactively systematized the placement on student teachers.
- The program and clinical educators use a common assessment tool to evaluate and provide feedback on candidate performance. Clinical educators utilize the OPR to evaluate candidate performance during practicum and student teaching. Clinical educator OPR data is used to inform candidate progression to student teaching and certification, thus providing clinical educators some input into the decision making process regarding the progression of candidates to certification.
- Analysis of submitted OPR forms revealed minimal, if any, written feedback to candidates. Candidates reported debriefing with clinical educators after observations but noted that some debriefs experiences were more helpful than others. Some candidates noted that the clinical educator and clinical supervisor did not always seem calibrated, with one providing more feedback than the other does.

Recommendations:

- Collaborate with district partners to strengthen partnerships so that they are mutually designed and mutually beneficial. Adopt agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness and analyze data from those indicators.
- Work collaboratively with current and future partners to assume joint responsibility to establish clinical experiences, measure impact on student learning, and establish processes to monitor outcomes and drive program improvement. Calibrate expectations regularly. Adopt or adapt educator performance assessment tools used in districts.
- Identify additional opportunities for clinical educators to have input into decisions about candidate progression within the program.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not systematically share responsibility with its partner to select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain clinical educators that demonstrate effectiveness and have coaching ability to support the development of candidate knowledge and skills.	

- Programs and clinical partners do not identify clear quality criteria for both PK-12 and program-based clinical educators that include at a minimum: demonstration of effectiveness in skills or best practice in the certification area; evidence of positive impact on student learning; ability to



work with adult learners; coaching and supervision skills and ability to evaluate and provide feedback to candidates using program and partner assessments. Evidence regarding criteria for clinical educator selection pointed in many different directions. The FSEHD clinical educator description, FSEHD partnership agreements from 2008-13, and the FSEHD partnership agreements sent on 2016 all articulated different criteria for clinical educators, and no description fully met the minimum criteria articulated in Standard 2.4. For example, the clinical educator description emphasizes highly qualified status rather than educator performance; the 2008-13 partnership agreement states clinical educators should have “above average” evaluation scores; and the 2015-16 partnership agreement says that clinical educators should “qualify as effective educators”. As evidenced in interviews, clinical educators were unaware of how they were selected to work with student teachers.

- Programs and clinical partners do not collaboratively recruit primarily educators who demonstrate effectiveness as teachers, administrators, or support professionals to serve as clinical educators; do not generally prepare them to work with adult learners, in coaching and supervision skills, and in the use of common assessment tools and measures. Programs and clinical partners do not select primarily educators who meet these criteria to serve as PK-12 and program-based clinical educators. RIC invites clinical educators to attend a single three hour training session by the OPP that provides an overview of FSEHD expectations. Specific topics include the OPR, Professional Behavior Indicators, TCWS, and Chalk and Wire. The training introduces the responsibility of the clinical educator and does not include coaching or supervision training. There was no evidence that the training provided opportunities to practice to use the tool or calibration activities to ensure that all clinical educators had shared understanding of the tool. Despite documentation of the training, there was no evidence regarding the overall participation in the training session.
- Programs and clinical partners do not systematically collect and analyze data on the effectiveness of PK-12 and program-based clinical educators and do not make retention decisions based on the evaluation data. The OPP shared a survey for college supervisors that began this academic year. The survey is designed to be completed by the college supervisor about the clinical educator’s collaboration with FSEHD and the early childhood candidate.

Recommendations:

- Collaborate with district partners to establish a clear system for placing candidates that includes the following: notifying districts of upcoming placement needs; recruiting, selecting, training, supporting, and evaluating clinical educators; and using multiple sources of data to inform future placement decisions and changes to clinical experiences.
- With district partners, review the expectations for component 2.4 of the PREP-RI rubric. Revise partnership agreements to include criteria for clinical educators that include the following: attainment of Highly Effective on the most recent educator evaluation, ability to work with adult learners, coaching and supervision skills, and ability to evaluate and provide feedback to candidates using program and partner assessments. As needed, include additional mutually agreed upon criteria.



Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Approaching Expectations
Candidate progression in the program is guided by a performance system, but the system lacks clear criteria, systemic implementation, and emphasis on the ability of the candidate to impact student learning.	

- The program assessment system has four major decision points: readiness for admission, readiness for practicum, readiness for student teaching/internship, and readiness for recommendation for certification.
- The program admits undergraduate candidates based on a cumulative GPA of 2.5 or 2.75 (depending on year), completion of college mathematics requirements, completion of college writing requirements, adequate performance on a basic skills test, completion of FNED 346 with a B- or better, submission of a FNED 346 faculty reference form, and submission of a FNED 346 student learning supervisor form. Each course of study also has a minimum content-area GPA, which, as reported in the Standard 3 Evidence Organizer, ranges from 2.5 in mathematics to 3.0 in English.
- According to the RIC website, the program admits graduate candidates based on the following requirements: a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or higher in undergraduate coursework, the equivalent of an undergraduate major in the content certification area, performance on the Praxis II Content Knowledge test, two disposition reference forms, two letters of recommendation, a statement of educational philosophy, a current resume, an interview with an advisor, and a plan of study approved by the advisor and appropriate dean. However, leadership of the English course of study stated the minimum GPA requirement was 2.75, not 3.0.
- In interviews, candidates reported that the requirements for admission were unclear and that they needed to talk with multiple people and search through the “quagmire” RIC website before finding the information they needed.
- Candidates who do not meet expectations are either denied progression/counseled out or required to take additional actions (e.g. retake courses, submit additional observations, resubmit assignments) prior to progression. Program faculty shared anecdotes of what they have done when candidates have not met expectations, but there is a lack of evidence of a systemic approach to monitoring and supporting candidate development throughout preparation. It was unclear how programs target areas where candidates need targeted support and document candidates who meet and do not meet program requirements.
- The assessment system includes several assessments that candidates must complete during the program such as a content portfolio, the Teacher Candidate Mini Work Sample, the Teacher Candidate Work Sample, and Praxis tests.
- The program assesses candidates’ teaching performance using the OPR, which all RIC teacher preparation programs use. Provider leadership acknowledged that multiple versions of the same tool exist, which has led to confusion about expectations. Within the secondary program, two different versions of the OPR are used—one during practicum and one during student



teaching. The scoring scale ranges from zero to six and has general performance descriptions for 0 Unacceptable, 1-2 Developing, 3-4 Acceptable, and 5-6 Target. The descriptions are of poor quality and do not help readers understand what expected performance looks like. For example, the description for 3-4 Acceptable is “Effective performance. Meets expectations this [*sic*] level of TC development.” In interviews, candidates and clinical educators noted that the difference between a 3 and 4 are unclear. After reviewing evidence and conducting interviews, it was not clear to the team if and how a summative score is calculated in a meaningful way. Overall, the OPR is a poorly designed tool that does not reflect best assessment practices.

- Candidates must score a 3 or better out of 6 on a majority of indicators on the OPR during practicum prior to student teaching and during student teaching prior to certification. The number of observations required during practicum is not consistent across content areas.
- The Teacher Candidate Mini-Work Sample (required prior to student teaching) and the Teacher Candidate Work Sample (required prior to certification) assess candidate’s ability to design standards-based instruction, implement assessments, and document impact on student learning. However, the rubrics focus on goal writing and data analysis rather than actual impact on student learning.
- Although there is some evidence that candidate assessment includes written and oral feedback, the quantity and quality of feedback is inconsistent. Work samples prior to and during practicum and student teaching included rubric scores but did not always include written feedback or included feedback that was perfunctory in nature.

Recommendations:

- Adopt or adapt performance assessments that are already widely used in Rhode Island and other states. Seek feedback on the selected tool and work with clinical partners to clarify expectations and performance. Hold trainings and calibration sessions to ensure clinical educators and clinical supervisors have a common understanding of performance expectations and can use the tool with fidelity. Share examples of practice with candidates to help them understand what expected performance looks like for each indicator of rubrics.
- Work with clinical partners to find additional opportunities for candidates to demonstrate proficiency in standards-based instruction, implementing assessments and using data, and documenting impact on student learning.
- Ensure that candidates receive specific and actionable written and oral feedback throughout their program connected to the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards.



3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Approaching Expectations
The recommendation for certification assessment point aligns generally to certification regulations and professional organization standards but as implemented does not ensure that only candidates who demonstrate proficiency on the full range of competencies are recommended for certification.	

- The program recommends candidates for certification based on candidate performance on the TCWS, OPR, and Professional Behavior Indicators (PBIs). These assessments align to most of the range of pedagogical competencies, content competencies, and field competencies identified in certification regulations.
- The program communicates performance expectations on the TCWS, OPR, and PBIs in course syllabi.
- Clinical educators and clinical supervisors are both responsible for evaluating the performance of candidates. The program requires all candidates to be formally observed thrice by clinical educators and thrice by clinical supervisors using the OPR. The clinical educator and clinical supervisor each complete a Professional Behavioral Indicators form as well.
- Beyond noting that training is offered (but not required) for clinical educators, the program did not provide evidence of how it trains and monitors program faculty to ensure consistent, fair, and accurate assessment decisions.
- While the design of the recommendation for certification assessment points aligns to certification requirements and professional organization expectations, actual implementation of the assessment point does not ensure that only candidates who are recommended for certification meet the full range of the standards. Cut scores on performance measures may be too low to ensure that certification is based on the candidate’s demonstrated performance of readiness for day one. Minimum expected is a three out of six on each indicator of the TCWS, PBIs, and OPRs. Program candidates and completers reported and demonstrated gaps in their knowledge and skills yet progressed through the assessment system.

Recommendations:

- Review candidate assessment measures in conjunction with the RIPTS and professional association standards to ensure that measures accurately assess candidate proficiency in all of the knowledge, skills, dispositions, content, and content pedagogy needed to be a successful educator.
- With district partners, collaboratively assess the authenticity of measures used and the minimum expectations for performance. Adopt or adapt tools that the field is already using or revise current tools to better align with what the field uses. Provide training, facilitate calibration opportunities, and monitor assessment implementation to ensure that assessment results are fair, accurate, and consistent across candidates.



Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program does not survey employers annually. Because of low response rates, data from the most recent survey did not produce actionable information.	

- The FSEHD surveys employers approximately once every four years, with the most recent administration being 2016. Although the survey is constructed to yield actionable information, response rates were too low to produce generalizable results. Program leadership identified the need for stronger return rates on surveys, but did not articulate a plan for improving response rates in the future. FSEHD collects feedback approximately once every four years instead of annually.
- In the 2015-16 school year, the aggregate performance of Rhode Island College program completers working in Rhode Island schools was comparable to the aggregate performance distribution for all recent completers in Rhode Island schools. However, this data is shown at the *provider* level instead of the *program* level. Therefore, few conclusions about the effectiveness of completers from the secondary program can be made.

Recommendations:

- Research best practices for survey administration and response rates, and seek feedback from districts about how to improve survey administration and response.
- Determine if there is additional program-level information that the program can gather to provide actionable information even if survey response rates are low.
- Develop a plan for annually administering surveys, analyzing the data in a timely manner, and using the data to improve program performance. Include partners in the survey analysis to broaden the interpretation of data and to enrich action plans based on the data.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not survey program completers annually. Because of low response rates, the most recent survey did not produce actionable data.	

- The FSEHD surveys program completers approximately once every four years, with the most recent administration being 2016. The survey included information regarding completers' employment outcomes and questions about their perceptions of whether their preparation enabled them to become effective educators. Program leadership identified the need for stronger return rates on surveys, but did not articulate a plan for improving response rates in the future.
- The program reported 30 secondary program completers in 2015-16. Forty-six percent of the 2015-16 completers were employed in 2016-17 using their secondary grades certificate in a Rhode Island school.



Recommendations:

- Recognize that Component 4.2 is a program-level responsibility. The program should view recent graduates as strong sources of information for program improvement. As such, programs should work more closely with completers to maintain lines of communication.
- Research best practices for survey administration and response rates, and seek feedback from districts about how to improve survey administration and response.
- Determine if there is additional program-level information that the program can gather to provide actionable information even if survey response rates are low.
- Develop a plan for annually administering surveys, analyzing the data in a timely manner, and using the data to improve program performance.

Special Education Program

The Special Education Program includes undergraduate (B.S.) and graduate (M.Ed.) pathways. Candidates in the undergraduate pathway may specialize in elementary special education, secondary special education, or severe and intellectual disabilities. Candidates pursuing an M.S. may specialize in early childhood special education, elementary special education, secondary special education, or severe and intellectual disabilities.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop proficiency in most Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS). Candidates do not always experience a consistent curriculum.	

- Per certification requirements, all special education teachers must also hold an early childhood, elementary grades, or secondary grades certificate. As a result, candidates studying special education are either concurrently enrolled in a general education program or already hold a teaching certificate.
- The course of study varies based on pathway and specialty. Total credit hours required range from 30 credits to 35 credits at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Across specialties, undergraduate candidates take the same classes in education foundations, educational psychology, behavior management, language development and communication challenges, and assessment. All graduate candidates take a course on research in special education.
- The program reported that it introduces candidates to the RIPTS early in their program and demonstrate application of the standards throughout the program. The program shared a crosswalk indicating that all three clusters of the RIPTS—instruction, environment, and professionalism—are addressed in multiple courses. However, the crosswalks did not indicate which specific standards are addressed in each course.



- A review of syllabi and interviews with candidates indicated gaps and inconsistencies in preparation, indicating that candidates do not always experience a consistent curriculum. In interviews, candidates shared that their experiences in courses varied based on the instructor of the course. In terms of required coursework, the curriculum does not address local, state, and federal law and procedures related to special education (i.e. regulations, IEPs, eligibility processes) (Standard 11) until late in the program. Undergraduate candidates take a course in behavior management, but not all graduate candidates do (Standard 6).

Recommendations:

- Create opportunities for faculty teaching different sections of the same course to meet and calibrate syllabi and expectations for students. Develop common syllabi and ensure that instructors use the common syllabi.
- Develop well-planned experiences for students that will help them develop a deep understanding of the RIPTS beginning early in the program and ensure that candidates have an opportunity to practice and receive feedback on their performance implementing the knowledge, skills, and dispositions captured in the RIPTS.

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Approaching Expectations
Candidates take extensive coursework in their field of study but have limited opportunities to develop the pedagogical-content knowledge needed as a special educator.	

- The program reports that the program and course of study aligns to the Council for Exceptional Children Initial Standards and cited recent results of its recent Specialized Professional Association Program (SPA) Review, which examined the extent to which submitted evidence addressed the CEC standards. With the exception of secondary special education, which had too few candidates to be reviewed, all special education programs were nationally recognized (B.A. in Elementary Mild/Moderate Disabilities, B.A. in Severe Intellectual Disabilities, and M.Ed. In Severe Intellectual Disabilities) or national recognized with conditions (M.Ed. in Early Childhood Special Education and M.Ed. in Elementary Mild Moderate Disabilities).
- The program provided an analysis of the program courses showing that the program addresses all standards, but the review team noted that the program addresses standards to varying degrees.
- A review of syllabi and candidate interviews indicated that candidates had limited experience writing and implementing lesson plans prior to student teaching (Standard 5). Candidates had extensive experience in Response to Intervention (RTI) but could not speak to specially designed instruction as part of special education services. Candidates often viewed RTI as a mode for special education service delivery and could not articulate the differences and connections between RTI and special education service delivery.
- Although some candidates take courses focused on teaching mathematics to students with disabilities, the review team did not see evidence that candidates were proficient in the



pedagogical content knowledge needed to teach the Common Core State Standards in mathematics (Standard 3). For example, review team members observed candidate use of mathematics language that was not appropriate to the content taught. Concerning English language arts, one candidate reported a lack of confidence related to teaching phonics.

- Review of candidate work samples revealed misunderstandings related to special education services that faculty did not address in feedback to candidates. For example, a candidate used the term intellectually disabled, which is a very specific eligibility category that did not match the student described, and feedback from faculty did not correct the misunderstanding. The review team also noted that lesson plans in work samples did not address speech and language needs even though such needs were identified.

Recommendations:

- Review the course and sequence of content and courses to ensure there are no gaps in student proficiency in the critical concepts, principles, and practices identified in the CEC standards. Review program assessments to ensure that the program assesses candidates and provides candidates with feedback on their proficiency in the CEC standards.
- Revise course syllabi and coursework to include greater emphasis on specially designed instruction and the use of assessments to develop baselines and progress monitor IEP goals. Shift some of the coursework on Response to Intervention to the elementary and secondary education coursework, since all educators would benefit from this knowledge.
- Adjust coursework to include less theory and focus more on teaching candidates research-based strategies for working with students with disabilities.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop a general understanding of applicable Rhode Island student standards and develop basic skills in designing lessons that will help students progress towards proficiency in the standards.	

- The program reports that courses address relevant content standards, but submitted crosswalks did not consistently include the Grade Span Expectations for Social Studies. Some syllabi reference student learning standards, but the program did not provide evidence of how candidates develop a deep understanding of student learning standards and how to use standards to inform planning of special education services.
- Candidates were generally familiar with the Common Core State Standards and were able to articulate the need to connect instruction with the Common Core State Standards.
- Candidates have limited experiences writing and implementing lesson plans prior to student teaching. There is a lack of consistency in expectations for lesson planning. In some classes, candidates needed to create and teach lessons but were not required to write out and submit plans.



Recommendations:

- Provide increased and earlier opportunities for candidates to learn about the importance of student standards and about how to use student standards. Ensure candidates understand that lesson planning should begin with the standard. Include more opportunities for candidates to practice writing lessons plans for students with disabilities that align to student standards and focus on helping students access the general education curriculum.
- Build more opportunities into coursework prior to practicum for students to unpack student standards and develop an understanding of the standards’ expectations of students and progression of expectations across grade levels/bands.

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

- All candidates take at least one course focused on assessment during their course of study. Candidates studying severe intellectual disabilities take three assessment courses. Through assessment courses, candidates develop a general understanding of the principles, concepts, and purposes of assessment and develop basic skills in selecting and implementing assessments.
- Assessment courses emphasize the analysis of data. Candidates learn about displaying data, identifying trend lines, etc. There is less emphasis on the use of data to inform goal setting and to monitor progress.
- The review team noted that candidates are well-grounded in the use of data and assessment related to Response to Intervention (RTI) and Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS). The RTI process and MTSS framework are explicit emphases within coursework. However, candidates did not see the connection between RTI, MTSS, and special education service delivery. In addition, the review team noted that in lesson plans and assignments, data collection and analysis was not an expectation for all lessons.
- Although the emphasis on data related to RTI and MTSS is strength of the program, the review team did not find comparable attention devoted to teaching candidates about the selection of administration of formal special education assessment tools. That said, reviewers found evidence that candidates studying SID gained exposure to alternate assessments, transition assessments, and some formal assessments.

Recommendations:

- Consult district partners to determine if there are assessments that are essential for special education candidates to be able to implement and use to inform instruction. Revise coursework to include additional opportunities for candidates to learn about formal educational testing relevant to special education.
- Incorporate additional instruction and practice opportunities related to the identification and implementation of assessments appropriate to the needs of students with disabilities.



- Include additional opportunities for candidates to use formative assessments to monitor IEP goals and objectives and use curriculum-based measurements to set baselines and write goals.
- Include additional opportunities for candidates to learn about, practice, and receive feedback on the use of other sources of data beside assessments.

1.5 Technology	Does Not Meet Expectations
Candidates use a variety of technology systems and tools as a student at Rhode Island College, but they have limited opportunities to develop proficiency in designing, implementing, and assessing digital age learning experiences and assessment to support student learning.	

- The program expects candidates to use technology to access and present information for course assignments (e.g. Infoworks, Chalk and Wire, Blackboard, etc).
- Most candidate exposure to using technology occurs during practicum and student teaching. However, candidate experiences can vary based on the availability of technology in their placements and the skills of the clinical educator. In interviews, candidates reported that they learned about technology in clinical experiences—not during their classes at RIC. During site visits, one candidate was observed using technology.
- Candidates do not receive sufficient instruction about how to use technology to enhance student learning. Course syllabi do not address the application of technology in lessons with students. Rubrics for class assignments do not address technology. Program leadership acknowledged in submitted evidence that technology was an area for improvement.
- Candidates preparing to work with students with SID reported having experience using low and high tech assistive technology, including augmentative communication devices. However, other candidates studying special education did not have the same level of knowledge or experience working with assistive technology.

Recommendations:

- Review special education programs that are national models of excellence to identify the technology expectations, course integration, instructional practices, and clinical supports that are effective and successful in preparing teachers to use current and varied technology to enhance student learning and outcomes.
- Revise the current program curriculum, course instruction, assessments, and clinical experiences to ensure that candidates have sufficient opportunities to learn about varied and effective technology. Ensure candidates have opportunities to practice and receive feedback on designing and implementing digital age learning experiences throughout their preparation.
- Provide faculty with professional learning or seek outside expertise regarding best practices for using technology in instruction and assessment to support student learning.



1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
Candidates develop skills for working with students with disabilities but experience few opportunities to develop skills for working with English learners and with families in diverse communities.	

- The program identified how it addresses equity throughout the courses of study in submitted evidence, but candidates did not report how the course of study and practicum address equity. Given that the program leads to certification in special education, the program supports students in designing and implementing strategies that are effective with students with disability.
- Program leadership, candidates, and clinical educators acknowledged a lack of emphasis on English learners as a weakness of the program. In an evidence organizer, program leadership noted that addressing the needs of English learners is a focus for the upcoming year. Some courses address strategies for working with English language learners, but candidates reported that working with English learners is not a focus of their program. During an interview, a clinical educator shared that student teachers were placed in self-contained special education classes that included ELL students who were not eligible for special education services; this information is concerning and does not reflect best practice.
- Candidate opportunity to work with families is inconsistent. Some candidates take SPED 440: Collaboration: Home, School, and Community, but a review of the syllabus indicates that the course does not include a strong focus on effective strategies for working with families. The review team noted that candidates pursuing a M.Ed. in Early Childhood Special Education have more opportunities than other candidates to design and implement strategies that are effective when working with families. In an evidence organizer, program leadership self-identified working with families as a program weakness and reported, “Practicum and internship provide a superficial experience in working closely with families often based on school/district wide policies” within the Secondary Special Education program.
- In SPED 415: Early Childhood Developmental Screening and Assessment, candidates complete a Child and Family Assessment Project, where they collect information from a child’s family members and use the information gathered in conjunction with other assessment data to develop a Case Study Report. In sped 561: Understanding Autism Spectrum Disorders, candidates interview a family member and conduct an observation to learn about the experiences of the family and the strengths and needs of a child with a diagnosis of being on the spectrum. Candidates also take SPED 544: Families in Early Intervention Programs: Essential Roles. Key assessments for the course include interviewing a family of a student with a disability to identify a goal or need, collaborating with the family to address the goal or need, and developing a plan of family collaboration for a program that serves young students with disabilities.



Recommendations:

- Incorporate a more consistent emphasis on research-based strategies and best practices related to working with English learners who are eligible for special education. Provide candidates feedback on the effectiveness of their implementation of these strategies and offer opportunities for growth and refinement.
- Teach candidates strategies for working with families in diverse communities and provide systematic opportunities for students to implement these strategies throughout their preparation. Ensure candidates receive coursework and practice opportunities related to parent engagement in the IEP process.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Approaching Expectations
Rhode Island initiatives are somewhat integrated into coursework and candidates develop a general understanding of a few key initiatives	

- Candidates gain exposure to some Rhode Island initiatives. During their coursework, candidates learn about the RTI process and MTSS, which are two important Rhode Island initiatives with implications for special education. As part of their TCMWS and TCWS, candidates write SLOs. However, the SLOs do not align with RIDE guidance or best practice related to writing SLOs.
- Candidate and cooperating interviews reported that candidates have limited familiarity with Rhode Island initiatives. In surveys, recent program completers from the Severe Intellectual Disabilities and Mild Moderate/Severe Intellectual Disabilities certificate areas identified understanding current Rhode Island initiatives, laws, and policies as an area of program improvement. Program leadership described efforts to infuse more Rhode Island educational initiatives into coursework since Spring 2015.
- Candidates have limited opportunities to write IEPs prior to practicum and student teaching. As reported by programs in pre-visit evidence, most courses of study required candidates to write an IEP in only one course prior to student teaching.

Recommendations:

- Work with clinical partners to identify key Rhode Island educational initiatives, laws, and policies. Review course syllabi and systematically infuse Rhode Island initiatives in more than one course.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Approaching Expectations
Candidate preparation includes a series of clinical experiences that provide candidates opportunities to develop proficiency as special educators, but not in a systemic way.	

- Candidates' clinical experiences begin early in their program and include a range of opportunities. During interviews, candidates articulated how their responsibilities within the classroom increased over time. However, candidate experiences are inconsistent; candidates' responsibility for instruction during practicum experiences varies based on placement.



- Candidates in this program meet Rhode Island certification requirements by completing more than 60 hours of field experience prior to student teaching and by completing 12 weeks of student teaching in special education. However, some placements do not align with the certification grade bands. The Elementary Special Education Teacher Certificate applies to grades 1 through 6 only, but the program placed some candidates in prekindergarten classrooms, kindergarten classrooms, and K-2 self-contained classrooms during their clinical experiences.
- Program leadership reported that it assigns candidates to practicum experiences to ensure they have a range of experiences identified based on service delivery model (e.g. resource-based, self-contained) and school/community context (e.g. urban, “schools that support inclusive practice of all students”). However, during interviews, faculty members shared that they struggle to find placements and rely on relationships they have built throughout the state rather than the diversity of location and service delivery model. The review team did not find evidence of a system for tracking candidate placement to ensure that all candidates have a similarly broad range of clinical experiences.

Recommendations:

- Establish a comprehensive system to track the range and diversity of clinical experiences for each candidate. Ensure that all placements, including practicum placements, are in special education settings and that teacher candidates are able to experience the full range of special education delivery models and settings.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Approaching Expectations
The program has not fully structured coherent clinical experiences that enable candidates to demonstrate increasingly positive impact on PK-12 students’ learning.	

- Candidate impact on student learning is primarily addressed through the Teacher Candidate Mini Work Sample (TCMWS), Teacher Candidate Work Sample (TCWS), and the Observation and Progress Report (OPR).
- Candidates write a student learning objective as part of the TCMWS and the TCWS. The SLO is not developed in partnership with districts. Candidate SLOs and feedback to candidates on their SLOs do not reflect guidance and best practice related to SLO writing as articulated in RIDE educator evaluation systems.
- Rubrics for the TCMWS and TCWS focus on the quality of the SLO and analysis of data rather than the results of the SLO. The SLO is not scored based on candidate ability to demonstrate student learning.
- The OPR includes expectations that candidates use assessments and engage in reflection after the lesson, but there is no specific indicator focused on whether students achieved the lesson objective or demonstrated growth.



- Feedback to candidates does not focus on measuring student growth. Candidates learn how to collect data, but the review team did not see how candidates used data to measure impact and further inform instructional planning. It was not evident in work samples, interviews or other documents that candidates are expected to systematically grow in their ability to impact student learning.

Recommendations:

- Review the expectations for partnership including that preparation programs consult with their partners to design coherent clinical experiences that positively impact student learning. Collaborate with partners to establish measures of student learning that are reflective and consistent with what districts use.
- Establish a process to collect data on candidate impact on student learning at multiple points during preparation. Work with clinical educators to review and use the data to help develop the skills of individual candidates and inform program improvement.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program shares some common expectations for performance and uses a single tool for student teaching observations. The program does not have established indicators for partnership effectiveness nor does the program utilize data from those indicators to make partnership decisions to benefit the program or the partner.	

- The Office of Partnerships and Placements primarily leads the outreach and organization of student teaching placements. Partnerships across Rhode Island exist among both LEA leadership and with specific clinical educators. In interviews, reviewers heard that there is a poorly articulated, informal system in place to recruit clinical educators. Recruitment mechanisms included approaching program graduates and posting a survey of interest on the RIC website.
- Clinical partners and the program do not have clear agreed-upon indicators of their partnerships’ effectiveness. RIC submitted a variety of partnership documents to the review team. Among the documentation were both expired agreements and agreements that did not identify specific benefits or outcomes. In interviews, district partners did not identify annual opportunities to provide input that could help shape and refine their partnership.
- Clinical partners interviewed ranged in their perspective of the placement process. Some districts had proactively systematized the placement on student teachers.
- The program and clinical educators use a common assessment tool to evaluate and provide feedback on candidate performance. Clinical educators utilize the OPR to evaluate candidate performance during practicum and student teaching. Clinical educator OPR data is used to inform candidate progression to student teaching and certification, thus providing clinical educators some input into the decision making process regarding the progression of candidates to certification.
- Analysis of submitted OPR forms revealed minimal, if any, written feedback to candidates.



Recommendations:

- Collaborate with district partners to strengthen partnerships so that they are mutually designed and mutually beneficial. Adopt agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness and analyze data from those indicators.
- Work collaboratively with current and future partners to assume joint responsibility to establish clinical experiences, measure impact on student learning, and establish processes to monitor outcomes and drive program improvement. Calibrate expectations regularly. Adopt or adapt educator performance assessment tools used in districts.
- Identify other opportunities for where clinical educators should have input into decisions about candidate progression within the program.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not systematically share responsibility with its clinical partners to select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain clinical educators that demonstrate effectiveness and have coaching ability to support the development of candidate knowledge and skills.	

- Programs and clinical partners do not identify clear quality criteria for both PK-12 and program-based clinical educators that include at a minimum: demonstration of effectiveness in skills or best practice in the certification area; evidence of positive impact on student learning; ability to work with adult learners; coaching and supervision skills and ability to evaluate and provide feedback to candidates using program and partner assessments. Evidence regarding criteria for clinical educator selection pointed in many different directions. The FSEHD clinical educator description, FSEHD partnership agreements from 2008-13, and the FSEHD partnership agreements sent on 2016 all articulated different criteria for clinical educators, and no description fully met the minimum criteria articulated in Standard 2.4 For example, the clinical educator description emphasizes highly qualified status rather than educator performance; the 2008-13 partnership agreement states clinical educators should have “above average” evaluation scores; and the 2015-16 partnership agreement says that clinical educators should “qualify as effective educators”. As evidenced in interviews, clinical educators were unaware of how they were selected to work with student teachers.
- Programs and clinical partners do not collaboratively recruit primarily educators who demonstrate effectiveness as teachers, administrators, or support professionals to serve as clinical educators; do not generally prepare them to work with adult learners, in coaching and supervision skills, and in the use of common assessment tools and measures. Programs and clinical partners do not select primarily educators who meet these criteria to serve as PK-12 and program-based clinical educators. RIC invites clinical educators to attend a single three hour training session by the OPP that provides an overview of FSEHD expectations. Specific topics include the OPR, Professional Behavior Indicators, TCWS, and Chalk and Wire. The training introduces the responsibility of the clinical educator. There was no evidence that the training provided opportunities to practice to use the tool or calibration activities to ensure that all clinical educators had shared understanding of the tool. Despite documentation of the training, there was no evidence regarding the overall participation in the training session.



Recommendations:

- Collaborate with district partners to establish a clear system for placing candidates that includes the following: notifying districts of upcoming placement needs; recruiting, selecting, training, supporting, and evaluating clinical educators; and using multiple sources of data to inform future placement decisions and changes to clinical experiences.
- With district partners, review the expectations for component 2.4 of the PREP-RI rubric. Revise partnership agreements to include criteria for clinical educators that include the following: attainment of Highly Effective on the most recent educator evaluation, ability to work with adult learners, coaching and supervision skills, and ability to evaluate and provide feedback to candidates using program and partner assessments. As needed, include additional mutually-agreed upon criteria.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Approaching Expectations
Candidate progression in the program is guided by a performance system, but the system lacks systemic implementation and emphasis on the ability of the candidate to impact student learning.	

- The program assessment system has three major decision points: readiness for admission, readiness for student teaching/internship, and readiness for recommendation for certification.
- Candidates are admitted to the program based on GPA, candidate references, a professional goals essay, content certification (M.Ed candidates only), and documentation of skills related to the general field of education of individuals with a disability by a recent supervisor. During interviews, some candidates expressed it was challenging to identify admissions requirements and procedures. Candidates reported not receiving answers or receiving erroneous information, which led to the length of time needed to complete their course of study. However, once in the program, the program assigned candidates an advisor.
- In order to progress to student teaching, all candidates must do the following: demonstrate coursework proficiency via GPA and individual course grades, meet expectations on key course assessments, and meet expectations on the OPR for key courses with a practicum. All candidates except those studying early childhood special education must also pass the appropriate Special Education Praxis II exam.
- Candidates are recommended for certification if they meet expectations on four key performance-based assessments: the TCWS, IEP, Professionalism assessment, and 6 OPRs. Candidates studying early childhood do not complete a TCWS and instead complete a comprehensive assessment. In submitted evidence, program leadership stated that the early special education internship is unique in its service delivery model and that the TCWS “utilized by FSEHD is not appropriate.”
- Students who do not meet expectations are either denied progression/counseled out or must complete additional action steps prior to progression. Program faculty shared anecdotes of what they have done when candidates have not met expectations, but there is a lack of



evidence of a systemic approach to monitoring and supporting candidate development throughout preparation. It was unclear how programs target areas where candidates need additional support and document candidates who meet and do not meet program requirements.

- Candidates demonstrate competency on performance-based instruments in the instructional and environmental clusters via the OPR. Unlike other programs, the OPR used in special education is a full rubric with unique performance level descriptors for each criterion. The rubrics vary slightly based upon the certificate area. The OPR instruments used in this program are of higher quality than in other programs.
- The OPR expects candidates to use assessment and reflect on their practice, but positive impact on student learning is not an explicit expectation.
- Stakeholders do not clearly understand or consistently apply candidate performance assessments. Although all major assessments include rubrics with performance-level descriptors, each performance-level descriptor represents a rating band or score band rather than a distinct rating or score. In interviews and documentation, it was not clear how clinical educators and clinical supervisors meaningfully differentiated between ratings and scores.
- The primary assessment for a measuring candidate impact on student learning is the TCMWS and TCWS. These assignments assess the candidate's ability to design standards-based instruction, implement assessments, and document impact on student learning. However, the rubrics focus on goal writing and data analysis rather than actual impact on student learning.
- All candidates in master's-level program must complete a Professional Impact Project, which accounts for 50 percent of the course grade for SPED 648: Interpreting and Developing Research in Special Education. This project requires candidates to design a study, collect data, analyze it, and make recommendations based on findings.
- Although there is some evidence that candidate assessment includes written and oral feedback, the quantity and quality of feedback is inconsistent. Work samples prior to and during practicum and student teaching included rubric scores but did not always include written feedback or included feedback that was perfunctory in nature.

Recommendations:

- Work with clinical partners to find additional opportunities for candidates to demonstrate proficiency in standards-based instruction, implementing assessments and using data, and documenting impact on student learning.
- Ensure that candidates receive specific and actionable written and oral feedback throughout their program connected to the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards.



3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Approaching Expectations
The recommendation for certification assessment point generally aligns to certification regulations and professional organization standards but as implemented does not ensure that only candidates who demonstrate proficiency on the full range of competencies are recommended for certification.	

- The program recommends candidates specializing in elementary mild/moderate disabilities, secondary mild/moderate disabilities, and severe and intellectual disabilities for certification based on acceptable performance on the TCWS, OPR, IEP, and a Professionalism Entry Rubric. These assessments align to most of the range of pedagogical competencies, content competencies, and field competencies identified in certification regulations.
- The program recommends candidates specializing in early childhood special education for certification based on acceptable performance on the Praxis II Special Education: Preschool/Early Childhood test, the OPR, Professional Performance Indicators, and a comprehensive examination. These assessments align to most of the range of pedagogical competencies, content competencies, and field competencies identified in certification regulations.
- The Student Teaching/Internship syllabi describe key assessments but do not always specify minimum expectations to be recommended for certification. The Exit Portfolio Guidelines for candidates specializing in elementary mild/moderate disabilities and secondary mild/moderate disabilities includes assessment instructions and copies of rubrics used to assess candidate work quality. The guidelines specify cut scores for the TCWS but not for other assessments.
- Clinical educators and clinical supervisors are both responsible for evaluating the performance of candidates. At a minimum, all candidates must be formally observed thrice by clinical educators and thrice by clinical supervisors using the OPR, and one of the observations is jointly done by the clinical educator and clinical supervisor. (Candidates specializing in severe intellectual disabilities must have two joint observations).
- Beyond noting that training is offered (but not required) for clinical educators, the program did not provide evidence of how it trains and monitors program faculty to ensure consistent, fair, and accurate assessment decisions. When describing the monitoring process, program faculty said someone from each program reviews scores in Chalk and Wire and, if a particular score standards out, talks to people involved. However, it was not clear what systemic procedure was in place or what types of action steps the program would take.

Recommendations:

- Review candidate assessment measures in conjunction with the RIPTS and professional association standards to ensure that measures accurately assess candidate proficiency in all of the knowledge, skills, dispositions, content, and content pedagogy needed to be a successful educator.
- With district partners, collaboratively assess the authenticity of measures used and the minimum expectations for performance. Adopt or adapt tools that the field is already using or revise current tools to better align with what the field uses. Provide training, facilitate



calibration opportunities, and monitor assessment implementation to ensure that assessment results are fair, accurate, and consistent across candidates.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program does not survey employers annually. Because of low response rates, data from the most recent survey did not produce actionable information.	

- The FSEHD surveys employers approximately once every four years, with the most recent administration being 2016. Although the survey is constructed to yield actionable information, response rates were too low to produce generalizable results. Program leadership identified the need for stronger return rates on surveys, but did not articulate a plan for improving response rates in the future. FSEHD collects feedback approximately once every four years instead of annually.
- In the 2015-16 school year, the aggregate performance of Rhode Island College program completers working in Rhode Island schools was comparable to the aggregate performance distribution for all recent completers in Rhode Island schools. However, this data is shown at the *provider* level instead of the *program* level. Therefore, few conclusions about the effectiveness of completers from the special education program can be made.

Recommendations:

- Research best practices for survey administration and response rates, and seek feedback from districts about how to improve survey administration and response.
- Determine if there is additional program-level information that the program can gather to provide actionable information even if survey response rates are low.
- Develop a plan for annually administering surveys, analyzing the data in a timely manner, and using the data to improve program performance. Include partners in the survey analysis to broaden the interpretation of data and to enrich action plans based on the data.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not survey program completers annually. Because of low response rates, the most recent survey did not produce actionable data.	

- The FSEHD surveys program completers approximately once every four years, with the most recent administration being 2016. The survey included information regarding completers' employment outcomes and questions about their perceptions of whether their preparation enabled them to become effective educators. Program leadership identified the need for stronger return rates on surveys, but did not articulate a plan for improving response rates in the future.



Recommendations:

- Recognize that Component 4.2 is a program-level responsibility. The program should view recent graduates as strong sources of information for program improvement. As such, programs should work more closely with completers to maintain lines of communication.
- Research best practices for survey administration and response rates, and seek feedback from districts about how to improve survey administration and response.
- Determine if there is additional program-level information that the program can gather to provide actionable information even if survey response rates are low.
- Develop a plan for annually administering surveys, analyzing the data in a timely manner, and using the data to improve program performance.

Administrator Certification Areas: Findings and Recommendations

Building Level Administrator Program

The Building Administrator Program is a graduate program that leads to an M.Ed. in Educational Leadership.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum addresses some but not all aspects of the Rhode Island Standards for Educational Leadership (RISEL), focusing primarily on the areas of curriculum and instruction.	

- The Building Administrator Program is a cohort-based, two-year program designed to prepare prospective school principals. Program candidates complete four semesters of coursework, and an additional course in the intervening summer. Candidates complete two supervised internships (one per year).
- The program is primarily organized by courses that focus on topics such as leadership skills, instruction and assessment, research, equity, school law, supervision, and leading for change. Course syllabi include specific requirements that candidate must meet to successfully complete each course as well as indications of which RISEL standards and indicators reflect specific requirements of the course.
- The program reported that the curriculum for the building administrator program fully aligns to the RISEL. The program also reported that candidates learn about and develop proficiency in the standards through course assignments and projects, readings, case studies, class and internship experiences, and through key assessments throughout the program.
- The program curriculum is structured so that candidates experience a consistent curriculum across cohorts and program courses. Two faculty members teach all but one of the courses, which promotes a consistent curriculum.



- A limitation of the program curriculum is that it consistently emphasizes certain aspects of the RISEL at the expense of other areas of the standards. Whereas the program provides extensive exposure and emphasis on curriculum and instruction, the program provides limited opportunities and emphasis on the principal as supervisor, the principal as building manager, and the principal as a leader who connects the school to the community, other stakeholders, and policy-makers.
- Interviews, observations, and candidate work samples demonstrate that candidates have limited knowledge and familiarity with the RISEL. When candidates referenced standards, they most commonly discussed the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium standards, which are no longer current.

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program curriculum does not provide candidates opportunities to engage the full range and depth of the professional standards, the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL).	

- The program reported that the course of study is designed and implemented to provide candidates opportunities to experience and develop proficiency in the full range of the professional standards. The program reported that the program aligns to the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) Standards. When review team members asked building administrator program leadership for a copy of the SPA report, program leadership failed to provide the report.
- The program did not report alignment to the ISLLC standards, but candidates most frequently cited the ISSLC standards. This discrepancy is perhaps supported by an outdated text that is required for program coursework that focuses on the 2007 ISLLC Standards and which was referred to as a program ‘bible.’
- In addition to confusion related to standards, a critical limitation of the program design is the absence of required leadership experiences and performances that all candidates must demonstrate proficiency in during the program. The program provides a list of sample activities and leadership practices but has not defined or articulated the baseline practices and proficiencies that are required of all candidates to complete the program.
- Candidates reported, and a review of candidate work supported, that the focus of a candidate’s leadership work and experiences during the program was often a result of their placement, their current role, and the needs of the school, rather than the full range of experiences necessary for prospective building administrators. In some instances, candidates completed the program focusing primarily on one or two areas of school leadership while others completed the program focusing on tasks with limited rigor such as leading student clubs, supervising bus duty, and administrative tasks.



- Candidates, program completers, and clinical supervisors reported gaps in the program curriculum in areas such as budgeting, the use of technology for school leaders, school-wide data analysis, and meeting the needs of students and families from diverse backgrounds.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
The program supports candidates to develop basic skills in the use of student learning standards expected of school leaders to help students and schools improve.	

- Program candidates are required to be certified teachers to gain admission to the program. As such, prospective candidates enter the program with some degree of knowledge and expertise in the area of student learning standards.
- While the program uses several measures at admissions to assess candidate preparedness (interviews, letters of recommendations, GPAs, a professional evaluation), it does not conduct a deep analysis of candidate’s knowledge of student learning standards. The program did not provide evidence that it provides opportunities for candidates to develop a deep and working knowledge of student learning standards consistent with the role of school principal.
- The program and several candidates reported that the Professional Impact Project is an opportunity for candidates to demonstrate how they work in schools and with faculty to focus on student learning standards. A review of the projects demonstrated a focus on creating structures such as professional learning communities and curriculum mapping projects, but did not directly show how leaders were trained and supported to lead faculty to make positive impacts on student learning.

1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Does Not Meet Expectations
Candidates demonstrated a limited understanding and ability to collect, analyze, and use data to improve student learning expected of school leaders.	

- The Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation require that prospective school administrator programs focus candidate preparation on the following areas of data-driven instruction and practice: developing a deep understanding of assessment, developing proficiency in using assessment data, using data from sources other than assessments, and developing proficiency in using school level data. The program provided evidence that it focuses only on the first requirement: data-driven instruction and practice.
- The program focuses on data-driven instruction and practice though the following: four courses in the areas of the alignment of curriculum and assessment, an assignment focused on developing a schedule that maximizes student learning; and the Professional Impact Project. Through each of these learning experiences, the program emphasizes collecting data through observation, interviews, supervision, and curriculum alignment.
- The program provided little evidence of a curricula or field-based focus on quantitative data sources such as academic, social-emotional, and community resources, how to collect, analyze and use this data, and how to involve others in the school and community in the process of data analysis and use. The program also did not provide evidence of explicit instruction, training, and



supervision to develop proficiency in the collection and use of data for student and school improvement.

- While some candidates may emphasize the use of data in their Professional Impact Projects or through field-based leadership activities, others may not due to their preferences, their current roles in the school, the predispositions of the clinical supervisor, and the needs of the particular school.

1.5 Technology	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not support or require candidates to develop proficiency or regularly use effective and varied technology as school leaders.	

- The program reports that technology is an essential tool for school leaders and offers examples of several technologies and tools that should be common practice for building principals. These examples include the following: communicating through blogs, texts, and tweets; using various devices and hardware such as smartboards, iPads, and radios; and using technology to present information.
- The program did not provide evidence of how it explicitly instructs candidates in the various technologies expected of school leaders and their use. The program also did not provide evidence of how it meets the technology expectations of the professional standards for school leaders or the ISTE standards.
- Candidates reported that technology use is discussed in some classes but at an abstract level and not with sufficient support, practice, and accountability to ensure that candidates learn and develop habits of leadership supported by varied technology.
- A review of candidate work and reports from interviews and observations showed that the primary use of technology was to share information through various presentation formats and software. The review team did not see evidence of using technology to analyze and share data, to connect with families and communities, or to lead faculty to develop proficiency and comfort.
- Candidates who excelled in using technology in their clinical experiences reported that they entered the program with this expertise rather than developing it through specific program learning experiences.

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum prioritizes exposing candidates to issues of equity and diversity but does not ensure that candidates are prepared to be effective school leaders of diverse students and their families.	

- The program places a strong emphasis on developing awareness of issues of equity and diversity. Several courses in the program—including those focused on ethics and accountability, education policy, and law—discuss diversity, but do so with limited depth.



- Candidates reported that equity and issues of diversity in schools are emphasized and that program faculty work with candidates to help candidates develop a sense of self and a sense of other cultures and worldviews that they will encounter in their schools.
- The review team observed the emphasis on awareness throughout the program through a review of syllabi and candidate work. The review team did not observe or see evidence of a similar emphasis on supporting candidates to develop specific practices and strategies to use as school leaders of diverse schools, students, and their families.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not ensure that candidates are proficient in serving as school leaders consistent with key Rhode Island initiatives, laws, and policies.	

- In response to this component, the program reported that school leaders should be ethical, professional, knowledgeable and capable of improving school performance. The program continued that “LEAD students experience the importance of this ideal in LEAD 505, where they review and critique a district and school’s strategic plan, [develop] a schedule that maximizes student learning, model various conferencing styles and [engage in] teacher observations and supervision experiences.”
- The program did not reference within this expectation any specific Rhode Island initiative or education policy that should be a priority to building administrators. This absence of focus was equally evident in course materials, candidate work samples, and in interviews with candidates and program faculty. Educator evaluation, a priority for school leaders, also was not a program priority in either its understanding or implementation.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not ensure that candidates have comprehensive and varied clinical experiences sufficient to develop the skills and expertise to serve as new school leaders.	

- The field-based component of the program focuses on two 150 hour, semester-long internship experiences, one occurring each year of the program. Program candidates also complete specified tasks as part of required field assignments, six hours and fifteen hours respectively, as part of two additional courses in which candidates shadow students, faculty, and administrators.
- There are several inherent and fundamental limitations of the internship structure and process. Candidates complete all their field placements in their place of employment, thus precluding them from practicing in varied settings and grade levels. Candidates do not assume the full role and responsibility of building principal; rather they complete “contact time related to the internship and activities,” which candidates and clinical faculty reported are insufficient to prepare school leaders. As practicing and employed teachers, candidates look for windows of opportunities to compile contact time such as before or after school or during planning times, none of which are ideal opportunities to practice and assume the role of school leader.



- While already mentioned above, another structural limitation in the internship experience is that there is no expected or required area of learning for all field placements and across all candidates. The program provides candidates with a sample list of learning activities and advises candidates to select their own field-based learning activities in consultation with their clinical supervisor. As a result, candidate experiences during their field placements vary considerably in the depth and rigor.
- A further limitation of the clinical experience is that the focus of many candidates' internship is based on their current role or an extension of their current role, rather than the full range of expectations for building administrators. Candidates who are special education specialists or instructional coaches tend to focus their field placement work on issues of special education or instructional practices, rather than how to become a fully prepared school leader.
- Program leadership reported the internship portfolio is a critical learning process and outcome of the internship experience. This was not evident to the review team based on reviews of candidate portfolios. The portfolios resembled a list of required paperwork and steps to document internship completion rather than field-based learning or the coherence and application of course-based learning with field-based learning and growth.
- Candidates, program completers, and clinical faculty reported structural limitations in the internship experience that precluded candidates from practicing across the full range of the expectations of the professional standards.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program did not provide evidence of how it works with its clinical partners to ensure that candidates increasingly demonstrate positive impact on student learning.	

- The program reports that having a positive impact on student learning should be a priority of “everything we do in the field of education” and an emphasis of the program. The program also reports that it particularly views the role of the building principal to improve instructional practice as important leverage to improve student learning. The program did not provide evidence to support this assertion or that it provides learning and field placement experiences that ensure candidates develop these capacities.
- Candidates are required to shadow and observe teachers during a field placement to help teachers better impact student learning, but they are provided limited guidance or support in how to do this, how to provide critical feedback, and if their feedback and observations were accurate. Often it appeared that the observations were conducted without supervision thus furthering the possibility of inaccurate or inconsistent observations and feedback.
- Candidates are required to conduct a needs assessment as part of the Professional Impact Project, but the nature and variety of the projects do not ensure that candidates emphasize impact on student learning or the improvement of instruction for this substantial component of their field placements.
- The program did not provide evidence that it works with clinical partners to determine the expectations for candidate impact on student learning or that it collects and uses either as a



program or in conjunction with clinical partners data from impact on student learning to improve the program or clinical experiences.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Does Not Meet Expectations
--	-----------------------------------

The program does not have partnerships with schools and districts; it requires candidates to develop placements and partnership on their own.	
---	--

- The Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation clearly establish the expectation that “approved partners form mutually beneficial PK-12 and community partnership arrangements for clinical preparation.” The Standards also define specific aspects of these partnerships such as shared expectations, evaluating the effectiveness of partnerships, and using data to improve partnerships. In response to this component, the program reported, “by design, LEAD program candidates have the responsibility to find their own clinical partnerships” which must be approved by LEAD supervisors. The program did not provide countervailing evidence or justification for its abdication of this critical programmatic responsibility.
- The only evidence the program provided for this component was a partnership agreement form that clinical supervisors signed. The form specified basic internship requirements for candidates such as expected hours, suggested activities a candidate could complete during internship, and basic supervisory responsibilities. Notably, the form was last revised in 2006 and was based on the no-longer current ISLLC Standards.
- The program reported that it requires clinical faculty to supervise and evaluate candidates several times during the course of the internship. The program did not provide evidence beyond specifying a limited number of meetings and discussions of how it works with the clinical educators to ensure they fully understand assessment instruments, provide consistent feedback, and integrate clinical input into decisions about candidate progress.
- The program did not provide evidence of how it works with clinical partners to ensure that there was a shared expectation for candidate performance, that clinical educators and partners supported candidates with consistent feedback, and that clinical partners were integrated into progression decisions in the assessment system.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Does Not Meet Expectations
-------------------------------	-----------------------------------

The program does not accept or acknowledge the responsibility to select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high quality clinical educators.	
--	--

- The program provided the following response to the expectations of this component: “Materials for recruitment (selection and training of clinical educators) are not necessary in the LEAD Program as the candidates are required to acquire an on-site supervisor as part of the leadership experience. Then the on-site supervisors are approved by the LEAD Program if they hold an Rhode Island or MA public school administrator license. It is also necessary that they are able to mentor the LEAD Program student in the area of administration that the student is interested in.”
- The program reported that it only evaluates the clinical educators on their completion of the specified terms of their supervision agreement – did they complete the correct forms, attend



the right meetings, and the like. The program does not evaluate clinical educators on the quality of their supervision, their practice in relations to the professional standards, or their ability to advance candidate growth and support a positive impact on student learning.

- The program reported that it is the responsibility of clinical educators to ensure candidates engage in diverse learning experiences during the internship, but it did not provide evidence how it communicates, articulates, and monitors this expectation. Clinical supervisors reported they did not always understand the expectations of the program nor receive support to ensure they were met and that they received little if any training for their roles.
- The quality of clinical placements, supervision, and rigorous learning opportunities varied considerably across placement sites due in part to the program not accepting responsibility to ensure field placements and clinical educators that meet established quality criteria.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program assessment system is a framework that is based on the professional standards but lacks the rigor, complexity, and depth to ensure that candidates develop proficiency as school leaders	

- Candidate admission and progress throughout the program are based on specified criteria and assessments. The program admits candidates based upon such criteria as evidence of meeting GPA requirements, teacher certification, professional reference, and impact on students.
- Candidates progress to the readiness for internship point by completing coursework and course assignments and meeting a minimal grade requirement of B. The required course assignments necessary to advance to the internship focus on curriculum mapping and analysis, the nature of assessment, case studies, and starting to develop a program portfolio.
- Beyond the readiness for internship decision point, candidate assessment is based on the completion of courses, course projects, and the continuing development of a program portfolio. The courses and course assignments emphasize knowledge of the field and leadership theory as well as the analysis and reflection of leadership activities. Since candidates select their own leadership activities to engage in, candidates are not assessed on consistent or specified areas of leadership knowledge and understanding.
- The program only assesses candidate performance as prospective school leaders through an internship evaluation instrument used by the clinical supervisor and program faculty six times during the internship. The program reports that the intern evaluation ensures that candidates demonstrate proficiency in the full range of the standards but evidence was not provided regarding how this form is used, how clinical and program faculty are trained and calibrated to use this form, and how this form is used to determine candidate progress.
- Candidates and clinical educators report that the program faculty members are readily available and responsive to questions and issues that arise. The candidates also reported that they felt very supported by program faculty and their clinical educators. The program did not provide evidence of expectations for consistent, standards-based feedback that would ensure



candidates develop proficiency in the professional standards based on rigorous public and consistent expectations for candidate performance. .

3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Does Not Meet Expectations
The assessment system does not ensure that candidates are recommended for certification based on developing proficiency in the full depth and breadth of the RISEL standards.	

- The program identified three criteria that candidates must meet to be recommended for certification as a building administrator: exemplary candidate performance in all courses, on the licensure test, and on the program portfolio.
- The program did not specify what constitutes exemplary performance on these criteria, how candidate performance across the three criteria are combined to determine a recommendation decision, nor justify that these criteria ensure the recommended candidates have demonstrated that they are proficient in the actual practice and performance of school leaders for each component of the professional standards.
- While the program clearly communicates the expectations of the assessment system to ensure the assessment system is transparent, the system does not ensure that as candidates complete internship projects, course assignments, and complete the portfolio and licensure tests that candidates are knowledgeable of the professional standards and expectations and prepared to be effective school leaders on day one.
- Clinical educators are not trained adequately in the assessment system nor are they evaluated and supported to ensure that they provide consistent standards-based feedback and assessment of candidate performance.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program does not survey employers annually. Because of low response rates, data from the most recent survey did not produce actionable information.	

- The FSEHD surveys employers approximately once every four years, with the most recent administration being 2016. Although the survey is constructed to yield actionable information, response rates were too low to produce generalizable results. Program leadership identified the need for stronger return rates on surveys, but did not articulate a plan for improving response rates in the future. Rhode Island College collects feedback approximately once every four years instead of annually.
- In the 2015-16 school year, the aggregate performance of Rhode Island College program completers working in Rhode Island schools was comparable to the aggregate performance distribution for all recent completers in Rhode Island schools. However, this data is shown at the *provider* level instead of the *program* level. Therefore, few conclusions about the effectiveness of completers from the secondary program can be made.



4.2 Employment Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not effectively or regularly seek input from program completers for program improvement.	

- As stated above, the program reported the FSHEd has been responsible for conducting surveys of program completers and, as with the employer surveys, these are done on an inconsistent basis, at times with large gaps in between surveys.
- The program provided evidence of survey results from six individuals, five from the educational leadership program and one from an individualized educational leadership program. The size of the survey responses and the infrequency of the information collected limit their usefulness and validity for program improvement efforts.
- As with the employer survey, the program reported that it intends to expand its collection of information from all program completers; however, the program did not provide evidence of efforts to conduct this process or how it intends to use this information.

Support Professional Certification Areas: Findings and Recommendations

Reading Specialist Program

The Reading Specialist Program is a graduate program that leads to an M.Ed. in Reading.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Not Applicable
Rhode Island does not have state-specific standards for the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for support professionals (reading specialists, school counselors, and school psychologists).	

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum provides candidates opportunities to develop proficiency in most, but not all of the critical concepts, skills, and proficiencies expected of reading specialists.	

- The Reading Specialist Program is a 36 credit hour program comprised of ten three credit courses and a six credit summer reading clinic. Candidates typically complete the program in a part-time basis and typically complete the program in three to four years.
- The program reports that the program and course of study aligns to the 2010 International Literacy Association (ILA) Standards. The program provided an analysis of the program courses showing that the program addresses all ILA standards, often in multiple courses. The program also reported that an indication of the effectiveness of the program is the pass rate for the state licensure test for program completers, 100% of candidates passed this assessment since 2012.
- The program curriculum provides candidates sufficient opportunities to develop proficiency in the ILA standard areas of foundational knowledge, curriculum and instruction, and assessment



and evaluation. Areas of the standards that were less well-represented and with which candidates were less proficient were diversity and professional leadership and learning.

- Candidates and program completers generally reported that they felt well-prepared for their roles as prospective and current reading specialists while acknowledging some gaps in their preparation, particularly in the areas of meeting the needs of diverse learners and the effective use of technology. During interviews, candidate responses indicated limited awareness and understanding of the ILA Standards.
- The program reported that there are no major programmatic or curricula components of the program that merit improvement—only the need for additional resources. However, the program did not provide evidence that it has conducted an analysis or evaluation of the program curriculum, assessment system, or clinical experiences in the last five years ensuring the current effectiveness of the program.

Recommendations:

- Review the course and sequence of content and courses to ensure there are no gaps in student proficiency in the critical concepts, principles, and practices identified in the ILA standards. Review program assessments to ensure that the program assesses all candidates and provides candidates with feedback on their proficiency in all ILA standards.
- Engage district partners in additional conversations about potential gaps in candidate content knowledge and pedagogy and implement changes to the course of study that aim to address such gaps.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum does not provide candidates sufficient opportunities to develop a deep understanding of student learning standards applicable to their certification area.	

- The program provided evidence that some of the program courses reference student learning standards embedded in the ACEI standards, but the program did not provide evidence of how it aligns to or supports candidates to develop a deep understanding of student learning standards appropriate for a reading specialist such as the Common Core state standards.
- The program curriculum provides candidates with a general understanding of the program quality and student services standards embedded in the ILA that are designed to ensure that prospective reading specialists can meet the needs of PK-12 students and provide effective reading and support services.
- Reading specialist candidates are required to be certified teachers to gain admission to the program. As such, prospective candidates enter the program with some degree of knowledge and expertise in the area of student learning standards based on their previous roles and certification areas.



- During the admission process the program does not review or determine a candidate’s knowledge and understanding of student learning standards.

Recommendations:

- Conduct an analysis of current full-range of PK-12 student learning standards expected of Rhode Island students. Determine which Rhode Island student learning standards are applicable to the reading specialist program and certification area and should be incorporated into program curriculum and learning opportunities.
- Determine the appropriate role for student learning standards in both the admissions process and program curriculum. Establish a process for assessing candidate awareness of student learning standards from their previous roles and the expectations for reading specialists.
- Revise the program curriculum, courses, assessments, and clinical experiences to ensure that program completers have a deep understanding of the student learning standards that are necessary for reading specialists to support students to attain these standards.

1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
The program provides candidates sufficient opportunities to develop proficiency in assessing and using student-level data but does not provide an equally sufficient focus on school-level data.	

- Program candidates have numerous opportunities to learn about and develop proficiency in using a variety of assessments to collect data on student performance and reading challenges. This includes standardized assessments, individual designed assessments, pre and post-test practices, and formative assessment practices.
- Candidates also develop proficiency in using the data from various assessments to develop and implement appropriate reading strategies and supports to develop student reading skills.
- Candidates and program completers reported that the strategies they learned in their courses and their opportunities to practice in clinical experiences prepared them to meet the needs of students on an individual and one-by-one basis.
- The program recently added a course focusing on the reading specialist as an academic coach to work with colleagues to support the development if student reading and writing skills. A goal of the course is that candidates will learn to lead other teachers to evaluate individual, classroom, and school-wide data to make instructional and support decisions.
- The coaching course appears to be an important addition to the program. Candidates also reported on the benefit of this added focus. However, the course alone, coming late in the program sequence, does not adequately provide candidates sufficient time, awareness, or opportunity to meet the full expectations of this component, particularly school-wide data.

Recommendations:

- Review the expectations of the ILA standards in the area of assessment and evaluation and leading and learning to identify the expectations and practices for the effective collection, analysis, use, and communication of school-wide student learning data.



- Revise the current program curriculum, courses, assessments, and clinical experiences to integrate based on the review. Include in the program curriculum a focus on school-wide data, including actual candidate instruction and practice in how to analyze, use, and communicate data to multiple audiences for instructional improvement and advanced student learning.

1.5 Technology	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program curriculum and faculty does not prioritize the use of technology for reading specialists nor ensure that candidates develop proficiency in this area.	

- The program’s response to this component stated, “Candidates are required to use new technologies throughout their coursework. The following grid demonstrates the activities in which candidates participate and how they are assessed.” The program then provided a list of activities and assessments that require and monitor candidate use of technology.
- The expected use of technology by candidates in the activities and assessments focuses on using presentations to share information, using the internet to conduct research, and to use a variety of on-line resources when developing lessons and strategies.
- A review of course syllabi and materials, as well as interviews with candidates, program completers, and program faculty indicated that the program curriculum provided limited opportunities for candidates to learn about and practice the use of multiple technologies expected of reading specialist. Program faculty reported that technology was not a priority for the program and not as important and candidates learning effective reading strategies and reflecting on their practice.
- Candidates and program completers reported that an area in which they struggled as new and prospective reading specialists was in the use of varied technology, digital resources, 21st century communication practices, and hardware and software that could support them as they work to improve student reading skills.

Recommendations:

- Review the current expectations for the use of technology in the ILA standards, the RIPTS, and other professional standards such as the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) Standards.
- Review reading specialists programs that are national models of excellence to identify the technology expectations, course integration, instructional practices, and clinical supports that are effective and successful in preparing reading specialists to use current and varied technology to better accomplish the work and goals of 21st reading specialists.
- Revise the current program curriculum, course instruction, assessments, and clinical experiences to ensure that candidates have sufficient opportunities to learn about varied and effective technology and to practice with support how to integrate technology into practice. Ensure that the program assesses candidates and provides feedback on the use of technology. Ensure



candidates have appropriate opportunities to practice and use technology in clinical experiences.

- Determine if there is sufficient expertise among the current program faculty to complete these recommendations regarding appropriate technology for reading specialists; if there is not current capacity, seek outside expertise.

1.6 Equity	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program provides superficial exposure to issues of diversity and equity and does not support reading specialists to develop the proficiencies necessary to meet the needs of diverse students and families.	

- The program reports that candidates are “introduced” to issues of equity throughout the program. As evidence, the program provided a list of readings and activities that candidate must complete that focus on diverse learners.
- Program candidates are also required to tutor “two adolescent minority students” two to three times during the program in clinical experiences that occur in pullout sessions on the college campus.
- The program has recently added a course, READ 507: Teaching Reading and Writing to ESL Students, which focuses on preparing reading specialists to meet the needs of students for whom English is not the primary language.
- The program did not provide evidence of how the strategies focused on in READ 507 were integrated into and throughout the program curriculum. Nor did the program provide evidence of how it prepares and support candidates to meet the needs of diverse students and their families beyond language diversity such as students with disabilities and students from other diverse backgrounds such as race, sexual orientation, gender identify, and national origin.
- Candidates and program completers reported that the program provided them with limited preparation and skills to work with diverse students and their families. Program faculty reported that it expects candidates to develop the skills and capacity to work with diverse learners and their families “with experience during their careers.”
- While not specifically a curriculum issue, the make-up of the program faculty and candidates and the structure of the clinical experiences further limits candidates’ ability to reflect on their own biases and develop a deeper awareness of other worldviews. Program faculty and candidates are exclusively white/Caucasian. Candidates do not conduct field experiences in diverse settings but in clinics created on the college campus or in their current places of employment. As a result, a candidate felt empowered to wonder why candidates had to learn to work with diverse students since there was little diversity in the candidate’s current school.



Recommendations:

- Review the current expectations for meeting the needs of diverse students and their families in the ILA standards, the RIPTS, and the FSEHD Conceptual Framework.
- Review the current program curriculum, courses, course instruction, assessments, and clinical experiences to identify gaps and missed opportunities to integrate and prioritize issues of equity, diversity and meeting the needs of students and families from diverse backgrounds.
- Identify partners within the Rhode Island College community and beyond that can help the program prioritize and intentionally integrate issues of equity and diversity throughout the program.
- Examine the current field experience structure of campus-based reading clinics to determine if the convenience of the current structure outweighs other models which provide more effective opportunities for candidates to develop proficiency in meeting the needs of students and families from diverse backgrounds and communities in the actual communities in which they live and go to school.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum provides limited opportunities and focus for reading specialists to meet the expectations of important Rhode Island initiatives.	

- The program curriculum provides candidates exposure to a variety of Rhode Island education initiatives and policies through courses, course activities, and assessments. Students are required to read about statewide initiatives, conduct research on initiatives, and present a professional development session. The program assesses candidates on these activities.
- Candidates are required to attend an annual statewide literacy conference that focuses on various issues and policies relating to education and literacy.
- Candidates reported a general understanding of Rhode Island initiatives and policies, based in part on their previous experience as certified and practicing teachers in the state.
- The program provides a limited focus on reading-specialist specific initiatives and policies such as personalized literacy plans and recent legislation about dyslexia.

Recommendations:

- Continue the current focus on Rhode Island initiatives and educations policies. Look for ways to better and more fully integrate these into the program curriculum beyond the exposure level.
- Build upon the working knowledge of program candidates based on their experience as teachers to elevate their understanding of Rhode Island educational initiatives and policies from a teacher only perspective to a reading specialist perspective. Connect this understanding and



need for additional capacities to the coaching role expected of reading specialists by the ILA Standards.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Meets Expectations
The program clinical experiences occur across the program of study, increase in complexity over time, and provide candidates opportunities to link their course-based learning to practice.	

- The program clinical experience is based within courses and through three reading clinics that occur during the program. Nine of the eleven courses either have a field-based component or are entirely field-based.
- The course-based clinical experiences require candidates to practice and apply course learning to actual field settings, such as conduct case studies, reflect on practices, plan lessons, and observe and coach colleagues.
- The three clinic-based experiences occur on the college campus through an after-school reading clinic with PK-12 students identified as struggling readers and through a six-week summer clinic with students from a variety of backgrounds.
- Candidates and program completers reported that the clinical experiences are an important part of their preparation and allow them the opportunity to put into practice what they learn during their courses and assignments.
- A concern with the clinical experience structure, as noted above, is that all the clinics take place on the college campus in pullout settings. While this structure may meet the needs of the program, it is not clear that this is the ideal clinical experience structure to ensure candidates develop the full range of proficiencies and capacities of reading specialists, including working with a wide range of students, working with multiple students simultaneously, interacting with their families, and supporting their colleagues.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Approaching Expectations
The program's clinical experiences provide candidates limited opportunities to demonstrate impact on student learning.	

- Clinical experience for program candidates occurs through individual activities that candidates complete at their own school sites or through tutorial-based reading clinics. Several courses include learning opportunities and projects that require candidates to conduct pre and post-assessments to monitor the impact of the learning opportunity on PK-12 students.
- The program does not engage its current partner, Project Goal, in determining the structure of the clinical experiences and the measures of impact on student learning that result from the tutoring sessions. The program also did not provide evidence how it links the work that PK-12 student do in the reading clinics to their actual schoolwork and learning needs.



- Candidates are required to conduct case studies of the PK-12 students they tutor. These case studies demonstrate instructional strategies and resources used as well as student progress during the course of the tutoring.
- The program did not provide evidence of how it supports candidates to work with groups of learners or school-wide data to identify measures of impact on student learning and to monitor the impact of practices on student learning.
- The program also did not provide evidence of how it uses the actual student learning data from the clinics or other field-based activities to inform and guide program improvement.

Recommendations:

- Review the expectations for partnership in the Rhode Island Standard for Educator Preparation Programs including that preparation programs consult with their partners to design coherent clinical experiences that positively impact student learning and mutually establish and monitor measures of student learning.
- Establish a process to collect data on impact on student learning, both at the individual level that is generated from individual tutoring as well as from school-wide data that is generated from candidate’s work beyond tutoring individual students. Use this data, in conjunction with program partners, to both help develop the capacities of individual program candidates as well as the inform program improvement efforts.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Does Not Meet Expectations
The project has a single partnership that focuses exclusively on providing tutees for the after-school reading clinic.	

- The program has a single partner, Project Goal (Greater Opportunities for Athletes to Learn). The focus of the partnership is to recruit young adolescents as tutees for the after-school reading clinics. Project Goal and the FSEHD share costs for transporting students to the campus for the clinics.
- The mutually beneficial nature of the partnership is that the selected PK-12 students receive tutoring services while the program candidates have a source of tutees with whom to practice reading specialist skills. While this benefit is not insignificant, it does not meet the expectations of this standard for a shared decision-making and mutually beneficial partnerships that work together to advance the goals of the partner and the program.
- The program reported a second partner, parents of PK-12 students who are recruited to attend the summer clinic and who receive a case study at the conclusion of the clinic. However, this group also does not rise to the level of a mutually beneficial partnership aimed at meeting the needs of the partner and improving the program and it candidates.
- The program did not provide evidence of it working to recruit true, mutually beneficial partners nor engagement efforts with schools or school districts that could benefit from a partnership with the program.



Recommendations:

- Review the expectations for mutually beneficial partnerships in the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation Programs. Determine how mutually beneficial partnerships can improve the mission of the partner while also working with the program to improve the program and candidate experience and learning opportunities.
- Develop additional partnerships that can elevate the program while providing service to the partners in meaningful ways. Work with any current and new partners collaboratively to assume joint responsibility to establish clinical experiences, intended impact on student learning, and processes to monitor outcomes and drive program improvement.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Approaching Expectations
The current clinical supervision structure is not sufficient to ensure all that candidates receive support during clinical experiences to develop proficiency as prospective reading specialists.	

- Clinical educators for the program are the full-time and part-time faculty members of the program. During the after-school and summer reading clinics, the program faculty members assume the role of clinical faculty responsible for the supervision and evaluation of candidates.
- The program did not provide evidence of established criteria for clinical supervisors, did not describe how clinical supervisors receive training for their roles, and did not share how the program evaluates their performance as clinical supervisors. The program reported that candidates conduct evaluation on faculty instruction during courses but did not provide evidence if clinical supervision was similarly evaluated.
- It was not evident to the review team that the current model of supervision was effective, intentional, based on standards and practices for supervision, nor that the program has established expected practices for candidate supervision. Candidates reported that they would benefit from modeling of expected reading specialist practices by clinical supervisors and feedback on their actual performance of reading specialist practices.

Recommendations:

- Regardless of the clinical experience structure, establish criteria for clinical educators based on accepted practices of supervision. Develop a process to ensure that only individuals who are current in their field and meet the expectations of the criteria serve in the role of clinical supervisors.
- Establish a process to recruit, evaluate, support and retain clinical educators who are current in their field, meet the criteria established by the program, and can work with the program to improve the overall candidate learning experience.



Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Meets Expectations
The assessment system aligns to the ILA standards, is clearly communicated to program candidates, and is the basis for candidate progression throughout the program.	

- The program assessment system aligns to the full range of the ILA standards. Candidates learn about the assessment system during the admissions process, through the program website, course materials, and through advisement with program faculty.
- Candidates are admitted to the program through specified criteria including standard tests scores, GPA, undergraduate transcripts, having a teaching certificate, letters of reference, supervisor evaluations, and an interview process. Program faculty jointly review application materials to make admission decisions.
- Candidates progress to the recommendation for internship decision point, prior to the summer reading clinic, by the successful completion of specified courses and maintaining a 3.0 or higher GPA in all courses.
- Included in both the recommendation for internship and recommendation for certification decision points are the successful completion of seven performance-based assessments that are aligned to the ILA standards and serve as major course assessments.
- Candidates receive regular feedback from program faculty primarily through feedback on projects, assessments, and rubrics and informally through relationships established between program faculty and candidates.
- Although the assessment system aligns to the ILA standards and is fully communicated to candidates, it was not clear that the assessment system outcomes are used for program improvement. The program should analyze and use this data to drive evidence-based program improvement efforts.

3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Approaching Expectations
The recommendation for certification assessment point aligns generally to the ILA standards but as implemented does not ensure that only candidates who meet the full range of the ILA standards are recommended for certification.	

- The program has established two criteria for the recommended for certification decision point, the successful completion of all courses with a GPA of 3.0 or higher and the successful completion of the state licensure test. As was stated above, required courses embed several performance-based assessments aligned to the ILA standards.
- The recommendation for certification assessment point is fully communicated to program candidates through course materials, the program website, and through advisement from program faculty.



- The program did not provide evidence of how it trains and monitors program faculty to ensure consistent, fair, and accurate assessment decisions beyond noting that two long-term faculty teach most of the courses and that an annual dinner is provided to discuss programmatic issues and concerns. As was stated above, the program did not provide evidence that it uses assessment results as a source of data for program improvement.
- While the design of the recommendation for certification assessment points aligns to the expectations of the ILA standards, the actual implementation of the assessment point does not ensure that only candidates who are recommended for certification meet the full range of the standards. Program candidates and completers reported and demonstrated gaps in their knowledge and skills yet advanced through the assessment system.

Recommendations:

- Review the entirety of this report and its recommendations and accurately assess the alignment of the recommendation for certification assessment point to the full range and depth and breadth of the ILA standards.
- Focus on gaps in the program curriculum and clinical experiences to identify possible misalignments in the assessment system to the ILA standards. Seek out partners and practitioners to assist in the analysis and to support improvements in the program and assessment system.
- Develop and implement meaningful systems to train, monitor, and evaluate all faculty members charged with assessing candidate work. Implement such systems and use the data gathered from this process to improve the quality and consistency of assessment, feedback, and data that can be used for program improvement.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program does not survey employers annually. Because of low response rates, data from the most recent survey did not produce actionable information.	

- The FSEHD surveys employers approximately once every four years, with the most recent administration being 2016. Although the survey is constructed to yield actionable information, response rates were too low to produce generalizable results. Program leadership identified the need for stronger return rates on surveys, but did not articulate a plan for improving response rates in the future. Rhode Island College collects feedback approximately once every four years instead of annually.
- In the 2015-16 school year, the aggregate performance of Rhode Island College program completers working in Rhode Island schools was comparable to the aggregate performance distribution for all recent completers in Rhode Island schools. However, this data is shown at the *provider* level instead of the *program* level. Therefore, few conclusions about the effectiveness of completers from the secondary program can be made.



Recommendations:

- Research best practices for survey administration and response rates, and seek feedback from districts about how to improve survey administration and response.
- Determine if there is additional program-level information that the program can gather to provide actionable information even if survey response rates are low.
- Develop a plan for annually administering surveys, analyzing the data in a timely manner, and using the data to improve program performance.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not seek input from recent program graduates for program improvement.	

- Like the employer survey, the program reported that the provider, FSEHD, not the program, is responsible for collecting information from recent program graduates for program improvement.
- The program reported that the most recent FSEHD alumni survey generated responses from eight recent program completers. These responses ranged from being adequately- to well-prepared. The program also reported that the only areas of dissatisfaction were areas beyond the control of the program such as salary and evaluation processes.
- The program inferred by its informal analysis of these limited results that the program is effective and not in need of improvement, rather than looking more deeply into the results, how a more effective survey could be developed to yield more helpful information, and how the program might better support recent graduates in areas of dissatisfaction.

Recommendations:

- Recognize that Component 4.2 is a program-level responsibility. Recent graduates should be viewed as strong sources of information for program improvement. As such, programs should work more closely with completers to maintain lines of communication.
- Develop a process to annually survey recent program graduates on their quality of their preparation, readiness for their roles, and other topics that can yield actionable information for program improvement.



School Counselor Program

The School Counselor program is a graduate level course of study that leads to an M.A. in School Counseling.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Not Applicable
Rhode Island does not have state-specific standards for the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for support professionals (reading specialists, school counselors, and school psychologists).	

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program curriculum does not provide opportunities for candidates to develop proficiencies in the full depth, breadth, and range of the school counseling competencies of the CACREP standards.	

- The school counselor course of study is a 13-course sequence. Eight of the 13 courses are courses shared with other counseling and psychology programs. Five of the courses are specific to the role of school counselors. Candidates report that they complete the program sequence in a self-paced fashion once they have been admitted to the program and do not take the first school counseling-specific course until mid-way through the program.
- Although the program reported that the course of study and program curriculum are based upon and fully aligned to the expectations of the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) standards, the review team found that the program prioritized general counseling and mental health practices at the expense of the specific, specialty area expectations for school counselors.
- The course of study provided candidates opportunities to develop proficiency in the CACREP areas of human growth and development, group work, and research and program evaluation but insufficient opportunities to focus on critical responsibilities of school counselors such as professional orientation and ethical practice, social and cultural diversity, and the foundations, contextual dimensions, and practice of school counseling.
- Candidates, program completers, and clinical faculty did not report or demonstrate strong knowledge, understanding, and implementation of school counseling practices consistent with the expectations of the professional standards. When asked about strengths and challenges with the CACREP standards, candidates (even those late in the program) seemed unfamiliar with the standards.
- The program reported that there is a need to adjust the program curriculum based on state certification changes that no longer require a background in teaching for school counselors. The certification requirement change occurred in 2012, but leadership has not adjusted the program or worked to address these changes.



1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program curriculum does not provide candidates an opportunity to develop knowledge of student learning standards consistent with the role of school counselors.	

- The program did not acknowledge or provide evidence that it has a responsibility in this area or that it supports prospective school counselors to develop an understanding and working knowledge of PK-12 student learning standards consistent with the role of school counselors.
- The On-Site Evidence Organizer (a tool that programs use to explain and describe program performance) for component 1.3, Standards-Driven Instruction, was left blank. RIDE and the review team gave the program multiple opportunities prior to and during the on-site to provide evidence and respond to questions about this and other components but failed to do so.
- Program candidates demonstrated limited knowledge and understanding of the program quality and student services standards contained in the CACREP standards and how as prospective school counselors they could support students to meet Rhode Island PK-12 student learning standards.

1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program provides limited and superficial opportunities for candidates to learn to effectively analyze and use student data to support and counsel students.	

- The program reported that the use of data is a focus of several school counseling courses - CEP 549: Foundations in School Counseling, CEP 540: Clinical Practicum with Children in Schools, CEP 541: Clinical Internship in School Counseling I and CEP 542: Clinical Internship in School Counseling II. The program also reported that the use of data is an important component of the Professional Impact Project that serves as a culmination of the candidate internship and an assessment instrument for program completion.
- Candidates are required to conduct a variety of assessments and to collect and analyze data as part of course requirements and the Professional Impact Project. However, candidate understanding and proficiency of data-driven instruction and practice was not consistent with that expected of prospective school counselors. Nor does the program provide candidates with sufficient opportunities to work with school-wide data and integrate this into the school counseling practices and supports.
- Candidates reported that they used data to conduct needs assessments, complete course projects, and complete the Professional Impact Project. It was not evident where candidates were specifically taught how to collect and use data nor monitored to ensure the effective and accurate use of data when proposing and designing interventions.



1.5 Technology	Approaching Expectations
The program exposes students to a limited range of technology and uses for technology but does not provide nor ensure that candidates develop proficiency in the full range of technology expected of 21 st century school counselors.	

- The program reports that the use of technology is regularly incorporated into the program curriculum and course instruction. The program also reported that candidates are required to use technology and integrate it into projects, assessments, and the Professional Impact Project.
- Program expectations for candidate use of technology were limited and focused on using technology to present information, interact with program and clinical faculty, and the program assessment system, and to analyze data. The review team also saw evidence of learning opportunities for candidates to develop proficiency in the use of student data management systems and some college and career-readiness tools.
- The review team did not see evidence of how candidates were provided instruction and practice in various technology such as current apps, social media, varied communication systems, and other tools, software, and hardware can serve as critical tools and supports for school counselors to work with students, families, colleagues, and the community.
- Candidates reported that they did not feel well-prepared or knowledgeable of current technologies that could improve their practice or of many of the data and communication systems that are commonplace in PK-12 schools.

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum provides candidates opportunities to reflect on their own biases but does not ensure that candidates are ready on day one to meet the needs of all students and their families.	

- The program reports that candidates learn about issues of diversity and equity during the course of study, particularly in the CEP 531: Human Development across Cultures. In this course, candidates learn about issues of diversity, bias, and an appreciation of other cultures.
- The program also reports that in CEP 549: Foundations in School Counseling that candidates are required to conduct a needs assessment at a clinical site and then identify gaps in services that may exist. The program suggests this can help candidates identify issues of equity, although the logic of this assertion was not fully clear to the review team as there may be other causes for gaps in services beyond equity issues.
- While candidates develop an awareness of issues of diversity and equity, candidates do not receive opportunities nor are they held accountable to develop and practice skills to work with diverse learners and their families. Candidates reported that they were not prepared or familiar with diverse students they interacted with in clinical placements.



1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program curriculum does not prioritize and ensure candidate proficiency in important Rhode Island educational initiatives including the comprehensive school counselling framework.	

- The program reported that Rhode Island educational initiatives and policies are integrated across the program curriculum, particularly the internship courses. The program reported that the Rhode Island Framework for Comprehensive School Counseling, educator evaluation, comprehensive literacy, and personal literacy plans are program focus areas.
- The program exposes candidates to several Rhode Island initiatives and policies during the internship courses, as well as the Foundation of School Counseling course, but candidates do not have sufficient opportunities or support to develop, apply, and build proficiency with the Rhode Island initiatives.
- The limited focus on and opportunities to develop proficiency in Rhode Island initiatives and educational policy is a particular challenge for candidates in the program who do not have an education background as schools and school issues are new experiences for these individuals.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program requires candidates to engage in several clinical experiences that provide candidates limited opportunities to develop proficiency as school counselors.	

- Program clinical experiences include a 75-hour practicum, two 150-hour internships, and two shorter experiences, one 5 and one 10 hours, as part of program courses.
- The clinical experiences increase in complexity over time and provide candidates opportunities to practice and apply what they learn in program courses. Many of the early experiences focus on observation and learning about current practices while later experiences allow candidates to perform as school counselors under the supervision of a PK-12 school counselor.
- Candidates reported that the clinical placements were an important learning and practice opportunity that allowed them to develop confidence and competence in skills and expectations for their certification area.
- A significant limitation of candidate clinical preparation is that candidates do not have opportunities to practice in a variety of settings as expected by this component. Candidates primarily complete clinical placements in a single school and do not experience a range of settings or grade levels.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Approaching Expectations
The program generally emphasizes candidate impact on student learning and encourages candidates to use various data to measure impact on student learning.	

- The program requires candidates to consider impact on students and student learning when designing and implementing interventions and activities for PK-12 students. The program also



requires candidates to report on outcomes for the interventions and activities that they conduct with PK-12 students.

- The Professional Impact Project, which spans the two internship experiences, is designed so that candidates consult school and student data and then implement practices and interventions that meet student needs. Candidates then share the results of the project with program faculty, reporting on the impact of their project.
- While the program emphasizes impact on student learning during the internship and Professional Impact Project, a similar focus is not consistent throughout the program. Candidates complete many projects and activities that include needs assessments, but it is not clear that candidates act upon information from the needs assessments or are supported to understand how to determine impact on learning.
- The program does not work with clinical partners to identify candidate impact measures or use these impact measures to monitor impact on learning over the duration of candidate clinical experiences.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not have mutually beneficial clinical partnerships for the preparation of candidates.	

- The program reported that prior to changes in certification requirements, all school counselor candidates were practicing teachers and clinical placements happened in the candidate’s school. Currently, the program locates clinical placements for candidates who are not practicing teachers through networking and other means. Neither arrangement meets the expectations of this component or rises to the level of clinical partners.
- The program did not provide evidence of how its partnerships are mutually beneficial to the program and the placement school. The program did not provide evidence of how it monitors partnership effectiveness to improve the partnership. The program did not provide evidence of how it shares common expectations for candidate performance and how it works with partners to monitor candidate progress in the clinical placement and program.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not have clear criteria for clinical educators nor does it have a formal process to recruit, prepare, evaluate, and retain clinical educators to support candidate development effectively.	

- The program reported that, since it has a small number of candidates and since only recently has the program had to locate placements and clinical educators, it does not have formal criteria for clinical educators nor a formal process to recruit and retain clinical educators.
- The program also reported that when it places a candidate in a PK-12 setting, it provides training and support to the clinical educator in how to serve as a clinical educator and supervise program candidates. The training materials made available to prospective clinical educators are limited to training videos and program materials, neither which are sufficient to ensure effective clinical educators or communicate program expectations for the candidate performance Clinical



educators reported limited interaction and communication with program faculty or support for their role as clinical supervisors.

- The expectations of this component are designed to ensure that candidates are placed in high quality field settings with PK-12 clinical educators who are particularly skilled and experienced to support the development of effective school counselors. The school counselor program did not provide evidence that it recognizes the importance of these expectations or ensures that candidates are only placed with effective clinical educators.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not have a standards-based and performance-based assessment system aligned to the professional standards for school counselors; rather, the program assesses candidates primarily based on the completion of course activities.	

- The program reports that the assessment system has five stages from admission to post-graduation. After candidates are admitted (stage 1) they proceed through stage 2 (matriculation), stage 3 (advanced practica), stage 4 (internship) and then stage 5 (post-graduation).
- Candidates are required to have a grade of B or better in specified courses to proceed through the stages of the assessment system. In addition to specified courses, stages 3 and 4 include additional measures such as a counselor competency scale, self-evaluations, a Performance Impact Project, a portfolio, and supervisor evaluations.
- Beyond providing course syllabi and sample portfolios, many of which were not current, the program did not provide evidence of the assessment system instruments, how the instruments were used to monitor and inform candidate progress, how the assessment system is communicated to candidates, and how clinical supervisors were trained and supported to conduct candidate evaluations.
- Based on the evidence that was provided and based on interviews and observations, the program assessment system does not prioritize performance as school counselors to advance in the program. Eight of the thirteen program courses are not school-counseling specific courses, thus candidates progression in the program based on these courses does ensure school counseling proficiency. The remainder of the assessment system appears to be based on completing projects and course work rather than actual assessment practices and measures that ensure all candidates perform consistent with the full depth and breadth of the school counselor standards.
- Candidates reported that the Performance Impact Project is an important part of their program and internship and that the portfolio was a valuable employment tool. However, as candidates did not appear knowledgeable of the professional standards and the full range of expectations for school counselors, it was not evident that the completion of this project and portfolio and the assessment system ensured proficiency in the CACREP standards.



- Candidates reported appreciation for the relationships they have developed with program and clinical faculty but also reported inconsistent feedback, support, and supervision as they progressed through the program.
- The program provided in pre-visit evidence a document titled ‘School Counseling Assessment System Overview’ which described the components of the assessment system. Included in the overview were 4 assessment measures that were added for the 2016-2017 academic year. The new components were a candidate site evaluation, a graduate survey, an advisory board survey, and an employer survey. The program did not provide evidence of these measures, the process by which they were developed, and any progress in implementing the measures. It was not clear to the review team why these measures were not already a part of the assessment system as each could provide valuable information and support to the program and candidates.

3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not recommend candidates for certification based on an assessment system that ensures candidates are prepared to serve as new school counselors.	

- As stated above, stage 4 of the assessment system in the internship stage. The program regards this stage as the final assessment point from which to recommend a candidate for certification. To complete this stage, candidates must have completed 2 internship courses with a grade a B or better, complete a Professional Impact Project, a portfolio, and site supervisor evaluations.
- As was also stated above, the program did not provide evidence of these measures, what level of performance was expected for successful performance (beyond a required course grade of B), how these measures were aligned to the professional standards, and how these measures were combined and weighted to make assessment decisions.
- The program reported that it no longer requires candidates to complete a comprehensive exam as an additional measure for program completion and readiness for recommendation for certification. Part of the justification for this change was the addition in 2012 of a state licensure test for school counselors. The program did not provide evidence of how it integrates the state licensure test into the program assessment system, if it is a requirement for program completion, or how it supports candidates to meet this licensure requirement.
- Candidates reported that they were generally aware of the assessment system and that it was communicated to them at program admissions and through course work and instruction. However the program did not provide evidence of how it ensures clinical faculty are aware of the assessment system or how it trains and monitors program and clinical faculty to ensure that the assessment system yields fair, accurate, and consistent results.



Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program does not survey employers annually. Because of low response rates, data from the most recent survey did not produce actionable information.	

- The FSEHD surveys employers approximately once every four years, with the most recent administration being 2016. Although the survey is constructed to yield actionable information, response rates were too low to produce generalizable results. Program leadership identified the need for stronger return rates on surveys, but did not articulate a plan for improving response rates in the future. Rhode Island College collects feedback approximately once every four years instead of annually.
- In the 2015-16 school year, the aggregate performance of Rhode Island College program completers working in Rhode Island schools was comparable to the aggregate performance distribution for all recent completers in Rhode Island schools. However, this data is shown at the *provider* level instead of the *program* level. Therefore, few conclusions about the effectiveness of completers from the secondary program can be made.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not seek input from program completers for program improvement.	

- As stated above, the program reported that it does not survey recent program completers rather that this is done by the FSEHD. The program reported, “Program completers have informally reported high levels of satisfaction with the program and the preparation with which they have been provided for their new careers as school counselors.” The program also reported that recent completers have been successful in securing employment, thus inferring successful outcomes.
- The program did not provide evidence of how it informally collects completer feedback, what the feedback was, or what levels of completer employment have occurred to justify and support the assertion of positive program outcomes.



School Psychologist Program

The School Psychologist program is a graduate course of study that leads to a Master of Arts or a Certificate of Graduate Study (C.A.G.S.).

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Not Applicable
Rhode Island does not have state-specific standards for the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for support professionals (reading specialists, school counselors, and school psychologists).	

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Meets Expectations
The program aligns fully to the NASP standards and ensures that candidates develop proficiency in the depth and breadth of the competencies expected of school psychologists.	

- The school psychologist program is a well-constructed program of study that integrates course-based learning, supervised training, clinical experiences, and candidate assessments each aligned to the expectations of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) Standards and Domains of Practice.
- The program of study is sequenced over a three-year period with years one and two focused on developing foundational skills and experiences within both course-based learning and clinical-based learning experiences. Year three of the program is dedicated to a year-long supervised internship focused on mastering the practices and performances of the professional standards. The program provides candidates optional paths such as completing the program part-time or only in pursuit of a C.A.G.S. if a candidate already has a master’s degree; however, all coursework and program requirements must be completed within 6 years.
- The program provided evidence that full depth and breadth of the professional standards are integrated and aligned across the program courses, key assessments, and the candidate training portfolio that is developed over the course of the program. Candidates develop and demonstrate increasing proficiency in the expectations and performances as school counselors through observations, original research, reflective papers, case studies, administering assessments, providing counselling, and serving as a resource to students, families, and the greater school community.
- An additional source of evidence indicating the depth, breadth, and rigor with which the program aligns to the professional standards is that 100% of candidates who have completed the program and pursued national certification have attained this status and all that over the last 6 years, all program completers have secured employment within three months.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations
The program curriculum and learning opportunities provide candidates sufficient opportunities to develop a deep understanding of student learning standards and professional standards that emphasize program quality and student services.	

- The program curriculum prioritizes that candidates develop proficiency in designing and delivering counseling and support services that meet the academic, social, and behavioral needs



of students. Candidates learn effective practices in course work and apply these in supervised settings in course and field-based experiences.

- The program reports that it provides a focus on student learning standards in several academic and field-based courses. These courses and learning experiences require candidates to apply knowledge of Common Core state standards and several Rhode Island educational initiatives to analyze, develop, and deliver academic supports to students. The program added CEP 651: Academic Instruction, Interventions, and Support to the program curriculum to ensure that candidates had additional and sufficient opportunities to develop the capacities to support student learning and success in schools.
- The program should examine the program curriculum and outcomes to determine if candidates have sufficient depth and breadth of student learning standards in both the Common Core State Standards as well as other academic standards in science, social studies, and other content areas necessary to support the learning needs of students and their families.

1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations
The program provides clear and extensive training in the use of data as an essential practice for all school psychologists.	

- The use of assessment and the emphasis on data-driven practice is a foundational aspect of the program. Six of the required courses specifically focus on assessment and data-based practices. The courses are logically sequenced to ensure that candidates develop increasing knowledge and proficiency as they progress through the program.
- CEP 534: Quantitative Measurement and Test Interpretation provides candidates important understanding and access to issues of standardized assessments, the results of assessments, and using the results to modify practice, instruction, and services. CEP 551: Behavioral Assessment and Intervention provides candidates a strong focus on learning from behavioral assessments to effectively support the needs of students. CEP 601: Cognitive Assessment provides candidates opportunities to develop knowledge and understanding in the use of various cognitive assessments instruments and practices.
- Candidates and clinical faculty reported that candidates were well-prepared and received specialized training in how to conduct a variety of assessments, how to make decisions based on data from assessments, and how to modify and inform instruction and interventions based on data from assessments. Program faculty report that a focus of the annual faculty retreats is ensuring that candidates develop the necessary expertise in the use of assessments and data to meet the needs of students and their families.

1.5 Technology	Meets Expectations
The program provides deep and varied exposure and support for candidates to develop proficiency in the effective use technology to diagnosis, treat, and serve students and their families.	

- The program has established extensive and varied expectations for candidates to develop proficiency in a wide-range of technologies necessary for school psychologists. These include using online data systems, using technology to communicate and share information, developing



websites, evaluating and using software and hardware, and using assistive technology. Importantly, the program does not presume knowledge or expertise but rather approaches each area of technology from a perspective of guided support and training.

- The program curriculum provides candidates multiple opportunities to practice and develop expertise in using online data management systems, conducting analysis of multiple data sources with tools such as Excel and developing interventions and supports that match the data and the needs of the student.
- The effective and appropriate use of technology is integrated into the assessment system and candidates, clinical faculty, and program faculty assess how well candidates integrate and use technology in the course-based and field-based practice.

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
The program provides a general exposure to the issues of equity and diversity while not ensuring candidates develop skills and strategies to work with students and their families from diverse backgrounds.	

- The program coursework and field-based learning opportunities provide candidates multiple opportunities to engage and reflect on issues of equity, diversity, and meeting the needs of all students and their families. Coursework also addresses how school psychologists have opportunities to understand and advance issues of equity in schools.
- Candidates focus on issues of equity through readings, course discussions, observing and reflecting on school practices and policies, and examining culturally responsive school practices and disproportionality. The program also identified several assessments used to monitor candidate progress relating to equity including presentations on diversity, class discussions, interview assignments, and a portfolio artifact.
- While the review team observed a focus on awareness and understanding of equity and diversity in the program curriculum, it did not find a similar emphasis on providing candidates specific strategies and practices that are effective with diverse students, including ELLs and students with disabilities, and their families.

Recommendations:

- Explore and identify research-based practices that are effective with working with diverse students and families into the program and field-based curriculum and ensure that candidates develop proficiency in the use of these practices.
- To better prepare program graduates to meet the needs of diverse students and their families, the program should look for additional opportunities and placements for candidates to practice in diverse settings. The further support candidates to develop as culturally responsive school psychologists, the program should look to increase the diversity of program candidates and clinical and program faculty to maximize issues of diversity both within the program and in clinical settings.



1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Meets Expectations
The program has integrated important Rhode Island initiatives into the program curriculum and requires that candidates develop proficiency in these areas..	

- The program has prioritized and integrated effectively throughout the program curriculum numerous important Rhode Island initiatives that impact students, families, and schools. Candidates learn about these initiatives in their courses, develop proficiency through supervised practice, and demonstrate evidence of meeting these expectations through assessments both in their courses and in their practicum and internship placements.
- While numerous initiatives are integrated across the courses and field-based learning opportunities, the program also reports that there can be improvement to candidate knowledge and skills in this area. The program reports a similar concern regarding the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards. Since program candidates are typically not practicing educators and may not have comparable background and understanding, the program may wish to further connect candidates to practicing educators through shadowing experiences, interviews, two-way communication opportunities, or other authentic learning opportunities across placements and grade levels to further develop their proficiency and skills in both the Rhode Island initiatives and teaching standards.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Meets Expectations
The program ensures that candidates engage in varied, substantial, and developmentally appropriate clinical experiences throughout the program.	

- Candidates engage in well-organized, sequenced, and carefully implemented clinical placements throughout the program that significantly contributes to their development as prospective school psychologists. Clinical placements parallel instruction and provide essential opportunities for candidates to practice, perform, and receive feedback to further direct their growth.
- Clinical placements begin in year one of the program through laboratory-based courses and practicum experience in which candidates work with PK-12 students under program supervision to begin to develop counseling and support skills. Year two of the program includes a 400-hour practicum across two semesters that requires candidates to further implement skills and strategies they are learning in their courses. The culmination of the clinical experience is a full-year internship in a partner setting in which the candidate serves as a full-time beginning school psychologist under the supervision of a clinical educator.
- The design of the clinical placement structure ensures that candidates explicitly connect what they are learning in their courses to actual school settings. The clinical placements also provide candidates the opportunity to assume the full responsibility of school psychologists, which supports them to be ready to serve on day one.



2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Meets Expectations
Program candidates develop proficiency and prioritize positive impact on student learning and growth academically, behaviorally, and socially.	

- Program curriculum and field-based learning experiences focus on and emphasize how candidates must ensure that all their work as prospective school psychologists positively impacts students, academically, socially, and behaviorally. The program provided evidence of rubrics that are used during the internship and in the evaluation of candidate's Professional Impact Projects that specifically measure how well candidate practice and performance impact student learning and success. The program uses analysis of these outcomes to monitor and improve the design of the program, courses, and internship.
- The program reports that it meets each year with clinical faculty from practicum and internship sites to review and discuss the acceptability and use of measures of impact on student learning that candidates will use during field placements. The measures focus on direct observation, goal attainment, and ratings of interventions and supports. The training in and use of these measures has been cited as a national model by the NASP.
- Candidates reported that they recognize the centrality to the program of positively impacting students academically, socially, and behaviorally and strive to develop the skills and capacities to meet these expectations. Clinical faculty also reported that candidates act upon and succeed in positively impacting students.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Meets Expectations
The program has established numerous mutually beneficial clinical partners that work closely with the program to support candidate training and deliver services to the partners and its students.	

- The program has developed a clinical partnership model through a consortium in which perspective partners agree to host an intern for a school year, provide a qualified clinical supervisor, and provide a stipend to offset the candidate's training. In return, the clinical partner receives the full-time services of a school psychologist for the school year, training in supervision and candidate support, and access to professional development and other in-kind services.
- The program recruits clinical partners from schools and school districts throughout Rhode Island and Massachusetts via an invitation letter sent the preceding year. The program then hosts a 'job fair' which serves as a potential matching opportunity for prospective clinical partners and intern candidates. Prior to the job fair, prospective partners receive access to candidate's resumes to help them schedule interviews with prospective interns.
- The program establishes formal partnerships through the use of a program-specific partnership agreement form. The form specifies the responsibilities of the partner to among others things ensure qualified supervision, adequate assessment materials, access to professional development, and "provide a full and varied training experience." The agreement also specifies program responsibilities among other things to provide a prepared candidate, supervision, training and support to the clinical supervisor, and to consult with the clinical supervisor on candidate assessment.



- The program currently has more than thirty clinical partners that range in type, location, and size and include large urban schools, medium to small rural/suburban schools, and schools and districts in Rhode Island and nearby Massachusetts.
- The clinical partnerships are a critical component of the program’s success and contribute greatly to the development and preparation of program candidates. While the program does have a range of clinical partners, it should work with its partners and other stakeholders to explore opportunities for schools and districts that may seek to enter into partnership with the program but may lack the financial resources to do so.
- While not typically viewed as a partnership for a preparation program, the program views current candidates as partners in the success and continuous improvement of the program. As such, candidates at each stage of the program are included in faculty and partner retreats and meetings to help bring the candidate perspective to the improvement process.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Meets Expectations
The program has clear criteria for clinical educators and integrates clinical educators into the design and implementation of the program.	

- The program has clear criteria for clinical educators. Prospective clinical educator must be certified school psychologists, have at least three years’ experience, and training and experience in the supervision of adults. The program reports that it jointly reviews prospective clinical educator’s credentials with school and district personnel to make selection decisions. The program also reports that many of the clinical educators are often program graduates and/or have been with the program for several years.
- Clinical educators receive information about the program and training for their roles through program handbooks and materials, through an annual clinical educator coffee hour, and through meetings at clinical sites during the school year. Clinical educators also participate in the job fair and selection proves to encourage a good fit between candidate and clinical educators.
- The program recognizes and values the importance of effective supervision to ensure positive outcomes for candidates, the clinical partners, and PK-12 students. The program demonstrates its commitment to effective supervision by adhering to the NASP guidelines for the selection, support, evaluation, and retention of clinical educators.
- A recent manifestation of the importance of clinical educators and their importance to the success of the program and its candidates was recent feedback from supervisors that a clinical assessment instrument was not as effective as it might be to produce consistent assessment and feedback across candidates and internship sites. The program called together clinical supervisors and program faculty and promptly revised the instrument.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Meets Expectations
The program assessment system aligns fully to the NASP standards and domains for school psychologists and ensures that candidates develop the expected proficiencies of the professional standards.	



- The program has a clear, systematic, and standard-based assessment system that ensures candidate progress is based on evidence of meeting the explicit criteria and on candidate progress towards meeting the expectations of the professional standards and program expectations.
- Admission requirements are clearly communicated to prospective candidates and include both FSEHD requirements (GPA, Bachelor’s degree, standardized test scores, and program-specific requirements, interviews, additional and exceptional contributions to education, and professional and life experiences. The entire program faculty reviews candidate admission files to make recommendations for admission to the FSEHD.
- The assessment decision point to recommend a candidate for the internship is extensive, robust, and prioritizes candidate performance as school psychologists during the first two years of the program. Among the assessment criteria are required course grades, a portfolio documenting candidate performance in each of the NASP standards, field supervisor positive evaluations of candidate performance during practicum, candidate’s self-assessment of their performance, and evidence of the required 400 hours of field-based work to advance to the internship year.
- Candidates who do not meet the criteria to advance to internship, depending on the extent of the remediation needed, are required to develop a training plan, resubmit materials, or retake coursework.
- Candidates receive extensive and standards-based feedback throughout the program courses and field-based learning opportunities. Candidates reported that the feedback they receive is critical to help them develop the skills and capacities required for school psychologists.

3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Meets Expectations
Candidates are recommended for certification based on an assessment system that is robust and ensures candidates are ready to serve as school psychologists on day 1.	

- As with the assessment decision point of recommendation for internship, the assessment decision point for recommendation for certification is equally robust, clear, and aligned to the expectations of the national standards and designed and implemented to ensure that all program completers are fully prepared to perform as school psychologists consistent with the full range of the NASP standards.
- Candidates must meet three criteria to be recommended for certification: completion of a performance portfolio that includes artifacts demonstrating competence in each of the domains of the NASP standards, successfully completing the PRAXIS school psychologist exam by meeting or exceeding the score established by RIDE, and meeting or exceeding a specified passing score on the clinical supervisor internship evaluation. The program has also established weights for each measure that are used to make a final recommendation decision. Candidates who do not meet these criteria are denied a recommendation for certification.



- The assessment system is clearly communicated to program candidates both prior to admissions and throughout the program. The program handbook is an invaluable tool that details not only the assessment system, but also the program of study, schedules and timelines, specific assessment instruments, and other resources for candidates. The program website is another important source of information about the assessment system and its criteria. Candidates and program completers also reported that program faculty members further communicate the assessment system expectations, requirements, and instruments through program courses.
- The program provided evidence that it recognizes the importance of consistent evaluation and works at multiple levels to ensure fair, accurate, and consistent evaluation. The program faculty meets monthly to review all issues relating to the program, including candidate assessment. The program conducts an annual retreat to review and revise as needed program assessment and courses. Adjunct faculty members receive a core faculty mentor to support and ensure consistent evaluations. Clinical supervisors receive training in the assessment system and the program monitors evaluation ratings to ensure consistency. The program is also developing additional tools to promote consistent evaluation by clinical faculty including case studies and exemplars.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program produces effective educators and uses informal employer feedback for program improvement.	

- The program uses an employer survey conducted by the FSEHD as a formal means to gather information on the effectiveness of the program and program graduates. The employer survey is not administered on an annual basis and does not generate responses sufficient to provide meaningful information for program improvement. The school psychology program received a single response from the FSEHD survey.
- The program receives informal feedback from employers through the job fair process used for candidate placements and matching as potential employers, and partners review and select candidates to interview. The program also receives informal feedback from employers through its partnerships and internships, which comprise numerous school districts throughout Rhode Island and nearby Massachusetts.
- Recent program graduates who sought employment in their field received positions. All program completers by program requirements must successfully pass the licensure test for school psychologists to complete the program. The program did not provide evidence of program completer effectiveness ratings on educator evaluations.
- The program recognizes the limitations of the employer survey process and the limited response rate. The program has reported plans to improve both the survey process and the response rate based in part on its positive alumni relations and regular interaction with employers.
- In the 2015-16 school year, the aggregate performance of Rhode Island College program completers working in Rhode Island schools was comparable to the aggregate performance distribution for all recent completers in Rhode Island schools. However, this data is shown at



the *provider* level instead of the *program* level. Therefore, few conclusions about the effectiveness of completers from school psychologist program can be made.

Recommendations:

- Work with leadership from the FSEHD and other educator preparation programs to develop an effective process to conduct an annual employer survey that produces significant response rates and yields actionable information for program improvement.
- Develop a program-level process to gather employer feedback on an annual basis from a substantial number of respondents that yields actionable information for program improvement.
- Collect information on the performance of recent program completers on employer evaluations and use this information to develop an understanding of the performance levels of recent completers and how this analysis can inform program improvement.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Meets Expectations
The program collects information from recent program completers and uses this for program improvement.	

- The program receives information on program completers from the FSEHD every three to five years through an alumni survey. The response rates are limited and the infrequency and length of time between surveys limited the effectiveness and usefulness of the information.
- The program supplements the FSEHD survey with a program-specific alumni survey that has been done every three years. The program-level survey generated significance response rates and the program reported that the information confirmed the effectiveness of the programs and provided suggestions for improvement based on what is happening in schools across the region. The program reported that its alumni are one of the strengths of the program and provide important insight and guidance for improvement.
- The program should work with program faculty, clinical faculty, alumni, and clinical partners to develop an effective program completer annual survey that yields actionable information for program improvement.

Provider-Level Findings and Recommendations

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.1 Diversity of Candidates	Does Not Meet Expectations
The provider does not recruit, admit, and support high-quality candidates who reflect the diversity of RI's PK-12 students nor does the provider and its programs capitalize on the diversity of candidates.	

- The provider reported that it uses a variety of on-campus recruitment efforts such as information tables, sessions, fliers, and introductory courses but these have not been sufficient



to recruit a variety of candidates to the school of education at the teacher, building administrator, and support provider level.

- Approximately 25 percent of all recent Rhode Island College graduates are from diverse backgrounds, reflective of the diversity of RI. However, only approximately 8 percent of recent FSEHD graduates are from diverse backgrounds. The Reading Specialist program has not admitted a diverse candidate in several years and several other programs have few diverse candidates among current candidates or recent graduates.
- The provider and institution have established several organizations and structures to support and retain diverse candidates such as Advanced Learning and Leadership Initiative for Educational Diversity (A.L.L.I.E.D.), Learning for Life, diversity initiatives, and an increased focus on intended majors to better integrate prospective candidates into programs. These efforts focus on candidates already interested in careers in education, remediation, and group identity rather than successful efforts to ensure the recruitment and admission of diverse candidates and programs that build on the diversity of its candidates.
- Among other efforts to increase the diversity of the candidates in the school of education, the provider has initiated a first year experience residential community, is seeking to revive a partnership with the Mt. Pleasant High School teacher academy, and is exploring affiliation with Educators Rising. These efforts are in the earliest stages and show potential, but additional and concerted strategies and efforts are necessary as well as a commitment to preparing educators who are reflective of the diversity of Rhode Island and its students.

Recommendations:

- Make the recruitment, admission, and retention of diverse candidates a provider-wide and program-wide priority. Work across all educator preparation programs to identify and implement additional strategies, beyond those currently employed, to ensure a candidate pool that is reflective of the diversity of RI.
- Engage with current and prospective stakeholders to identify current roadblocks to increased representation of diverse candidates in the school of education.
- Conduct an analysis of the educator preparation programs at Rhode Island College and determine which programs are more effective in recruiting, admitting, and supporting diverse candidates. Build on the strategies of these more successful programs.
- Seek out and employ community and professional expertise to create a culture across all education programs—including non-teacher programs—that capitalize, integrate, and build on the background and diversity of its candidates.



3.2 Response to Employment Needs	Approaching Expectations
The provider and its programs make limited effort to collect and share employment data with prospective and current candidates. The provider and its programs do not effectively use employment data to inform and guide systematic program improvement.	

- FSEHD did not provide evidence of a comprehensive and systematic process to collect and share information with prospective and current candidates regarding employment prospects within RI, the region, or in hard to staff areas.
- Provider leaders reported that they informally advise and counsel candidates to pursue certification areas with increased employment prospects and to consider additional certifications such as special education, middle grades, and English as a Second Language to enhance candidates' employment prospects.
- Evidence provided to the review team listed thirteen educator shortage areas. The list included typical hard-to-staff areas such as secondary science and mathematics, bilingual and dual language, and world language teachers. However, the list also included certification areas that are not typically considered hard-to-staff and with limited employment prospects such as early childhood education, elementary education, and secondary social studies. A review of program enrollments indicated that early childhood education, elementary education, and secondary social studies have some of the largest program enrollments, despite limited employment prospects.
- Clinical partners reported that, although they partner with Rhode Island College and its educator preparation programs, they desire increased prospective educators in the areas of secondary math and science, world languages, special education, and English as a second language. Partners also wish prospective educators had further training and expertise in the areas of technology, classroom management, and meeting the needs of diverse learners.
- Several programs provided examples of programmatic changes based on employment prospects, such as the Reading Specialist program adding a course in coaching, the School Psychologist program adding learning experiences to meet the needs of English language learners, and the World Languages Program adding coursework to help candidates meet the needs of PK-6 students. However, the provider does not have a systematic or comprehensive process to review and modify programs based on employment information.

Recommendations:

- Develop a process and determine the individuals responsible to conduct, on an annual basis, a needs assessment for employment prospects in Rhode Island and the region including hard to staff areas and schools. Include in this process annual consulting with clinical partners to determine their employment needs – both certification areas and prospective educator skills and capacities.
- Require each program to report to the leadership of FSEHD on an ongoing basis how it uses employment information to review and make changes to program curriculum and learning opportunities reflective of the employment information.



- Develop and implement a process through which all prospective candidates to the educator preparation programs engage in a required orientation to prospective employment prospects for all educators in Rhode Island and the region, including hard to staff areas and schools.

3.3 Admissions Standards for Academic Achievement and Ability	Approaching Expectations
The provider and program admission system does not align fully to the Rhode Island Department of Education expectations for prospective candidates. The provider and its programs utilize an informal, rather than formal, conditional acceptance process and do not track progress of candidates granted admission through informal conditional acceptance.	

- FSEHD leadership reported that all programs adhere to Rhode Island Department of Education expectations for candidate admissions for including both individual and cohort requirements. However, individual programs provided contradictory evidence including accepting GPAs below the required minimum of 2.75 and confusion regarding the expectations for minimum cohort GPAs.
- FSEHD provided contradictory evidence regarding admissions for candidates who do not meet minimal requirements. During a meeting, leadership reported that there was not a formal waiver process or conditional admittance. However, leadership also reported that, in some instances, candidates who did not meet minimal requirements were allowed to enroll in program classes, the equivalent of a waiver process or conditional admission. Documentary evidence provided for the PREP-RI process contained similar contradictory information.

Recommendations:

- Ensure that leadership and faculty in all educator preparation programs are aware of minimum admission requirements established by the Rhode Island Department of Education.
- Conduct a review and audit of all program materials and information regarding candidate admissions, including the RIC website. Revise any contradictory information to ensure that all programs communicate and admit prospective candidates who meet expected admission requirements.
- As a school of education, determine if FSEHD will use any process that admits candidates to the program or program coursework without meeting minimal admission requirements. If the FSEHD elects to use a conditional acceptance policy of any type, ensure that the process is formal, clearly communicated to the candidate and program faculty, established as provider policy, and that a process is simultaneously developed to track the process of any candidate admitted through a conditional acceptance process.



3.6 Additional Selectivity Criteria	Approaching Expectations
FSEHD has identified a limited set of dispositions for candidate admissions and provided inconsistent evidence as to how FSEHD and programs use these dispositions to monitor candidate progress across all programs.	

- RIC provided a set of FSEHD professional behavior indicators required for candidate admissions, but it did not provide evidence regarding how these dispositions were selected or the research base demonstrating that the selected dispositions are indicative of educator effectiveness.
- The building administrator and support professional programs did not appear to align their admission and assessment system to the FSEHD professional behavior indicators, relying instead on letters of reference and interviews. Across all programs, the professional behavior indicators appeared to be an isolated assessment tool, rather than interconnected part of the assessment system.
- The provider and programs did not provide evidence of how programs and candidate instruction integrate the professional behavior indicators, how candidates learn about the indicators' importance to educator effectiveness, and how candidates receive instruction on and support related to the dispositions.

Recommendations:

- As a school of education, including all teacher and non-teacher programs, conduct research and analysis of the critical dispositions and additional selectivity criteria essential to be an effective educator and a program completer from RIC.
- Engage and consult with clinical partners and other stakeholders to ensure that the selected dispositions and additional selectivity criteria are current, valid, and consistent with the needs of Rhode Island schools and communities.
- While revising the assessment system based on the results of the PREP-RI visit, clearly integrate the dispositions and selectivity criteria into candidate admissions, recommendation for student teaching/internship, and recommendation for certification.
- While revising program curricula based on the results of the PREP-RI visit, incorporate learning opportunities for candidates in all programs to develop understanding of and capacity in developing and practicing consistent with the expectations of the dispositions and selectivity criteria.

Standard 5: Program Quality and Improvement

5.1 Collection of Data to Evaluate Program Quality	Approaching Expectations
The provider and its programs have established some structures and processes to collect data to evaluate program quality, but the data is not collected annually, comprehensively, or strategically in a way that is aligned to critical areas of improvement.	

- The provider reported in an evidence organizer that it “has numerous (perhaps too many) systems for and/or processes for collecting and analyzing data.” The majority of the data



collection processes reported are connected to either accreditation purposes (CAEP, SPA, NEASC, and the PREP-RI process) or to internal reporting requirements.

- The provider reported that program level assessment data is reported on an annual basis; however, evidence provided to the review indicate that nearly half of these reports dating back to the 2012-13 academic year remain either incomplete or in process.
- The provider and its programs reported that they collect data from program graduates and employers of graduates to monitor program quality and inform improvement efforts. However, this data is not collected regularly (only every two to four years) nor does it generate significant response rates. Some programs as few as one respondent to surveys.
- The provider does not have a strategic and purposeful data collection plan or process that is intentional, aligned to critical areas of program improvement, and monitored to ensure effective data collection.

Recommendations:

- Establish a provider-wide annual data collection process aligned to critical program improvement areas including candidate and completer performance, course and program quality, clinical experiences, and the candidate assessment system.
- Ensure that the data collection process focuses on program improvement rather than accreditation or compliance and includes those elements that are most critical and most likely to lead to actionable improvement information.

5.2 Analysis and Use of Data for Continuous Improvement	Does Not Meet Expectations
The provider and its programs do not engage in systematic, comprehensive, and continuous program improvement nor does the provider and its programs systematically analyze and use data for improvement.	

- While FSEHD reported multiple systems to collect data, the provider and its programs did not provide evidence of sufficient or effective systems or processes to use data and information for program improvement. A provider-wide assessment committee appears to act as the primary vehicle for comprehensive improvement, but it was not clear of the mission, scope, reach, connectivity to the programs, or the efficacy of the committee.
- The FSEHD reported being overwhelmed with accreditation and compliance requirements and that there existed “considerable fatigue and cynicism about the entire continuous improvement process.” The FSEHD also reported that from 2011 to mid-2015 there was “no coordinated approach to continuous improvement at the provider-level” due to the absence of a director of assessment.
- The lack of effective—and in some cases minimal—preparation for the PREP-RI visit, the lack of evidence provided by some preparation programs, and significant variability in the quality and effectiveness of programs demonstrate a lack of commitment to continuous program improvement and the absence of a no-excuses attitude. In addition, the lack of oversight of the



assessment system, which led to the creation of multiple versions of the same assessment, confusion related to performance expectations, and a lack of coherence across programs, demonstrates a lack of leadership focused on continuous improvement.

- Evidence was provided of data analysis completed by FSEHD data analysts such as student teacher, clinical educator, and college supervisor evaluations, preparation program and school site evaluation reports, as well as completer and employer outcome reports. However, the review team did not observe or hear reports of how this data was used to evaluate programs and make targeted improvements based on data.
- Programmatic changes that were observed and reported such as revised, additional, or deleted courses, expanded diversity outreach efforts, changes to assessment instruments, and increased field experiences do not appear to be based on proactive and systematic uses of data and analysis, but reactions to changes in professional standards, certification regulations, and anecdotal information.

Recommendations:

- Establish a provider-wide and program-wide continuous improvement process that is specifically designed to review program quality and candidate outcomes and make improvement recommendations based on comprehensive data and analysis.
- Work with program leadership to connect them to the improvement process and develop processes to ensure the two-way vertical sharing of program improvement priorities, expectations, and responsibilities.
- As a provider and program faculty and staff, conduct an audit of the multiple data collection and analysis systems, determine which are critical to program improvement and should be maintained and which are less essential and may be minimized or discarded.

5.3 Reporting and Sharing of Data	Does Not Meet Expectations
The provider and its programs do not prominently display the Educator Preparation Index on their website nor do they supplement the Index with additional data on candidate outcomes and program performance.	

- The Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation require that educator preparation providers prominently display the Educator Preparation Index on their website, share it with stakeholders, and engage in discussions with stakeholders about how the data should be used to inform improvement. The Index is not displayed on the FSEHD website, stakeholders were not aware of the Index, nor did the provider present evidence of discussions with stakeholder based on Index data to drive program improvement.
- The Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation also require that educator preparation providers supplement the Educator Preparation Index with additional data based on program and candidate outcomes. The FSEHD does not supplement the Index as required to fully inform prospective and current candidates, employers, the community, and stakeholders regarding program and provider quality and effectiveness.



- The provider reported that it shares program and candidate outcome data through the FSEHD website. A review of the website revealed, along with a brief, undated list of “Quick Facts and Assessment Results” about candidates and graduates, two reports, one from previous graduates and one from employers. The reports contained data from 2010 and 2011 had relatively low ‘n’ sizes of 65 and 64, respectively.

Recommendations:

- Adhere to the requirements of the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation by prominently displaying the Educator Preparation Index on the FSEHD website, supplementing the Index with additional and impactful program and candidate outcome data, and regularly share the Index with stakeholders to support and inform the continuous improvement process.
- Conduct a review of the FSEHD website and other reporting mechanisms and systems to ensure that the program and candidate quality information is current, relative, and meaningful to all potential consumers of the information.

5.4 Stakeholder Engagement	Does Not Meet Expectations
The provider and its programs do not engage systematically or regularly with stakeholders to review program performance or seek stakeholder feedback for program improvement.	

- The provider identifies its stakeholders to include “candidates themselves, FSEHD faculty, Clinical educators/Internship Mentors, program completers (immediately at exit and again 1-5 years post-graduation), employers of program completers, and district personnel.” While evidence was provided of meetings, workshops, information sessions, and surveys with the above groups, evidence was not provided of a systematic process to engage the above groups in two-way discussions to share program performance and collect feedback for improvement. The focus of many of the engagement sessions focus on delivering information about how to serve as a clinical educator, how to use the assessment and reporting system, and how to supervise candidates.
- The provider reported that stakeholder engagement for “program evaluation and improvement occurs mainly through the use of surveys administered by FSEHD.” These surveys are addressed to program completers, employers, and on occasion district administrators. However, the provider also reports that surveys are not done on an annual basis but may occur as infrequently as five years, thus minimizing the effectiveness of the information received and discouraging strong and meaningful partnerships.
- During meeting with clinical partners, including district leadership and personnel, while many appreciated services that were provided to their districts such as candidate placements, math and science partnerships, the partners also reported that there was not a clear pathway to communicate to the provider and its programs specific needs and improvements that were desired in Rhode Island College graduates.



Recommendations:

- Develop a common understanding across provider and program leadership and program faculty of who are the appropriate stakeholders for program evaluation and improvement, what role they can serve, and what are the appropriate forums and strategies to best engage stakeholders productively in evaluation and improvement.
- In conjunction with stakeholders, identify models of excellence of comparable providers, programs, and processes that can inform and guide the continuous evaluation and improvement process that is essential to ensure Rhode Island College prepares candidates who are ready on day one to best serve PK-12 students.

5.5 Diversity and Quality of Faculty	Does Not Meet Expectations
The provider and its program do not ensure that candidates are prepared and supported by a diverse and qualified faculty nor was evidence provided demonstrating that ongoing faculty evaluation is used to assure quality instruction.	

- Many candidates and program completers reported that program faculty were generally current in their field, provided effective instruction, and modeled practices that were consistent with the expectations of their professional standards. These candidates and completers also reported that program faculty were the strength of their program and provided necessary support and advisement to begin their careers as new educators.
- Based on curriculum vitae, program and course materials, and interviews, it was not evident to the review team that all educator preparation programs are led and served by faculty members with the necessary expertise for their specific roles and that all faculty members are current in the areas of the use of technology and important Rhode Island educational initiatives and policies. Review of faculty curriculum vitae indicated that the leadership of the school counseling program does not have formal education or experience in school counseling. Based on interviews and review of curriculum vitae, it was not evident that elementary education faculty have sufficient content background, particularly in mathematics.
- Since 2011, the FSEHD has hired 16 new faculty members. The provider identified each of the new faculty members as being white. Seven of the current 87 full-time faculty members (8 percent) in the FSEHD are from diverse backgrounds. While not reflective of the diversity of RI, the full-time faculty of Rhode Island college is appreciably more diverse – 51 of 361 (14%). The FSEHD provided documentary evidence of policies used by the provider to ensure a diverse faculty that clearly are not effective or sufficient.
- RIC provided evidence to the review team that described the faculty evaluation process that includes annual evaluation, review of service, and details promotion and tenure procedures. The FSEHD did not provide evidence of how leadership uses faculty evaluation, including candidate feedback on program faculty, to ensure that high quality instruction is maintained throughout the programs.



Recommendations:

- Review the credentials of all program leadership and faculty to ensure there is a strong correlation between assignment and an individual’s background and expertise. Effectively employ the faculty evaluation process, including candidate feedback, to assure the maintenance of high quality instruction throughout the programs.
- Recognize that the faculty of the FSEHD does not reflect the diversity of RI, an expectation for all Rhode Island preparation providers and programs. Make addressing and redressing this inequity a provider and program priority, including a thorough examination of the current recruitment and hiring process. Work with the leadership of Rhode Island College, which has been more effective than the FSEHD in maintaining a diverse faculty in this effort as well as clinical partners and stakeholders.

5.6 Other Resources	Approaching Expectations
The providers and its programs report generally sufficient resources to meet the needs of their programs and candidates.	

- The FSEHD reported that it has “excellent facilities on campus to meet expectations for program quality.” The provider also reported that it has adequate technology, curricula, and materials resources necessary for its faculty and candidates.
- The provider reported frustrations with multiple data collection and storage processes and systems that inhibit the sharing, analysis, and reporting of data. The provider reported that it is in need of a data warehouse to meet better the needs of a wide-ranging faculty and program needs. However, reviewers familiar with Chalk and Wire, one of RIC’s current systems, noted that Chalk and Wire is a data warehouse and could meet current needs.
- The provider reported leadership and faculty frustration with accreditation and approval demands on provider and program resources, citing Rhode Island program approval, CAEP and SPA accreditation, and NEASC data and reporting requirements. The provider also reported that the continuous improvement process and stability of the assessment system was negatively impacted during a three-year period from 2012 to 2015 when the provider did not have a director of assessment.

Recommendations:

- Work with Rhode Island College leadership to determine and secure the resources necessary, including personnel resources, to implement the recommendations and improvements contained in this report.
- Work with provider and program leadership, and with individuals with expertise in data systems, to determine the current systems and capacities, provider and program needs, and develop a data system, storage, and reporting improvement plan benchmarked to specific timelines and deliverables.



- Recognize that program approval and reporting requirements are critical responsibilities of an educator preparation provider entrusted with the preparation of prospective educators. Integrate and communicate that reporting and approval responsibilities are part of the work of being an educator provider and program. CAEP accreditation and SPA commendation are not required to operate in Rhode Island, but these processes may be a source of valuable feedback to inform the program. Consider whether RIC will continue to seek CAEP accreditation and SPA commendation.



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

The following guidance is used by review teams 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 Approval with Distinction or Full Approval; Most provider components Meets Expectations.	No conditions
5 Years	Most programs are Approval with Distinction or Full Approval though there may be a small number of programs Approved with Conditions; Most provider components are Meets Expectations.	No conditions
4 or 3 Years	Program performance is varied. A number of programs are Approved with Conditions; Many components are Approaching Expectations.	No conditions
2 Years	Program performance is varied. Some programs are Approved with Conditions and others are Low Performing or Non-Renewal; Many components are Approaching Expectations.	Action Plan and interim visit
Non-Renewal	Overall program performance is low. All programs are Low Performing or Non-Renewal; Most components are Does Not Meet Expectations.	No subsequent visit



Appendix C: Glossary

Candidate: A person who is 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 experience: 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 partner: District, charter, or private school where a candidate is placed during clinical experiences

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