PREP-RI
Rhode Island Department of Education

Review Team Performance Report

Johnson & Wales University

November 5, 2017 through November 8, 2017

Table of Contents

Performance Review of Educator Preparation - Rhode Island

The Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) believes that strong educators are crucial for ensuring that all Rhode Island students are college and career-ready upon graduating from high school. To that end, it is RIDE's expectation that every educator who completes a Rhode Island educator preparation program will:
- Demonstrate positive impact on PK-12 student learning
- Be ready to succeed in Rhode Island schools
- Serve as leaders and professionals

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

As part of the PREP-RI process, a team of independent reviewers evaluates program and provider quality. The reviewers base their evaluation on all evidence made available to them by the program and provider: pre-visit evidence, on-site evidence, data, documentation, observations, and interviews with faculty, staff, candidates, completers, and other stakeholders. Based on this evaluation, the review team assesses program and provider performance for each component of the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation, designates a program classification, and assigns a provider approval term[1]. To support continuous improvement, the review team also provides specific and actionable recommendations, suggestions, and commendations. Additional information regarding the PREP-RI process is available on the RIDE website.

Report Purpose and Layout

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

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

---

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

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

Key Terms Used in this Report

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

Report Summary

The educator preparation provider, Johnson & Wales University (JWU), offers three RIDE-approved teacher preparation programs. JWU opened these three programs in 2016. The programs have core courses that include candidates from each program due to the small nature of the programs and cohort sizes. Each program also includes some program-specific courses as well as practicum and student teaching experiences.

The tables on the following pages list the programs and courses of study reviewed during this visit. Because JWU does not yet have any program completers, the PREP-RI team did not provide ratings for four components that focus on issues relating to program completers and recommendation for certification (Components 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, or 5.3)   However, this report summarizes evidence provided and includes recommendations for the program and provider as they move forward.

JWU and its programs have made progress in working toward the expectations captured in the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation. JWU's adjunct faculty members bring currency to the programs and help keep the programs connected to districts. In addition, multiple stakeholders praised the accessibility and responsiveness of JWU provider leadership. JWU has begun to develop an assessment system and has begun to collect data. Increased efforts to refine the assessment system and develop a systemic approach to data analysis would well position JWU and its programs to meet fully the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation.

Teacher Certification Programs

Certification Program	Graduate
Elementary Education	M.A.T in Elementary Education/Elementary Special Education
Secondary Grades	M.A.T in Business Education/Secondary Special Education
	M.A.T in Secondary Career and Technical Education (Quantity Food Preparation)
	M.A.T in Secondary Career and Technical Education (Vocational Baking)

The review team conducted the review from November 5, 2017 through November 8, 2017. Review team members were:

- Fatima Whitaker, Special Education Teacher at West Warwick Public School
- Christine Baum, Special Education Teacher at Cranston Public Schools
- Jamie Finkelstein, Career and Technical Education Teacher at Westerly Public Schools
- Dr. Nancy Hoffman, Professor at Central Connecticut State University
- Dr. Leontye Lewis, Associate Professor at Coppin State University
- Cheryl Murray, Business Education Teacher at Lincoln Public Schools

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

Program Classifications

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

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

Program	Classification
Elementary Education and Elementary Special Education	Approved with Conditions
Secondary Grades Business Education and Secondary Special Education	Approved with Conditions
Secondary Grades Career and Technical Education: Vocational Baking and Quantity Food Preparation	Approved with Conditions

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	Johnson & Wales University
Approval Term	Three Years

Conditions
- JWU must meet annually with RIDE to report on progress related to the findings and recommendations included in the PREP-RI report.   - When addressing the feedback, JWU must prioritize improving the candidate assessment system and the clinical experiences of candidates.

Component Ratings

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

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

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

Component	Elementary Education & Elementary Special Education	Secondary Business & Secondary Special Education	Secondary Career and Technical Education
1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations
1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Not Applicable[†]
1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations
1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations
1.5 Technology	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations
1.6 Equity	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations
1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations

[†]Rhode Island has not adopted competencies prescribed by a national professional association for Secondary Career and Technical Education.

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.

Teacher Certification Area Programs	Elementary Education & Elementary Special Education	Secondary Business & Secondary Special Education	Secondary Career and Technical Education
2.1 Clinical Preparation	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations
2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Does Not Meet Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations
2.4 Clinical Educators	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

Approved programs demonstrate responsibility for the quality of candidates by ensuring that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program- from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences- and in 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	Elementary Education & Elementary Special Education	Secondary Business & Secondary Special Education	Secondary Career and Technical Education
3.1 Diversity of Candidates*	Meets Expectations		
3.2 Response to Employment Needs*	Meets Expectations		
3.3 Admission Standards for Academic Achievement and Ability*	Meets Expectations		
3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations

Component	Component Ratings		
Teacher Certification Area Programs	Elementary Education & Elementary Special Education	Secondary Business & Secondary Special Education	Secondary Career and Technical Education
3.5 Recommendation for Certification	No Rating	No Rating	No Rating
3.6 Additional Selectivity Criteria*	Meets Expectations		

Standard 4: Program Impact

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

Teacher Certification Area Programs	Elementary Education & Elementary Special Education	Secondary Business & Secondary Special Education	Secondary Career and Technical Education
4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	No Rating	No Rating	No Rating
4.2 Employment Outcomes	No Rating	No Rating	No Rating

Standard 5: Program Quality and Improvement

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

Component	Component Ratings		
Teacher Certification Area Programs	Elementary Education & Elementary Special Education	Secondary Business & Secondary Special Education	Secondary Career and Technical Education
5.1 Collection of Data to Evaluate Program Quality*	Approaching Expectations		

Component	Component Ratings		
Teacher Certification Area Programs	Elementary Education & Elementary Special Education	Secondary Business & Secondary Special Education	Secondary Career and Technical Education
5.2 Analysis and Use of Data for Continuous Improvement*	Does Not Meet Expectations		
5.3 Reporting and Sharing of Data*	No Rating		
5.4 Stakeholder Engagement*	Approaching Expectations		
5.5 Diversity and Quality of Faculty*	Approaching Expectations		
5.6 Other Resources*	Meets Expectations		

Teacher Certificate Areas: Findings and Recommendations

Elementary Education & Elementary Special Education Program

The M.A.T. in Elementary Education/Elementary Special Education program prepares candidates in two certificate areas. Candidates take fourteen courses, including eleven core courses and three additional methods courses. Candidates are required to participate in field experiences in four of the five terms leading up to student teaching. Candidates complete two student teaching assignments—one in elementary education and one in elementary special education.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Approaching Expectations
The program aligns to the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS). Candidates experience a consistent curriculum and have the opportunity to develop proficiency in most but not all RIPTS.	

- The program uses a cohort model. All candidates experience a consistent curriculum that provides comparable learning opportunities to meet professional standards.

- The program provides candidates with opportunities to develop proficiency in the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions encompassed in most, but not all, of the RIPTS. The program provided a crosswalk that identified which courses address each RIPTS, but the program addresses RIPTS at varying depth.

- Program leadership reported that the M.A.T. assessment system "is grounded in the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards" and noted, "Connections [to the RIPTS] are made in the background of every rubric." Although the curriculum generally aligns to the RIPTS and the program provided evidence that leadership had aligned rubrics to the RIPTS, the program does not explicitly identify and communicate to candidates how their learning and experiences align to the RIPTS. Candidates were aware that the RIPTS existed, but they were not able to describe teaching practice in relation to the RIPTS. After reviewing the RIPTS, candidates reported that the program prepared them well in the professional teaching standards.

- The program has designed a Professional Development Self-Study Worksheet for candidates to complete during student teaching. This "reflection inventory is designed to help [the candidate] begin developing a personal teaching profile based on the RIPTS." Candidates self-rate each component of the RIPTS during their first student teaching placement and then are supposed to re-review it in their second placement. After each student teaching placement, candidates must submit a reflection based on the worksheet that describes their professional growth, identifies areas of strengths, identifies areas in need of further development, and articulates professional goals for the future. Because no candidates are student teaching, the program has not yet implemented this assessment.

- The program has identified 20 professional dispositions. Both candidates and faculty were familiar with the dispositions. Program faculty assess candidates' professional dispositions at admissions, throughout preparation, and before certification.

- Based on syllabi review, interviews, and site visits, reviewers noted that the program prepares candidates well to create age-appropriate lessons and activities that meet the developmental levels of students (Standard 3) and create instructional opportunities that reflect a respect for the diversity of learners (Standard 4).

- Evidence indicated a limited focus on how candidates can facilitate student involvement in the school and wider communities (Standard 1), the role of community agencies in supporting schools and working collaboratively with them as appropriate (Standard 7), and local, state, and federal law pertaining to educational and instructional issues (Standard 11).

Recommendations

- Align RIPTS more explicitly throughout course syllabi and candidate experiences so candidates understand what they should know and be able to do as a teacher. A more purposeful and transparent alignment will further enhance the personal teaching profile. Articulate and use the RIPTS more consistently with students to help deepen their proficiency in using the language of the standards.

- Review the depth at which RIPTS are integrated throughout the program and identify where to enhance RIPTS 1.4, 7.3, 10.4, 11.2, and 11.3.

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum aligns partially to the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) and Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) standards. Candidates do not have sufficient opportunities to develop proficiency in the range of knowledge and skills to meet the expectations of the standards.	

- Professional staff members use transcript review as a measure to determine if candidates have sufficient content knowledge. Prior to admission, candidates must demonstrate a B or higher in collegiate coursework in composition, history, literature, mathematics, psychology, and science. Prior to practicum, candidates must demonstrate a C or higher in collegiate coursework in the arts, social studies, English/language arts, mathematics, science, and health.

- The program provided a crosswalk demonstrating alignment between course syllabi and the ACEI and CEC standards. However, program emphasis on the standards is uneven. Reviewers also noted that the program does not consistently use the current CEC standards. The student teaching handbook and some syllabi include the 2003 version of the CEC standards.

- As with the RIPTS, candidates knew of the CEC and ACEI standards. Candidates were not proficient in the language of the standards, but they demonstrated understanding of the concepts, principles, and practices captured within the standards.

- The review team noted that there are several areas of strength in the program curriculum related to CEC standards. The program curriculum addresses strongly assessment (Standard 4) and collaboration (Standard 7). However, the review team noted that program curriculum does

not as thoroughly address cross-disciplinary knowledge and skills (Standards 3 and 5). The program curriculum also does not address sufficiently how to intervene safely and appropriately with individuals with exceptionalities in crisis (Standard 2).

- The review team noted that the program curriculum addresses most of the ACEI Standards. The program's emphasis on assessment (Standard 4) is a strength. Reviewers noted that candidates would benefit from additional emphasis on professionalism, particularly related to collaboration with families, colleagues, and community agencies (Standard 5).

Recommendations

- Update all materials to reflect current CEC Standards.

- Align CEC and ACEI more explicitly throughout course syllabi and candidate experiences to build candidate fluency and familiarity. This alignment will enhance candidate ability to align standards and assessments.

- Review the depth and coverage of all CEC and ACEI Standards.   Ensure more development of CEC Standards 2.3 and 3.1. Ensure more development of ACEI Standard 5.2.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations
The program provides candidates with a deep understanding of student standards. The program provides candidates multiple opportunities to develop proficiency in developing, implementing, and assessing standards-based lessons.	

- The program emphasizes student standards throughout coursework. The program introduces the student standards in early coursework. Candidates deepen their understanding of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), Grade Span Expectations (GSEs), and Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) during subject-specific methods courses.

- Candidates demonstrated strong knowledge of student standards. In interviews, they were able to cite specific standards and explain how they use standards to inform lesson planning. Adjunct faculty, who teach most courses, are currently practicing educators with strong fluency in student standards. In interviews, faculty discussed how they stay current and integrate their own professional learning into the curriculum.

- Prior to student teaching, candidates design multiple lessons in each content area aligned to student standards. Lesson plan rubrics attend to the use of standards. For example, in EDUC 5170: Best Practices in Literacy Instruction, expected performance includes "The specific CCSS to be addressed in the lesson are clearly identified and their relationship to the objectives is clear" and "The objectives are appropriate for the intended grade level and are aligned with CCSS." Work samples revealed that candidates received feedback from instructors related to their identification of standards. In a few cases, instructors identified when part of a lesson plan did not seem aligned to the standard the candidate intended to address.

- The program includes multiple key assessments that help students develop understanding of the standards. In EDUC 6140: Methods of Teaching Social Studies, students unpack the GSEs in a group activity. In EDUC 5260: Strategies for Teaching Mathematics, candidates use a Looking at Student Work protocol to review assessment data, identify student performance in relation to specific standards, and determine next steps for instruction.

1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations
The program focuses on data-based instruction. Candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and capacity to collect, analyze, and use data to make instructional decisions.	

- Data-driven instruction is a consistent thread and focus throughout the program. Coursework and assignments emphasize the importance of collecting and using data to inform instructional decisions. In interviews, candidates spoke knowledgably about the purposes of assessment, named specific examples of formative assessment, and described how to use data to inform instruction.

- Candidates also take two courses that focus on assessment. In EDUC 6120: Assessment of Student Learning candidates learn about assessment types and purposes, formative assessment methodologies, assessment practices and techniques, data analysis, grading practices, assessment and data are a consistent thread across coursework. In SPED 5120: Assessment and Evaluation of Exceptional Learners, candidates learn about benchmark and diagnostic assessments, running records, progress monitoring, standardized assessments, behavior assessments, and data-based individualization. In interviews, candidates spoke knowledgably about the purposes of assessment and about how to use data to make instructional decisions.

- Prior to student teaching, multiple key assessments emphasize the collection and analysis of data, including a data project (EDUC 5120: Foundations for Learning and Teaching), the Looking at Student Work assignment (EDUC 5260: Strategies for Teaching Mathematics), assessment administration and reflection (EDUC 6120: Assessment of Student Learning), a case study (SPED 5110: Inclusive Teaching of Exceptional Learners), and a functional behavioral assessment (SPED 6110: Understanding and Managing Behavior). Student work samples indicated that candidates received feedback on their performance on these assessments.

- Candidates learn about and use data from sources other than assessments to improve student learning and instructional practice. They use school-level data from Infoworks in a data project (EDUC 5120: Foundations for Learning and Teaching), interview a family (SPED 5170: Collaboration: Home/School/Community), and use Infoworks to inform the development of the cultural competency plan during student teaching. While these are important learning opportunities, the program should continue to expand and integrate additional opportunities for candidates to learn about and practice using data from sources other than assessments to improve student learning and instructional practice.

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

- Program leadership reported—and candidates corroborated—that course instructors use "transparent facilitation" in its classes to provide "opportunities for teacher candidates to participate in a variety of technology-based learning activities and then discuss their impact on themselves as learners, and brainstorm ways that these same practices might be employed to support learning/assessment in K-12 classrooms."

- A review of course syllabi and uLearn (JWU's online course management platform) indicated that candidates receive instruction on flipped classrooms, blended learning, and multiple apps/websites for learning/assessment. The use of technology to enhance student learning and assessment is a consistent thread throughout coursework, especially in methods classes. Some instructors require that candidates use Google Classroom throughout the course since so many PK-12 districts in Rhode Island use the Google suite.

- In interviews, candidates talked about the differences between assistive technology and universal technology. Candidates also demonstrated familiarity with a range of technology tools for both collaboration and implementation. Their knowledge of how to integrate technology to support learning was accurate and current.

- The program assesses candidates on their use of technology through a technology assessment prior to student teaching. For this assessment, candidates must create a visual presentation that supports an oral discussion of their growth in the area of education technology use throughout the program. The presentation must include an embedded video, links to educational apps or websites, lesson plans that include embedded technology with an explanation of the purpose and learning benefit of the chosen technology, examples of participation in technology-based collaboration, and a site used for professional learning and/or professional resources. A team of assessors evaluates the candidate's competency in technology using a rubric focused on technology use within the domains of planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities.

- Although the program meets expectations for this component, reviewers noted that the program should consider articulating explicit expectations that candidates receive feedback from clinical educators and university supervisors on their use of technology during clinical preparation.

1.6 Equity	Meets Expectations
The program prioritizes issues of diversity, equity, and working with families from diverse settings to meet the needs of students and their families.	

- The program reported that equity and diversity are consistent threads throughout coursework. According to provider leadership, "Teacher candidates are expected to embrace diversity in all

of its forms within their future classes/schools, and, throughout coursework and student teaching, are supported in the development of self-awareness and culturally sound practices that will support each student."

- The elementary/elementary special education program includes instruction and learning experiences focused on unpacking biases, supporting students with disabilities, supporting English learners, and working with families. Candidates also have the opportunity to work with a diverse group of learners within a variety of settings during clinical placements.

- Candidates have multiple opportunities to reflect on their own biases and cultures during the program. In EDUC 5150: Educational Psychology, students write reflections about their own cultural scripts and identify an instance when bias affected their thinking or actions. Both EDUC 5150: Educational Psychology and SPED 6110: Understanding and Managing Behavior include multiple readings on bias, racism, culture, and cultural responsiveness. In SPED 5170: Collaboration: Home/School/Community, candidates develop their own cultural autobiography.

- Candidates take multiple courses in special education where they learn about the needs of students with disabilities and learn practices and strategies that are effective when working with students with disabilities. Coursework includes multiple opportunities for candidates to learn, practice, and receive feedback on their understanding of special education. Key assessments are practice-based and emphasize planning, supporting, and assessing students with disabilities. Assessments include case studies, an individualized education plan, lesson plans with modifications, and a comprehensive classroom management plan.

- SPED 5130: Communication: Language Development briefly addresses the teaching of English learners, but both program leadership and candidates cited EDUC 5280: Strategies for Teaching Science as the primary course in which candidates learned strategies for working with ELs. Moving forward, the program should work to embed English learning strategies within additional courses to make it a more consistent emphasis throughout coursework.

- Multiple courses also address working with families in some capacity, but the course SPED 5170: Collaboration: Home/School/Community includes the most explicit and concentrated focus on working with families. During interviews, candidates described specific strategies that they learned in this class. Key assignments for the class include interviewing a family member of an individual with a disability, a small group research project on a community-based family support agency that includes interviewing members or leaders of the agency, and reflecting on topics in class. Moving forward, the program should strengthen the emphasis on working with families by increasing candidate opportunities to work with families and receive feedback on their practice in this area.

- The final candidate portfolio submitted prior to certification must include key artifacts related to equity, including a cultural competency plan, a reflection on the effectiveness of efforts to implement the plan, and examples of family engagement and communication. The cultural competency plan includes a review of data and an action plan that describes three to five specific ways candidates will demonstrate cultural competence in teaching. Candidates implement the plan during student teaching and then reflect on the effectiveness of their efforts.

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

- Candidates receive introductory information about some educational initiatives, laws, and policies through coursework and develop a basic understanding of the initiatives. Although the program provided a crosswalk showing that coursework addressed multiple Rhode Island initiatives, candidates demonstrated limited knowledge of initiatives during interviews. Candidates were aware of Rhode Island educator evaluation, the Rhode Island Comprehensive Assessment System, Response to Intervention, and Multi-tiered Systems of Support, but they could not describe these initiatives in detail.

- The program notes that it "assesses teacher candidate knowledge of Rhode Island initiatives primarily through application to projects, presentations, reflections, and other course-based assessments." Candidate work samples included a three-question quiz on RTI and MTSS. Another assignment, the data project in EDUC 5210: Foundations for Teaching and Learning, requires candidates to access school data on Infoworks, read the school improvement plan, and interview the school principal before identifying areas in need of improvement. However, few assignments make explicit connections to Rhode Island initiatives. The program does not assess clearly candidate proficiency in initiatives and does not assess candidate proficiency in the knowledge and skills needed to implement initiatives successfully.

- Although the program reports that candidates learn about the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act and special education law, candidates noted that they wished they had learned more about education laws and policies. Candidates also voiced that they were not familiar with social-emotional learning.

Recommendations
- Work with clinical partners and other stakeholders to identify which Rhode Island initiatives are most important for elementary and elementary special education candidates to learn about during their program of study. Identify the knowledge, skills, and practices embedded in those key Rhode Island educational initiatives relevant to these certification areas. Intentionally embed state laws, policies, and initiatives throughout the program to develop a deep understanding of these critical practices. Do not rely solely on the influence of the clinical educator or field experiences to inform candidates of these initiatives

- Integrate more explicitly relevant state laws, policies, and initiatives throughout the program.

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

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

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

- Clinical experiences begin first semester of the program and continue throughout the program. The program reported that candidates complete 96 hours of elementary education field experience, 72 hours of elementary special education field experiences, and two twelve-week student teaching experiences—one in elementary education and one in elementary special education. Collectively, candidate clinical preparation exceeds the required amount established by Rhode Island certification requirements.

- Most candidates had five or six different school placements and had the opportunity to work in a range of grades and environments. Adjunct faculty, particularly those teaching methods courses, noted that sometimes they recommend specific placements for candidates because they know the placement will be a strong instructional model.

- The program works with candidates who currently hold full-time jobs to find suitable placements. However, reviewers noted that one candidate had all early special education placements at a specialized special education placement and expressed concern that this candidate did not have sufficient opportunity to work with students with a range of disabilities. The program should continue to seek a balance between meeting the needs of candidates working full time and ensuring candidates experience a range of placements.

- The practicum experiences align intentionally to specific courses and serve as field settings to observe, implement, and practice skills, strategies and assessments featured in courses. Candidates receive specific reflection prompts that connect course content with observations in the field. In some cases, the program has identified alternative approaches when a candidate cannot implement the assignment in the current placement, but these approaches are not always in an elementary setting. For example, candidates shared that their instructor allowed them to conduct a Functional Behavioral Assessment of a family member or friend. The program should find additional ways for candidates to complete assignments in an elementary setting if the semester placement will not work.

- Candidate clinical preparation begins early in the program. Early clinical experiences emphasize observation, but candidates must teach multiple lessons prior to student teaching. Per the student teaching handbook, the program expects candidates to use practicum as an opportunity to learn about students, the classroom, and the school, begin to develop a unit plan and cultural competency plan, and increase opportunities to work with all instructional groupings. The program should articulate and execute a clearer set of expectations for candidates to practice their instruction and receive feedback during practicum and align these expectations with the candidate's trajectory towards assuming all teaching responsibilities.

- Per the student teaching handbook, the program expects candidates to take over all teaching responsibilities gradually, beginning with teaching one lesson per day in early weeks and

assuming 80 percent of all teaching and planning in Week 5. Candidates assume 100 percent of all teaching responsibilities for five weeks, from Weeks 6 through 11.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program's current design does not enable candidates to increasingly demonstrate positive impact on PK-12 students' learning.	

- Program leadership identified—and reviewers agreed—that the program needs to improve how it measures candidate impact on student learning. When asked to give examples of how the program used data collected from early clinical measures of impact on student learning to inform and improve candidate preparation, program leadership described a survey. In an evidence organizer, program leadership noted that it had "developed a survey for host teachers to gather more data regarding the impact of our teacher candidates during course-based fieldwork" and acknowledged that responses were not high. This survey, while a potentially useful source of information, is not an impact measure.

- The program has not identified early measures of candidate impact on student learning and therefore does not use evidence of impact from early clinical measures to inform and improve candidates' ability to impact student learning in later clinical experiences.

- The program has not established clear expectations for demonstrating positive impact on PK-12 students' learning. During interviews, multiple stakeholders could not describe expectations regarding impact on student learning.

- Candidates must complete a case study as part of their student teaching. For this assignment, candidates identify a student who needs intervention, deliver an intervention, and then describe student progress and the student's response to educational interventions. One indicator of the rubric focuses on candidate use of assessment and candidate understanding of student strengths and weaknesses, but it does not look at candidate impact on student learning.

- Candidates must also implement a unit plan during student teaching. The JWU Portfolio Outline specifies that candidates will need to reflect on whether students met the intended outcomes and provide evidence. However, it is unclear the extent to which evaluators of the portfolio focus on candidate impact on student learning.

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

Recommendations

- Consider how PK-12 schools define and measure impact on student learning and explore what impact of student learning means for preparation programs. Work with clinical partners to develop a programmatic definition, approach, and expected impact levels that the program can communicate to candidates, faculty, and clinical educators.

- Develop impact measures in conjunction with clinical partners and embed these measures and expectations throughout the program. Find ways to develop opportunities for candidates and various stakeholders to identify, monitor, and refine this critical aspect of teaching.

- Clearly communicate expectations and measures of candidate impact on student learning with clinical educators and candidates. Require candidates to collect and analyze impact on student learning data across clinical placements.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has created an innovative, mutually beneficial partnership with Pawtucket Public Schools. However, the program has not established clear indicators for partnership effectiveness with other districts nor does the program utilize data from those indicators to make partnership decisions.	

- Professional staff members primarily lead the outreach and organization of clinical placements, although adjunct faculty also sometimes recommend placements.

- In the past year, the provider has established a strong, mutually beneficial partnership with Pawtucket School District. This partnership is a strength. Pawtucket School District has hired four current elementary teacher candidates as permanent substitutes, which has provided a source of income to teacher candidates and has helped address Pawtucket's shortage of substitutes. Candidates complete their early fieldwork during their free periods. Both provider and district leadership discussed how they have problem solved as issues have arisen to ensure that the partnership is mutually beneficial. Both provider and district leadership noted that they have met a few times to discuss the success of the partnership thus far and to problem solve as needed.

- Other district partners could not speak to agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness. However, district partners noted that hosting JWU candidates is potentially beneficial since JWU's programs address shortage areas. One partner described the clinical placement as "a three-month interview" for candidates and expressed that they hope to hire strong candidates after they complete their program.

- Provider leadership acknowledged that clinical partners currently have limited input into the design, implementation, and assessment of clinical experiences. However, JWU recently created an M.A.T. Advisory Board that includes multiple clinical partners. The board has not met yet, but, according to provider leadership, "The primary work of this group will be to help program staff/faculty look at our data and find opportunities to improve our systems, protocols, and curriculum to create stronger connections between the university and the schools in which our candidates serve."

Recommendations

- Build upon connections and relationships with practitioners to identify, document, and establish agreed-upon indicators of partnership progress and success. Include clinical educators, principals, and central office leaders in these conversations. Determine how the program and

its clinical partners will track and analyze data from agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness.

- Consider where and how candidate impact on student learning and district hiring (or intent to hire) could be used as indicators of partnership success.

- Incorporate agreed-upon indicators of partnership success in stakeholder conversations and documents to move closer to mutually beneficial and symbiotic relationships with districts.

- Identify additional opportunities for clinical educators to have input into decisions about candidate progression within the program, particularly prior to student teaching.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Approaching Expectations
The program has identified criteria for recruiting clinical educators during student teaching, has provided initial training, and has begun to plan how it will evaluate clinical educators. Current practices do not ensure that all candidates receive high quality clinical experiences.	

- The student teaching handbook identifies selection criteria for clinical educators that include at least three years' professional experience in the certification area, "professional teaching behaviors and strategies that are exemplary of the RIPTS, CECs, and Cultural Competency Standards," administrative approval from the school district, and a resume that provides "evidence of continuous growth." Although multiple clinical partners said they select highly effective educators to be clinical educators, the provider did not explicitly state "demonstration of earning Highly Effective" in the candidate handbook. The selection criteria also do not include ability to work with adult learners, coaching and supervision skills, or ability to evaluate practice and provide feedback to candidates.

- The program structure provides professional staff members who serve as advisors and establish clinical placements for students. Candidates reported that they indicate their preferences on a survey, and then their advisor works to find a placement. Both candidates and clinical partners praised the responsiveness of professional staff members in problem solving when candidate placement or performance issues arose.

- Clinical educators in early clinical placements do not receive any training. There is no formal mechanism for providing candidates or the program feedback on candidate performance in classrooms during early field experiences.

- The program recently provided a training to clinical educators in preparation for student teaching placements. The training agenda included an overview of practicum, evaluation forms, an assessment calibration activity, and training on Taskstream. Program leadership reported in an evidence organizer, "Clinical educators can also request a visit by program staff to the school site if they are unable to make one of the several training sessions held at the JWU Harborside Campus." The program did not have clear plans of how it will engage clinical educators in ongoing calibration.

- Provider leadership trains university supervisors and submitted evidence from the training. The training content mirrored the clinical educator training. The agenda included time to share dispositions, practicum expectations, evaluation forms, an assessment calibration activity, and training on Taskstream.

- The review team noted that the uploaded training materials focused on models of co-teaching and spent little time focused on expectations for candidates and expectations related to feedback. While the review team appreciated the inclusion of a calibration activity within the training, current training and calibration efforts are insufficient.

- The program has not had student teachers yet but has created surveys that the program will use to assess the university supervisor and clinical educator. The candidate will provide feedback about the university supervisor and clinical educator, the university supervisor will provide feedback about the candidate and clinical educator, and the clinical educator will provide feedback about the candidate and university supervisor. The surveys include 12 to 15 statements and ask candidate to identify their level of agreement with each statement.

Recommendations

- Refine selection criteria for clinical educators to include all aspects necessary in supporting adult learners. Criteria must include a demonstrated ability to coach candidates.

- Establish an ongoing expectation for clinical educators to calibrate their observations, usage of JWU tools, and feedback to candidates.   Create, facilitate, and monitor clinical educator access to these opportunities to ensure alignment and to redirect practices when necessary.

- Ensure that all clinical educators—not just those supervising student teachers—receive training on best adult learning practices and expectations for candidates. Require that all clinical educators retrain on a regular basis and, as needed, offer more training sessions.

- Collaborate with partner districts to revise and implement training for both clinical educators and university supervisors. During training and subsequent calibration sessions, communicate clear expectations for feedback, including when to provide feedback, preferred delivery feedback method, and the level of detail expected to ensure that clinical educators, school and district leaders, and clinical supervisors have shared expectations for feedback on candidate performance.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has established an assessment system that is clear to candidates and stakeholders. The assessment system does not prioritize candidate performance working with PK-12 students prior to student teaching.	

- The program assessment system includes three major decision points: readiness for admission, readiness for student teaching, and recommendation for certification. The program relies on regular communication between candidates, advisors, and faculty to identify candidate performance issues and intervenes as needed. Program leadership noted, "Mid-term data check-ins with faculty who are teaching in the program and advisor-candidate check-ins assure that candidates who may not be performing at high levels are provided supports in a timely manner" or are counseled out of the program.

- In order to proceed to student teaching, candidates must have a GPA of 3.0 or higher, complete all field experience requirements, meet standard on key assessments, score "meets standard" or higher on 90 percent of dispositions rubrics, pass the 15-minute recorded lesson assessment, pass Praxis content area tests, and complete successfully the technology assessment.

- Other than the 15-minute recorded lesson, the assessment system does not emphasize candidate performance in clinical experiences prior to student teaching. Clinical educators and university supervisors do not assess formally candidate performance working in clinical experiences and do not have input into progression decisions.

- Key assessments have performance-based rubrics with defined performance levels. Candidate assessment begins early in the program and increases in both expectations and complexity as candidates progress through the program. Most key assessments are authentic performance tasks requiring candidates to apply their learning (e.g. case study, a functional behavioral assessment and behavior intervention plan, an individualized education program, lesson plans, unit plan).

- Work samples demonstrated that candidates receive written feedback on key assignments and have opportunities to redo assignments when performance does not meet expectations. However, candidates do not receive formal feedback from clinical educators or clinical supervisors on their performance working with PK-12 students in early clinical experiences.

- Multiple stakeholders noted that frequent communication between candidates, advisors, and faculty enables the program to intervene quickly when candidate performance is below expectations. However, the program did not demonstrate a systemic approach to monitoring and supporting candidate development throughout the program. Program leadership engage in multiple conversations about candidate performance but do not document these programs in systematic way. Program leadership have begun to use Taskstream, but currently do not use the system to proactively track and monitor individual candidate performance.

- As noted above, the program has not clearly established or articulated measures of candidate impact on student learning and has not integrated measures into the assessment system.

Recommendations

- Work with clinical partners to design and implement performance assessments to use in early clinical placements and practicum to ensure candidates are ready for student teaching. Revise the assessment system to prioritize candidate performance working with PK-12 students during

early clinical experiences beyond the 15-min recorded lesson and ensure that clinical educators have input into decisions about candidate progression.

- Institute measures of candidate impact on student learning and incorporate that critical aspect of effective pedagogy into the assessment system. Identify and pilot potential measures to understand how they fit with the program.

- Develop conversation protocols and tracking systems to help move from anecdotal and informal data gathering to a more structured and systematic approach to conversations related to candidate performance.

3.5 Recommendation for Certification	No Rating
The program has not yet recommended candidates for certification but has identified criteria it will use in the future. The program does not yet have quality measures and a system in place that will assure fair, accurate, and consistent evaluation of candidate performance.	

- Prior to recommendation for certification, candidates must have a GPA of 3.0 or higher, complete successfully student teaching, receive a passing score on a recorded lesson from student teaching, complete successfully the program final assessment (which includes presentation of a portfolio and exit interview), and meet all clinical experience hour requirements. The program clearly articulates these requirements in the student teaching handbook.

- Clinical educators and clinical supervisors are both responsible for evaluating the performance of candidates. According to the assessment system overview, the program expects the clinical educator to complete four assessments and the university supervisor to complete three assessments of the candidate's practice using a modified version Charlotte Danielson's *Framework for Teaching* rubric. The rubric is organized into four domains. The evaluator rates performance using a scale of "1-little/no evidence" to "5-exemplary evidence" for each component being evaluated. The rubric does not include indicator-specific performance levels. Clinical educators focus on Domain 1 during the Week 3 assessment, Domain 3 during the Week 6 assessment, and Domain 2 during the Week 9 assessment. The assessment system overview states that, by the final evaluation, the candidates must be "on target" with no more than two criteria in each domain assessed as "on track" evidence.

- Although the aforementioned student teaching observation tool aligns to the indicators of the *Framework for Teaching*, the current design and implementation of the student teaching assessment does not maintain fidelity to the intentional design of the tool. Efforts to streamline the tool based on stakeholder feedback have comprised quality. The student teaching assessment does not include indicator-level performance level descriptions of practice and therefore does not provide a clear common set of expectations for candidate performance. Additionally, by focusing on specific domains for each observation, it will be difficult for the program to quantify candidate improvement in practice over time.

- The program also provided evidence that program and clinical faculty receive training for their roles in the assessment system. This evidence included training materials and agendas. It was

not clear to the review team that the training focus and activities sufficiently addressed or fully prepared clinical educators for their role in candidate assessment. Specifically, it is not clear that training attendees develop a consistent and deep understanding of the expected levels of candidate performance consistent with professional standards.

- The program does not have a clear plan for monitoring candidate performance to ensure the implementation of performance-based assessments yields fair, accurate, and consistent evaluation of candidate performance. However, provider leadership noted that they have identified rater discrepancies in dispositions form ratings and are working to recalibrate expectations.

Recommendations

- Consult implementation research for the Danielson rubric to understand specifically why and how this framework has established strong field and research credibility. Consider how JWU's usage may or may not align with this research. Specifically, review how JWU's performance levels impact candidate and clinical educator transparency and calibration.

- Convene clinical educators and practicing faculty to reconcile a possible disconnect between how JWU and Rhode Island schools are using the *Framework for Teaching*. Focus a conversation on where and how educators and evaluators determine performance levels and coach towards improvement.

- Consider other methods of decreasing the burden on clinical educators and university supervisors while maintaining fidelity of the *Framework for Teaching* tool. Rating by component rather than indicator, providing additional training to improve clinical educator fluency with the tool, or leveraging technology may help address stakeholder feedback without compromising the quality of the tool.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	No Rating
The program does not yet have program completers but has plans to survey employers annually.	

- The program reported that it plans to survey employers annually "as we become aware of where our graduates are employed." The program has developed a draft ten-question survey that asks respondents to rate how well prepared JWU program completers are as a beginning teacher in a variety of skills aligned to the Danielson rubric and includes one open-ended question for comments about the program.

- The survey asks administrators to rate aggregate performance for all program completers hired from the JWU M.A.T. program. As a result, the survey may not result in program-specific, actionable data.

Recommendations

- Work with district partners to identify the best time and method for disseminating the survey. Identify proactively specific strategies for improving response rates as needed.

- Develop a formal plan for survey dissemination, data collection, and analysis. Consider how provider leadership will share the data with program faculty and clinical partners and how the program will use the data as part of a formal and active continuous improvement cycle.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	No Rating
The program does not yet have program completers. It intends to survey candidates at program start, program completion, and one year after program completion. The program does not have plans for using data from program completers to inform program improvements.	

- The program has developed a suite of surveys based on the work done by well-known researchers at another preparation program. The surveys are extensive and include more than 100 questions on each survey.

- Questions are similar across surveys and will enable the program to track changes over time. The majority of questions ask candidates to rate their preparation in various skills using a Likert scale ranging from "Poor" to "Excellent". The surveys do not include an open-ended question where candidates or completers can provide additional feedback to the program.

- The program has administered the entry survey to its second cohort and will administer the completer survey in Spring 2018. It intends to administer the third survey one year after program completion.

- Provider leadership noted, "There has been some discussion with other providers as to the possibility of creating a common survey perhaps in consultation with district HR and administrative personnel." However, there were no concrete plans at the time of the visit.

Recommendations

- Monitor survey response rates and responses closely to determine if the survey is providing the number and quality of responses needed to be actionable data. Consider the length of time needed to complete the survey and adjust survey length if necessary.

- Consider including an open-response question for candidates to provide specific, narrative feedback about their program.

- Develop a formal plan for survey dissemination, data collection, and analysis. Consider how provider leadership will share the data with program faculty and clinical partners and how the program will use the data as part of a formal continuous improvement cycle.

Secondary Grades Business Education & Secondary Special Education Program

The M.A.T. in Secondary Education/Secondary Special Education is a cohort program. Candidates take fourteen courses, including eleven core courses and three additional courses. Candidates are required to participate in field experiences in four of the five terms leading up to student teaching. Candidates complete two student teaching assignments—one in secondary business education and one in secondary special education.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Approaching Expectations
The program aligns to the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS). Candidates experience a consistent curriculum and have opportunity to develop proficiency in most but not all RIPTS.	

- The program uses a cohort model. All candidates experience a consistent curriculum that provides comparable learning opportunities to meet professional standards.

- The program provides candidates with opportunities to develop proficiency in the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions encompassed in most, but not all, of the RIPTS. The program provided a crosswalk that identified which courses address each RIPTS, but the program addresses RIPTS at varying depth.

- Program leadership reported that the M.A.T. assessment system "is grounded in the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards" and noted that "connections [to the RIPTS] are made in the background of every rubric." Although the curriculum generally aligns to the RIPTS and the program provided evidence that leadership had aligned rubrics to the RIPTS, the program does not explicitly identify and communicate to candidates how their learning and experiences align to the RIPTS. Candidates were aware that the RIPTS existed, but they were not able to describe teaching practice in relation to the RIPTS. After reviewing the RIPTS, candidates reported that the program prepared them well in the professional teaching standards.

- The program has designed a Professional Development Self-Study Worksheet for candidates to complete during student teaching. This "reflection inventory is designed to help [the candidate] begin developing a personal teaching profile based on the RIPTS." Candidates self-rate themselves on each component of the RIPTS during their first student teaching placement and then are supposed to re-review it in their second placement. After each student teaching placement, candidates must submit a reflection based on the worksheet that describes their professional growth, identifies areas of strengths, identifies areas in need of further development, and articulates professional goals for the future. Because no candidates are student teaching, the program has not yet implemented this assessment.

- The program has identified 20 professional dispositions. Both candidates and faculty were familiar with the dispositions. Program faculty assess candidates' professional dispositions at admissions, throughout preparation, and before certification.

- Evidence indicated a strong focus on creating a supportive learning environment (Standard 6). Candidates also demonstrated strong content knowledge (Standard 2).

- Reviewers noted that candidates would benefit from additional emphasis on creating interdisciplinary learning experiences (Standard 1) and creating instructional opportunities to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, performance skills, and literacy across content areas (Standard 5). The program also places limited emphasis on certain aspects of Standards 8 and 9.

Recommendations

- Align RIPTS more explicitly throughout course syllabi and candidate experiences so candidates understand what they should know and be able to do as a teacher. A more purposeful and transparent alignment will further enhance the personal teaching profile. Articulate and use the RIPTS more consistently with students to help deepen their proficiency in using the language of the standards.

- Review the depth at which RIPTS are integrated throughout the program and identify where to enhance RIPTS 1.2, 1.3, 5, 8.2, 8.4, 9.1, 9.4, and 9.7.

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum aligns partially to the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) standards. Candidates do not have sufficient opportunities to develop proficiency in the range of knowledge and skills to meet the expectations of the standards.	

- Professional staff members use transcript review as a measure to determine if candidates have sufficient content knowledge in business. Prior to admission, candidates must demonstrate a B or higher in collegiate coursework in accounting, business law, management, marketing, economics, career development, personal finance, information technology/coding, international/global business/economics, and software applications. Prior to practicum, candidates must demonstrate a C or higher in collegiate coursework in social studies/history, English/language arts, psychology, science, and writing/composition. In some cases, advisors substitute a course requirement with demonstrated work experience.

- The program provided a crosswalk demonstrating alignment between course syllabi and the CEC standards. However, program emphasis on the standards is uneven. Reviewers also noted that the program does not consistently use the current CEC standards. The student teaching handbook and some syllabi include the 2003 version of the CEC standards.

- Candidates were aware that the CEC standards existed. After reviewing a hard copy of the CEC standards, candidates could speak in general terms about the standards. However, candidates did not demonstrate a deep understanding of the standards.

- As evidenced by site visits, candidate interviews, and work samples, candidates demonstrated proficiency in most—but not all—critical concepts, principles, and practices embedded within the CEC standards.

- The review team noted that there are several areas of strength in the program curriculum related to CEC standards. The program curriculum addresses strongly assessment (Standard 4) and collaboration (Standard 7). However, the review team noted that program curriculum does not as thoroughly address cross-disciplinary knowledge and skills (Standards 3 and 5). The program curriculum also does not address sufficiently how to intervene safely and appropriately with individuals with exceptionalities in crisis (Standard 2).

- A review of syllabi and key assessments revealed limited differentiation between elementary and secondary special education. For example, the case study assignment in SPED 5110: Inclusive Teaching of Exceptional Learners requires secondary grades candidates to consider an elementary education scenario instead of a secondary education scenario. In addition, the emphasis on designing and implementing transition plans—a critical part of a secondary special educator's role—is limited (Standard 5).

Recommendations

- Update all materials to reflect current CEC Standards.

- Align CEC more explicitly throughout course syllabi and candidate experiences to build candidate fluency and familiarity. This alignment will enhance candidate ability to align standards and assessments.

- Review the depth and coverage of CEC Standards 2, 3 and 5 to ensure sufficient development.

- Collaborate with district partners and current practitioners to revise the candidate experience to include a more explicit emphasis on transition planning. Review course syllabi, assessments, and instruction to ensure sufficient differentiation during coursework between elementary and secondary special education.

- After candidates complete the program, engage program completers and clinical partners in additional conversations about current gaps in candidate content knowledge and pedagogy. Implement changes to the course of study that address such gaps.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum provides some opportunities for candidates to learn about student standards and their critical importance to instructional planning and assessment. Candidates develop a partial understanding of standards-based instruction.	

- The program introduces student standards in early coursework and then integrates them into later courses. Candidates also learn about the National Standards in K-12 Personal Finance Education in EDUC 5190: Teaching Financial Management.

- Candidates demonstrated knowledge of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and the National Business Education Association (NBEA) standards in interviews and work samples. Candidates had a limited understanding of the Next Generation Science Standards and Grade Span Expectations, which candidates will need to know as secondary special educators.

- Interviews and a review of course syllabi indicated a focus on personal finance with limited emphasis on other disciplines within the NBEA standards. In particular, there was insufficient focus on business law.

- In interviews, candidates were able to explain how they use standards to inform lesson planning. Prior to student teaching, candidates design lessons aligned to student standards. Some lesson plan rubrics attend to the use of standards. For example, in EDUC 5170: Best Practices in Literacy Instruction, expected performance includes "The specific CCSS to be addressed in the lesson are clearly identified and their relationship to the objectives is clear" and "The objectives are appropriate for the intended grade level and are aligned with CCSS."

- Candidates develop basic skills in designing and implementing standards-based lessons and assessments prior to student teaching. Because of the emphasis on observation during early clinical experiences, candidates have limited opportunities to implement standards-based lessons and limited opportunities to grow their practice in this area prior to student teaching.

Recommendations

- Extend candidate interaction with student standards early in the program to go beyond planning. Create opportunities for candidates to teach lessons aligned to student standards to build their capacity in standards-based instruction. Incorporate additional standards-based assessment opportunities to mirror candidate teaching opportunities.

- Expand the breadth and depth of candidate interaction and usage of student standards. Ensure candidates have a deep understanding of the structure, expectations, and content contained within the NBEA standards. Ensure candidates are prepared to teach and modify lessons aligned to the NGSS and GSEs.

1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations
The program focuses on data-based instruction. Candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and capacity to collect, analyze, and use data to make instructional decisions.	

- Data-driven instruction is a consistent thread and focus throughout the program. Coursework and assignments emphasize the importance of collecting and using data to inform instructional decisions. In interviews, candidates spoke knowledgably about the purposes of assessment, named specific examples of formative assessment, and described how to use data to inform instruction.

- Candidates also take two courses that focus on assessment. In EDUC 6120: Assessment of Student Learning candidates learn about assessment types and purposes, formative assessment methodologies, assessment practices and techniques, data analysis, grading practices, assessment and data are a consistent thread across coursework. In SPED 5120: Assessment and Evaluation of Exceptional Learners, candidates learn about benchmark and diagnostic assessments, running records, progress monitoring, standardized assessments, behavior

assessments, and data-based individualization. Candidates complete the RIDE online video training on formative assessment techniques in EDUC 5230: Methods of Teaching Business.

- Prior to student teaching, multiple key assessments emphasize the collection and analysis of data, including a data project (EDUC 5120: Foundations for Learning and Teaching), assessment administration and reflection (EDUC 6120: Assessment of Student Learning), a case study (SPED 5110: Inclusive Teaching of Exceptional Learners), and a functional behavioral assessment (SPED 6110: Understanding and Managing Behavior). Student work samples indicated that candidates received feedback on their performance on these assessments.

- Candidates learn about and use data from sources other than assessments to improve student learning and instructional practice. They use school-level data from Infoworks in a data project (EDUC 5120: Foundations for Learning and Teaching), interview a family (SPED 5170: Collaboration: Home/School/Community), and use Infoworks to inform the development of the cultural competency plan during student teaching. While these are important learning opportunities, the program should continue to expand and integrate additional opportunities for candidates to learn about and practice using data from sources other than assessments to improve student learning and instructional practice.

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

- Program leadership reported—and candidates corroborated—that course instructors use "transparent facilitation" in its classes to provide "opportunities for teacher candidates to participate in a variety of technology-based learning activities and then discuss their impact on themselves as learners, and brainstorm ways that these same practices might be employed to support learning/assessment in K-12 classrooms."

- A review of course syllabi and uLearn (JWU's online course management platform) indicate that candidates receive instruction on flipped classrooms, blended learning, and multiple apps/websites for learning/assessment. The use of technology to enhance student learning and assessment is a consistent thread throughout coursework, especially in methods classes. Candidates also take EDUC 6130: Digital Collaborative Tools, which focuses on how to incorporate technology into classrooms. The program should continue to emphasize applications and technology that are particularly relevant within a business context (e.g. Microsoft Excel).

- In interviews, candidates talked about the differences between assistive technology and universal technology. Candidates demonstrated familiarity with a range of technology tools for both collaboration and implementation. Their knowledge of how to integrate technology to support student learning was accurate and current.

- The program assesses candidates on their use of technology through a technology assessment prior to student teaching. For this assessment, candidates must create a visual presentation

that supports an oral discussion of their growth in the area of education technology use throughout the program. The presentation must include an embedded video, links to educational apps or websites, lesson plans that include embedded technology with an explanation of the purpose and learning benefit of the chosen technology, examples of participation in technology-based collaboration, and a site used for professional learning and/or professional resources. A team of assessors evaluates the candidate's competency in technology using a rubric focused on technology use within the domains of planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities.

- Although the program meets expectations for this component, reviewers noted that the program should attend to how candidates receive feedback on their use of technology during clinical preparation.

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
The program design provides candidates multiple opportunities to reflect on their own biases and develop proficiency in designing and implementing strategies that are effective with students with disabilities. However, the program provides limited emphasis on working with English learners and working with families in diverse communities.	

- The program reported that equity and diversity are consistent threads throughout coursework. According to provider leadership, "Teacher candidates are expected to embrace diversity in all of its forms within their future classes/schools, and, throughout coursework and student teaching, are supported in the development of self-awareness and culturally sound practices that will support each student." However, the program does not sufficiently focus on working with English learners and candidates do not consistently have opportunities to practice working with a diverse range of learners in clinical placements.

- Candidates have multiple opportunities to reflect on their own biases and cultures during the program. In EDUC 5150: Educational Psychology, students write reflections about their own cultural scripts and identify an instance when bias affected their thinking or actions. Both EDUC 5150: Educational Psychology and SPED 6110: Understanding and Managing Behavior include multiple readings on bias, racism, culture, and cultural responsiveness. In SPED 5170: Collaboration: Home/School/Community, candidates develop their own cultural autobiography.

- Candidates take multiple courses in special education where they learn about the needs of students with disabilities and learn practices and strategies that are effective when working with students with disabilities. Coursework includes multiple opportunities for candidates to learn, practice, and receive feedback on their understanding of special education. Key assessments are practice-based and emphasize planning, supporting, and assessing students with disabilities. Assessments include case studies, an individualized education plan, lesson plans with modifications, and a comprehensive classroom management plan.

- SPED 5130: Communication: Language Development briefly addresses the teaching of English learners, but preparation is insufficient. The curriculum does not include sufficient explicit instruction in instructional strategies that are effective when working with English language

learners, nor do clinical placements provide adequate opportunities for candidates to practice working with English language learners.

- The course SPED 5170: Collaboration: Home/School/Community includes an explicit focus on working with families. Key assignments for the class include interviewing a family member of an individual with a disability, a small group research project on a community-based family support agency that includes interviewing members or leaders of the agency, and reflecting on topics in class. However, candidates have limited opportunities to interact with parents prior to student teaching.

- The final candidate portfolio submitted prior to certification must include key artifacts related to equity, including a cultural competency plan, a reflection on the effectiveness of efforts to implement the plan, and examples of family engagement and communication. The cultural competency plan includes a review of data and an action plan that describes three to five specific ways candidates will demonstrate cultural competence in teaching. Candidates implement the plan during student teaching and then reflect on the effectiveness of their efforts.

Recommendations

- Provide candidates clear, specific instruction in strategies for supporting English language learners. Identify and implement performance requirements for implementing strategies for supporting English Language Learners. Ensure candidates receive feedback on their implementation of strategies.

- Communicate explicitly an expectation that candidates interact with parents and receive feedback on their interactions throughout clinical preparation.

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

- Candidates receive introductory information about some educational initiatives, laws, and policies through coursework and develop a basic understanding of the initiatives. Although the program provided a crosswalk showing that coursework addressed multiple Rhode Island initiatives, candidates demonstrated limited knowledge of initiatives during interviews. Candidates were aware of Rhode Island educator evaluation, but they could not describe these initiatives in detail. When reviewers asked candidates about recent high school reforms, candidates did not provide detailed answers. Candidates did not demonstrate an understanding of new graduation requirements.

- The program notes that it "assesses teacher candidate knowledge of Rhode Island Initiatives primarily through application to projects, presentations, reflections, and other course-based assessments." Candidate work samples included a three-question quiz on RTI and MTSS. Another assignment, the data project in EDUC 5210: Foundations for Teaching and Learning, requires candidates to access school data on Infoworks, read the school improvement plan, and

interview the school principal before identifying areas in need of improvement. However, few assignments make explicit connections to Rhode Island initiatives. The program does not assess clearly candidate proficiency in initiatives and does not assess candidate proficiency in the knowledge and skills needed to implement initiatives successfully.

- Although the program reports that candidates learn about the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act and special education law, candidates noted that they wished they had learned more about education laws and policies.

Recommendations
- Work with clinical partners and other stakeholders to identify which Rhode Island initiative are most important for secondary business education and secondary special education candidates to learn about during their program of study. Identify the knowledge, skills, and practices embedded in those key Rhode Island educational initiatives. Intentionally embed state laws, policies, and initiatives throughout the program to develop a deep understanding of these critical practices. Do not rely on the influence of the clinical educator or field experiences.

- Ensure all candidates understand high school graduation requirements.

- Develop methods for assessing candidate understanding and ability to integrate relevant state laws, policies, and initiatives throughout the program.

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

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Approaching Expectations
Candidates' clinical preparation is coherent. Clinical preparation builds from and continues to link theory to practice. However, candidates' early clinical preparation is not of sufficient depth, breadth, or diversity.	

- Clinical experiences begin first semester of the program and continue throughout the program. The program reported that candidates complete 96 hours of secondary business field experience, 72 hours of secondary special education field experiences, and two twelve-week student teaching experiences—one in secondary business and one in secondary special education.   Collectively, candidate clinical preparation exceeds the required amount established by Rhode Island certification requirements.

- A review of current clinical placements indicated that candidates typically have three or four different placements prior to student teaching but do not experience a diverse range of placements. Placements were very similar to each other in terms of school type (i.e. middle v. high school), PK-12 student demographics, and urbanity.

- The program works with candidates who currently hold full-time jobs to find suitable placements. Like in the elementary program, one secondary candidate had all early special education placements at a specialized special education placement. Reviewers expressed concern that this candidate did not have sufficient opportunity to work with students with a range of disabilities. The program should continue to seek a balance between meeting the needs of candidates working full time and ensuring candidates experience a range of placements.

- Early clinical experiences align intentionally to specific courses and serve as field settings to observe skills, strategies and assessments featured in courses. Candidates receive specific reflection prompts that connect course content with observations in the field. However, early clinical experiences emphasize observation and provide limited opportunities for candidates to practice working with PK-12 students.

- Although the student teaching handbook specifies that candidates should "assist with activities in instructional groupings", "assist with all classroom responsibilities", and "increase opportunities to work with all instructional groupings" during practicum, multiple stakeholders shared that the expectation during practicum is to conduct observations. Although candidates noted that they have taught lessons and worked with groups, there was no explicit expectation that candidates teach prior to student teaching. Multiple stakeholders noted that the program did not expect clinical educators to provide written feedback to candidates during clinical placements prior to student teaching.

- Per the student teaching handbook, the program expects candidates to take over all teaching responsibilities gradually, beginning with teaching one lesson per day in early weeks and assuming 80 percent of all teaching and planning in Week 5. Candidates assume 100 percent of all teaching responsibilities for five weeks, from Weeks 6 through 11.

Recommendations

- Initiate a process to review candidate placement to guarantee diverse settings prior to student teaching. Candidates prepared for a secondary grades special education role need experience teaching in a range of settings. The program's interest in recruiting and preparing candidates that may hold full-time jobs should not come at the expense of the candidate's readiness to work in all settings.

- Articulate and execute a clearer set of expectations for candidates to instruct and receive feedback prior to student teaching. Review and align these expectations with the candidate's trajectory towards assuming all teaching responsibilities. Consider how the program would need to modify expectations for a candidate already serving in a full-time role.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program's current design does not enable candidates to increasingly demonstrate positive impact on PK-12 students' learning.	

- Program leadership identified—and reviewers agreed—that the program needs to improve how it measures candidate impact on student learning. When asked to give examples of how the program used data collected from early clinical measures of impact on student learning to inform and improve candidate preparation, program leadership described a survey. In an evidence organizer, program leadership noted that it had "developed a survey for host teachers to gather more data regarding the impact of our teacher candidates during course-based fieldwork" and acknowledged that responses were not high. This survey, while a potentially useful source of information, is not an impact measure.

- The program has not identified early measures of candidate impact on student learning and therefore does not use evidence of impact from early clinical measures to inform and improve candidates' ability to impact student learning in later clinical experiences.

- The program has not established clear expectations for demonstrating positive impact on PK-12 students' learning. During interviews, multiple stakeholders could not describe expectations regarding impact on student learning.

- Candidates must complete a case study as part of their student teaching. For this assignment, candidates identify a student who needs intervention, deliver an intervention, and then describe student progress and the student's response to educational interventions. One indicator of the rubric focuses on candidate use of assessment and candidate understanding of student strengths and weaknesses, but it does not look at candidate impact on student learning. The program did not mutually design this measure with clinical partners.

- Candidates must also implement a unit plan during student teaching. The JWU Portfolio Outline specifies that candidates will need to reflect on whether students met the needed outcomes and provide evidence. However, it is unclear the extent to which evaluators of the portfolio focus on candidate impact on student learning. The program did not mutually design this measure with clinical partners.

Recommendations
- Consider how PK-12 schools define and measure impact on student learning and explore what impact of student learning means for preparation programs. Work with clinical partners to develop a programmatic definition, approach, and expected impact levels that the program can communicate to candidates, faculty, and clinical educators.

- Develop impact measures in conjunction with clinical partners and embed these measures and expectations throughout the program. Find ways to develop opportunities for candidates and various stakeholders to identify, monitor, and refine this critical aspect of teaching.

- Clearly communicate expectations and measures of candidate impact on student learning with clinical educators and candidates. Require candidates to collect and analyze impact on student learning data across clinical placements.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has created an innovative, mutually beneficial partnership with Pawtucket Public Schools. However, the program has not established indicators for partnership effectiveness with other districts nor does the program utilize data from those indicators to make partnership decisions.	

- Professional staff members primarily lead the outreach and organization of clinical placements, although adjunct faculty also sometimes recommend placements.

- In the past year, the provider has established a strong, mutually beneficial partnership with Pawtucket School District. This partnership is a strength. Pawtucket School District has hired one secondary business and secondary special education candidate as a permanent substitute, which has provided a source of income to the teacher candidate and has helped address Pawtucket's shortage of substitutes. The candidate completes their early fieldwork during their free periods. Both provider and district leadership discussed how they have problem solved as issues have arisen to ensure that the partnership is mutually beneficial. Both provider and district leadership noted that they have met a few times to discuss the success of the partnership thus far and to problem solve as needed.

- Other district partners could not speak to agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness. However, district partners noted that hosting JWU candidates is potentially beneficial since JWU's programs address shortage areas. One partner described the clinical placement as "a three-month interview" for candidates and expressed that they hope to hire strong candidates after they complete their program.

- Provider leadership acknowledged that clinical partners currently have limited input into the design, implementation, and assessment of clinical experiences. However, JWU recently created an M.A.T. Advisory Board that includes multiple clinical partners. The board has not met yet, but, according to provider leadership, "The primary work of this group will be to help program staff/faculty look at our data and find opportunities to improve our systems, protocols, and curriculum to create stronger connections between the university and the schools in which our candidates serve."

Recommendations
- Build upon connections and relationships with practitioners to identify, document, and level-set indicators of partnership progress and success. Include clinical educators, principals, and central office leaders in these conversations. Determine how the program and its clinical partners will track and analyze data from agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness.

- Consider where and how candidate impact on student learning and district hiring (or intent to hire) could be used as indicators of partnership success.

- Incorporate agreed-upon indicators in stakeholder conversations and documents to move closer to mutually beneficial and symbiotic relationships with districts.

- Identify additional opportunities for clinical educators to have input into decisions about candidate progression within the program, particularly prior to student teaching.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Approaching Expectations
The program has identified criteria for recruiting clinical educators during student teaching, has provided initial training, and has begun to plan how it will evaluate clinical educators. Current practices do note ensure that all candidates receive high quality clinical experiences.	

- The student teaching handbook identifies selection criteria for clinical educators that include at least three years' professional experience in the certification area, "professional teaching behaviors and strategies that are exemplary of the RIPTS, CECs, and Cultural Competency Standards," administrative approval from the school district, and a resume that provides "evidence of continuous growth". Although multiple clinical partners said they select highly effective educators to be clinical educators, the provider did not explicitly state "demonstration of earning Highly Effective" in the candidate handbook. The selection criteria also do not include ability to work with adult learners, coaching and supervision skills, or ability to evaluate practice and provide feedback to candidates.

- The program relies on its professional staff members to establish clinical placements for students. Candidates reported that they indicate their preferences on a survey, and then their advisor works to find a placement. Both candidates and clinical partners praised the responsiveness of advisors in problem solving when candidate placement or performance issues arose.

- Clinical educators in early clinical placements do not receive any training. There is no formal mechanism for providing candidates or the program feedback on candidate performance in classrooms during early field experiences.

- The program recently provided a training to clinical educators in preparation for student teaching placements. The training agenda included an overview of practicum, evaluation forms, an assessment calibration activity, and training on Taskstream. Program leadership reported in an evidence organizer, "Clinical educators can also request a visit by program staff to the school site if they are unable to make one of the several training sessions held at the JWU Harborside Campus." The program did not have clear plans of how it will engage clinical educators in ongoing calibration.

- Provider leadership trains university supervisors and submitted evidence from the training. The training content mirrored the clinical educator training. The agenda included time to share dispositions, practicum expectations, evaluation forms, an assessment calibration activity, and training on Taskstream.

- The review team noted that the uploaded training materials focused on models of co-teaching and spent little time focused on expectations for candidates and expectations related to

feedback. While the review team appreciated the inclusion of a calibration activity within the training, current training and calibration efforts are insufficient.

- The program has not had student teachers yet but has created surveys that the program will use to assess the university supervisor and clinical educator. The candidate will provide feedback about the university supervisor and clinical educator, the university supervisor will provide feedback about the candidate and clinical educator, and the clinical educator will provide feedback about the candidate and university supervisor. The surveys include 12 to 15 statements and ask candidate to identify their level of agreement with each statement.

Recommendations

- Refine selection criteria for clinical educators to include all aspects necessary in supporting adult learners. Criteria must include a demonstrated ability to coach candidates.

- Establish an ongoing expectation for clinical educators to calibrate their observations, usage of JWU tools, and feedback to candidates.   Create, facilitate, and monitor clinical educator access to these opportunities to ensure alignment and to redirect practices when necessary.

- Ensure that all clinical educators—not just those supervising student teachers—receive training on best adult learning practices and expectations for candidates. Require that all clinical educators retrain on a regular basis and, as needed, offer more training sessions.

- Collaborate with partner districts to revise and implement training for both clinical educators and university supervisors. During training and subsequent calibration sessions, communicate clear expectations for feedback, including when to provide feedback, preferred delivery feedback method, and the level of detail expected to ensure that clinical educators, school and district leaders, and clinical supervisors have shared expectations for feedback on candidate performance.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has established an assessment system that is clear to candidates and stakeholders.	

- The program assessment system includes three major decision points: readiness for admission, readiness for student teaching/internship, and recommendation for certification. The program relies on regular communication between candidates, advisors, and faculty to identify candidate performance issues and intervenes as needed. Program leadership noted, "Mid-term data check-ins with faculty who are teaching in the program and advisor-candidate check-ins assure that candidates who may not be performing at high levels are provided supports in a timely manner" or are counseled out of the program.

- In order to proceed to student teaching, candidates must have a GPA of 3.0 or higher, complete all field experience requirements, meet standard on key assessment, score "meets standard" or higher on 90 percent of dispositions rubrics, pass the 15-minute video lesson assessment, pass Praxis content area tests, and complete successfully the technology assessment.

- Other than the 15-minute video lesson, the assessment system does not emphasize candidate performance in clinical experiences prior to student teaching. Clinical educators do not assess candidate performance working in clinical experiences and do not have input into progression decisions.

- Key assessments have performance-based rubrics with defined performance levels. Candidate assessment begins early in the program and increases in both expectations and complexity as candidates progress through the program. Most key assessments are authentic performance tasks requiring candidates to apply their learning (e.g. case study, FBA-IP, IEP, lesson plans, unit plan).

- Work samples demonstrated that candidates receive written feedback on key assignments and have opportunities to redo assignments when performance does not meet expectations. However, candidates do not receive formal feedback from clinical educators or clinical supervisors on their performance working with PK-12 students in early clinical experiences.

- Multiple stakeholders noted that frequent communication between candidates, advisors, and faculty enables the program to intervene quickly when candidate performance is below expectations. However, the program did not demonstrate a systemic approach to monitoring and supporting candidate development throughout the program.

- As noted above, the program has not clearly established or articulated measures of candidate impact on student learning.

Recommendations
- Work with clinical partners to design and implement performance assessments to use in early clinical placements and practicum to ensure candidates are ready for student teaching. Revise the assessment system to prioritize candidate performance working with PK-12 students during early clinical experiences beyond the 15-minute recorded lesson and ensure that clinical educators have input into decisions about candidate progression.

- Institute measures of candidate impact on student learning and incorporate that critical aspect of effective pedagogy into the assessment system. Identify and pilot potential measures to understand how they fit with the program.

- Develop conversation protocols and tracking systems to help move from anecdotal and informal data gathering to a more structured and systematic approach to conversations related to candidate performance.

3.5 Recommendation for Certification	No Rating
The program has not yet recommended candidates for certification but has identified criteria it will use in the future. The program does not yet have quality measures and a system in place that will assure fair, accurate, and consistent evaluation of candidate performance.	

- Prior to recommendation for certification, candidates must have a GPA of 3.0 or higher, complete successfully student teaching, receive a passing score on a recorded lesson from student teaching, complete successfully the program final assessment (which includes presentation of a portfolio and exit interview), and meet all clinical experience hour requirements. The program clearly articulates these requirements in the student teaching handbook.

- Clinical educators and clinical supervisors are both responsible for evaluating the performance of candidates. According to the assessment system overview, the program expects the clinical educator to complete four assessments and the university supervisor to complete three assessments of the candidate's practice using a modified version Charlotte Danielson's *Framework for Teaching* rubric. The rubric is organized into four domains. The evaluator rates performance using a scale of "1-little/no evidence" to "5-exemplary evidence" for each component being evaluated. The rubric does not include indicator-specific performance levels. Clinical educators focus on Domain 1 during the Week 3 assessment, Domain 3 during the Week 6 assessment, and Domain 2 during the Week 9 assessment. The assessment system overview states that, by the final evaluation, the candidates must be "on target" with no more than two criteria in each domain assessed as "on track" evidence.

- Although the aforementioned student teaching observation tool aligns to the indicators of the *Framework for Teaching*, the current design and implementation of the student teaching assessment does not maintain fidelity to the intentional design of the tool. Efforts to streamline the tool have comprised quality. The student teaching assessment does not include indicator-level performance level descriptions of practice and therefore does not provide a clear common set of expectations for candidate performance. Additionally, by focusing on specific domains for each observation, it will be difficult for the program to quantify candidate improvement in practice over time.

- The program also provided evidence that program and clinical faculty receive training for their roles in the assessment system. This evidence included training materials and agendas. It was not clear to the review team that the training focus and activities sufficiently addressed or fully prepared clinical educators for their role in candidate assessment. Specifically, it is not clear that training attendees develop a consistent and deep understanding of the expected levels of candidate performance consistent with professional standards.

- The program does not have a clear plan for monitoring candidate performance to ensure the implementation of performance-based assessments yields fair, accurate, and consistent evaluation of candidate performance. However, provider leadership noted that they have identified rater discrepancies in dispositions form ratings and are working to recalibrate expectations.

Recommendations

- Consult implementation research for the Danielson rubric to understand specifically why and how this framework has established strong field and research credibility. Consider how JWU's usage may or may not align with this research. Specifically, review how JWU's performance levels impact candidate and clinical educator transparency and calibration.

- Reconcile a possible disconnect between how JWU and Rhode Island schools are using the Danielson model by convening clinical educators and practicing faculty. Focus a conversation on where and how educators and evaluators determine performance levels and coach towards improvement.

- Consider other methods of decreasing the burden on clinical educators and university supervisors while maintaining fidelity of the *Framework for Teaching* tool. Rating by component rather than indicator, providing additional training to improve clinical educator fluency with the tool, or leveraging technology may help address stakeholder feedback without compromising the quality of the tool.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	No Rating
The program does not yet have program completers but has plans to survey employers annually.	

- The program reported that it plans to survey employers annually "as we become aware of where our graduates are employed." The program has developed a draft ten-question survey that asks respondents to rate how well prepared JWU program completers are as a beginning teacher in a variety of skills aligned to the Danielson rubric and includes one open-ended question for comments about the program.

- The survey asks administrators to rate aggregate performance for all program completers hired from the JWU M.A.T. program. As a result, the survey may not result in program-specific, actionable data.

Recommendations

- Work with district partners to identify the best time and method for disseminating the survey. Identify proactively specific strategies for improving response rates as needed.

- Develop a formal plan for survey dissemination, data collection, and analysis. Consider how provider leadership will share the data with program faculty and clinical partners and how the program will use the data as part of a formal and active continuous improvement cycle.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	No Rating
The program does not yet have program completers. It intends to survey candidates at program start, program completion, and one year after program completion. The program does not have plans for using data from program completers to inform program improvements.	

- The program has developed a suite of surveys based on the work done by well-known researchers at another preparation program. The surveys are extensive and include more than 100 questions on each survey.

- Questions are similar across surveys and will enable the program to track changes over time. The majority of questions ask candidates to rate their preparation in various skills using a Likert scale ranging from "Poor" to "Excellent". The surveys do not include an open-ended question where candidates or completers can provide additional feedback to the program.

- The program has administered the entry survey to its second cohort and will administer the completer survey in Spring 2018. It intends to administer the third survey one year after program completion.

- Provider leadership noted, "There has been some discussion with other providers as to the possibility of creating a common survey perhaps in consultation with district HR and administrative personnel." However, there were no concrete plans at the time of the visit.

Recommendations

- Monitor survey response rates and responses closely to determine if the survey is providing the number and quality of responses needed to be actionable data. Consider the length of time needed to complete the survey and adjust survey length if necessary.

- Consider including an open-response question for candidates to provide specific, narrative feedback about their program.

- Develop a formal plan for survey dissemination, data collection, and analysis. Consider how provider leadership will share the data with program faculty and clinical partners and how the program will use the data as part of a formal continuous improvement cycle.

Secondary Grades Career and Technical Education

The M.A.T. in Secondary Career and Technical Education (CTE) is a cohort program. Candidates complete six core courses, five CTE-specific classes, and student teaching in culinary CTE. Candidates are required to participate in field experiences during three of their five terms prior to student teaching. Depending on their previous preparation and culinary background, candidates who complete this program may be eligible for a certificate in Quantity Food Preparation or in Vocational Baking.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Approaching Expectations
The program aligns to the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS). Candidates experience a consistent curriculum and have opportunity to develop proficiency in most but not all RIPTS.	

- The program uses a cohort model. All candidates experience a consistent curriculum that provides comparable learning opportunities to meet professional standards.

- The program provides candidates with opportunities to develop proficiency in the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions encompassed in most, but not all, of the RIPTS. The program provided a crosswalk that identified which courses address each RIPTS, but the program addresses RIPTS at varying depth.

- Program leadership reported that the M.A.T. assessment system "is grounded in the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards" and noted, "Connections [to the RIPTS] are made in the background of every rubric." Although the curriculum generally aligns to the RIPTS and the program provided evidence that leadership had aligned rubrics to the RIPTS, the RIPTS are not consistently identified and visible to candidates in syllabi, assessments, or assignments; in particular, reviewers noted the lack of explicit naming of RIPTS in course syllabi. Candidates were aware that the RIPTS existed, but they were not able to describe teaching practice in relation to the RIPTS.

- The program has identified 20 professional dispositions. Both candidates and faculty were familiar with the dispositions. Program faculty assess candidates' professional dispositions at admissions, throughout preparation, and before certification.

- Candidate coursework helps candidates develop the background knowledge and skills embedded within the RIPTS, but candidates have limited opportunities to practice those skills within a CTE context prior to student teaching.

- The program has designed a Professional Development Self-Study Worksheet for candidates to complete during student teaching. This "reflection inventory is designed to help [the candidate] begin developing a personal teaching profile based on the RIPTS." Candidates self-rate each component of the RIPTS during their first student teaching placement and then are supposed to re-review it in their second placement. After each student teaching placement, candidates must submit a reflection based on the worksheet that describes their professional growth, identifies areas of strengths, identifies areas in need of further development, and articulates professional

goals for the future. Because no candidates are student teaching, the program has not yet implemented this assessment.

- The program emphasizes candidate reflection (Standard 10). Although candidates receive preparation on creating instructional opportunities for students, they receive little opportunity prior to student teaching to develop proficiency in this standard (Standard 4). Candidates also receive limited preparation in local, state, and federal law (Standard 11).

Recommendations

- Align RIPTS more explicitly throughout course syllabi and candidate experiences so candidates understand what they should know and be able to do as a teacher. A more purposeful and transparent alignment will further enhance the personal teaching profile. Articulate and use the RIPTS more consistently with students to help deepen their proficiency in using the language of the standards.

- Review the depth at which the program integrates the RIPTS. Revise the course of study to ensure candidates develop proficiency in RIPTS 1.4, 7.2, 7.3, 10.4, 11.2, and 11.3.

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Not Applicable
Rhode Island does not have professional association standards for career and technical education or culinary education. The program admits candidates who have demonstrated relevant culinary knowledge and skills in prior coursework.	

- Professional staff members use transcript review as a measure to determine if candidates have sufficient content knowledge in either baking and pastry or quantity food preparation. During the review, advisors look primarily for collegiate coursework but sometimes substitute work experience for a particular course. At admission, candidates seeking certification in baking and pastry must demonstrate competency in the following: business and math skills/food and beverage cost controls; basic fundamental skills and techniques; hot and cold plated desserts; tiered and decorated cakes; production of laminated and non-laminated doughs; production of chocolates and confections; and human relation skills. Candidates seeking certification in quantity food preparation must demonstrate competency in business and math skills; hot/cold food production; introduction to cooking techniques/knife skills, basic baking; purchasing, receiving, inventory and storage; nutrition; dining room service; menu planning; human relation skills; and industry experience. All candidates must have prior work experience or an internship in the culinary arts and must hold the ServPro certificate.

- Prior to practicum, all students must demonstrate a grade of C or higher in collegiate coursework in social studies, English/language arts, science, and writing/composition.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations

The program curriculum provides some opportunities for candidates to learn about student standards and their critical importance to instructional planning and assessment. Candidates develop a partial understanding of standards-based instruction.

- Culinary education candidates work with both the American Culinary Foundation (ACF) standards and the Common Core State Standards in Mathematics (CCSS). Candidates receive introductions to the standards in early coursework and then work with them at greater depth in methods coursework.

- Culinary methods coursework emphasize consistently the ACF standards. Candidates demonstrated a deep understanding of the standards in interviews and work samples. The review team also observed part of a lesson taught by a candidate that aligned fully to the ACF standards. All lesson and unit plans demonstrated alignment to ACF standards.

- Candidates take a culinary-specific math course, EDUC 5220: Strategies for Teaching Culinary Arts Mathematics. The mathematics course covers the CCSS as well as key mathematics skills needed within a culinary CTE context. During interviews, candidates were able to talk about the CCSS for Mathematics and expressed confidence in their ability to integrate these standards into lessons.

- In EDUC 5160: Integrating Literacy in the Culinary Arts Classroom, candidates learn about the CCSS for English Language Arts. Candidates complete an assignment where they must unpack the College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and identify examples of how students might demonstrate the standard within a CTE context. However, in interviews, candidates expressed they were less familiar with the CCSS for English Language Arts and were less confident in their ability to use these standards compared to other standard sets.

- The program does not expect candidates to teach in early clinical experiences and in practicum, which limits opportunities for candidates to practice, received feedback on, and demonstrate proficiency in standards-based instruction prior to student teaching.

Recommendations

- Ensure candidates receive feedback on their design and implementation of standards-based lessons and assessments throughout their clinical preparation.

- Work with candidates and clinical partners to identify and address current gaps in candidate preparation related to the CCSS in English Language Arts.

1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations

The program focuses on data-based instruction. Candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and capacity to collect, analyze, and use data to make instructional decisions.

- Assessment and data are a consistent thread throughout coursework. Candidates learn about a variety of formative assessment strategies and formal and standardized assessments in their courses. In interviews, candidates and faculty described learning experiences related to using data, including rubric assignments, using profiles to identify salient data points, and looking at PARCC and SAT scores. In EDUC 5220: Strategies for Teaching Culinary Arts Mathematics, candidates analyze pre- and post-assessment results to determine student learning and identify learning gaps.

- Candidates take one class focused on assessment. In EDUC 6120: Assessment of Student Learning candidates learn about assessment types and purposes, formative assessment methodologies, assessment practices and techniques, data analysis, and grading practices.

- Prior to student teaching, multiple key assessments emphasize the collection and analysis of data, including a data project (EDUC 5120: Foundations for Learning and Teaching), assessment administration and reflection (EDUC 6120: Assessment of Student Learning), a case study (SPED 5110: Inclusive Teaching of Exceptional Learners), and a functional behavioral assessment (SPED 6110: Understanding and Managing Behavior). Student work samples indicated that candidates received feedback on their performance on these assessments.

- Candidates learn about and use data from sources other than assessments to improve student learning and instructional practice. They use school-level data from Infoworks in a data project (EDUC 5120: Foundations for Learning and Teaching), interview a family (SPED 5170: Collaboration: Home/School/Community), and use Infoworks to inform the development of the cultural competency plan during student teaching. While these are important learning opportunities, the program should continue to expand and integrate additional opportunities for candidates to learn about and practice using data from sources other than assessments to improve student learning and instructional practice.

1.5 Technology	Meets Expectations

The program integrates instruction about technology and digital age learning experiences throughout the program.

- Program leadership reported—and candidates corroborated--that course instructors use "transparent facilitation" in its classes to provide "opportunities for teacher candidates to participate in a variety of technology-based learning activities and then discuss their impact on themselves as learners, and brainstorm ways that these same practices might be employed to support learning/assessment in K-12 classrooms."

- A review of course syllabi and uLearn (JWU's online course management platform) indicate that candidates receive instruction on flipped classrooms, blended learning, and multiple

apps/websites for learning/assessment. The use of technology to enhance student learning and assessment is a consistent thread throughout coursework, especially in methods classes. Assignments for candidates include reflecting on the use of technology in a clinical placement, creating a WebQuest, developing playlists, and designing a flipped class as part of an instructional unit.

- The program assesses candidates on their use of technology through a technology assessment prior to student teaching. For this assessment, candidates must create a visual presentation that supports an oral discussion of their growth in the area of education technology use throughout the program. The presentation must include an embedded video, links to educational apps or websites, lesson plans that include embedded technology with an explanation of the purpose and learning benefit of the chosen technology, examples of participation in technology-based collaboration, and a site used for professional learning and/or professional resources. A team of assessors evaluates the candidate's competency in technology using a rubric focused on technology use within the domains of the *Framework for Teaching*.

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
The program design provides candidates multiple opportunities to reflect on their own biases and ensures candidates develop basic skills for working with students with disabilities. However, the program does not emphasize working with English language learners and working with families in diverse communities.	

- Multiple stakeholders noted that candidates benefit from being part of a diverse cohort and therefore have an opportunity to unpack issues of diversity in courses. Candidates have some opportunities to reflect on their own biases and cultures during the program. In EDUC 5150: Educational Psychology, students write reflections about their own cultural scripts and identify an instance when bias affected their thinking or actions. Both EDUC 5150: Educational Psychology and SPED 6110: Understanding and Managing Behavior include multiple readings on bias, racism, culture, and cultural responsiveness.

- Candidates take an introductory special education course, EDUC 5110: Inclusive Teaching of Exceptional Learners. In this class, candidates learn about the educational characteristics and needs of students according to the IDEA disability categories. Course content also addresses Response to Intervention (RTI), Understanding by Design (UDL), assistive technology, diversity, and collaboration.

- Coursework does not include an explicit focus on ensuring candidates are prepared to implement strategies with English learners. In interviews, both candidates and course instructors acknowledged that candidates do not learn strategies for working with English learners.

- Program-provided crosswalks stated that candidates learn about working with families in its CTE-specific methods courses, but an analysis of course syllabi and candidate work samples demonstrated insufficient focus on working with families. Candidates also have limited opportunities to interact with parents prior to student teaching.

- The final candidate portfolio submitted prior to certification must include key artifacts related to equity, including a cultural competency plan, a reflection on the effectiveness of efforts to implement the plan, and examples of family engagement and communication. The cultural competency plan includes a review of data and an action plan that describes three to five specific ways candidates will demonstrate cultural competence in teaching. Candidates implement the plan during student teaching and then reflect on the effectiveness of their efforts.

Recommendations

- Integrate strategies for working with families more explicitly throughout coursework. Consider whether students would benefit from taking SPED 5170: Collaboration: Home/School/Community or if the program could integrate the content in other ways into the program. Communicate explicitly an expectation that candidates interact with parents and receive feedback on their interactions throughout clinical preparation.

- Provide candidates clear, specific instruction in strategies for supporting English language learners. Identify and implement performance requirements for implementing strategies for supporting English Language Learners. Ensure candidates receive feedback on their implementation of strategies.

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

- Candidates receive introductory information about some educational initiatives, laws, and policies through coursework and develop a basic understanding of the initiatives. Although the program provided a crosswalk showing that coursework addressed multiple Rhode Island initiatives, candidates demonstrated limited knowledge of initiatives during interviews. Candidates were aware of Rhode Island educator evaluation, but they could not describe it in detail. Candidates were not familiar with new high school graduation requirements.

- In EDUC 5180: Curriculum Development for Culinary Arts programs, candidates develop a four-year curriculum that is not aligned with Rhode Island expectations for high school culinary CTE programs.

- The program notes that it "assesses teacher candidate knowledge of Rhode Island Initiatives primarily through application to projects, presentations, reflections, and other course-based assessments." One example is the data project in EDUC 5210: Foundations for Teaching and Learning, which requires candidates to access school data on Infoworks, read the school improvement plan, and interview the school principal before identifying areas in need of improvement. However, few assignments make explicit connections to Rhode Island initiatives. The program does not assess clearly candidate proficiency in initiatives and does not assess candidate proficiency in the knowledge and skills needed to implement initiatives successfully.

Recommendations

- Work with clinical partners and other stakeholders to identify which Rhode Island initiatives are most important for culinary CTE candidates to learn about during their program of study. Identify the knowledge, skills, and practices embedded in those key Rhode Island educational initiatives. Intentionally embed state laws, policies, and initiatives throughout the program to develop a deep understanding of these critical practices. Do not rely on the influence of the clinical educator or field experiences.

- Ensure all candidates understand high school graduation requirements and relevant state CTE policies and practices.

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

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Approaching Expectations
Candidates' clinical preparation is coherent. Clinical preparation builds from and continues to link theory to practice. However, candidates' early clinical preparation is not of sufficient depth, breadth, or diversity.	

- Clinical experiences begin first semester of the program and continue throughout the program. The program reported that candidates complete 72 hours of culinary CTE field experiences, 24 hours of secondary special education field experiences, and one twelve-week student teaching experience in a culinary CTE classroom. Collectively, candidate clinical preparation exceeds the required amount established by Rhode Island certification requirements.

- Candidates experience a limited range of placements during clinical preparation. Not all candidates experience placements in grades 7 or 8; although culinary programs are typically at the high school level, it is important that candidates are prepared to teach in the full grade range of their certification area. In addition, candidates spend most if not all of their clinical preparation hours at the same culinary site. As a result, candidates do not gain exposure to the full range of CTE programming types and kitchen setups that exist within Rhode Island schools and have limited opportunities to work with a diverse range of learners.

- Early clinical experiences emphasize observation. Although the student teaching handbook specifies that candidates should "assist with activities in instructional groupings", "assist with all classroom responsibilities", and "increase opportunities to work with all instructional groupings" during practicum, multiple stakeholders shared that the expectation during practicum is observation. Multiple stakeholders noted that there was no expectation of written feedback from clinical educators prior to student teaching. Candidates complete the pre-student teaching video lesson assignment, but the clinical educator does not score this assignment.

- According to the student teaching handbook, the program expects candidates during student teaching to assume teaching responsibilities gradually, beginning with teaching one lesson per

day in early weeks and assuming 80 percent of all teaching and planning in Week 5. Candidates assume 100 percent of all teaching responsibilities for five weeks, from Weeks 6 through 11.

Recommendations

- Ensure every CTE candidate experiences field placements with qualified clinical educators and varied student populations, physical settings, and program settings (i.e. CTE centers, secondary high schools, and charter schools).

- Articulate and execute a clearer set of expectations for candidates to instruct and receive feedback prior to student teaching. Review and align these expectations with the candidate's trajectory towards assuming all teaching responsibilities. Consider how the program would need to modify expectations for a candidate already serving in a full-time role.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program's current design does not enable candidates to increasingly demonstrate positive impact on PK-12 students' learning.	

- Program leadership identified—and reviewers agreed—that the program needs to improve how it measures candidate impact on student learning. When asked to give examples of how the program used data collected from early clinical measures of impact on student learning to inform and improve candidate preparation, program leadership described a survey. In an evidence organizer, program leadership noted that it had "developed a survey for host teachers to gather more data regarding the impact of our teacher candidates during course-based fieldwork" and acknowledged that responses were not high. This survey, while a potentially useful source of information, is not an impact measure.

- The program has not identified early measures of candidate impact on student learning and therefore does not use evidence of impact from early clinical measures to inform and improve candidates' ability to impact student learning in later clinical experiences.

- The program has not established clear expectations for demonstrating positive impact on PK-12 students' learning. During interviews, multiple stakeholders could not describe expectations regarding impact on student learning.

- Candidates must implement a differentiation plan during student teaching and provide three examples of differentiation. Candidates must submit reflections that identify the results of differentiation and identify how they evaluated success of their actions (assessment, observation, level of student engagement, etc.). However, there is not an explicit focus on whether candidates impacted positively student learning. The program did not mutually design this measure with clinical partners.

- Candidates must also implement a unit plan during student teaching. The JWU Portfolio Outline specifies that candidates will need to reflect on whether students met the needed outcomes and provide evidence. However, it is unclear the extent to which evaluators of the portfolio

focus on candidate impact on student learning. The program did not mutually design this measure with clinical partners.

Recommendations

- Consider how PK-12 schools define and measure impact on student learning and explore what impact of student learning means for preparation programs. Work with clinical partners to develop a programmatic definition, approach, and expected impact levels that the program can communicate to candidates, faculty, and clinical educators.

- Develop impact measures in conjunction with clinical partners and embed these measures and expectations throughout the program. Find ways to develop opportunities for candidates and various stakeholders to identify, monitor, and refine this critical aspect of teaching.

- Clearly communicate expectations and measures of candidate impact on student learning with clinical educators and candidates. Require candidates to collect and analyze impact on student learning data across clinical placements.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has created an innovative, mutually beneficial partnership with Pawtucket Public Schools. However, the program has not established indicators for partnership effectiveness with other districts nor does the program utilize data from those indicators to make partnership decisions.	

- Professional staff members primarily lead the outreach and organization of clinical placements, although adjunct faculty also sometimes recommend placements.

- In the past year, the provider has established a strong, mutually beneficial partnership with Pawtucket School District. This partnership is a strength. Pawtucket School District has hired four CTE candidates as long-term substitutes, which has provided a source of income to teacher candidates and has helped address Pawtucket's shortage of substitutes. Candidates complete their early fieldwork during their free periods and are working to ensure CTE candidates receive release time and have access to a CTE placement in another district for CTE fieldwork. Both provider and district leadership discussed how they have problem solved as issues have arisen to ensure that the partnership is mutually beneficial. Both provider and district leadership noted that they have met a few times to discuss the success of the partnership thus far and to problem solve as needed.

- Other district partners could not speak to agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness. However, district partners noted that hosting JWU candidates is potentially beneficial since JWU's programs address shortage areas. One partner described the clinical placement as "a three-month interview" for candidates and expressed that they hope to hire strong candidates after they complete their program.

- Provider leadership acknowledged that clinical partners currently have limited input into the design, implementation, and assessment of clinical experiences. However, JWU recently

created an M.A.T. Advisory Board that includes multiple clinical partners. The board has not met yet, but, according to provider leadership, "The primary work of this group will be to help program staff/faculty look at our data and find opportunities to improve our systems, protocols, and curriculum to create stronger connections between the university and the schools in which our candidates serve."

Recommendation:

- Build upon connections and relationships with practitioners to identify, document, and level-set indicators of partnership progress and success. Include clinical educators, principals, and central office leaders in these conversations. Determine how the program and its clinical partners will track and analyze data from agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness.

- Build upon the early success of the partnership with Pawtucket by developing a similarly strong relationship with one or more districts with high school culinary CTE programs.

- Consider where and how candidate impact on student learning and district hiring (or intent to hire) could be used as indicators of partnership success.

- Incorporate agreed-upon indicators in stakeholder conversations and documents to move closer to mutually beneficial and symbiotic relationships with districts.

- Identify additional opportunities for clinical educators to have input into decisions about candidate progression within the program, particularly prior to student teaching.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Approaching Expectations
The program has identified criteria for recruiting clinical educators during student teaching, has provided initial training, and has begun to plan how it will evaluate clinical educators. Current practices do note ensure that all candidates receive high quality clinical experiences.	

- The program relies on professional staff members to establish clinical placements for students. Candidates reported that they indicate their preferences on a survey, and then their advisor works to find a placement.

- The student teaching handbook identifies selection criteria for clinical educators that include at least three years' professional experience in the certification area, "professional teaching behaviors and strategies that are exemplary of the RIPTS, CECs, and Cultural Competency Standards," administrative approval from the school district, and a resume that provides "evidence of continuous growth". Although multiple clinical partners said they select highly effective educators to be clinical educators, the provider did not explicitly state "demonstration of earning Highly Effective" in the candidate handbook. The selection criteria also do not include ability to work with adult learners, coaching and supervision skills, or ability to evaluate practice and provide feedback to candidates.

- The program recently provided a training to clinical educators in preparation for student teaching placements. The training agenda included an overview of practicum, evaluation forms, an assessment calibration activity, and training on Taskstream. Program leadership reported in an evidence organizer, "Clinical educators can also request a visit by program staff to the school site if they are unable to make one of the several training sessions held at the JWU Harborside Campus." During interviews, clinical educators were able to describe the training and articulated the expectations for candidate assessment. However, there are no plans for ongoing calibration.

- Provider leadership trains university supervisors and submitted evidence from the training. The training content mirrored the clinical educator training. The agenda included time to share dispositions, practicum expectations, evaluation forms, an assessment calibration activity, and training on Taskstream. This initial training is a start but is insufficient to ensure that clinical supervisors are prepared to conduct high quality observations of candidate practice.

- The review team noted that the uploaded training materials focused on models of co-teaching and spent little time focused on expectations for candidates and expectations related to feedback. While the review team appreciated the inclusion of a calibration activity within the training, current training and calibration efforts are insufficient.
- The program has not had student teachers yet but has created surveys that the program will use to assess the university supervisor and clinical educator. The candidate will provide feedback about the university supervisor and clinical educator, the university supervisor will provide feedback about the candidate and clinical educator, and the clinical educator will provide feedback about the candidate and university supervisor. The surveys include 12 to 15 statements and ask candidate to identify their level of agreement with each statement.

Recommendation:

- Refine selection criteria for clinical educators to include all aspects necessary in supporting adult learners. Criteria must include a demonstrated ability to coach candidates.

- Track and monitor the types of culinary CTE placements to ensure candidates have experiences in varied types of culinary programs and settings.

- Establish an ongoing expectation for clinical educators to calibrate their observations, usage of JWU tools, and feedback to candidates. Create, facilitate, and monitor clinical educator access to these opportunities to ensure alignment and to redirect practices when necessary.

- Ensure that all clinical educators—not just those supervising student teachers—receive training on best adult learning practices and expectations for candidates. Require that all clinical educators retrain on a regular basis and, as needed, offer more training sessions.

- Collaborate with partner districts to revise and implement training for both clinical educators and university supervisors. During training and subsequent calibration sessions, communicate clear expectations for feedback, including when to provide feedback, preferred delivery feedback method, and the level of detail expected to ensure that clinical educators, school and

district leaders, and clinical supervisors have shared expectations for feedback on candidate performance.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has established an assessment system that is clear to candidates and stakeholders.	

- The program assessment system includes three major decision points: readiness for admission, readiness for student teaching, and recommendation for certification. The program relies on regular communication between candidates, advisors, and faculty to identify candidate performance issues and intervenes as needed. Program leadership noted, "Mid-term data check-ins with faculty who are teaching in the program and advisor-candidate check-ins assure that candidates who may not be performing at high levels are provided supports in a timely manner" or are counseled out of the program.

- In order to proceed to student teaching, candidates must have a GPA of 3.0 or higher, complete all field experience requirements, meet standard on key assessments, score "meets standard" or higher on 90 percent of dispositions rubrics, pass the 15-minute video lesson assessment, pass Praxis content area tests, and complete successfully the technology assessment.

- Other than the 15-minute video lesson, the assessment system does not emphasize candidate performance in clinical experiences prior to student teaching. Candidates videotape three lessons in EDUC 5270: Advanced Methods of Teaching Culinary Arts, but program leadership does not consider candidate performance during these lessons when deciding to advance candidates to student teaching. Clinical educators and university supervisors do not assess candidate performance working in clinical experiences and do not have input into progression decisions.

- Key assessments have performance-based rubrics with defined performance levels. Candidate assessment begins early in the program and increases in both expectations and complexity as candidates progress through the program. Most key assessments are authentic performance tasks requiring candidates to apply their learning (e.g. case study, classroom management plan, unit plans, lesson plans, curriculum design).

- Work samples demonstrated that candidates receive written feedback on key assignments and have opportunities to redo assignments when performance does not meet expectations. However, candidates do not receive formal feedback from clinical educators or clinical supervisors on their performance working with PK-12 students in early clinical experiences.

- Multiple stakeholders noted that frequent communication between candidates, advisors, and faculty enables the program to intervene quickly when candidate performance is below expectations. However, the program did not demonstrate a systemic approach to monitoring and supporting candidate development throughout the program.

- As noted above, the program has not clearly established or articulated measures of candidate impact on student learning.

Recommendations

- Work with clinical partners to design and implement performance assessments to use in early clinical placements and practicum to ensure candidates are ready for student teaching. Revise the assessment system to prioritize candidate performance working with PK-12 students during early clinical experiences beyond the 15-min recorded lesson and ensure that clinical educators have input into decisions about candidate progression.

- Institute measures of candidate impact on student learning and incorporate that critical aspect of effective pedagogy into the assessment system. Identify and pilot potential measures to understand how they fit with the program.

- Develop conversation protocols and tracking systems to help move from anecdotal and informal data gathering to a more structured and systematic approach to conversations related to candidate performance.

3.5 Recommendation for Certification	No Rating
The program has not yet recommended candidates for certification but has identified criteria it will use in the future. The program does not yet have quality measures and a system in place that will assure fair, accurate, and consistent evaluation of candidate performance.	

- Prior to recommendation for certification, candidates must have a GPA of 3.0 or higher, complete successfully student teaching, receive a passing score on a recorded lesson from student teaching, complete successfully the program final assessment (which includes presentation of a portfolio and exit interview), and meet all clinical experience hour requirements. The program clearly articulates these requirements in the student teaching handbook.

- Clinical educators and clinical supervisors are both responsible for evaluating the performance of candidates. According to the assessment system overview, the program expects the clinical educator to complete four assessments and the university supervisor to complete three assessments of the candidate's practice using a modified version of the *Framework for Teaching*. The rubric is organized into four domains. The evaluator rates performance using a scale of "1- little/no evidence" to "5-exemplary evidence" for each component being evaluated. The rubric does not include indicator-specific performance levels. Clinical educators focus on Domain 1 during the Week 3 assessment, Domain 3 during the Week 6 assessment, and Domain 2 during the Week 9 assessment. The assessment system overview states that, by the final evaluation, the candidates must be "on target" with no more than two criteria in each domain assessed as "on track" evidence.

- The program also provided evidence that clinical educators and clinical supervisors receive training for their roles in the assessment system. This evidence included training materials and agendas. It was not clear to the review team that the training focus and activities sufficiently addressed or fully prepared clinical educators for their role in candidate assessment. Specifically, it is not clear that training attendees develop a consistent and deep understanding of the expected levels of candidate performance consistent with professional standards.

- The program does not have a clear plan for monitoring candidate performance to ensure the implementation of performance-based assessments yields fair, accurate, and consistent evaluation of candidate performance. However, provider leadership noted that they have identified rater discrepancies in dispositions form ratings and are working to recalibrate expectations.

Recommendations

- Consult implementation research for the *Framework for Teaching* to understand specifically why and how this framework has established strong field and research credibility. Consider how JWU's usage may or may not align with this research. Specifically, review how JWU's performance levels impact candidate and clinical educator transparency and calibration.

- Reconcile a possible disconnect between how JWU and Rhode Island schools are using the Danielson model by convening clinical educators and practicing faculty. Focus a conversation on where and how educators and evaluators determine performance levels and coach towards improvement.

- Through conversation and calibration, ensure all clinical supervisors, clinical educators, and candidates have a clear understanding of what the components look like within the unique setting of a CTE classroom.

- Consider other methods of decreasing the burden on clinical educators and university supervisors while maintaining fidelity of the *Framework for Teaching* tool. Rating by component rather than indicator, providing additional training to improve clinical educator fluency with the tool, or leveraging technology may help address stakeholder feedback without compromising the quality of the tool.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	No Rating
The program does not yet have program completers but has plans to survey employers annually.	

- The program reported that it plans to survey employers annually "as we become aware of where our graduates are employed." The program has developed a draft ten-question survey that asks respondents to rate how well prepared JWU program completers are as a beginning teacher in a variety of skills aligned to the Danielson rubric and includes one open-ended question for comments about the program.

- The survey asks administrators to rate aggregate performance for all program completers hired from the JWU M.A.T. program. As a result, the survey may not result in program-specific, actionable data.

Recommendations

- Work with district partners to identify the best time and method for disseminating the survey. Identify proactively specific strategies for improving response rates as needed.

- Develop a formal plan for survey dissemination, data collection, and analysis. Consider how provider leadership will share the data with program faculty and clinical partners and how the program will use the data as part of a formal and active continuous improvement cycle.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	No Rating
The program does not yet have program completers. It intends to survey candidates at program start, program completion, and one year after program completion. The program does not have plans for using data from program completers to inform program improvements.	

- The program has developed a suite of surveys based on the work done by well-known researchers at another preparation program. The surveys are extensive and include more than 100 questions on each survey.

- Questions are similar across surveys and will enable the program to track changes over time. The majority of questions ask candidates to rate their preparation in various skills using a Likert scale ranging from "Poor" to "Excellent". The surveys do not include an open-ended question where candidates or completers can provide additional feedback to the program.

- The program has administered the entry survey to its second cohort and will administer the completer survey in Spring 2018. It intends to administer the third survey one year after program completion.

- Provider leadership noted, "There has been some discussion with other providers as to the possibility of creating a common survey perhaps in consultation with district HR and administrative personnel." However, there were no concrete plans at the time of the visit.

Recommendations

- Monitor survey response rates and responses closely to determine if the survey is providing the number and quality of responses needed to be actionable data. Consider the length of time needed to complete the survey and adjust survey length if necessary.

- Consider including an open-response question for candidates to provide specific, narrative feedback about their program.

- Develop a formal plan for survey dissemination, data collection, and analysis. Consider how provider leadership will share the data with program faculty and clinical partners and how the program will use the data as part of a formal continuous improvement cycle.

Provider-Level Findings and Recommendations

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

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

- JWU views its mission to attract and prepare non-traditional candidates and candidates from diverse backgrounds. It views its niche among preparation providers in Rhode Island as its year-round, cohort structure, which helps attract a diverse group of potential students, including career changers. The provider values life and work experiences that candidates bring to programs and considers these factors in its admissions and conditional acceptance processes.

- Approximately 25 percent of JWU's current students identify as non-white. In addition, candidates bring a diverse range of prior experiences to the program, including experiences from other countries. Multiple stakeholder groups noted that having a diverse cohort enriches conversations and preparation within the programs.

- Candidates know who their advisors are and work closely with them throughout their program. Multiple stakeholders praised the accessibility and responsiveness of advisors when issues or concerns arise. When needed, advisors work with candidates to provide individualized problem solving and support. Candidates also have access to campus-wide supports, such as counseling services, student financial services, and the JWU Writing Lab.

- Provider leadership noted that a strong relationship exists between the admissions officers who support the M.A.T program. Admissions officers and provider leadership reported using a variety of digital and on-the-ground methods to recruit a diverse group of candidates. In addition to keeping materials on its website, JWU uses radio ads, Facebook geofencing, graduate school fairs, and education conferences to increase awareness of programs and recruit candidates. The admissions office noted that it has begun to track and assess the quality of recruitment efforts. The office should continue to track and assess the quality of efforts to identify those that have been most successful.

- JWU recently began offering a 30 percent tuition discount to parents, teaching assistants, and other individuals in local partner school districts in an effort to attract potential career changers to its programs. However, during interviews, few clinical partners were aware of this discount. The provider should communicate more clearly the tuition discount and the conditional acceptance policy to clinical partners.

- The provider markets that the JWU M.A.T. program is possible to complete while working full-time (up until student teaching). However, multiple stakeholders thought JWU could have done a better job describing the demands of the program up front.

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

- The provider has developed a strong, active network from which it learns about current and anticipated job openings. Alumni of the previous JWU program keep in touch with program leadership and share information about current and anticipated openings within the state, region, and country. Districts partners and adjunct faculty also share employment prospects with candidates and provider leadership. Provider leadership also reported regularly accessing SchoolSpring. The provider should build upon current efforts to share hiring data with candidates by sharing hiring information with prospective candidates and in candidate advising.

- JWU is the only provider in the state to offer programs in Secondary Business and Secondary Career and Technical Education. In addition, the combined Elementary Education & Elementary Special Education and the combined Secondary Business Education & Secondary Special Education programs help make candidates more marketable, given that special education, particularly secondary special education, is a shortage area.

3.3 Admissions Standards for Academic Achievement and Ability	Meets Expectations
The provider and program admissions requirements meet Rhode Island Department of Education's expectations for prospective candidates. The provider and its programs have an approved conditional acceptance policy and plans to track progress of candidates granted admission through conditional acceptance.	

- During the admissions process, the program evaluates candidates' general academic ability, content knowledge, personal and professional qualities, communications skills, and citizenship. The program uses a transcript analysis form to determine if candidates have met the minimum undergraduate GPA and if they have taken sufficient foundational coursework. In some cases, the program will substitute life experience for a specific course requirement. Program leadership also reviews letters of recommendation, disposition forms, completed interview rubrics from two staff members, and writing samples. Candidates must also pass a BCI check prior to admission.

- Provider leadership reported that all programs adhere to RIDE expectations for candidate admissions. Multiple provider and program documents confirmed that all fully accepted M.A.T. candidates must have an overall undergraduate GPA of 3.0.

- The provider has RIDE-approved conditional acceptance policy that allows JWU to admit promising applicants who do not meet minimum GPA requirements. Provider leadership value and take seriously the conditional acceptance policy, which provides some flexibility in the admissions process. Per JWU's policy, conditionally accepted candidates who do not meet GPA requirements must meet all other admissions requirements and score within one standard error of the passing score on the Praxis content test for his/her concentration within the first semester. JWU monitors the performance of conditionally accepted candidates through mid-

semester check-ins with instructors and regular monitoring of Taskstream. Candidates admitted under the policy must attain a GPA of 3.0 before completing the program.

- Clinical partners were not aware of JWU's conditional acceptance policy and, as a result, admitted that they did not encourage some people to apply to JWU because they thought they did not meet GPA requirements.

3.6 Additional Selectivity Criteria	Meets Expectations
The provider has identified a set of professional dispositions and research-based traits critical to educator effectiveness. The program assesses candidate dispositions at entry, throughout coursework, and prior to certification.	

- After reviewing a variety of research and scholarly work, provider leadership identified 20 dispositions that are critical to educator effectiveness.

- During the application process, references are asked to rate the candidate's performance on the 20 dispositions on a scale from one to five, with five being exemplary. The provider also developed a five-scale dispositions rubric that has performance-level descriptions at the levels of one, three, and five. Faculty rate candidate performance on the dispositions in each course. Clinical educators and university supervisors also rate candidate performance on the dispositions.

- Faculty and candidates were all aware of the dispositions and knew how the program assesses those dispositions. Faculty gave multiple examples of how they intervened if a candidate was not performing as expected on any of the specified dispositions.

- Provider leadership has identified inconsistency across raters in their evaluations and has worked to improve calibration. The provider should continue to monitor dispositional ratings and engage all raters in regular calibration.

Standard 5: Program Quality and Improvement

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

- The provider uses Taskstream as a data management system. Advisors use Taskstream to upload data from the admissions process. During preparation, adjunct faculty upload dispositional data and key course assessment data into the system. Clinical educators and university supervisors will also use Taskstream once candidate progress to student teaching.

- As part of its involvement with the Collaborating for Effective Educator Development, Accountability and Reform Center, a federally funded national technical assistance center, JWU has engaged in a review of its scope and sequence. Faculty have begun using two Innovation Configurations, tools to ensure that teacher preparation programs are using strategies that align with evidence-based practices. These efforts to date have focused on reviewing course syllabi

and key assignments to ensure that the candidate experience includes sufficient emphasis on the key elements of culturally responsive teaching and Understanding by Design. However, provider leadership and faculty did not articulate next steps for this work in interviews.

- JWU recently switched the collection method for all student course feedback moving from in-person Scantron collection to an online emailed course feedback form. The online emailed course feedback form did not immediately yield a reliable response rate. JWU noted this challenge and identified a new version of the end of course feedback form. Candidates interviewed over the course of the visit mentioned that these were currently in their emails awaiting their follow-up.

Recommendations

- Develop a system for gathering and analyzing data on both candidate progress and program assessment.

- Collaborate with JWU offices to identify a way to sort course feedback based on candidate profiles. Course feedback currently does not allow candidates to identify their specific program or if they are pursuing educator certification readiness.

- Institute a system to track educator effectiveness in Rhode Island and outside of the state by developing data sharing agreements with appropriate stakeholders.

- Add a question to the candidate surveys that enables respondents to identify if they are seeking Rhode Island certification so that the program can differentiate between the responses of non-certification-seeking and certification-seeking culinary candidates.

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

- The provider acknowledged—and review teams agreed—that the provider needs to be "more systematic and inclusive" in their data conversations.

- The provider reported that it hopes to meet quarterly with faculty to review data and identify areas for improvement. At the time of the visit, the provider did not have clear desired outcomes for these meetings, nor has it identified how it will systematically analyze and use data to inform program improvements.

- When asked about its plans to use data for continuous improvements, provider leadership shared ideas that they had been pondering and soft plans. At the time of the visit, the provider did not have an intentional plan for systematic use of data for continuous improvement.

- As previously mentioned, JWU recently created an M.A.T. Advisory Board that includes multiple clinical partners. At the time of the visit, the board had not yet met, but provider leadership noted that this board might have a role in reviewing data and providing input into programmatic changes.

- Provider leadership provided examples of how it used feedback from the pilot of the CTE program to inform changes to the program. The program revised the tool used during student teaching to assess candidate performance after feedback from clinical educators and university supervisors indicated that it was too cumbersome. It also designed a common rubric for key assessments. The provider also cited how it changed the scheduling of two classes the first semester based on feedback from the first cohort. Leadership did not articulate how it will evaluate if these changes have been effective as part of an ongoing continuous improvement cycle.

Recommendations

- Identify clearly key outcomes or specific measures that matter most for the JWU teacher education program. Backwards map where and how provider leadership will understand progress towards these goals and measures. Identify crucial data collection processes and timing to ensure analysis can occur in a strategic way.

- Think ahead to how the data will support decisions for continuous improvement. Consider collaborating with JWU leadership to explore options for support in this planning and implementation.

5.3 Reporting and Sharing of Data	No Rating
The provider does not yet have data on its program completers but has a plan for reporting. The provider and its programs meet all RIDE reporting requirements.	

- The provider and its programs meet all RIDE data reporting requirements and timelines.

- The provider and its programs do not yet have program completers. JWU plans to share completer information on their website. Provider leadership emphasized the need for data shared on the website to be clear and easy to understand. Leadership also acknowledged that the provider will need to be "thoughtful about public reporting" given the small cohort size and the need to preserve confidentiality of individuals. The provider stated its intention to link to publically shareable results from its own assessment system but did not give examples of types of data it will share.

Recommendations

- Strategize on how to best share data given small cohort size and appropriate suppression rules. Consider if and how data sharing agreements could support this work.

5.4 Stakeholder Engagement	Approaching Expectations
The provider and its programs have identified how it will engage stakeholders in program evaluation and improvement efforts but has not yet identified desired outcomes from such engagement.	

- The provider recently created an M.A.T Advisory Board, which will convene for the first time in January 2018, and will meet "at least twice each year to look at program data and make suggestions as to the future direction of the program." Both provider leadership and members of the M.A.T. Advisory Board could not articulate clearly the desired outcomes of the board or the plan for the board moving forward. A flowchart provided by provider leadership suggests that the first meeting will be focused on identifying short- and long-term goals, setting priorities, forming workgroups tied to specific goals, posing questions for data discussions, and identifying gaps in board membership.

- The M.A.T. Advisory Board includes 13 Rhode Island school and district leaders. The review team noted the lack of teacher representation on the board—especially a lack of culinary CTE educators. Reviewers also noted that four of the 13 members are currently adjunct faculty at JWU, which limits the number of other voices on the board. In interviews, clinical partners and clinical educators noted that the provider or its programs have not asked them to give feedback about the provider or its programs.

Recommendations

- Identify a clear charge for the advisory group that prioritizes system-level data.

- Build out the advisory board to include practicing educators like current JWU clinical educators from each program area.

- Consider including one or more candidates on the advisory board to bring in candidate voice and to support leadership development.

- Highlight a consistent program weakness, impact on student learning, as an early and critical conversation for the group to tackle.

5.5 Diversity and Quality of Faculty	Approaching Expectations
The provider ensures that most faculty and staff members have the appropriate qualifications for their role. The diversity of the School of Education staff and faculty does not reflect the diversity of Rhode Island.	

- Candidates generally reported that their instructors, advisors, and supervisors were very effective in their roles as teachers. They felt strongly supported by their instructors and advisors.

- The provider values its adjunct faculty members and sees the value of having a mostly practitioner faculty. According to the provider, adjunct faculty "provide real-time information about what is going on in many of our Rhode Island districts, and are able to provide insight and

advice that helps to keep our teacher candidates current and well-prepared for RI's classrooms."
The adjunct faculty members generally bring currency to the program. In interviews, faculty
cited multiple examples of how they integrated district practices and their own professional
learning into courses. However, reviewers noted that some syllabi are outdated in that they
incorporated dated texts and readings or incorporate outdated versions of professional
association standards.

- Through a review of curricula vitae and faculty qualifications, the review team found most
  faculty members fully qualified for their roles. However, multiple stakeholders expressed
  concern that the university supervisors do not have a CTE and/or secondary education
  background. The review team shared this concern after reviewing résumés of current university
  supervisors. In addition, the selection criteria for university supervisors include "personal
  teaching philosophies that are exemplary of the RIPTS, CECs, and cultural competencies",
  "extensive experience as a teacher or administrator," "successful completion of an interview",
  and "a résumé to provide evidence of substantial experience" but do not prioritize experience
  knowledge of and experience in the content area.

- University policy specifies that all full-time staff members must receive an evaluation and that
  all adjunct faculty must receive formal observations. The provider did not comply with
  university expectations related to adjunct faculty observations at the time of the visit; provider
  leadership had not yet instituted a policy or process for observing adjunct faculty members. As a
  result, it was unclear how provider leadership intended to make retention decisions at the end
  of the year.

- The university also uses course evaluations as way to measure the effectiveness of faculty
  instruction. The university recently changed course evaluations to make them electronic, which
  decreased overall response rates. In response, the university created a system or reminders
  that it hopes will improve response rates. At the provider level, course evaluations do not allow
  leadership to disaggregate responses from non-certification-seeking and certification-seeking
  CTE students.

- The small size of the programs present challenges related to the course evaluations. Given the
  small size of the programs, some candidates noted that they were hesitant to provide honest
  feedback. Some course faculty received low scores on evaluations, but provider leadership had
  not acted yet on the data because the sample was so small.

- Neither the provider nor JWU's Providence Campus as a whole has a diverse faculty. Currently,
  all faculty within the School of Education identify as white and 92 percent of faculty members at
  JWU's Providence Campus identify as white. Nearly all clinical educators identify as white.

- Provider leadership reported challenges in recruiting diverse adjunct faculty, but did not provide
  strong evidence of prior efforts. When recruiting new adjunct faculty members, the Director of
  Teacher Education Programs often recruits specific individuals who have the expertise and
  credentials needed.

- Although the provider does not have an ethnically diverse faculty, provider leadership noted
  that its adjunct faculty have varied positions in Rhode Island schools. Adjunct faculty members

come from a variety of districts and hold a variety of roles, including superintendent of schools, curriculum director, mathematics and literacy coach, special education director, principal, and teacher leader. The provider presented a compelling case as to how this diversity enhances the programs.

- The provider reports all faculty vacancies on the JWU work site. The provider advertises full-time openings on a variety of other job-related websites, but the School of Education has not had any recent full-time openings.

Recommendations

- Revise criteria for selecting clinical supervisors to emphasize knowledge of and experience in the content area. Address concerns regarding the CTE university supervisor background and readiness to support CTE candidates.

- Enact JWU-required adjunct faculty observations. Utilize information from observations to ensure faculty quality, currency, and relevancy.

- Continue to monitor survey response rates and take action as needed to ensure data are actionable. Consider alternate ways of collecting feedback from candidates when cohort and class sizes are small or communicate more clearly to candidates safeguards in place to assure anonymity and eliminate potential retribution. When needed, triangulate data from multiple sources.

- Address proactively concerns surfaced in course evaluations, even when sample sizes are small.

- Prioritize increasing the diversity of program staff and adjunct faculty. Explore and implement additional and innovative recruitment and retention strategies beyond those currently used to fill vacant positions.

- Document specific outreach to invite racially and ethnically diverse adjunct faculty to JWU and continue to collaborate with JWU offices to continue working toward a more diverse faculty. Consider implementing strategies to identify high quality clinical educators of color.

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

- The provider currently uses resources to operate and support three graduate-level educator preparation programs. As has been reported throughout this report, the programs are working diligently to conduct and improve their programs to meet candidate and employer needs and the expectations of the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation.

- Provider leadership reported that the provider and its programs generally have sufficient resources. The department budget covers faculty and professional staff salaries and benefits,

stipends and related funding for student teaching placements, and funds for other program-related expenses. The university also provides significant information technology support. Candidates also have access to on-campus supports.

- Although the provider and its programs are generally well resourced, the provider noted that it does not have dedicated funding to support professional learning for its adjunct faculty and professional staff. The provider has been able to provide some support using its CEEDAR funds, but a long-term funding source is not available. Additional funds for professional learning would help ensure that staff remain current in their fields.

Appendix A: Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation

STANDARD ONE: PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STANDARD TWO: CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE

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

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

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

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

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

STANDARD THREE: CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STANDARD FOUR: PROGRAM IMPACT

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

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

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

STANDARD FIVE: PROGRAM QUALITY AND IMPROVEMENT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Provider Approval Term	Description	Conditions
7 Years	All programs have classifications of Approval with Distinction or Full Approval. Most provider components are rated Meets Expectations.	No conditions
5 Years	Most programs have classifications of Approval with Distinction or Full Approval, although there may be a small number of programs classified as Approved with Conditions. Most provider components are rated Meets Expectations.	No conditions
4 or 3 Years	Program performance is varied. A number of programs are Approved with Conditions. Many provider components are rated	No conditions

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

Appendix C: Glossary

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

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

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

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

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

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

Component: Defines a distinct aspect of standard

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

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

Program completer: See *Completer*

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

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

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

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

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

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