Review Team Performance Report

University of Rhode Island

March 26, 2017 through March 29, 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 and denote the quality of the certificate area programs that the provider offers. The provider approval term is based on both program classifications and provider-level components and denotes the overall quality of the provider. Certain program classifications and provider approval terms result in approval conditions that must be addressed prior to the next PREP-RI review.

---

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

The Program and Provider Component Findings and Recommendations sections contain specific information regarding provider and program performance for each component. The sections include a summary statement of the current level of performance for the component. The summary statement is followed by a brief list of evidence that details the performance level and where appropriate suggestions for improvement or commendations for notable practice. 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, URI must take action to address issues of performance related to all components rated as Approaching Expectations or Does Not Meet Expectations.

Key Terms Used in this Report

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

Report Summary

The educator preparation provider, The University of Rhode Island (URI), offers ten RIDE-approved teacher and support professional programs. URI has been a RIDE-approved educator preparation provider since 1976. RIDE last reviewed the educator preparation programs in 2008 as part of the Rhode Island Program Approval process. The tables on the following pages list the programs and courses of study reviewed during this visit.

Please note that the review team did not review any courses of study not listed in the tables. RIDE authorized teacher programs for Bilingual and Dual Language and English as a Second Language at URI. Due to the timing of the authorization of the Bilingual and Dual Language and English as a Second Language options, they were not included in this visit. URI did not submit the School Psychology program for program renewal, meaning that the School Psychology program cannot accept new candidates until it submits a new program application and receives approval from RIDE.

URI and its programs have clearly made progress since the last full RIPA visit in 2008. Many of the programs are working diligently to conduct and improve their programs to meet candidate and employer needs as well as the expectations of the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation. URI has demonstrated a responsiveness to employer needs by recently adding additional programs and pathways based on needs from the field. Leadership, systems, and structures are in place to promote continuous improvement of programs. URI has undertaken efforts to improve its assessment system and strengthen relationships with clinical partners. These efforts, coupled with some additional strategic outreach and refinement, would well position URI and its programs to meet fully the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation.

Teacher Certification Programs

Certification Program	Undergraduate	Graduate	Non-Degree
All Grades Education	B.M. (Bachelor of Music)	M.M. (Master of Music) in Music Education	Teacher Certificate Program in Music
	B.A. in Secondary Education (World Languages)	M.A.. in Secondary Education (World Languages)	Teacher Certificate Program in World Languages
	B.S. in Kinesiology (Health and Physical Education)	M.Ed. with Teaching Certification (Health and Physical Education)	Teacher Certificate Program in Health and Physical Education
Early Childhood Education	B.S. in Human Development and Family Studies (Early Childhood Concentration)	-	Teacher Certificate Program in Early Childhood
Elementary Education	B.A. in Elementary Education	M.A. in Elementary Education	Teacher Certificate Program in Elementary Education
Library Media Specialist	-	Master of Library and Information Studies (M.L.I.S.)	Teacher Certificate Program in Library and Media Studies
Middle Grades – Elementary Extension	-	-	English
			Mathematics
			Science
			Social Studies
Middle Grades – Secondary Extension	-	-	English
			Mathematics
			Science
			Social Studies
Secondary Education	B.A. in Secondary Education (Biology)	M.A. in Secondary Education (with Teacher Certification in Biology)	Teacher Certificate Program in Biology
	B.A. in Secondary Education (Chemistry)	M.A. in Secondary Education (with Teacher Certification in Chemistry)	Teacher Certificate Program in Chemistry
	B.A. in Secondary Education (English)	M.A. in Secondary Education (with Teacher Certification in English)	Teacher Certificate Program in English
	B.A. in Secondary Education (General Science)	M.A. in Secondary Education (with Teacher Certification in General Science)	Teacher Certificate Program in General Science

Certification Program	Undergraduate	Graduate	Non-Degree
	B.A. in Secondary Education (Mathematics)	M.A. in Secondary Education (with Teacher Certification in Mathematics)	Teacher Certificate Program in Mathematics
	B.A. in Secondary Education (Physics)	M.A. in Secondary Education (with Teacher Certification in Physics)	Teacher Certificate Program in Physics
	B.A. in Secondary Education (Social Studies)	M.A. in Secondary Education (with Teacher Certification in Social Studies)	Teacher Certificate Program in Social Studies
Special Education Program	-	M.A. in Special Education	-

Support Professional Certification Programs

Certification Program	Undergraduate	Graduate	Non-Degree
Reading Specialist	-	M.A. in Education (Reading Specialization)	-

The review team conducted the review from March 26, 2017 through March 29, 2017. Review team members were:

- Meredith Astrologo, Elementary Math Specialist at North Kingstown Public Schools
- Nicole Chilla, Senior Advisor, Divisions of Teaching and Learning at New York City Department of Education
- Genevieve Cicerone, Reading Specialist at Cranston Public Schools
- Dr. Vincent Connelly, Associate Professor University of New Hampshire
- Kristen Coutoulakis, Health and Physical Education Teacher at East Providence Public Schools
- Dr. Sherry Crow, Associate Professor at University of Nebraska Kearney
- Dr. Elaine Holden, Owner and Reading Consultant at The Reading Foundation
- Dr. Linda Houser, Assistant Dean for Program Evaluation and Assessment at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
- Maria Hunter, Middle School Social Studies Teacher at South Kingstown Public Schools
- Diane Lebrun, Library Media Specialist at Woonsocket Public Schools
- Sara Mickelson, Senior Manager of Early Learning at Bainum Family Foundation
- Janel Paquin, World Language Teacher at Newport Public Schools
- Susan Toohey Kaye, Reading Specialist at Coventry Public Schools
- Marissa St. Louis, Elementary Teacher at Pawtucket Public Schools
- Dr. Mark Stickney, Assistant Professor and Director of Bands at Plymouth State University

- Maryjane Utley, Science Department Chair at Westerly Public Schools
- Brian Walker, Director of North County Teacher Certification Program at Plymouth State University
- Dr. William Weber, Associate Professor at The University of Toledo (retired)

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
Teacher Certification Programs	
All Grades Education	Approved with Conditions
Early Childhood	Approved with Conditions
Elementary Education	Approved with Conditions
Library Media Specialist	Approved with Conditions
Middle Grades Education	Approved with Conditions
Secondary Grades Education	Approved with Conditions
Special Education	Full Approval
Support Professional Certification Programs	
Reading Specialist	Full Approval

Provider Approval Term

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

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

Provider	University of Rhode Island
Approval Term	Four years
Conditions	

- By December 2017, URI must establish a plan for program improvement based on the findings and recommendations included in the PREP-RI report and share this plan with the Commissioner of Education for review.

- By December 2017, URI must ensure that all programs meet the minimum hours of clinical experience articulated in certification requirements and ensure that all clinical experiences comply with RIDE requirements.

- Beginning in 2017-18 and over the next two years, the provider must deepen engagement in substantial and meaningful collaboration with K-12 districts. This work must include a review of courses and clinical experiences within each program to ensure that candidate preparation is deep, relevant, and meeting the expectations of the PREP-RI standards. Together, URI and its clinical partners should strengthen alignment around the rigor of teaching practice, observation, and evaluation of teaching practices. URI and its clinical partners should work to ensure that all candidates receive high quality feedback on teaching practice aligned to assessment tools. Engagement with the field should also include improved training and calibration of clinical educators and clinical supervisors and discussion of which dispositions and traits are essential to being an effective educator. URI must continue to engage in work related to establishing mutually beneficial partnerships with K-12 districts. The team believes this deeper level of engagement will assist URI in meeting many of the detailed recommendations in the report.

- During the 2017-18 school year, URI must improve systems and processes for communicating and collaborating across colleges that house preparation programs: Alan Shawn Feinstein College of Education and Professional Studies, College of Health Sciences, and College of Arts and Sciences. URI demonstrated multiple challenges in ensuring alignment across colleges. This misalignment negatively affected the quality of preparation programs, particularly in the early childhood program.

- During the 2017-18 school year, the provider must review current recruitment efforts and improve processes for collecting and analyzing data on the success of recruitment efforts.

Program enrollment will be significantly increasing in the upcoming year. The provider should seek to understand specifically what efforts are working and for what types of candidates.

- The Provost of URI and the Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education will establish bi-annual check-ins where URI leadership will provide updates on efforts to address the findings and recommendations of the PREP-RI report. URI will also establish a public progress report that documents improvement efforts accomplished to date. If URI makes insufficient progress, the Commissioner of Education reserves the right to establish more specific interim program improvement benchmarks.

Component Ratings

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

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

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

Component	Component Ratings						
Teacher Certification Area Programs	All Grades	Early Childhood	Elementary	Library Media Specialist	Middle	Secondary	Special Education
1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations
1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations
1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations
1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations
1.5 Technology	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations
1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations
1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations

Component	Component Ratings
Support Professional Certification Area Program	Reading Specialist
1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Not Applicable
1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Meets Expectations
1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations
1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations
1.5 Technology	Meets Expectations
1.6 Equity	Meets Expectations
1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Meets Expectations

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

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

Component	Component Ratings						
Teacher Certification Area Programs	All Grades	Early Childhood	Elementary	Library Media Specialist	Middle	Secondary	Special Education
2.1 Clinical Preparation	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations
2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations
2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations
2.4 Clinical Educators	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations

Component	Component Ratings
Support Professional Certification Area Programs	Reading Specialist
2.1 Clinical Preparation	Meets Expectations
2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Meets Expectations
2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations
2.4 Clinical Educators	Approaching Expectations

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

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

Component	Component Ratings						
Teacher Certification Area Programs	All Grades	Early Childhood	Elementary	Library Media Specialist	Middle	Secondary	Special Education
3.1 Diversity of Candidates*	Does Not Meet Expectations						
3.2 Response to Employment Needs*	Approaching Expectations						
3.3 Admission Standards for Academic Achievement and Ability*	Meets Expectations						
3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations
3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations
3.6 Additional Selectivity Criteria*	Approaching Expectations						

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

Standard 4: Program Impact

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

Component	Component Ratings						
Teacher Certification Area Programs	All Grades	Early Childhood	Elementary	Library Media Specialist	Middle	Secondary	Special Education
4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations
4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations

Component	Component Rating
Support Professional Certification Area Programs	Reading Specialist
4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations

Standard 5: Program Quality and Improvement

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

Component	Component Ratings						
Teacher Certification Area Programs	All Grades	Early Childhood	Elementary	Library Media Specialist	Middle	Secondary	Special Education
5.1 Collection of Data to Evaluate Program Quality*	Meets Expectations						
5.2 Analysis and Use of Data for Continuous Improvement*	Approaching Expectations						
5.3 Reporting and Sharing of Data*	Meets Expectations						
5.4 Stakeholder Engagement*	Approaching Expectations						
5.5 Diversity and Quality of Faculty*	Approaching Expectations						
5.6 Other Resources*	Approaching Expectations						

Component	Component Ratings
Support Professional Certification Area Programs	Reading Specialist
5.1 Collection of Data to Evaluate Program Quality*	Meets Expectations
5.2 Analysis and Use of Data for Continuous Improvement*	Approaching Expectations
5.3 Reporting and Sharing of Data*	Meets Expectations
5.4 Stakeholder Engagement*	Approaching Expectations
5.5 Diversity and Quality of Faculty*	Approaching Expectations
5.6 Other Resources*	Approaching Expectations

Teacher Certificate Areas: Findings and Recommendations

All Grades Education Program

The All Grades Education Program includes courses of study in music education, world languages education, and physical education/health. For all content areas, there are three available pathways: undergraduate, graduate, and non-degree (Teacher Certification Program, or TCP).

The music department within the College of Arts and Sciences houses the music education program. The program is 131 credits total and includes 18 major courses, seven semesters of ensembles, seven semesters of music convocation, seven semesters of applied music, and 6 music methods classes. The education course sequence includes an introduction to music teaching, three methods classes, two field experiences, a seminar in student teaching, and student teaching.

The health and physical education program is one of three emphasis areas for students majoring within the Kinesiology Department housed within the College of Health Sciences. The physical education/health program prepares candidates to seek certifications in physical education, adaptive physical education, and health education. The program consists of core curriculum courses (25 credits) covering various aspects of kinesiology, content area requirements (46 credits) focused on physical and health education, and professional electives (13 credits). The program reported, "… the HPE curriculum emphasis includes content and skill knowledge that are connected to all of the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards and the Society of Health and Physical Educators (SHAPE)."

The program of study for world languages education mirrors the program of study for secondary education. Candidates take two foundational courses, six methods courses, a seminar, and five field experiences.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Meets Expectations
The program aligns to the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS). Candidates experience a consistent curriculum and have sufficient opportunities to develop proficiency in the RIPTS.	

- The specific set of courses taken by candidates varies by content area. However, all candidates take a pre-professional field experience, an education psychology course, multiple practicum experiences, student teaching, and a student teaching seminar. Candidates enrolled in the MA/TCP pathway follow a course of study that is similar to the undergraduate course of study.

- Critical performance tasks and course syllabi map to the RIPTS. Throughout the program, candidates demonstrate their proficiency via RIPTS-aligned rubrics. During interviews, candidates demonstrated familiarity with and understanding of the RIPTS.

- Reviewers noted that candidate preparation seemed particularly strong related to creating instructional opportunities that reflect an understanding of how children learn and develop (Standard 3).

- Although candidates have opportunities to develop proficiency in the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards, reviewers noted that candidates would benefit from additional opportunities to practice interacting with students, parents, and colleagues (Standard 11) based

on interviews with clinical educators and clinical supervisors. Based on feedback from clinical educators, the program should also consider integrating additional opportunities into the curriculum for candidates to deepen their understanding and proficiency in strategies for critical thinking and problem solving (Standard 5).

- Candidates studying world languages select three RIPTS that they would like the clinical educator or clinical supervisor to focus on within each observation. Observers address all RIPTS at least once across evaluations, but the review team noted that this practice required candidates to reflect on their performance and seek feedback on specific areas of practice. However, it is important that the program ensure that candidates receive feedback on the RIPTS at multiple points through the clinical experience.

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum aligns partially to professional association standards. Candidates do not have sufficient opportunities to develop proficiency in the full range of knowledge and skills necessary to meet the expectations of the standards.	

- The specific set of courses taken by candidates varies by content area, but all courses of study include content courses, education courses, and clinical experiences. Candidates take a range of courses in their program area prior to practicum.

- The program assesses candidate proficiency in content knowledge specific to their field during student teaching using a rubric aligned to program association standards. The program assesses candidates in each student teaching placement.

- Candidates do not develop proficiency in all of the critical content and content pedagogy concepts, principles, and practices within their area of certification.

Music

- The program provided a crosswalk demonstrating alignment between course syllabi and the National Association for Schools of Music. However, program emphasis on the standards is uneven.

- One of the program's key assessments is a content evaluation conducted during student teaching using a rubric aligned to the NASM standards.

- Candidates develop deep content knowledge during the program. Candidates engage in in-depth study in the following: history/philosophy of music education (Section (b)(4)); vocal, kinesthetic, and aural practices for children (Section c(2)); secondary choral/vocal ensemble techniques, and instrumental and ensemble techniques (Section c(3)(c)). All music majors must also demonstrate proficiency in their principal instrument.

- Candidates develop proficiency in most but not all critical pedagogical-content concepts, principles, and practices. Clinical educators reported that candidates do not always have sufficient rehearsal skills (Section b(1), Section c(4)(e)). They also noted that they would benefit

from more coursework that placed greater emphasis on individual instrument methods (Section c(3)(a)).

Health and Physical Education

- Program leadership reported that the American Association of Health Education and the National Association of Sport and Physical Education nationally recognized the program through the 2016 Specialized Professional Association (SPA) review. Program-provided crosswalks and syllabi demonstrated that the program aligns to professional association standards, but reviewers noted that the depth of alignment varies. Reviewers noted that candidate preparation was strongest in scientific and theoretical knowledge (Standard 1) and weakest in skill-based and fitness-based competence (Standard 2).

- The program assesses candidate proficiency in content and content pedagogy during clinical experiences using a rubric. The program assesses proficiency using a NASPE Content Evaluation during candidates' elementary practicum placement and using an AAHE Health Evaluation during candidates' secondary practicum placement.

- Multiple evidence sources indicated that candidates do not receive sufficient instruction and support in the area of health education. Several program completers expressed concerns with the quality, depth, and breadth of their preparation. Some were concerned that they were not prepared to teach health. Others wished there was greater emphasis and focus on health education.   Program leadership acknowledged health education as an area in need of improvement and cited actions it is considering. Leadership reported in an evidence organizer that candidates "sometimes need to take the health content test more than once to reach the passing score of 162 or higher and proceed to student teaching" and also noted that "no program faculty have a terminal academic degree in health education." That said, the program reported in an evidence organizer that the team is "considering adding new assignments that more specifically address health standards earlier in the program."

World Languages

- The review team noted that candidates studying world languages education received strong preparation in content and content pedagogy. The program reports that the Specialized Professional Association has nationally recognized the world language education program. Submitted evidence shows that program courses align with the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) standards.

- The program assesses candidate proficiency in content and content pedagogy through the mid-term and final evaluations, which align to the ACTFL content standards. Candidates also create a professional content knowledge portfolio during student teaching that must align candidate work with the 5Cs.

- Although the program content aligns with ACTFL standards, the program does not prepare candidates to teach in the full grade span identified in the ACTFL standards (P-12). The program does not sufficiently emphasize the elementary grades.

- A review of course syllabi revealed a strong emphasis on content and content pedagogy aligned to the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages standards. During site visits and interviews, candidates generally demonstrated strong content knowledge and content pedagogy. However, candidate interviews and evidence organizers revealed that candidates would benefit from additional support on candidate presentation of oral and written information to audiences of listeners or readers (Standard 1) because candidates sometimes struggle to meet expectations on the Oral Proficiency Interview. Reviewers also noted that the program should continue to model integrating cultures, linguistics, literatures, and concepts from other disciplines into instruction (Standard 2).

Recommendations:

- Engage program completers and clinical partners in additional conversations about current gaps in candidate content knowledge and pedagogy and implement changes to the course of study that address such gaps.

- Review and revise course syllabi in music and music education as well as clinical experiences to provide candidates additional opportunities to develop and receive feedback on rehearsal skills. Identify ways to place additional emphasis on individual instrument methods.

- Continue efforts to strengthen candidate proficiency in health education. Through additional hiring or professional learning, augment faculty's current capacity to provide high quality preparation in the area of health preparation.

- Provide additional opportunities for candidates specializing in world languages to develop oral proficiency in coursework preceding the assessments.

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 only a basic understanding of standards-driven instruction.	

- During their program, candidates develop an awareness of student standards and begin to develop proficiency in how to use standards as an educator. Course syllabi reference student standards and provide some introductory activities and assignments for candidates to develop familiarity with the standards.

- Program leadership identified multiple lesson planning and teaching opportunities where candidates can demonstrate proficiency in using student standards to guide planning and instruction. However, candidate work samples and site visits revealed inconsistencies in candidate proficiency and use of standards.

Music

- The program reported that MUS 339: Choral Methods and Materials is the primary course where candidates apply Grade Span Expectations (GSEs) in creating lessons for a school music

program. The program reports that the course's key assessment, the choral handbook, must include a completed course review for GSEs in music. However, the review team did not see evidence of this in work samples. One rubric row of the 2016 rubric addresses the GSEs, but the program graded work samples using a version of the rubric that does not address the GSEs at all.

- During interviews, candidates were aware of the GSEs but did not demonstrate a full depth and breadth of understanding of the standards and of how to use the standards to inform instruction.

Health and PE

- The program reported that it introduces candidates to health and physical education standards in KIN 270: Introduction to Teaching Health and Physical Education, focus on lesson planning and unit planning in methods courses, and then give candidates multiple opportunities to apply content knowledge and implement standards-based instruction through clinical experiences.

- Reviewers saw evidence of alignment to the Rhode Island Frameworks in candidate work samples and lesson plans, but the activities and assessments within lesson plans did not consistently address the standard in sufficient depth. Reviewers also noted a lack of focus on or conversation about student standards during site visits and candidate interviews. Not all lessons observed during site visits aligned to health and physical education standards. Neither the candidates nor the clinical educators discussed the success of the lesson relative to student standards.

World Languages

- Reviewers noted that candidate proficiency in standards and standards-based instruction was stronger in world languages compared to other specializations within the All Grades Program. Rhode Island does not have state-specific standards for world languages, but world language candidates exhibited solid knowledge and use of the ACTFL World Readiness Standards for Learning Language (5Cs) in lesson plans and site visits. Prior to and during student teaching, the program requires candidates to link their planned activities to the ACTFL World Readiness Standards for Learning Languages.

Recommendations:

- Revise candidate tasks to ensure candidates develop a critical understanding of the full range of student learning standards. Ensure all candidates have opportunities to practice using student standards across the full grade ranges. Incorporate reflection and planning questions in the program curriculum that require candidates to think beyond single lessons to develop deep and critical understanding of the student standards.

- Ensure that candidate preparation emphasizes the critical importance of student standards and their role as a driver of lesson planning, assessment, and reflection. Work with program faculty and clinical educators to incorporate analysis of student work and student work samples into course assignments and clinical observation debriefs. Require candidates to reflect on their developing proficiency in the use of student standards. Ensure candidates know how build on

prior instruction in ways that increasingly support students to meet the expectations of the standards.

- Work with program faculty and clinical educators to incorporate additional resources and materials into the methods courses and clinical experiences designed to help candidates unpack, develop understanding, and design instruction consistent with student standards.

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

- The program reported that the candidates had multiple opportunities to develop proficiency in data-driven instruction, but the sequence and types of opportunities vary by content area. Across all content areas, however, reviewers found limited emphasis on using assessment results to inform future instruction. Candidates develop a general understanding of assessment. They understand that all instruction should have one or more formal or informal assessments as well as some assessment strategies. It was not evident that candidates learn to design instruction by first collecting data on student learning, using data from student learning to modify practice, and using data from multiple sources in their instruction. The program does not include a clear, intentional focus on the use of data to inform instruction.

- Candidates specializing in world languages and physical education/health take an assessment class that introduces them to the core principles, concepts, and purposes of assessment. As part of EDC 371: Educational Measurements, world language candidates develop and administer both a performance assessment task and a multiple-choice test. As part of KIN 368: Tests and Measurements, physical education/health candidates must develop three assessments (a checklist, a survey, and "an established test from the literature"), administer the assessments, and then analyze the data using descriptive statistics and at least one t-test and one correlation.

- Music candidates do not take a course focused on assessment. The program reported that candidates receive an introduction to assessment in MUS 235: Introduction to Music Teaching and then deepen their understanding through methods courses.

- The program cited the Informal and Formal Assessment of Learning task completed during student teaching as a key candidate assessment related to data-driven instruction. In this assessment, candidates must prepare and administer informal and formal assessments to students, mark and submit student work, write rationales for selection of criteria within assessments, and provide commentary on candidate work. The assessment also requires candidates to aggregate and disaggregate data and reflect on the learning of three or four representative students.

- Across content areas, candidates have insufficient opportunities to learn about and practice collecting and using data from sources other than assessments. In EDC 102: Introduction to American Education, candidates write a paper based on their reflection on data collected from KidsCount, InfoWorks, and other source. Other than this assignment, reviewers found limited

evidence of candidates learning and practicing how to use data from sources other than assessments to improve student learning and instructional practice.

Recommendations:

- Review and revise course syllabi and candidate experiences to integrate additional opportunities to learn about and practice using assessment to inform instruction. Ensure that the program clearly communicates the data-based instruction cycle and ensures that all candidates learn, practice, and receive feedback on their use of the data-based instruction program to progress in the program.

- Consult with clinical partners and other stakeholders to identify important content-specific assessments that candidates should be familiar with prior to program completion. Ensure candidates have opportunities to not only collect data using these assessments but also practice using data to track student progress and inform future teaching.

- For music, consider if candidates would benefit from one of the introductory assessment classes offered through other programs.

1.5 Technology	Approaching Expectations
The program expects candidates to use technology as technology users and as teachers. However, the program provides insufficient instruction and modeling to candidates.	

- Program faculty provide limited explicit instruction and modeling to candidates related to designing digital age learning experiences. During interviews, candidates gave examples where faculty shared general technologies (e.g. Plickers, Kahoot) and content-specific technologies (SmartMusic and TalkAbroad), but candidates did not convey a systematic approach to teaching candidates how to design and implement digital age learning experiences. Program completers also shared that professors did not frequently or adequately model use of technology to improve student learning.

- The program reported that it expects candidates to use technology in lesson planning, unit planning, and classroom observations during student teaching. The candidate work samples and lessons plans revealed that candidate utilization of technology tends to focus on engaging students and keeping their interest. During interviews, candidates and clinical faculty gave examples of playing musical jeopardy, using pedometers, or using iPads. In some cases, the program made technology available to candidates (e.g. iPads, pedometers) for lessons, but reviewers learned in interviews that candidates do not utilize these resources. Overall, reviewers did not observe strategic use of technology to improve instruction or close instructional gaps in site visits, lesson plans, or candidate work.

- The program reported in an evidence organizer that it assesses candidate knowledge of the ISTE standards using a quiz on Taskstream; however, the minimum expected performance level and the quiz's relationship to the assessment system were unclear to reviewers. This assessment does not ensure all candidates are proficient in the use of technology consistent with the ISTE standards.

- Clinical educators described mixed experiences related to candidate preparation in technology. A few clinical educators described mutually beneficial relationships where clinical educators and candidates learned technologies from each other. For example, some clinical educators described how they taught candidates how to use the online textbook or gradebook used in the district and then candidates taught them how to use apps like Quizlet, Kahoot, and other games. Other clinical educators shared different experiences, stating that candidates had "minimal" knowledge of technology and that the lack of preparation in technology was "surprising."

- Faculty interviews, candidate interviews, and program completer surveys indicated that the quality of music education facilities is a major obstacle to helping candidates develop proficiency in technology. Interview participants and survey respondents gave examples of outdated facilities with minimum capability to provide candidates with rich digital learning experiences or to enable candidates to practice implementing digital learning experiences.

Recommendations:

- Engage clinical partners to determine current best practices for incorporating technology in the classroom. With partners, identify current instructional technologies and resources for implementing, assessing, and supporting student learning.

- Review and revise course syllabi and candidate experiences to ensure candidates receive assessment results and feedback on their implementation of digital age learning experiences and assessments.

- Ensure faculty members and clinical educators are proficient in designing and implementing digital age learning experiences. Embed opportunities within courses for candidates to learn about and practice designing digital age learning experiences.

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum provides candidates limited opportunities to develop proficiency in the areas of equity, diversity, and working with families in diverse communities. Candidates develop basic skills for working with a diverse range of learners.	

- Candidate preparation in the area of equity varies by content area within the All Grades program. However, candidate experiences lack the depth needed in order for candidates to develop proficiency in working with English language learners, students with disabilities, and families.

- Through coursework, candidates develop basic skills for working with a diverse range of learners. During an interview, clinical educators acknowledged that student teachers are not always prepared to work in diverse environments but noted that candidates have basic skills for working with diverse populations and ask clinical educators about what works with particular populations.

- Across content areas, the program does not sufficiently provide candidates with instruction and authentic learning opportunities focused on working with families. Candidates specializing in physical education, health, or world language receive some but insufficient content on working

with families through introductory special education courses. In KIN 410: Adapted Physical Education, candidates specializing in physical education and health complete an assessment report and share it with a parent. Coursework and clinical experiences do not meaningfully integrate opportunities for candidates to learn about and practice working with parents.

Music Education:

- In EDC 250: Introductory Field Experience in Education, candidates reflect on biases through reflections. During interviews, program completers said that this course is where they received preparation to work in diverse environments.

- Candidates studying music do not take any courses in special education. The music program identified multiple courses where coursework addresses areas of diversity, PL 94-142, Section 504 of IADA, Universal Design for Learning, multiculturalism, and creating safe spaces. However, in exit surveys, a few candidates noted that a class in special education would have been helpful to "really solidify the skill set of running an inclusion setting classroom."

- Music educators noted that the split placement does not always align with performance schedules or parent conferences, so candidates may have little opportunity to interact with parents during student teaching. Reviewers did not find any evidence of instruction on how to work with parents.

Health and Physical Education:

- Candidates develop basic skills for working with students with disabilities through a required special education course, EDC 402: Teaching Students with Special Needs in Inclusive Classes. Candidates also take coursework in adaptive physical education. As part of their adaptive physical education coursework and clinical experiences, candidates work one on one with a student with a disability, complete an IEP project, and modify a peer teach activity.

- During KIN 270: Introduction to Teaching Physical Education and Health, candidates write a diversity paper "focused on candidate awareness of diversity in the classroom as it relates to both the RIPTS and the diversity statement.   In KIN 410: Adapted Physical Education, candidates participate in a "disability experience" where they simulate a disability using either a wheelchair, blindfold, ear plugs, or a weight vest for a day and then write a paper reflecting on their experience. Candidates also each spend a day assisting a peer during their simulation.   In interviews, candidates spoke to their role in helping students overcome biases related to gender, weight, sexual identity, and development.

World Languages:

- Reviewers noted that the emphasis on equity was stronger in the world languages course of study. Candidates reflect on their own biases through reflections throughout their coursework, but they do so particularly in EDC 415: Adolescents and Classroom Management. In that class, candidates take the Harvard Implicit Bias test, complete a self-evaluation on their comfort discussing race and racism, and complete a cultural competence scale. Candidates learn about

an extensive breadth of diversity considerations (gender, socio-economic, race, disability, language proficiency). The readings identified in the syllabus are current, varied, and encourage candidates to consider student difference from a place of strength. However, while the course emphasizes empathy, non-judgment, and care, it does not focus on practical measures around engaging and supporting a variety of student learners.

- Candidates develop basic skills for working with students with disabilities through a required special education course, EDC 402: Teaching Students with Special Needs in Inclusive Classes.

Recommendations:

- Work with clinical partners to identify best practices for working with English learners and students with disabilities in music, physical education/health, and world languages. Identify authentic experiences for working with parents that the program should integrate into candidates' courses of study.

- Review and revise course syllabi and clinical experiences to ensure that candidates receive instruction in and receive opportunities to practice working with English learners, students with disabilities, and families in diverse communities.

- Ensure program faculty members are proficient and can model for candidates teaching a diverse group of learners, including those with disabilities and those who are learning English.

- Incorporate a greater emphasis on working with parents throughout coursework that extends beyond special education classes. Teach candidates strategies for working with families in diverse communities.

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 general understanding of the initiatives. For example, candidates studying physical education and health learn about anti-bullying initiatives and are familiar with social-emotional learning initiatives. In their introductory course, candidates access InfoWorks and write a paper based on the data they accessed.

- The program assesses candidate proficiency in Rhode Island educational initiatives through a fifteen-question quiz on Taskstream. The quiz, which includes only recall-level questions, does not assess 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 there is a "discussion of impacts and implications of the new teacher evaluation system", candidates receive little exposure to the educator evaluation system. During an interview, program completers said they were not familiar with the educator evaluation system when they graduated and subsequently felt "thrown off" when evaluated in their districts.

Recommendations:

- Work with clinical partners and other stakeholders to identify which initiatives are most important for All Grades candidates to learn about during their program of study. These initiatives should not just be RIDE-led initiatives but also the key initiatives occurring in schools, districts, and statewide. Identify the knowledge, skills, and practices embedded in those key initiatives, and then revise coursework and clinical experiences appropriately.

- Ensure that all candidates understand the process, components, and rubric language embedded within educator evaluation systems used in the state. Consider adopting or adapting performance assessments that are already widely used in Rhode Island and other states.

- Review the course sequence to see where and how the program introduces RI initiatives to candidates. Ensure candidate understanding and ability to demonstrate proficiency related to RI initiatives appropriately build over time. Assess candidate proficiency in Rhode Island educational initiatives in ways that are more authentic and in-depth than a single multiple-choice quiz.

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' clinical preparation is not of sufficient depth, breath, or diversity.	

- The program-level rating for this component is Approaching Expectations due to a variation in performance across content areas. However, health education, adapted physical education, and music education clinical experiences do not meet expectations because candidates do not complete both 12 weeks of student teaching and 60 hours of field experience prior to student teaching in the content area.

- Within each content area, clinical preparation is coherent and builds from and continues to link to theory. However, clinical preparation lacks sufficient depth, breadth, and diversity. Across all content areas, the current design of clinical preparation design does not ensure that candidates practice in diverse settings. For many candidates, the only experience they receive in diverse settings occurs in the pre-professional field experience.

Health and Physical Education:

- According to documentation submitted by the program, candidates complete approximately 90 hours of field experiences in physical education prior to student teaching. Candidates also complete 16 weeks of student teaching—8 weeks in an elementary setting and 8 weeks in a secondary setting.

- Candidates' clinical preparation in health education does not meet certification requirements. Candidates complete a forty-hour practicum experience and then do not have a specific health education student teaching placement. As a result, candidates' opportunity to teach health during student teaching varies based on the schedule of the clinical educator, meaning that

some candidates have no or very little opportunity to teach health. During interviews, program completers voiced that they wished they had had more clinical preparation in health education.

- Candidates also take two twenty-hour practicum experiences in adapted PE. Because certification requirements specify candidates must have 75 hours of practicum in adapted physical education, the duration of clinical experience for adapted physical education is insufficient. In addition, both experiences are in an adapted aquatics setting and candidates work with only one child.

- During interviews, candidates noted that they wish they had additional experience working in a high school setting. Analysis of program completer surveys also indicates that candidates feel they would benefit from more teaching experiences during practicum.

Music:

- Prior to student teaching, candidates' clinical preparation consists of a supervised pre-professional field experience and a supervised field experience. Expectations during clinical placements increase in responsibility. During the pre-professional field experience, candidates are expected to teach and video record two 10-15 minute lessons. During the practicum, candidates assist with warmups, teach one-on-one or sectional lessons, teach short musical selections, or teach lessons based on the clinical educator's plan. Candidates then must teach three 15-20 minute independent lessons. However, the total number of field experience hours prior to student teaching (44 hours) does not meet Rhode Island certification requirements.

- During student teaching, candidates spend eight weeks in an elementary setting and eight weeks in a secondary setting. The student teaching handbook clearly articulates expectations for candidates to assume responsibility of the classroom. At the elementary level, candidates begin by assuming responsibility for teaching classes in grades 3 and 4 and add additional classes each week until they are teaching the full load of classes in weeks 6 and 7 of the placement. At the secondary level, candidates begin by teaching all non-ensemble classes and all warm-ups with ensembles during week 3 and adding additional responsibilities each week until they assume a full load of classes in weeks 6 and 7.

- Candidates experience a range of educational environments across their preparation, including urban and suburban placements as well as elementary and secondary placements.

World Language:

- The structure of clinical preparation in world language mirrors that of secondary education. Undergraduate candidates have a clinical experience each semester after admissions, and each clinical experience pairs with two theory courses. This approach to clinical preparation is coherent and emphasizes the full range of the RIPTS. Both candidates and program faculty noted that this structure is beneficial and a strength of the program.

- Candidate clinical preparation includes a pre-professional field experience, three clinical experiences taken concurrently with coursework, and student teaching. The program reported that candidates spend 135 hours in the field prior to student teaching. Sample checklist items for practicum experiences include working with a small group of students, creating/assisting

with learning centers, co-teaching, or doing a demonstration lesson. Reviewer analysis of exit surveys revealed that completers wish they had more experience teaching lessons prior to student teaching.

- Candidates spend 14 weeks student teaching, which meets minimum certification requirements. Candidates assume responsibility for teaching by the third week of their placement. During student teaching, candidates must assemble an electronic portfolio that includes an instructional unit plan, the informal and formal assessment of learning task, results of four observations conducted by the clinical supervisor and clinical educator, and the midterm and final evaluation of the student teacher completed by the clinical supervisor and the clinical educator.

- Clinical preparation for world language candidates does not ensure the candidates experience a range of educational environments that capture the diversity of educational settings for which they will be certified. Specifically, clinical preparation remains focused on secondary grades; candidates do not have a clinical placement at the elementary education level. During interviews, program completers noted that they wish they had had experience working at the elementary level during their program.

Recommendations:

- Review current Rhode Island certification requirements and revise expectations for clinical preparation to ensure the length of clinical experience in each content area meets these requirements. For physical education and health, develop systems to track and ensure that all candidates meet clinical experience requirements for all three certifications.

- Work with clinical partners to identify or design a clinical experience for world language candidates at the elementary level and ensure that candidates have an opportunity to learn about best practices for working with elementary students prior to the experience. Current after school and elementary language programs hold great potential as clinical experiences for candidates.

- Gather feedback from clinical partners, program completers, and candidates about how to improve clinical preparation of candidates. Ensure that all candidates have opportunities to teach in a range of placements across PK-12 and in a variety of school settings.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Approaching Expectations
The program has not fully structured clinical experiences in a way that enables candidates to demonstrate increasingly positive impact on students' learning.	

- The program has begun to measure candidate impact on student learning. The program has identified one primary measure and identified a few other opportunities, but it was unclear the extent to which these other opportunities focus on candidate impact on student learning. The program does not include impact measures from early clinical experiences as well as later clinical experiences.

- The program measures candidate impact on student learning primarily through the Informal and Formal Assessment of Learning task completed during student teaching. This assessment

requires candidates to prepare and administer informal and formal assessments to students, mark and submit student work, write rationales for selection of criteria within assessments, and provide commentary on candidate work. The assessment also requires candidates to aggregate and disaggregate data and reflect on the learning of three or four representative students. There is no evidence that the program and clinical partners mutually designed this measure of candidate impact on student learning.

- Candidates specializing in music and world languages must video record lessons and post them to a Sakai forum during their clinical experiences. Candidates complete reflections after each lesson and receive feedback from peers. However, it was unclear the extent to which these conversations are grounded in impact on student learning.

- During an interview, a music clinical educator noted that music candidates work with their clinical educator to select a piece of music to teach from sight-reading to concert. Music candidates videotape performances each week to track student growth over time.

- During site visits, review team members observed clinical supervisors giving feedback to candidates, but the feedback did not tie the observation back to student standards or student learning. Similarly, the review team did not find evidence that the program uses data from early clinical measures of candidate impact on student learning to inform future candidate preparation.

Recommendations:

- Collaborate with clinical partners to determine and design appropriate measures of candidate impact on student learning. Establish clear expectations for the collection and analysis of data throughout the program and articulate expected levels and evidence of impact on student learning. Provide explicit instruction in how candidates are to use measures of impact on student learning to inform their continuous growth as teachers.

- Clearly communicate the 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.

- Integrate explicit instruction, feedback, and assessment in how to demonstrate an impact on student learning throughout the program curriculum so that all candidates are well prepared to meet these expectations during clinical placements.

- Incorporate a focus question for student teaching observations that develops a strong habit for all adults, clinical educators, student teachers, and clinical supervisors, to bring the conversation directly to understanding the impact of instruction on student learning.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has begun efforts to improve the quality of clinical partnerships. The program and clinical partners use common assessment tools to evaluate candidate performance, but the program does not ensure rater calibration or ensure that PK-12 clinical educators have input into decisions about candidate progression.	

- The Office of Teacher Education (The Office of Teacher Education) primarily leads the outreach and organization of student teaching placements. The Office of Teacher Education has begun efforts to develop stronger and more clearly articulated partnerships between the program and K-12 districts. For example, a new partnership agreement with Chariho, Exeter-West Greenwich, and South Kingstown efforts to systematize the placement of student teachers and increase URI-district collaboration. In an interview with clinical partners, some acknowledged that URI is open to true collaboration. Partners also noted that the program has been responsive to individual district requests.

- For clinical experiences prior to student teaching, the clinical educator completes a practicum evaluation of the candidate's performance in the practicum. The program reported that the practicum clinical educator must recommend the candidate for student teaching. However, it is unclear from syllabi and evaluation what the expected level of performance is and how the practicum evaluation informs the course grade and recommendation to advance to student teaching. The practicum evaluation does not include differentiated performance level descriptors.

- The program and clinical educators use common observation and evaluation tools to evaluate and provide feedback during student teaching. Clinical educators have some input into the decision making progress regarding the progression of candidates throughout the assessment system through their involvement in assessing candidate practice in clinical settings. The clinical educator and clinical supervisor complete separately the midterm and final evaluations prior to discussing with the candidate. The clinical educator and the clinical supervisor also complete observations of candidate performance—although the role and structure of these observations varies by content area.

- Programs and clinical partners do not have common expectations for candidate performance or for the level of detail and quality of feedback given to candidates. Candidates shared in an interview that they received superficial feedback from their clinical supervisors. Similarly, clinical partners noted that the feedback from the clinical supervisor does not align to the expectations of Rhode Island teachers as captured in the Rhode Island Model Teacher Evaluation System. A review of written feedback from faculty and clinical educators given to candidates also revealed variation in quality; some forms included evidence justifying the rating, while other forms did not include any written feedback for some criteria. Generally, reviewers saw little written constructive feedback in observation and evaluation forms uploaded to Taskstream.

Recommendations:

- Build upon recent efforts to engage with clinical partners and identify agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness. Determine how programs and clinical partners will track and analyze data from agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness.

- Ensure that all candidates understand the process, components, and rubric language embedded within educator evaluation systems used in the state. Engage PK-12 and clinical faculty in calibration sessions to ensure there are shared expectations for performance. Provide training and guidance about how to provide high quality feedback, and monitor feedback given to candidates for quality.

- Identify additional opportunities for clinical educators to have input into decisions about candidate progression within the program.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Approaching Expectations
The program has begun revising both the criteria for the recruitment of clinical educators and the processes to select clinical educators. Current practices, especially those related to training clinical educators, do not ensure that all candidates receive a high quality clinical experience.	

- URI's School of Education (School of Education) has Criteria for Clinical educators that all initial teacher programs use. These criteria, which were revised in spring 2017, include having at least three years professional experience in the certification area, earning educator evaluation ratings of highly effective, being able to work effectively with adult learners, and being able to provide "solicited and spontaneous, in-depth observation and feedback to the candidate (both written and verbal) on a regular basis using program and partner assessments." These criteria are consistent with RIDE's expectations for clinical educators.

- Program faculty across content areas acknowledged it used professional associations as a pipeline for clinical educators. In an evidence organizer, music program leadership reported, "First, the district's involvement with NafME and RIMEA is always an indicator of a district's desire to encourage quality and support in their own programs. Educators in those high quality programs are sought out and invited to collaborate with URI by becoming a clinical educator." The review team noted that professional associations may be a good place from which to recruit clinical educators, so long as initial recruitment efforts are coupled with other efforts to ensure quality; participation or even leadership within a professional association does not indicate that the educator is effective at improving K-12 student learning or that the educator has the skill set needed to be a strong cooperative teacher.

- Clinical partners acknowledged URI's recent efforts to improve the recruitment and selection of clinical educators but noted a desire to establish a more standardized process besides common criteria. One partner noted the need to better incentivize RI's best teachers to become clinical educators, and another noted that stronger communication about the student teacher's strengths and needs would help ensure a stronger match between the clinical educator and student teacher. One partner suggested that providing more information about candidate performance to clinical partners would help other school and district personnel, such as the language specialist, provide feedback and support to candidates.

- In an evidence organizer, the program reported that all clinical educators must attend a training or receive a one-on-one training from a clinical supervisor each fall, but other evidence conflicted with this statement. The submitted clinical educator data file showed that only the clinical educators of the student teaching placement completed a training; none of the clinical educators for EDC 250 or subsequent practicum courses completed a training. Clinical educators reported that training is not required and that many of them had not attended a training in several years.

- The sample clinical educator training agenda provided by URI includes a welcome and overview, an orientation to Taskstream, informational breakout groups discussing required forms and expectations, an evaluation of sample video lessons using an observation form, and a mentoring

workshop. 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.

- During site visits, review team members observed variation in how clinical educators supported candidates. There was a considerable contrast between physical education and health site visits. In one site visit, the candidate delivered a lesson that was not aligned to physical education standards and the clinical educator was not involved with the candidate debrief. In a later visit, the clinical educator led the debrief conversation with the candidate, provided evidence of what was observed during the observation, discussed the areas the candidate was working on, and offered constructive feedback.

Recommendations:

- 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 assessment system is clear to candidates and stakeholders. However, the current implementation and monitoring of the assessment system does not ensure that only candidates meeting expectations progress through the assessment system.	

- The program assessment system has three major decision points: readiness for admission, readiness for student teaching/internship, and recommendation for certification. The program uses multiple systems, including Taskstream and Filemaker, to track candidate information and performance over time. As demonstrated through interviews, candidates, faculty, and clinical educators were aware of key assessments. However, program leadership noted in an evidence organizer that the physical education/health and music programs are still transitioning to using these systems. In an evidence organizer, music program leadership noted that they "need to get all music faculty on Starfish and Filemaker" as an area for improvement. Physical education/health program leadership reported that there is a "slight learning curve" associated with using Taskstream and Sakai and that it can be challenging to get everyone set up and using these systems.

- During the admissions process, the program evaluates candidates' GPA, basic skills proficiency, admissions portfolio application, and admissions interview. Candidates must meet overall GPA Requirements (2.75 or higher for undergraduate candidates and 3.0 for graduate candidates),

and undergraduate candidates meet minimum expectations on a required test (Praxis CORE, SAT, or ACT). At the point of admission, the program also assess candidates' interpersonal and communication skills, work experience and community service with children/adolescents, and multicultural/diversity awareness. Music education graduate and TCP candidates must have a minimum GPA of 3.0 in music.

- The program reported that, prior to student teaching, candidates must successfully pass the Praxis II PLT and certification area content tests, complete a unit plan assignment, and meet all expectations during practicum. Candidates studying World Languages must achieve acceptable scores on the Oral Proficiency Interview and Writing Proficiency Tests. Candidates and faculty can access key assessments in Taskstream.

- Candidate assessment begins early in the program and includes written and oral formative feedback, but the quality of feedback varies. Expectations of candidates build over time.

- Program faculty members assess candidate assignments in Taskstream using rubrics, but the design and implementation of the rubrics reduces the rigor of the assessment system. Performance level descriptors in some rubrics did not address the skills, knowledge, and/or dispositions noted by the standard or indicator. In some places, there was not a clear developmental sequence from level to level. While reviewing candidate work samples, reviewers noted that often the rubric rating did not match the actual performance of the candidate.

Recommendations:

- Audit candidate work samples to identify discrepancies between candidate performances and ratings assigned. Use audit findings to inform additional revisions to the assessment system.

- Collaborate with clinical partners to identify ways to assess and provide feedback on candidate performance with PK-12 students in early clinical experiences.

- Review and, where appropriate, revise course assessment rubrics to ensure that each indicator of the rubric has clearly differentiated levels of performance.

- Consider adopting or adapting performance assessments that are already widely used in Rhode Island and other states. Seek feedback on the selected tool and work with clinical partners to clarify expectations and performance. Hold trainings and calibration sessions to ensure program faculty, clinical educators, and clinical supervisors have a common understanding of performance expectations and can use tools with fidelity. Share examples of practice with candidates to help them understand what expected performance looks like for each indicator of rubrics.

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

- The program is very transparent about assessment purposes, processes, and outcomes. Candidates, clinical educators, and program faculty are aware of expectations for the recommendation to certification assessment point.

- Program expectations for candidates during student teaching vary slightly by program content area. Candidates studying world language use the Initial Programs Student Teaching Handbook whereas candidates studying music, physical education, and health use student teaching handbooks specific to their content area. As articulated in the student teaching handbook, the program assesses candidate performance during student teaching based on their instructional unit, Informal and Formal Assessment of Learning task, four observations of teaching, midterm evaluation and final evaluation of the student teacher by the clinical supervisor and the clinical educator. During student teaching, candidates must pass the RI Initiatives Quiz and content evaluation. Candidates studying world languages must also complete an Advocacy Project promoting language study in their target language. Candidates specializing in health and physical education also complete a bulletin board assignment and a professional development reflection.

- Clinical educators and clinical supervisors are both responsible for evaluating the performance of candidates for the midterm and final evaluations. Additionally, clinical educators and clinical supervisors also evaluate candidates through observations, but it is not clear how clinical educator feedback on observations informs candidate progression decisions in music and physical education. For health and physical education, the program expects clinical educators to complete daily and weekly evaluations of candidates, but only the clinical supervisor observations are key assessments that inform candidate progression. For music, an evidence organizer states that music candidates receive four formal observations (two per placement), but the student teaching handbook specifies that the clinical supervisor completes six formal observations (three at each placement) and the clinical educator completes one formal observation.

- The assessment overviews emphasize that the expected performance level on student teaching assessments is "meets standard" for all indicators, but program leadership across the All Grades program does not monitor candidate performance at the indicator level. For world languages, candidates must perform at the "meets standard" level on all performance indicators on the final cooperating teacher and university supervisor observations. Candidates studying music must "Meet the Standard" or higher on all elements on the formal observation of student teaching, midterm and final evaluations of student teachers, and on four observations by the supervisor. In health and physical education, candidates must "meet or exceed all RIPTS in classroom practice at a beginning teacher level", although the specific assessment is not specified. However, the Outcomes Assessment and Accreditation Specialist monitors overall performance on key assessments and flags for the program when performance falls below an overall cut score. Given current practice, some candidates may perform significantly below standard on one or more indicators but still progress within the assessment system.

- The program reported that it conducts "checks on inter-rater reliability for critical performance tasks, review of rubrics, training sessions for adjunct faculty and clinical educators using the evaluation instruments, and identification of areas with consistently weaker performance." However, both candidates and clinical partners noted discrepancies between clinical supervisor

and clinical educator ratings and feedback. During site visits, review team members observed inconsistencies between candidate performance and rubric scores, particularly in music. A candidate demonstrating strong instructional practices received lower rubric scores than a candidate who was still demonstrating basic proficiency in instructional practices.

- The quality of assessment rubrics varies by program content area. For example, the weekly observation form and midterm evaluation form included in the *Student Teacher/YMS Internship Handbook* for health and physical education includes a general rubric and then a list of indicators that clinical educators must rate. Based on the description, it is not clear what performance looks like for each rating of each indicator. These assessments also are not included in Taskstream. World language rubrics include differentiated performance-level descriptors, but they have inconsistent designs, which limit the collection of valid and reliable data.

Recommendations:

- Review candidate assessment measures in conjunction with the RIPTS and professional association standards to ensure that measures accurately assess candidate proficiency in all of the knowledge, skills, dispositions, content, and content pedagogy needed to be a successful educator. Ensure that all faculty and clinical educators have rigorous and clear performance expectations for candidates.

- Adopt or adapt observation tools that the field is already using or revise current tools to better align with what the field uses to ensure all indicators are observable in every observation. Provide training, facilitate calibration opportunities, and monitor assessment implementation to ensure that assessment results are fair, accurate, and consistent across candidates. Clarify expectations for feedback to ensure that candidates receive observation results and high quality feedback in a timely manner.

- Revise monitoring processes to include monitoring of candidate performance in Taskstream at the indicator level to ensure that the program recommends only candidates who fully meet expectations for certification. Ensure the program uploads all critical performances to Taskstream and monitors candidate performance.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Meets Expectations
The program surveys employers annually and has made efforts to increase survey responses.	

- The School of Education surveys employers annually and then disaggregates data by program. The survey is constructed to yield actionable information. Response rates to the survey have historically been low—between 10 percent and 15 percent. However, in response to employer feedback, the School of Education revised the employer survey in Fall 2016 to make it mobile and handheld friendly, administered the survey by program, sent reminders, and provided principals with a chart including a list of program completers and where they are currently teaching. The School of Education should monitor the success of its recent survey changes and continue to implement strategies to improve survey response rates. URI should also consider including more questions that are open-ended to allow for more specific, substantive feedback for program improvement.

- Leadership of the various content areas reported using survey data to inform recent improvements, including increasing emphasis on actual teaching and reflection during practicum experience and using expert music teachers as guest speakers.

- For the 2015-16 school year, the aggregate performance of University of Rhode Island program completers working in Rhode Island schools was comparable to the aggregate performance distribution for all recent completers in Rhode Island schools. However, RIDE reports this data at the *provider* level instead of the *program* level. Therefore, few conclusions about the effectiveness of completers from the All Grades program can be made.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program surveys program completers annually but does not have strategies in place to track post-completion employment for completers working outside of Rhode Island public schools.	

- The School of Education collects information from program completers via an exit survey administered to all candidates at the end of student teaching and via a survey it sends to completers two years after they complete their program. The surveys are constructed to yield actionable information.

- Prior to 2012, exit survey response rates were around 50-60 percent. The School of Education has since moved the survey from SurveyMonkey to Taskstream and made it a seminar requirement. As a result, response rates are now approximately 95 percent.

- The two-year-out survey originally contained 44 questions. URI recently streamlined the survey to include 27 questions. At the time of the visit, URI had sent out the latest edition of the survey a month prior with the intention of sending out reminders every three months through the summer of 2017. The program reported, "Response rates are optimistically high at this point in the data collection."

- At the time of the visit, the program had limited strategies and systems to track post completion employment for candidates who pursue employment in states other than Rhode Island. Specifically, leadership of the music program reported in an evidence organizer that it has been able to track program completers who receive jobs in Massachusetts or Connecticut through involvement with state music associations.

Recommendations:

- Encourage program completers to continue a line of communication with the program/provider with respect to employment status and measures of employment success.

- Continue to implement strategies to increase survey response rates.

Early Childhood Education Program

There are two options available for the Early Childhood Education program. Most candidates complete the Bachelor of Science degree in Human Development and Family Studies with a concentration in Early Childhood Education. The teacher certificate program (TCP) option is available to those candidates who already hold Bachelor's degrees. Candidates in both tracks fulfill program requirements through the

Department of Human Development and Family Studies and the School of Education. Early childhood have preadmission coursework as well as coursework after admission. Courses taken after admission into the program include three curriculum courses, two literacy courses, an assessment course, and a course that focuses on working in an inclusion setting. Clinical preparation includes a supervised preprofessional field experience, three practicum experiences, one course-embedded practicum, and supervised student teaching.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Meets Expectations
The program aligns to the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS). Candidates experience a consistent curriculum and have sufficient opportunities to develop proficiency in the RIPTS.	

- Pre-admission coursework for early childhood undergraduate candidates differs from many of the other University of Rhode Island teacher education programs as it includes 12 credits in human development courses, School of Education prerequisite courses, and a nutrition course. The Human Development courses include HDF 200: Life Span Development, HDF 202: Research Perspectives, HDF: 230 Marriage and Family Relationships, HDF: 305 Family Engagement, and HDF 357: Family and Community Health.

- Pre-admission coursework for TCP candidates does not include identical pre-admission requirements. The program reviews individual candidates' previous experience and coursework to determine which courses are required to meet program admission requirements for this track.

- The candidate experience includes many opportunities for candidates to learn and reflect on the RIPTS. Throughout the program, candidates have opportunities each semester to demonstrate proficiency in relationship to the RIPTS through performance rubrics aligned to the RIPTS. Mapping of RIPTS throughout course syllabi as well as candidate work samples demonstrated a strong alignment to the standards.

- All candidates experience a consistent curriculum that includes experiences in the School of Human Development and Family Studies as well as the School of Education. Candidates and program completers reported that the program prepared them well in the professional teaching standards through their course work and field experiences.

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Approaching Expectations
The program provides candidates opportunities to develop proficiency in some of the critical concepts, principles, and practices of the NAEYC standards. The curriculum does not provide sufficient content or content pedagogy at the K-2 grade levels.	

- The program reported that the Early Childhood Education program is a "comprehensive program" that provides candidates with instruction and clinical experiences which represent the full range of the National Association of the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) standards. The

program shared in an evidence organizer that the professional association has nationally recognized the program. The program reported that the assessment system aligns to the NAEYC standards and ensures that candidates demonstrate proficiency in the full range of the standards prior to program completion.

- Course syllabi and program assessments align to the NAEYC standards and candidates are required to demonstrate how they design and implement instruction consistent with these standards. Several course and program assessments also require candidates to reflect upon their developing knowledge of the standards. Candidates further learn about and develop proficiency in some of the NAEYC standards through clinical experiences in pre-school settings and at the K-2 grade level.

- The review team observed that while program and course materials, assessments, and clinical experiences align to the NAEYC standards, the program emphasizes knowledge, application and proficiency in the NAEYC standards at the preschool level rather than the required full range of PK-2 grade levels. This gap was particularly evident in the area of content knowledge and content pedagogical knowledge for grades K – 2.

- Early childhood Program completers, candidates, and a review of candidate work corroborated the program's emphasis on preschool levels and the inadequate focus on the K-2 grade levels. Candidates and program completers also reported there was insufficient focus and time to develop content pedagogical knowledge necessary for preschool and K-2 grade levels through coursework and clinical experiences. Candidates at all levels of preparation, as well as program completers, expressed confusion between pedagogical-content knowledge that is expected in preschool versus K-2 grade levels, indicating that they felt these years demanded significantly different competencies.

- In addition to the limited proficiency at the K-2 levels, candidates also demonstrated limited understanding about the role and relationships between the NAEYC standards and the Rhode Island Early Learning and Development Standards (RIELDS), the student learning standards for PK-2 grade levels. Candidates were confused about the difference between the NAEYC Standards and the RIELDS. Some candidates believed the standards were interchangeable. Notably, in evidence compiled for this review, in response to a prompt about student learning standards, the program stated that, "the RIELDS, NAEYC, and CCSS are integrated into course syllabi and key assessments," which suggests that the program thinks NAEYC are student-learning standards.

Recommendations:
- Review the expectations of the NAEYC standards for the K-2 grade levels. Work with faculty members from the HDF and the School of Education as well as clinical partners to review and revise the program curriculum, clinical preparation, and assessment system to ensure that there is an equal focus on the knowledge, skills, and proficiencies expected for preschool as well as the K-2 grade levels.

- Review the expectations for content knowledge and content pedagogical knowledge in the NAEYC standards. Work with faculty members from the School of Human Development and School of Education to develop a common understanding of these expectations and revise the

curriculum and clinical experiences to ensure candidates have sufficient opportunity to develop and practice content knowledge and content pedagogical knowledge consistent with these expectations.

- Review how the program introduces candidates to the NAEYC standards and RIELDS. Develop and implement methods and practices to ensure that candidates at all levels of preparation understand the specific purposes for the standards and their relationship to early childhood education and PK-2 students.

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

- As stated above, the program reported that it integrates student standards, including the RIELDS, the CCSS, the NGSS, and the Rhode Island GSEs for social studies into course syllabi and keys assessments. Candidates are required to develop and implement lessons that incorporate student standards as part of course and clinical-based learning experiences.

- Candidates learn about the RIELDS early in program foundational courses such as HDF 203: Introduction to Working with Young Children. Candidates learn about the CCSS, NGSS, and Rhode Island GSEs in the later in program curriculum courses, HDF 301: Introduction to Curriculum, HDF 303: Integrated Math and Science, and EDC 426: Language Arts and Social Studies. Several other course syllabi throughout the program sequence also reference the student learning standards.

- Despite exposure to student learning standards in several program courses, learning tasks, and assessments, candidates demonstrated a general and surface-level understanding of the student learning standards. Candidates did not demonstrate a deep understanding of the essential concepts, skills, and processes encompassed in the standards. During interviews and in reflections on work, candidates were able to identify and explain which standards they were including in lessons or student assessments. They were not equally able to justify their use of standards, explain how individual standards build upon each other within and across grade levels, and how to design subsequent lessons to ensure that students received the support needed to progress to proficiency on the standards.

- A practice that may inhibit candidates from developing a deep understanding of student learning standards is the lesson plan development process. In many course and program assessments, candidates may select the student learning standards to feature in a lesson. This practice allows candidate choice, but it also may also allow candidates to avoid content areas and grade spans that they are less comfortable working in and developing skills and proficiency. An additional area of program design and implementation that may inhibit candidate deep understanding of the student learning standards is the lack of clarity in how the program communicates and connects the developmental trajectory between the RIELDS and the CCSS, NGSS, and Rhode Island GSEs for social studies.

- Program candidates were less well prepared to design, implement, and effectively reflect on standards-based lessons that focused on the CCSS, the NGSS, and the Rhode Island GSEs for

social studies at upper levels of the PK-2 grade span. Despite the focus on these standards in the three curriculum courses, candidate work samples and observation of candidate practice demonstrated limited knowledge and understanding of these standards. Candidates echoed these concerns and reported that their preparation and clinical experiences did not provide sufficient attention and opportunity to become fully proficient in these student standards.

Recommendations:

- Review the program curriculum, clinical experiences, and assessment system as it pertains to the full range of student learning standards. Working with clinical partners, identify and implement additional, effective course and clinical-based learning experiences for candidates that will ensure they develop deep knowledge and understanding of the full range of the student learning standards, across all content areas and grade levels.

- Examine how the program currently communicates the interconnection and developmental trajectory of the RIELDS with the CCSS, NGSS, and Rhode Island GSEs for social studies. Identify and implement specific course and clinical-based learning experiences that provide candidates with an understanding of this connection to ensure they are able to support student progress across the entire grade span.

- Provide candidates additional course and clinical-based learning opportunities in how to design and implement lessons that are based on student standards. Provide experiences that help candidates understand how standards build upon each other, and that support candidates to assess accurately student progress towards meeting the standards.

- Reexamine the practice of allowing students to self-select standards during the lesson planning process. Self-selection should not be the sole method for candidate engagement with student content standards. Develop practices and policies to ensure that candidates have experience working with the full range of student learning standards, across all content areas and grade levels.

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

- The program reported that candidates learn about data-driven instruction and assessment primarily through the curriculum-focused courses in the program – HDF 203, HDF 301, HDF 303, HDF 455 and EDC 426. In these courses, candidates learn about and are required to use in their practice with students multiple types of assessments, including observation, authentic assessment, and formal and informal assessment strategies.

- Although the program reported that candidates have multiple opportunities to learn about and practice data-driven instruction, the primary assessment of candidate knowledge and proficiency in data-driven instruction is the Informal and Formal Assessment of Learning completed during student teaching. As part of this task, candidates are required to conduct assessments, evaluate student work from the assessments, analyze data from the assessments

at the aggregate and disaggregate level, and reflect on changes to instruction that should be made based on assessment results of three students.   Although the student teacher must report data from the whole class, the level of analysis required is not consistent with a classroom teacher's practice, since the student teacher deeply analyzes assessment results of only three students.

- These and other instructional and assessment opportunities throughout the program support candidates to develop a general understanding of assessment, the purposes for assessment, various types of assessment, and provide candidates beginning practice in how to modify and redirect instruction based on data and assessment outcomes. These learning and assessment opportunities did not ensure that candidates develop a deep understanding of the primacy of data-based instruction or ensure that candidates were proficient in using data and assessment information to change practice.

- Through interviews, review of candidate work, and observations of practice, it appeared that candidate priorities and focus for assessment when working with students are on task completion, behavior, and self-assessments rather than a full array of assessment and data collecting practices that focus on student learning and proficiency across the student learning standards. The review team also did not observe a sufficient focus on or knowledge of how to use data from a variety of sources to inform instructional practice. Candidates reported that the Informal and Formal Assessment of Learning Task was an important learning opportunity but did not provide sufficient opportunity to become proficient in data-based instruction.

Recommendations:

- Revise the program curriculum and courses to include a specific focus on the overarching purpose and importance of data-based instruction to include explicit instruction, practice, and candidate assessment in how to collect data from a variety of sources, how to analyze the various data, and how to use data to inform instructional practice.

- Provide candidates additional learning opportunities to focus on the general purposes of assessment and the specific purposes for individual types and forms of assessment. Require that candidates use a variety of assessment forms and strategies in course and clinical-based learning experiences. Ensure that candidate assessment and feedback on their assessment practices requires candidates to develop proficiency in using a wide variety of formal and informal assessment strategies.

- Provide candidates additional instruction and clinical practice in how to collect and analyze student data from a variety of sources and across the full range of content areas and grade spans. Provide additional explicit instruction, practice, and assessment in how to modify instruction and practice based on the analysis of a variety of data.

1.5 Technology	Approaching Expectations
The program provides candidates limited opportunities to learn and practice creating digital age learning experiences.	

- The program reported that several courses throughout the program address the use of technology. These include HDF 203: Introduction to Working with Young Children, the three curriculum courses, and HDF 420: Introduction to Language and Literacy. The program also provided a document that identified specific course and program-based tasks and assessments that require candidates to incorporate technology.

- Candidates are required to develop and implement lesson plans that incorporate technology in course and clinical-based learning experiences. Candidates understand how to use PowerPoint and Google Slides and are well versed in using technology to present information. Candidates are required to complete a self-assessment as part of program completion requirements of their knowledge and proficiency of the ISTE standards.

- The review team did not observe evidence of explicit instruction in how to use technology to create digital age learning experiences and assessments for students. In addition, the program does not require candidates to effectively integrate technology across content areas or within the full PK-2 grade span. As a result, candidates receive little if any feedback on their use of technology to enhance and assess student learning. The review team also did not observe the intentional and increasingly proficient integration of technology into candidate lesson plans as they progressed through the program.

- Candidates demonstrated a basic knowledge and understanding of how to use common instructional and communicative technologies. Candidates who had a deeper understanding and proficiency in multiple technologies typically resulted from clinical placements that had access to multiple technologies and supported candidates to learn these technologies. Clinical educators reported that candidate knowledge of content-specific technology and pedagogical technology was also inconsistent and varied greatly across candidates.

- Some courses address technology and lesson plans often require integration of technology. Clinical educators noted candidates were limited in their knowledge of pedagogical technology and assessment of digital age learning experiences was not evident to reviewers.

- Intentional learning opportunities for candidates to design, implement, and assess digital age learning experiences and assessment to support student learning were not evident. Candidate exposure to and experience with technology is inconsistent and appears to be a function of their practicum and student teaching placements as opposed to intentional learning opportunities provided by the program.

Recommendations:

- Work with program faculty and clinical educators to ensure a common understanding and expectation of current technology for teachers of early childhood students. Continue to review, explore, and integrate into program coursework research on the effective types and use of technology for PK-2 students.

- Review and revise the program curriculum to include explicit instruction, clinical-based practice, and assessment and feedback in how to use a wide variety of technology that is appropriate for students in grades PK-2. Ensure that all candidates are fully prepared to support learning needs regardless of their clinical placements.

- Ensure program and clinical faculty are current in the latest research on technology and young children in its child development curriculum. Incorporate the continually growing body of research around young children and technology into coursework. Consider utilizing URI's own research through its TPAC project to inform this improvement.

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
The program provides candidates opportunities to learn about diversity, equity, and working with families in diverse communities but does not ensure that candidates develop proficiency in working with diverse students and families.	

- Through the design of the early childhood program, candidates learn about how to work with families. Aspects of cultural competence and developing a deeper awareness of worldviews are included in the first early childhood curriculum class. Candidates also participate in an equity discussion in HDF 203: Introduction to Work with Young Children and take courses that address family engagement strategies. Despite this learning thread, candidates do not have opportunities to implement strategies for working with English Language Learners or working with families of diverse backgrounds.

- Candidates were not able to articulate clearly their use or knowledge of effective strategies when working with English Language Learners, students from diverse backgrounds, or families from diverse backgrounds. When asked, candidates spoke of differentiation and their knowledge of Universal Design for Learning (UDL). They did not have the knowledge or experience to name effective strategies for ELL or working with families of diverse backgrounds. Additionally, clinical placements are not in diverse settings. There was no evidence that candidates at the early childhood level reflected on their own bias.

Recommendations:

- Incorporate more opportunities for candidates to reflect upon and develop a deeper awareness of their own worldviews, the experiences of other cultures in a deep way beyond surface level understandings of traditions and foods, the impact of poverty on learning, and a definition of diversity that moves beyond the definition of "non-white". Faculty should check their understanding of terms like urban and diverse to ensure there are not misinterpretations by their candidates.

- Continue to provide the programmatic focus on issues of awareness of bias, equitable access, and inclusive education. Move beyond this current focus to include a deeper understanding of diversity in all of its forms and how candidates can best engage and meet the needs of all students.

- Continue the programmatic focus on how to engage families in the education of young children. Move beyond the current focus to include specific strategies and practices to work with families in diverse communities. Require candidates to participate in opportunities throughout the program that would result in proficiency in implementing strategies that are effective when working with families in diverse communities.

- Review and revise the program curriculum to include specific strategies and practices that are effective in meeting the needs of English Language learners and students who live in poverty. Involve clinical partners and other stakeholders in this effort.

- Move beyond multiple intelligences and UDL as the primary focus of differentiation for all students, and include more targeted instruction and opportunities to implement specific strategies for English (Dual) Language Learners and students with disabilities. Consider building on efforts in its current curriculum to address ELL/DLL children through identification and application of effective 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.	

- The program reported that Rhode Island educational expectations were included in every course. Course syllabi included the Rhode Island Workforce Knowledge and Competency Frameworks for Teachers and Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Educators. Despite reporting a strong integration of relevant initiatives unique and required in Rhode Island schools, candidates experience limited exposure to critical Rhode Island educational expectations and therefore developed a level of basic skill.

- The program assesses candidate proficiency in Rhode Island educational initiatives through a fifteen-question quiz on Taskstream. The quiz, which includes only recall-level questions, does not assess candidate proficiency in initiatives and does not assess candidate proficiency in the knowledge and skills needed to implement initiatives successfully.

- Candidates receive introductory information about some educational initiatives, laws, and policies through coursework and develop a general understanding of the initiatives. For example, candidates studying early childhood discuss and use InfoWorks in EDC 102: Foundations of Education.

- Although the program introduces several Rhode Island initiatives and policies to candidates, candidates do not have sufficient opportunities or support to develop, apply, and build proficiency with the key Rhode Island initiatives to prepare them as beginning early childhood teachers.

Recommendations:

- Work with clinical partners and other stakeholders to identify which initiatives are most important for Early Childhood candidates to learn about during their program of study. These initiatives should not just be RIDE-led initiatives but also the key initiatives occurring in schools, districts, and statewide.

- Identify the knowledge, skills, and practices embedded in those key initiatives, and then revise coursework and clinical experiences appropriately. Move beyond a definition of Rhode Island Initiatives that is specifically RIDE initiatives toward a definition that incorporates key initiatives occurring in schools, districts, and statewide. Ensure the program addresses initiatives, policies, and laws relevant to early childhood teachers and update these on ongoing basis. For example, early childhood candidates should be familiar with dual language/language programs, Response to Intervention/Multi-Tier System of Supports, Personal Literacy Plans, BrightStars, state-funded Pre-K vs. IDEA-funded integrated pre-school, state assessment, and the role of the early grades in developing student understanding and content knowledge and STAR or universal screening assessments.

- Ensure that all candidates understand the process, components, and rubric language embedded within educator evaluation systems used in the state. Consider adopting or adapting performance assessments that are already widely used in Rhode Island and other states.

- Review the course sequence to see where and how the program introduces initiatives to ensure candidate understanding and ability to demonstrate proficiency appropriately builds over time. Assess candidate proficiency in Rhode Island educational initiatives in ways that are more authentic and in-depth than a single multiple-choice quiz.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The design of the program's clinical experiences does not provide candidates coherent, sufficient, or diverse clinical preparation.	

- The program reported that the clinical experiences for the Early Childhood program occur throughout the program, are numerous, and are "one of our program's strengths." Prior to program admission, candidates conduct observations in a diverse setting and observe a preschool setting weekly. Upon admission to the program, candidates have two semester-long clinical placements in preschool settings that align to the program courses and provide field-based learning opportunities. Candidates also complete two practicums—a semester-long experience in a preschool setting and a thirty-hour practicum in the elementary classroom in which they will student teach. The final clinical placement is a semester-long student teaching experience in the elementary classroom. The program expects student teachers to assume the full range and responsibilities of the classroom educator for at least two weeks.

- The review team has several concerns with the current structure and processes of the design of the clinical placements. Rather than provide a coherent clinical experience for candidates, the program presents two distinct and at times confusing clinical experiences. Those placements that emerge from the HDF courses focus on preschool and include a distinct set of expectations

and requirements for candidates. Those placements that emerge from the EDC courses focus on elementary grades and include a different set of expectations and requirements. Given the disjointedness between the two types of clinical placements, later clinical experiences do not sufficiently build upon or connect to earlier clinical preparations. Collectively, the incoherence of the clinical preparation does not ensure that candidates have the opportunity to practice and develop consistent with the full range of the professional standards.

- The program's focus and clinical experiences over-emphasize the HDF courses and the preschool portion of the program. All early in program clinical experiences, aside from the observations in EDC 250: Urban Field Experience, are conducted in preschool settings and child development centers. Many clinical experiences occur in the Child Development Centers located on the Kingston and Providence campuses. Candidates do not experience placements in elementary grades until the practicum and student teaching placement, which typically occurs in the last year of the program.

- In addition to issues of coherence and over-emphasis on preschool settings, the design of the clinical preparation does not ensure that candidates experience clinical placements in a range of settings. Candidates have limited opportunity to practice in the full grade range for PK-2. Many candidates and program completers reported that most of their clinical experiences are in the preschool grades and that they did not feel prepared to teach in grades K-2.

- The clinical preparation design also does not ensure that candidates practice in diverse settings. For many candidates, the only experience they receive in diverse settings occurs in EDC 250: Urban Field Experience. Candidates are expected to "spend a minimum of 21 hours in schools, in tutorial sessions with students, or in other academic activities with school age children", but the only class assignments are reflective journals. Because this placement occurs prior to program admission, some candidates complete this placement in elementary instead of early childhood grades. As such, candidates may have limited or no experience working with PK-2 students from diverse backgrounds or students who are English Language learners.

Recommendations:

- Recognize that the current clinical preparation structure is incoherent and does not effectively support candidate learning and their preparation to become early childhood educators. Work together across the Department of Human Development and Family Studies and the School of Education to create a single, coherent clinical preparation experience with common expectations and with balance across the preschool and K-2 grade ranges.

- Revise the clinical preparation sequence so that there is a mixture of preschool and K-2 learning experiences throughout the clinical experiences, rather than the current structure which places all preschool experiences early in program and all K-2 experiences late in program.

- Revise the clinical placement design so that candidates experience clinical placements in a variety of preschool and elementary settings, rather than the current reliance on campus-based child-development centers and preschools.

- Work with the School of Education and the Office of Teacher Education to integrate the placement process for early childhood education candidates into the same processes used to monitor and ensure diverse placements for candidates in other teacher education programs.

- Across all clinical placements, ensure that candidates have the opportunity to assume the full responsibility for the role of early childhood education teacher, beyond the current two-week requirement that occurs in some placements.

- Modify or extend the amount of time that candidates experience the full range of responsibilities within a program (e.g., more than a 2-week takeover).

- Find ways to develop the skills of candidates to complete beginning of the year responsibilities (room set-up, behavior management) and the unique issues that early childhood educators face in the first week of school given the social/emotional development of young children. Candidates and completers voiced this feedback. Ensure that candidates have sufficient opportunity to learn and practice beginning and end of year responsibilities' expected for the role, including classroom setup and behavior management.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program has not structured clinical experiences in a way that enables candidates to demonstrate increasingly positive impact on students' learning. Candidate assessment methods are limited and rely primarily on candidate reflection.	

- Similar to other teacher programs, the early childhood program measures candidate impact on student learning primarily through the Informal and Formal Assessment of Learning Task completed during student teaching. This assessment requires candidates to prepare and administer informal and formal assessments to students, mark and submit student work, write rationales for selection of criteria within assessments, and provide commentary on candidate work. The assessment also requires candidates to aggregate and disaggregate data and reflect on the learning of a few representative students. There is no evidence that the program and clinical partners mutually designed this or any other measure of candidate impact on student learning. Reviewers did not find a programmatic expectation that the assessments used in this project be rigorous, of high quality, and aligned to student standards.

- The program also reported that it uses other learning tasks and assessments to measure impact on student learning. These course and clinical-based tasks and assessments include a student teaching professional development reflection task, an anecdotal notes activity, a content evaluation of a unit plan, and several lesson-planning tasks. However, these tasks emphasize reflection rather than data analysis. Overall, the review team did not find evidence of student learning measures that are appropriate and reflective of best practice in the early childhood field.

- Beyond these individual learning tasks and activities, the program did not provide evidence of a coherent or clear approach to identify appropriate measures of impact on student learning. The program did not provide evidence that it has worked with its clinical partners to ensure measures of impact on student learning were valid and appropriate. The review team did not find evidence that the program collects and analyzes data on impact on student learning throughout preparation, nor did the review team find evidence that the program uses

information from analyses on impact on student learning to help candidates increasingly demonstrate impact on student learning.

- The program has not established an expectation that candidates approach all instruction and interaction with students from a data-driven perspective. The program has not worked with its candidates to collect data on student learning needs, design and implement instruction to have impact on learning to meet these needs, collect and analyze data to determine impact, and then use learning results to guide future practice. Candidate work and observations of practice that candidates consistently omitted a focus on student learning, and candidate reflections on practice often focused on student behaviors and issues of child development, rather than student learning.

Recommendations:

- Collaborate with clinical partners to determine and design appropriate measures of candidate impact on student learning. Establish clear expectations for the collection and analysis of data throughout the program and articulate expected levels and evidence of impact on student learning. Provide explicit instruction in how candidates are to use measures of impact on student learning to inform their continuous growth as early childhood educators.

- Clearly communicate the 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 their clinical preparation.

- Integrate explicit instruction, feedback, and assessment in how to demonstrate an impact on student learning throughout the program curriculum so that all candidates are well prepared to meet these expectations during clinical placements.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has established a mutually beneficial relationship with clinical partners, but the program has not established agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness.	

- The program reported that the School of Education has established "a number of deep engagements" with partner schools and districts. The program provided a database of more than fifty clinical placement sites it has used since 2012 for the placement of candidates for the clinical preparation. The program also provided a formal partnership agreement that the School of Education uses identify roles and responsibilities for the program and its partners.

- The program and clinical educators reported that the partnership between the program and the clinical placements are mutually beneficial. The program benefits from field placement sites for program candidates to learn and practice the skills of an early childhood educator. The partners benefit from the additional support and instruction candidates provide to PK-2 students, the professional growth that clinical educators receive through their affiliation with the program, and the opportunity to contribute to the profession.

- The program did not provide evidence that it has worked with its clinical partners to establish agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness or that it tracks and analyses data on partnership effectiveness to improve the partnership, expectations of this component.

- The program and its clinical partners use a common assessment instrument to assess and provide feedback on candidate performance, a University and Cooperating Teacher Evaluation. Clinical partners reported that they receive training in the use of this instrument but that it is not sufficient to ensure common expectations for candidate performance. Some clinical partners reported that the Rhode Island educator evaluation system and rubric might be a more effective instrument to use to assess candidate performance in PK-2 school.

Recommendations:

- Build upon the ongoing efforts to engage with clinical partners established by the School of Education and identify agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness. Determine how programs and clinical partners will track and analyze data from agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness to improve the partnership.

- Work with the clinical partners to review current expectations for candidate performance and the current assessment instruments used to evaluate and provide feedback. Explore if the current instruments and expectations are effective and appropriate. Consider adopting or adapting performance assessment tools used in schools and districts.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Approaching Expectations
The program has begun revising both the criteria for the recruitment of clinical educators and the processes to select clinical educators. Current practices, especially those related to training clinical educators, do not ensure that all candidates receive a high quality clinical experience. The program also requires training and support clinical educators that are unable to attend by working with them one-on-one.	

- URI's School of Education has Criteria for Clinical educators that all initial teacher programs use. These criteria, which were revised in spring 2017, include, but are not limited to, the following: "be a certified educator with a minimum of three years professional experience in appropriate certification area and show a demonstration of earning high effective [*sic*] on educator evaluations"; "be able to work effectively with adult learners"; "use professional knowledge and current best practices to guide the support given to the candidate"; and "provide solicited and spontaneous, in-depth observation and feedback to the candidate (both written and verbal) on a regular basis using program and partner assessments." These criteria are consistent with RIDE's expectations for clinical educators.

- The Early Childhood Education program builds upon the efforts of the School of Education and the Office Teacher Education. The early childhood program builds relationship primarily through one individual in the program, Dr. Brand. Dr. Brand conducts outreach and follow-up to establish connections with clinical educators directly. Stakeholders interviewed about the program consistently praised her efforts.

- The program provided evidence that it evaluates clinical educators annually. Reviewers saw in evidence that the program did not use in subsequent years clinical educators who did not receive high evaluation ratings.

- In an evidence organizer, the program reported that all clinical educators must attend a training or receive a one-on-one training from a clinical supervisor each fall, but other evidence

conflicted with this statement. The submitted clinical educator data file showed that only the clinical educators of student teachers completed a training; none of the clinical educators for EDC 250 or subsequent practicum courses completed a training. Clinical educators reported that training is not required and that many of them had not attended a training in several years.

- The sample cooperating training agenda provided by URI includes a welcome and overview, an orientation to Taskstream, informational breakout groups discussing required forms and expectations, an evaluation of sample video lessons using an observation form, and a mentoring workshop. 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 practices are insufficient.

Recommendations:

- 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 clinical supervisors. During training and subsequent calibration sessions, communicate clear expectations for feedback (when, how, what detail) and ensure that clinical educators, school and district leaders, and clinical supervisors have shared expectations for candidate performance.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Meets Expectations

The program clearly communicates the assessment system to candidates and ensures that candidate progress in the program is based on candidate performance in meeting the professional standards.

- The program assessment system has three major decision points: readiness for admission, readiness for student teaching/internship, and recommendation for certification. The program uses multiple systems, including Taskstream and Filemaker, to track candidate information and performance over time. As demonstrated through interviews, candidates, faculty, and clinical educators were aware of key assessments and noted that they had access to Taskstream.

- During the admissions process, the program evaluates candidates' GPA, basic skills proficiency, admissions portfolio application, and admissions interview. Candidates must meet overall GPA Requirements (2.75 or higher for undergraduate candidates and 3.0 for graduate candidates), and undergraduate candidates meet minimum expectations on a required test (Praxis CORE, SAT, or ACT). At the point of admission, the program also assess candidates' interpersonal and communication skills, work experience and community service with children/adolescents, and multicultural/diversity awareness.

- The program has clear criteria for the readiness for student teaching decision point. These criteria are included on the program website, through courses, program faculty, and through assessment handbooks. These criteria include an overall minimum GPA of 2.5, successful completion of the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching test or the Education of Young

Children and Early Childhood Education, successful completion of specified courses, and a minimal score of three on evaluation rubrics for course and program assessments completed at this decision point. The program reported that candidates who do not meet these criteria do not proceed to student teaching.

- Major course and program assessments, including observations and evaluations of candidate performance have performance-based rubrics with defined performance levels that align to the RIPTS and the NAEYC standards. Candidate assessment begins early in the program and increases in both expectations and complexity as candidate progress through the program.

- Unlike in other programs where candidates reported receiving inconsistent or poor quality feedback, candidates in early childhood reported that they appreciate the feedback they receive and that it supports their growth in the program. Candidates receive effective and consistent feedback from program faculty and clinical educators that is typically aligned to or reflective of the RIPTS and NAEYC standards and provides clear guidance for improvement. Program and clinical faculty reported that they coordinate closely to monitor candidate progress. The small size of the program makes coordination efforts easier.

- As noted above, expected measures of candidate impact on student learning are not currently clearly established or articulated. As the program works with its clinical partners to meet these expectations, it should continue working with its clinical partners to integrate fully these expectations into the assessment system.

- The program should also examine the current practice of assessing candidate performance on all the RIPTS at the readiness for student teaching assessment point. The current process allows candidates to select focus areas for the RIPTS rather than the full range of the standards. The program should consider a more robust process in which the program assesses candidates on the full range of the RIPTS earlier in the program sequence to ensure opportunities for candidate growth.

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

- The program has explicit criteria for the recommendation for certification assessment point. These criteria include a minimum overall GPA of 2.5, the successful completion of all program courses, successful completion of student teaching, and receiving a minimum score of all major program assessments. These assessments include an instructional unit, Informal and Formal Assessment of Learning task, four observations of teaching, midterm evaluation and final evaluation of the student teacher by the clinical supervisor and the clinical educator, professional development reflection, and an exit survey. During EDC 485: Seminar in Student Teaching, candidates must also complete a Rhode Island Educational Initiatives Quiz.

- Clinical educators and clinical supervisors are both responsible for evaluating the performance of candidates. The program requires that all candidates be observed at least four times—twice by the clinical supervisor and twice by the clinical educators. The program does not expect the

reviewers to observe each standard in each observation, but "each standard must be addressed by each observer at least once." The program provided evidence that the School of Education has established specific processes to ensure that program faculty and clinical educators work together to assess candidate performance and make recommendations for certification following established guidelines and protocols. Though both the clinical supervisor and the clinical educator observe and score student teaching, the clinical supervisor's observation is the observation that determines candidate readiness.

- The assessment system overview states that candidates must receive a three or above on evaluation rubrics indicating that the candidate has met the standard for all assignments and evaluations. Prior to recommending candidates for certification, the Outcomes Assessment and Accreditation Specialist within the School of Education checks overall performance on key assessments and flags for the program when performance does not meet the cut score. Given current practice, some candidates may perform significantly below standard on one or more indicators but still progress within the assessment system.

- The program and School of Education also provided evidence that program and clinical faculty receive training for their roles in the assessment system. This evidence included training materials, agendas, and specific tasks completed during the annual training. 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 and of how this performance aligns to program rubrics and assessment instruments.

- Although the program assessment system has clear criteria and multiple assessment instruments aligned to professional standards, as implemented, the recommendation for certification decision point does not ensure that only candidates who meet the full expectations of the RIPTS and the NAEYC standards receive recommendation for student teaching. Program completers and candidates near the end of the program reported—and candidate work corroborated—not to being fully prepared in several areas of the standards: K-2 instruction, content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, student learning standards, and data-based instruction.

- The program does not assure that candidates will be ready on day one to assume positions in the full grade range of the certificate area. Due to the current structure of the clinical placement, the program recommends candidates for certification who have not had sufficient opportunities to practice and develop proficiency in the RIPTS and the NAEYC standards in settings at the K-2 grade level. In addition, candidates recommended for certification do not always have experiences working beyond childcare centers or in diverse placements.

Recommendations:

- Working with faculty from the Department of Human Development and Family Studies, School of Education, clinical partners, and other stakeholders, review and analyze the findings of this report. As the program revises its program curriculum and clinical experiences based on these findings, integrate these revisions into the assessment system, particularly the recommendation

for certification assessment point to ensure that only candidates who meet the full expectations of the RIPTS and NAEYC receive a recommendation for certification.

- Review the current assessment instruments and criteria for the recommendation for certification assessment point. Examine how candidates and program completers who report not being fully prepared for their roles progress pass this decision point. Based on this analysis, consider if the current instruments and criteria are sufficient and appropriate to ensure candidate proficiency in the full range, depth, and breadth of these standards.

- In conjunction with other teacher educator programs at URI, consider if the current observation and evaluation of practice instruments used for the midterm and final evaluation of student teaching are fully effective. Consider school or district performance instruments that may align more fully to the RIPTS and NAEYC and in use in schools.

- Continue to work to revise and implement the clinical educator training in conjunction with the other teacher education programs and the School of Education. Ensure that the training meets the needs of clinical educators and that all clinical educators, including those who supervise and support candidates beyond the student teaching placement, attend the training.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Meets Expectations
The program surveys employers annually and has made efforts to increase survey responses.	

- The School of Education surveys employers annually and then disaggregates data by program. The survey is constructed to yield actionable information. Response rates to the survey have historically been low—between 10 percent and 15 percent. In response to principal feedback, provider leadership revised the employer survey in Fall 2016 to make it mobile and handheld friendly, administered the survey by program, sent reminders, and provided principals with a chart including a list of program completers and where they are currently teaching. URI should monitor the success of its recent survey changes and continue to improve survey response rates. URI should also consider including more questions that are open-ended to allow for more specific, substantive feedback for program improvement.

- For the 2015-16 school year, the aggregate performance of University of Rhode Island program completers working in Rhode Island schools was comparable to the aggregate performance distribution for all recent completers in Rhode Island schools. However, RIDE reports this data at the *provider* level instead of the *program* level. Therefore, few conclusions about the effectiveness of completers from the early childhood program can be made.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program surveys program completers annually but does not have strategies in place to track post-completion employment for completers working outside of Rhode Island public schools.	

- The School of Education collects information from program completers via an exit survey administered to all candidates at the end of student teaching and via a survey that it sends to

completers two years after they complete their program. The surveys are constructed to yield actionable information.

- Prior to 2012, exit survey response rates were around 50-60 percent. The School of Education has since moved the survey from SurveyMonkey to Taskstream and made it a seminar requirement. As a result, response rates are now approximately 95 percent.

- The two-year-out survey originally contained 44 questions. URI recently streamlined the survey to include 27 questions. At the time of the visit, URI had sent out the latest edition of the survey a month prior with the intention of sending out reminders every three months through the summer of 2017.

- At the time of the visit, the program had limited strategies and systems to track post completion employment for candidates who pursue employment in states other than Rhode Island.

Recommendations:
- Increase capacity to track post completion employment for all completers and better address satisfaction with employment outcomes.

Elementary Education Program

The Elementary Education Program includes three pathways: a Bachelor of Arts (BA), a Teacher Certification Program (TCP), and a Masters of Art in Education. The program typically admits candidates during the first semester of their junior year. Prior to admission, in addition to completing the pre-professional field experience, candidates complete general education requirements and take content-based courses consistent with program completion requirements in English, mathematics, science, and the social sciences. Course requirements for candidates in the Master's and TCP program vary based on candidate's previous experience and course history.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Meets Expectations
The program aligns to the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS). Candidates experience a consistent curriculum and have sufficient opportunities to develop proficiency in the RIPTS.	

- Candidates experience a consistent curriculum. Candidates in both the degree and TCP program take a sequence of twelve courses, four foundation courses, seven methods courses that focus on teaching and learning in the areas of assessment, literacy, mathematics, science, and social studies, and a seminar that corresponds to the student teaching placement. Candidates also complete five credit-based field experience including a pre-admission supervised field experience, three practicums that correspond to the teaching and learning methods courses, and a student teaching placement.

- Most program course syllabi and program assessments show RIPTS standards and content standards aligned to course work, clinical experiences, and major assessments. Candidates develop, implement, and receive feedback on lesson and unit plans that align to the RIPTS. The program assesses candidates on their performance in field placements on their ability to design and implement instruction consistent with the RIPTS.

- The program uses RIPTS-based rubrics for major course and program assessments as well as to evaluate candidate performance in their field experiences. The program tracks candidate proficiency on the RIPTS through an on-line data management system, Taskstream, which all educator preparation programs use. Candidates and program completers reported, and clinical educators concurred, that the program effectively prepares candidates in the professional standards prior to program completion.

- Based on syllabi review, candidate interviews, and site visits, reviewers noted that candidates develop deep content knowledge (Standard 2) and learn how to create a supportive learning environment (Standard 6).

- Although candidates have opportunities to develop proficiency in the RIPTS, reviewers noted that candidates would benefit from additional opportunities focused on higher order thinking skills (Standard 5), assessment strategies (Standard 9), and interacting with parents (Standard 11).

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Meets Expectations
The program curriculum aligns to ACEI Standards. Candidates have multiple opportunities to develop proficiency in the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the expectations of the standards.	

- The program curriculum aligns fully to the expectations of the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) Standards. The program introduces candidates to the ACEI standards in early in program foundation courses. Candidates develop increased proficiency in their use during the methods courses and aligned clinical experiences, and are required to demonstrate practice consistent with the depth and breadth of the standards during the student teaching placement.

- Program leadership reported that ACEI has nationally recognized the program through the Specialized Professional Association (SPA) review process. The program also provided a crosswalk document that demonstrates full alignment between the ACEI standards and the program courses and major assessments.

- Through course and clinical-based learning experiences, candidates learn about the ACEI standards and about how to practice consistent with the expectations of the standards. Candidates learn about child development and learner differences in EDC 312: Psychology of Learning and EDC 453: Individual Differences. Candidates learn about content specific instruction in several methods courses, including EDC 456: Mathematics Methods, EDC 457: Science Methods, and EDC 458: Social Studies Methods. Candidates also complete courses that focus on literacy, assessment, and meeting the needs of students with disabilities consistent with the expectations of the ACEI standards.

- Program syllabi, candidate learning tasks, and program assessments include references to the ACEI standards and articulate expected performance levels for candidate performance. The program assesses candidate clinical practice in part using evaluation instruments and rubrics aligned to the standards. The program and clinical educators provide candidate feedback based on the standards and identify areas for candidate growth. Candidates reported that they understand the ACEI and feel well prepared to practice as elementary grade teachers.

- Although candidates have opportunities to develop proficiency in the critical concepts, skills, and proficiencies expected of elementary teachers articulated in the ACEI standards, the review team noted that candidates would benefit from increased focus on curriculum (Standard 2). The program reported that candidates learn about arts, health education, and physical education during student teaching, which occurs late in the candidate experience. In addition, survey responses from employers indicate that candidates would benefit from additional focus on early literacy.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
The program provides candidates with a general understanding of student learning standards and candidates demonstrate basic skills in developing, implementing, and assessing standards-based lessons.	

- Elementary candidates work with a range of student standards that include the Common Core State Standards in Mathematics and English Language Arts, Next Generation Science Standards, and Social Studies Grade Span Expectations. Methods courses expose candidates to applicable elementary student standards and are listed as part of course syllabi. An online learning module in the elementary individual difference course appropriately frames the role of standards in teaching and learning.

- Mathematics program requirements for undergraduate candidates include two courses in Numeracy for Teachers. These courses help ensure that elementary candidates have requisite knowledge to build a necessary and deep understanding of math concepts required for teaching to meet the CCSS . Literacy, reading, and English program course requirements also support candidates to develop knowledge and skills to meet the literacy expectations of the CCSS.

- Site-visit observations and the review of candidate work demonstrated a range in candidate understanding and proficiency in standards-driven instruction and a range of candidate awareness across grade levels and content areas. Observation debriefs between student teachers, clinical educators, and clinical supervisors did not include mention of specific standards nor did they display habits or practices where the candidate would be prompted to identify or explain the extent to which student were progressing toward meeting particular student learning standards. Candidate work demonstrated inconsistent use of student standards and the development of lesson plans that focused on a narrow range of standards rather than student standards across all content areas and grade levels.

- Candidates reported a general knowledge and awareness of student standards but demonstrated limited understanding of how the standards function. During interviews, candidates struggled to explain their selection and use of standards or justify how specific standards were included lesson design and their clinical practice. Additionally, clinical educators shared that the program did not expect candidates to be familiar with student standards outside of the grade level of their student teaching placement.

- The program did not provide evidence that candidates are required to develop understanding of how student-learning standards connect across lessons, units, and across grade levels or practice designing and implementing instruction that builds across student standards.

Candidates primarily learn about and practice using student standards through tasks and assessments that require individual lesson plans that align to one or more standard.

Recommendations:

- Revise candidate tasks to ensure candidates develop a critical understanding of the full range of student learning standards across all content areas and grade levels. Ensure that all candidates have opportunities to practice using student standards across the full grade ranges and content areas within the elementary program. Incorporate reflection and planning questions in the program curriculum that require candidates to think beyond single lessons to develop deep and critical understanding of the student standards.

- Work with program faculty and clinical educators to incorporate into course assignments and clinical and observations and debriefs analysis of student learning standards in candidate work and practice. Require candidates to reflect on their developing proficiency in the use of student standards. Ensure candidates know how to build on instruction to support students increasingly to meet the expectations of the standards.

- Work with program faculty and clinical educators to incorporate additional resources and materials into the methods courses and clinical experiences designed to help candidates unpack, develop understanding, and design instruction consistent with student standards.

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

- The program reported that candidates learn about assessment and data-driven instruction through their courses, clinical practice, and program assessments. EDC 452: Evaluation of Elementary and Middle School Students is the primary course that focuses on assessment. In this course, candidates learn about the purposes for assessment and various assessment strategies and instruments. Candidates complete one of the major program assessment tasks, the Informal and Formal Assessment of Learning, during this course. Through this task, candidates are required to conduct multiple forms of assessment, evaluate student work from the assessments, analyze data from the assessments at the aggregate and disaggregate level, and reflect on changes to instruction that should be made based on assessment results.

- The program reported that candidates also learn about assessment in the content-specific methods courses. In these courses, candidates develop lessons using the Plan, Teach, Assess, Reflect (PTAR) process that is consistent across the other teachers program and courses. In this process, candidates design lessons, implement the lessons, assess student learning, and reflect on the effectiveness of their practice. Program faculty reported that, in literacy courses, candidates analyze running records and spelling data and discuss how candidates would differentiate instruction based on student work samples. The program also reported that candidates learn about assessment practices and modifying lessons based on student data for students with disabilities in EDC 402: Teaching Students with Special Needs.

- The program expects candidates to develop further their understanding of assessment and data-driven instruction through practicum and student teaching placements. The program reported that it expects candidates to analyze student-learning needs as part of the student teaching experience and use this information to develop and implement instruction. The program also reported that candidates are required to develop an understanding of student learning needs from the IEP and RTI processes as part of their student teaching responsibilities. The evaluation instruments used to assess candidate practice during student teaching also include components that focus on how candidates assess student learning.

- Despite the opportunities for candidates to learn about and practice using assessments, it was not evident to the review team that candidates develop more than a general understanding of data-driven instruction. Candidates reported that they were aware of the need to include assessment strategies in their lessons, but that they did not have sufficient opportunities to actually implement the assessments until their student teaching placements. Observations of candidate practice, interviews with candidates and clinical educators, and the review of candidate work revealed that although candidates learn about the need to modify instruction based on assessment data, the program design does not ensure that candidates do this to complete the data-driven instruction cycle.

Recommendations:

- Revise the program curriculum and courses to include a specific focus on the overarching purpose and importance of data-based instruction to include explicit instruction, practice, and candidate assessment in how to collect data from a variety of sources, how to analyze the various data, and how to use data to inform instructional practice.

- Provide candidates additional instruction and clinical practice in how to collect and analyze student data from a variety of sources and across the full range of content areas and grade spans. Provide additional explicit instruction, practice, and assessment in how to modify instruction and practice based on the analysis of a variety of data.

- Consult with clinical partners and other stakeholders to identify important assessments and data (e.g. NWEA data, PARCC data, DRA, Lexile levels) that candidates should be familiar with upon program completion. Ensure candidates have opportunities to not only collect data using these assessments but also practice using data to track student progress and inform future teaching.

- Re-align methods and practicum courses to move past theoretical instructional next steps. Create opportunities for candidates to implement teaching next-steps based on student learning analysis. Consider having candidates teach consecutive lessons. Creating more practical application opportunities will allow for candidates to learn what works and in what scenarios. Expand candidate tasks to look across classes to see and understand how an analysis of student learning should include all students and across all content areas that an elementary educator will be responsible for upon program completion.

1.5 Technology	Approaching Expectations
The program expects candidates to use technology both as teachers and as students. However, candidates have limited structured and intentional opportunities to learn about and practice	

- The program reported that the several courses, tasks, and program assessments incorporate the use of technology. The program requires candidates to incorporate technology in each of the lessons developed during the methods courses. Candidates are also required to complete a self-assessment and develop a professional develop plan based on the ISTE standards and component 2.4 of the RIPTS which focuses on technology.

- Based on feedback from clinical educators to include earlier in program, explicit instruction and opportunities to develop proficiency in the use of technology, the program recently revised EDC 423: Teaching Comprehension and Response and EDC 423: Teaching Literacy to Primary Students to include a great focus on the use of technology with elementary students. Candidates are now required to use iPads, digital communication, and explore several technology applications as part of these courses. The program design and assessment system also requires candidates to interact with several online systems and applications including Taskstream, Sakai, Flipgrid, and other video applications.

- Despite the opportunities reported by the program, the review team did not observe evidence of sufficient and explicit instruction in how to use technology, how to effectively integrate technology into instruction, and practices to ensure all candidates develop proficiency in digital age learning experiences. Candidates demonstrated a basic knowledge and understanding of how to use common instructional technologies. Candidate proficiency in the use of technology was also dependent on clinical placements. Candidates who student taught in settings that emphasized technology demonstrated a deeper understanding and effective use of technology.

- Clinical educators and program completers reported that although candidates receive exposure to technology, the current program design does not ensure that all candidates develop proficiency in the use of technology. This feedback recommended that all candidates receive explicit instruction in a wide range of technology and are required to practice using technology with elementary students in their clinical placements.

Recommendations:

- Rethink what elementary digital age learning looks like so that the program may move beyond the expectations within RIPTS 2.4. Expand faculty understanding of digital age systems to ensure that candidates will not depend on their clinical setting to practice using various technologies. Find ways to articulate that vision through various performance rubrics used with candidates throughout the program.

- Utilize partnership districts and other relevant resources to identify specific technology outcomes that all elementary candidates should master.   Work together to find ways to think ahead for the strong and necessary digital age learning experiences that elementary students need. Work with clinical partners or other organizations to identify appropriate, current, and field-based expectations for the use of technology in elementary classrooms to support student learning. Review and revise the current program design based on this analysis.

- Develop program, course and clinical learning experiences that ensure that all candidates, regardless of their clinical placements, receive sufficient opportunities to learn about and

practice using a wide range of instructional and communicative technology to design and implement digital age learning experiences.

- Review the effectiveness of the ISTE assessment instrument and professional development plan. Consider if the current design and placement of the assessment in the program sequence is sufficient to ensure candidate proficiency in the use of technology.

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum provides candidates limited opportunities to develop proficiency in the areas of equity, diversity, and working with families in diverse communities. Candidates develop basic skills for working with a diverse range of learners.	

- The program reported that it integrates issues of diversity and meeting the needs of individual learners throughout the program. Candidates are required to complete observations in diverse settings as part of admission requirements in EDC 250: Initial Field Experience. Program courses such as EDC 402: Teaching Students with Special Needs and EDC 453: Individual Differences specifically focus on understanding student learning needs and strategies to support students with disabilities. As part of the methods courses and case study, candidates are also required to identify and reflect on how they meet individual student learning needs.

- As part of EDC 453: Individual Differences, candidates are required to complete a 'Culturally Competent Practice' task. The task requires candidates to write about five aspects of their practice – planning and instruction, assessment, professional behavior, collaboration, communication. Within each aspect, the candidate then speaks to a strategy they could use in their practicum setting, their reasoning for selecting that strategy, more info about the culturally responsive practice, research, and a reflection. Program faculty members evaluate the task using a rubric tagged with items from the ACEI standards that primarily focus on aspects of professionalism. Elementary education candidates unpack their biases through this writing and reflection.

- Candidate work samples, scoring, and feedback did not consistently push candidate thinking in regards to this critical educator expectation. The level and quality of feedback varied greatly. Given the variation in feedback, it was also unclear the level of calibration or the expectations of candidates as it related to issues of equity on this one assignment.

- Candidates reported that they learn about issues of culturally competent practice through program courses and clinical experiences. The review team did not see evidence that candidates develop proficiency in meeting the needs of English Language learners or working with families in diverse communities.

- The individual differences course, and paired field experience, introduce candidates to issues of diversity, perspective, and power structures related to educational access. The individual differences course schedule lists strategies for ELLs and strategies for differentiation as focus areas for particular weeks.

Recommendations:

- Work with program faculty, clinical educators, and other stakeholders to review the program's focus and approach to issues of equity, diversity, and working with families in diverse communities. Continue the program's focus on meeting the needs of students with disabilities and understanding student individual differences. Integrate additional opportunities to learn about and practice meeting the needs of English Language learners and working with families in diverse communities.

- Explore how to integrate more fully issues of equity, diversity, and working with families in diverse communities throughout the program. Build upon the Culturally Competent Practice task so that it is not an isolated learning experience but connected to candidate learning and growth over the course of the program. Require candidates to include in this assessment and other program and course tasks specific and effective strategies to work with English Language learners and families in diverse communities. Ensure that candidates are receiving appropriate feedback on their reflective writing.

- Develop and implement additional course and clinical-based learning experiences that require candidates to move beyond developing an awareness of their own worldviews to developing proficiency in designing and implement instruction and practice that meets the needs of all students and families.

- Work with program faculty and clinical educators to review current feedback practices to ensure that candidates receive critical and instructive feedback on their developing practice in the areas of equity, diversity, and working with families in diverse communities.

- Identify specific research-based strategies that all elementary candidates should demonstrate proficiency on and backward map how candidates will move from novice to proficiency by program completion.

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.	

- The program reported that candidates learn about important Rhode Island educational initiatives in multiple classes and field experiences. For example, the program requires candidates to take the SLO modules on the RIDE website as part of EDC 485: Seminar in Student Teaching. In interviews, candidates could articulate several ways that they implement Rhode Island initiatives in their clinical work. However, candidates noted that they wish they knew more about the Rhode Island educator evaluation system.

- The program assesses candidate proficiency in Rhode Island educational initiatives through a fifteen-question multiple-choice quiz on Taskstream. This quiz does not assess candidate understanding of initiatives or candidate proficiency in the knowledge, skills, and practices embedded in key Rhode Island initiatives.

- In interviews, candidates noted bullying prevention as a key RI initiative but did not demonstrate deep knowledge of other initiatives.

Recommendations:

- Work with clinical partners and other stakeholders to identify which Rhode Island initiatives are most important for elementary grades candidates to learn about during their program of study. Identify the knowledge, skills, and practices embedded in those key Rhode Island educational initiatives, and then revise coursework and candidate experiences appropriately.

- Ensure program and clinical faculty members are proficient in Rhode Island educational initiatives.

- Identify ways to assess candidate proficiency in Rhode Island educational initiatives in ways that are more authentic and in-depth than a multiple-choice quiz.

- Ensure that all candidates understand the process, components, and rubric language embedded within educator evaluation systems used in the state. Consider adopting or adapting performance assessments that are already widely used in Rhode Island and other states.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Approaching Expectations
Clinical preparation provides candidates multiple opportunities to practice in classrooms but does not ensure candidates develop proficiency in meeting the expectations of the professional standards.	

- The program reported that candidates have multiple opportunities to practice in the full range of elementary grades and that candidates have at least one placement each in grades one and two, three and four, and five and six. These experiences begin prior to admission in EDC 250, continue through four practicum experiences aligned to the methods courses, and culminate in the thirteen-week student teaching placement. Collectively, candidate clinical experience meets the required amount established by Rhode Island certification requirements.

- During EDC 250, candidates complete journal entries about their observations. During practicum placements, candidates build on and apply what they learn in methods courses in elementary classrooms. The first practicum experience takes place in an urban environment where candidates may work one-on-one or with a small group of students. The second practicum requires candidates to teach three lessons across the content areas of math, science, and social studies. The third practicum—which candidates take concurrently with language arts methods, evaluation, and education of special needs—requires candidates to demonstrate classroom management. All practicums include a weekly visitation to the clinical setting.

- Prior to student teaching, candidates primarily teach lessons in isolation or conduct small group instruction. In these settings, candidates develop and reflect on lessons that they construct based on specific course learnings and strategies in the methods courses. During student teaching, the program expects candidates to assume the full responsibility of the classroom based on specific guidance provided in the School of Education student teaching handbook. Candidates typically complete student teaching in a classroom that was one of their practicum placements

- The review team observed that clinical preparation begins early in the program and builds in complexity over time. The clinical preparation also connects course-based learning to practice in elementary classrooms to promote program coherence. A particular concern with the student teaching placement is the minimal requirement that candidates only assume full responsibility for classrooms for three weeks.

Recommendations:

- Examine and consider if candidates would benefit from practicum placements that occurred on consecutive days rather than once a week as a way to provide more authentic and effective learning experiences prior to student teaching. Allowing candidates to see ongoing adjustment of instruction on a day-to-day basis may support the program's deficits with data-driven instruction and depth of understanding in student standards.

- Review the current requirement that candidates only assume full responsibility for classrooms for three weeks during student teaching. Increase these expectations and provide additional supports in practicum placements if necessary so that candidates may have sufficient opportunity to understand and experience the role of elementary teacher.

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

- The program has begun to measure candidate impact on student learning. The program has identified one primary measure and identified a few other opportunities, but it was unclear the extent to which these other opportunities focus on candidate impact on student learning. The program does not include impact measures from early clinical experiences as well as later clinical experiences.

- The program measures candidate impact on student learning primarily through the Informal and Formal Assessment of Learning Task completed during student teaching. This assessment requires candidates to prepare and administer informal and formal assessments to students, mark and submit student work, write rationales for selection of criteria within assessments, and provide commentary on candidate work. The assessment also requires candidates to aggregate and disaggregate data and reflect on the learning of three or four representative students. There is no evidence that the program and clinical partners mutually designed this or any other measure of candidate impact on student learning.

- The program submitted additional assignments as "examples of guidance and tools that programs provide to candidates to encourage them to assess impact on student learning": the Culturally Competent Practice Portfolio, the Case Study completed during student teaching, and the professional development reflection. These assignments require reflection and may connect to student assessment, but they do not focus sufficiently on candidate impact on student learning. For example, for the Culturally Competent Practice Task requires candidates to implement a strategy to provide a more culturally competent experience for their students, reflect on their own learning, and then identify how they might change their own teaching to be more culturally responsive.

- The Student Teaching Evaluation assesses candidates' use of assessment to guide instruction and report progress. Performance-level descriptors for Components 5.4 and 5.5 of the rubric focus on candidate ability to use "a wide range of assessments to guide planning and make adjustments to teaching" as well as providing "comprehensive information about students' progress and improvement plans to students, families, and support personnel."

- During site visits, review team members observed clinical supervisors giving feedback to candidates, but the feedback did not connect observed candidate practice to student standards or student learning.

Recommendations:

- Collaborate with clinical partners to determine and design appropriate measures of candidate impact on student learning. Establish clear expectations for the collection and analysis of data throughout the program and articulate expected levels and evidence of impact on student learning. Provide explicit instruction in how candidates are to use measures of impact on student learning to inform their continuous growth as secondary grade educators.

- Clearly communicate the 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 their clinical preparation.

- Integrate explicit instruction, feedback, and assessment in how to demonstrate an impact on student learning throughout the program curriculum so that all candidates are well prepared to meet these expectations during clinical placements.

- Incorporate a focus question for student teaching observations that develops a strong habit for all adults, clinical educators, student teachers, and clinical supervisors, to bring the conversation directly to understanding the impact of instruction on student learning.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has begun efforts to improve the quality of program-district partnerships. Programs and clinical partners use common assessment tools to evaluate candidate performance, but rater calibration and PK-12 clinical educators input into candidate progression decisions are insufficient.	

- The Office of Teacher Education (The Office of Teacher Education) primarily leads the outreach and organization of student teaching placements. The Office of Teacher Education has begun efforts to develop stronger and more clearly articulated partnerships between the program and K-12 districts. For example, a new partnership agreement with Chariho, Exeter-West Greenwich, and South Kingstown documents efforts to systematize the placement of student teachings and increase URI-district collaboration. In an interview with clinical partners, some acknowledged that URI is open to true collaboration. Partners also noted that the program has been responsive to individual district requests.

- For clinical experiences prior to student teaching, the clinical educator completes a practicum evaluation. The program reported that the practicum clinical educator must recommend the candidate for student teaching. However, it is unclear from syllabi and evaluation what the

expected level of performance is and how the practicum evaluation informs the course grade. The practicum evaluation does not include differentiated performance level descriptors.

- The program and clinical educators use common observation and evaluation tools to evaluate and provide feedback during student teaching. The clinical educator and clinical supervisor complete separately the mid-term and final evaluations prior to discussing with the candidate. At a minimum, the clinical educator and the clinical supervisor must each complete two classroom observations. These are key assessments used to inform candidate progression to student teaching and certification, thus providing clinical educators some input into the decision making process regarding the progression of candidates to certification.

Recommendations:

- Build upon recent efforts to engage with district partners and identify agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness. Determine how programs and clinical partners will track and analyze data from agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness.

- Clarify expectations for candidate performance and calibrate expectations regularly. Communicate expectations for oral and written feedback and develop mechanisms to ensure that the quality is consistent across clinical supervisors and clinical educators. Consider adopting or adapting performance assessment tools used in districts.

- Identify additional opportunities for clinical educators to have input into decisions about candidate progression within the program.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Approaching Expectations
The program has begun revising both the criteria for the recruitment of clinical educators and the processes to select clinical educators. Current practices, especially those related to training clinical educators, do not ensure that all candidates receive a high quality clinical experience.	

- The program uses the School of Education's criteria for selecting clinical educators. These criteria, which were revised in spring 2017, include having at least three years professional experience in the certification area, earning educator evaluation ratings of highly effective, being able to work effectively with adult learners, and being able to provide "solicited and spontaneous, in-depth observation and feedback to the candidate (both written and verbal) on a regular basis using program and partner assessments." These criteria are consistent with RIDE's expectations for clinical educators.

- The Office of Teacher Education and program faculty work with partner districts to secure practicum and student teaching placements. URI leadership noted that recruitment and placement efforts vary by district. Traditionally, URI has used faculty networking, professional associations, workshops and professional development to identify potential clinical educators and then reached out to the districts requesting that a specific educator serve as a clinical educator. When working with some districts, URI sends a request for a clinical educator and then the superintendents and principals determine or recommend who would be the strongest clinical educator.

- Clinical partners acknowledged URI's recent efforts to improve the recruitment and selection of clinical educators but noted a desire to establish a more standardized process besides common criteria. One partner noted the need to better incentivize Rhode Island's best teachers to become clinical educators, and another noted that stronger communication about the student teacher's strengths and needs would help ensure a stronger match between the clinical educator and student teacher.

- In an evidence organizer, the program reported that all clinical educators must attend a training or receive a one-on-one training from a clinical supervisor each fall, but other evidence conflicted with this statement. The submitted clinical educator data file showed that only the clinical educators of student teachers completed a training; none of the clinical educators for EDC 250 or subsequent practicum courses completed a training. Clinical educators reported that training is not required and that many of them had not attended a training in several years.

- The program did not require training for all clinical educators after adjusting the rubrics for elementary student teaching observations from a five-point scale to a three-point scale.

- The sample cooperating training agenda provided by URI includes a welcome and overview, an orientation to Taskstream, informational breakout groups discussing required forms and expectations, an evaluation of sample video lessons using an observation form, and a mentoring workshop. 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.

Recommendations:

- 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 clinical supervisors. During training and subsequent calibration sessions, communicate clear expectations for feedback (when, how, what detail) and ensure that clinical educators, school and district leaders

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. However, the current implementation and monitoring of the assessment system does not ensure that only candidates meeting expectations progress through the assessment system.	

- The program assessment system has three major decision points: readiness for admission, readiness for student teaching/internship, and recommendation for certification. The program uses multiple systems, including Taskstream and Filemaker, to track candidate information and performance over time. As demonstrated through interviews, candidates, faculty, and clinical educators were aware of key assessments and noted that they had access to Taskstream.

- The program reports that, prior to student teaching, candidates must successfully pass the Praxis II PLT and content tests, complete the unit plan assignment in EDC 430, and be evaluated as ready for student teaching by his or her clinical educator in the practicum evaluation. In addition to these critical assignments, candidates and faculty can access additional assessments in Taskstream. Candidates who do not meet performance expectations on the Praxis tests or unit plan assignments must retake the assessment(s) until achieving a passing score. If a candidate does not receive a recommendation from the clinical educator to progress to student teaching, "a conference with the clinical educator is held to determine specific steps to ensure the candidate is ready for student teaching."

- Candidate assessment begins early in the program and includes written and oral formative feedback, although the quality of feedback varies. Expectations of candidates build over time.

- Program faculty members assess candidate assignments in Taskstream using rubrics, but the design and implementation of the rubrics reduces the rigor of the assessment system. Reviewers noted when reviewing candidate work samples that often the rubric rating did not match the actual performance of the candidate. Reviewers noted that some rubrics are overly complex and/or lack differentiation in performance levels. The assessment system emphasizes completion of reflective journals during early clinical experiences rather than candidate performance.

Recommendations:

- Collaborate with clinical partners to identify ways to assess and provide feedback on candidate performance with PK-12 students in early clinical experiences.

- Review and, where appropriate, revise course assessment rubrics to ensure that each indicator of the rubric has clearly differentiated levels of performance.

- Adopt or adapt performance assessments that are already widely used in Rhode Island and other states. Seek feedback on the selected tool and work with clinical partners to clarify expectations and performance. Hold trainings and calibration sessions to ensure program faculty, clinical educators, and clinical supervisors have a common understanding of performance expectations and can use tools with fidelity. Share examples of practice with candidates to help them understand what expected performance looks like for each indicator of rubrics.

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

- The program has explicit criteria for the recommendation for certification assessment point. These criteria include a minimum overall GPA of 2.5, the successful completion of all program courses, successful completion of student teaching, and receiving a minimum score of all major program assessments. These assessments include an instructional unit, Informal and Formal Assessment of Learning task, four observations of teaching, midterm evaluation and final

evaluation of the student teacher by the clinical supervisor and the clinical educator, professional development reflection, and an exit survey. During EDC 485: Seminar in Student Teaching, candidates must also complete a Professional Development Reflection and a Rhode Island Educational Initiatives Quiz.

- Clinical educators and clinical supervisors are both responsible for evaluating the performance of candidates. The program requires that all candidates be observed at least four times—twice by the clinical supervisor and twice by the clinical educators. The program does not expect the reviewers to observe each standard in each observation, but "each standard must be addressed by each observer at least once." The program provided evidence that the School of Education has established specific processes to ensure that program faculty and clinical educators work together to assess candidate performance and make recommendations for certification following established guidelines and protocols.

- The program and School of Education also provided evidence that it trains program and clinical on the assessment system. This evidence included training materials, agendas, and specific tasks from the annual training. 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. There was a lack of consistent and deep understanding of the expected levels of candidate performance consistent with professional standards.

- The program reported that it conducts "checks on inter-rater reliability for critical performance tasks, review of rubrics, training sessions for adjunct faculty and clinical educators using the evaluation instruments, and identification of areas with consistently weaker performance." However, both candidates and clinical partners noted discrepancies between clinical supervisor and clinical educator ratings and feedback.

- Although the program assessment system has clear criteria and multiple assessment instruments aligned to professional standards, as implemented, the recommendation for certification decision point does not ensure that only candidates who meet the full expectations of the RIPTS and ACEI standards receive recommendation for certification.

- The review team also observed inconsistent assessment results and feedback on several of the major program assessments. Candidates who completed similar quality work received different scores from individual assessors. Some assessors also provided extensive, standards-based feedback whereas other provided limited comments that focus on general work quality rather than detailed information on learning gaps and areas for improvement.

Recommendations:

- Working with faculty, clinical educators and partners, and other stakeholders, review and analyze the findings of this report. As the program revises its program curriculum and clinical experiences based on these findings, integrate these revisions into the assessment system, particularly the recommendation for certification assessment point to ensure that only candidates who meet the full expectations of the RIPTS and AECI standards receive recommendation for certification.

- Review the current assessment instruments and criteria for the recommendation for certification assessment point. Examine how candidates and program completers who report not being fully prepared for their roles progress pass this decision point. Based on this analysis, consider if the current instruments and criteria are sufficient and appropriate to ensure candidate proficiency in the full range, depth, and breadth of these standards. Work with program faculty and clinical educators to ensure that candidates receive consistent feedback on the major program assessments.

- In conjunction with other teacher educator programs at URI, consider if the current observation and evaluation of practice instruments used for the midterm and final evaluation of student teaching are fully effective. Consider school or district performance instruments that may align more fully to the RIPTS and ACEI and in use in schools.

- Continue to work to revise and implement the clinical educator training in conjunction with the other teacher education programs and the School of Education. Ensure that the training meets the needs of clinical educators and that all clinical educators, including those who supervise and support candidates beyond the student teaching placement, attend the training.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Meets Expectations
The provider surveys employers annually and has made efforts to increase survey responses.	

- The School of Education surveys employers annually and then disaggregates data by program. The survey is constructed to yield actionable information. Response rates to the survey have historically been low—between 10 percent and 15 percent. In response to principal feedback, provider leadership revised the employer survey in Fall 2016 to make it mobile and handheld friendly, administered the survey by program, sent reminders, and provided principals with a chart including a list of program completers and where they are currently teaching. URI should monitor the success of its recent survey changes and continue to improve survey response rates. URI should also consider including more questions that are open-ended to allow for more specific, substantive feedback for program improvement.

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

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The provider surveys program completers annually but does not have strategies in place to track post-completion employment for completers working outside of Rhode Island public schools.	

- The School of Education collects information from program completers via an exit survey administered to all candidates at the end of student teaching and via a survey it sends to

completers two years after they complete their program. The surveys are constructed to yield actionable information.

- Prior to 2012, exit survey response rates were around 50-60 percent. The School of Education has since moved the survey from SurveyMonkey to Taskstream and made it a seminar requirement. As a result, response rates are now approximately 95 percent.

- The two-year-out survey originally contained 44 questions. URI recently streamlined the survey to include 27 questions. At the time of the visit, URI had sent out the latest edition of the survey a month prior with the intention of sending out reminders every three months through the summer of 2017. The program reported, "Response rates are optimistically high at this point in the data collection."

- At the time of the visit, the program did not have in place strategies and systems to track post completion employment for candidates who pursue employment in states other than Rhode Island.

Recommendations:

- Encourage program completers to continue a line of communication with the program/provider with respect to employment status and measures of employment success.

Library Media Specialist

The School Library Media program is a graduate-level program and one of several tracks that candidates can select within the Master of Library and Information Studies (MLIS) program. The program also offers a certification track for candidates who already have a MLIS degree and wish to pursue certification as a school librarian.

The program consists of five required courses including a pre-practicum course, LSC: 520 School Library Media Services and LSC: 596 School Library Media Practicum and Seminar. In addition to the five required courses, candidates select three additional courses from several electives. Candidates typically complete the program on a part-time basis over a two- to three-year period. Due to shortages for school librarians, some candidates in the program concurrently are candidates in the program while also serving as emergency-certified school librarians in PK-12 schools.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum aligns partially to the RIPTS and provides insufficient opportunities for candidates to develop proficiency in the full expectations of the standards.	

- The program provided evidence that three course syllabi (LSC 520, LSC 527: Digital Information Literacy Instruction for Librarians, and LSC 596) and some course tasks and program assessments are aligned to the RIPTS. Other courses, tasks, and assessments did not reference or align to the standards. Within these three RIPTS-aligned classes, candidates learn about and demonstrate knowledge of the standards by identifying applicable RIPTS within lesson plans, through observations based on RIPTS of their practicum experience, and by providing evidence and analysis of artifacts for an end of program professional portfolio.

- Beyond this limited exposure, it was not clear where in the program curriculum candidates receive explicit and varied instruction in what the expectations of the RIPTS are and how the expectations translate into actual practice. It was not clear if and where candidates receive critical coaching, assessment, and feedback to demonstrate increasing progress towards meeting the expectations of the standards.

- Program completers, candidates, and clinical faculty reported and candidate work demonstrated that the limited exposure to the RIPTS did not ensure that all candidates were aware of, knowledgeable in, and proficient in performing as school librarians consistent with these standards. Since the program design relies on the practicum experience as a major learning and proving ground for the RIPTS, the variability of the practicum placements and the sequence within the program further inhibits ensuring that all candidates have sufficient time and opportunity to learn about and demonstrate proficiency in the RIPTS.

- Program completers and candidates also reported that passing the Praxis Teaching and Learning test, required for program completion, was a significant challenge and something candidates did not feel well-prepared for by their preparation in the program. This is notable and consistent with the limited exposure and understanding of the RIPTS since the Praxis Teaching and Learning test assesses practices, skills, and knowledge consistent with the teaching and learning expectations embedded in the RIPTS.

- The program curriculum provides a sufficient focus on content knowledge (Standard 2), working collaboratively with school personnel (Standard 7), and using effective communication to work with students (Standard 8).

- The program curriculum does not sufficiently focus on how students learn and develop (Standard 3), critical thinking and problem solving (Standard 5), supportive learning environments (Standard 6), assessment strategies (Standard 9), and serving as a reflective practitioner (Standard 10).

Recommendations:

- Review and revise the current program design. Establish additional course-based learning opportunities that specifically focus on issues of teaching and learning that are not sufficiently represented in the current design. Specifically and minimally, explore requiring an additional three-credit course that occurs early in the program that focuses on teaching and learning consistent with the RIPTS and the role of school librarians. Require field experiences to practice such skills.

- Review the current program design and curriculum to address gaps in the program curriculum in the areas of RIPTS 3, 5, 6, 9 and 10. Revise the program design and curriculum to ensure that candidates receive explicit instruction, opportunities to practice, and critical and supportive assessment and feedback on the full range of the RIPTS.

- Consult with program completers, candidates, and clinical faculty to understand the challenges associated with the Praxis Teaching and Learning test. Use this information to guide the review and revision of program curriculum since this assessment measures many areas of the teaching and learning RIPTS and should help identify gaps in the program design and curriculum.

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Meets Expectations
The program curriculum aligns with the expectations of the American Association of the School Librarian (AASL) Standards. Candidates develop proficiency in the critical concepts, principles, and practices expected of school librarians.	

- The program curriculum prioritizes the expectations embodied in the American Association of School Librarian (AASL) Standards and has integrated these expectations and standards throughout the program curriculum, course sequence, and clinical experiences.

- Candidates learn about the AASL standards in coursework early in the program. They receive explicit instruction, complete course and program-based assessments to demonstrate increasing knowledge and understanding of the standards and expectations, and receive feedback on their progress towards meeting the expectations of the standards.

- Program candidates also develop knowledge and skills associated with the expectations of the AASL standards through core courses in the MLIS program that focus on general librarianship and library media services to various groups, in addition to PK-12 students.

- Program completers, candidates, and clinical faculty reported that candidates are well prepared in the area of school librarianship through their course and field-based learning and practice.

- Specific AASL standards that are areas of strength for the program curriculum are literacy and reading (Standard 2), information and knowledge (Standard 3), and advocacy and leadership (Standard 4). Consistent with the findings for Component 1.1 above, the program should prioritize teaching and learning (Standard 1) as well as additional opportunities for candidates to further engage learning opportunities focused on program management and administration (Standard 5).

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum provides some opportunities for candidates to design and implement instruction consistent with student learning standards, but not across the full range of content areas.	

- The program reported that it integrates the AASL Standards for 21st Century Learners, Common Core State Standards, and Rhode Island GLEs and GSEs in the program curriculum, course syllabi, and unit planning tasks. The program also provided a document that identified specific courses, learning activities, and assessments that include instruction and assessment opportunities to ensure candidates develop knowledge and proficiency in PK-12 student learning standards.

- A review of evidence including course syllabi, program assessments, and candidate work confirmed that the program focuses on the AASL Standards for 21st Century Learners in course and clinic-based learning experiences. While the program reports that its curriculum aligns to the AASL's Standards for the 21st Century Learner, and it may choose to do so, these are not currently recognized student learning standards for Rhode Island PK-12 students.

- Candidate work and interviews with candidates indicated that candidates develop an awareness at a general level of student learning standards, particularly the CCSS for literacy. Candidates who demonstrated a deeper knowledge beyond CCSS literacy standards typically had a background in teaching or were in clinical placements that required the integration of multiple

content areas in candidate work. The program curriculum design did not ensure that all candidates were aware of or proficient in designing and implementing instruction across all content areas.

- Beyond reporting that it integrates standards, the program did not provide evidence demonstrating that it prioritizes CCSS mathematics, NGSS, or the Rhode Island GSEs for social studies in the course of study. The program also reported that it aligns to Rhode Island GLEs for science, but these are no longer the currently recognized Rhode Island student learning standards for science.

Recommendations:

- Conduct a review to determine the currently recognized Rhode Island PK-12 student learning standards that are required and assessed in Rhode Island public schools. Review and revise the program curriculum to ensure that all candidates receive explicit instruction, clinical practice, and assessment and feedback in how to design and implement instruction across the full range of currently recognized Rhode Island PK-12 student learning standards.

- Provide candidates additional learning opportunities to design and implement authentic instruction that integrates mathematics, science, social studies, health, physical education, and the arts as well as literacy to support the full range of student learning needs across all PK-12 grade levels.

1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum provides candidates limited opportunities to develop proficiency in data-driven instruction and assessment to inform instructional and professional practice.	

- The program reported that candidates learn about data-driven instruction and formal and informal assessment during coursework in LSC 527: Digital Information Literacy Instruction and LSC 520: School Library Media Services and then candidates put this knowledge into practice during LSC 596: School Library Media Practicum and Seminar.

- The program also provided a document identifying specific learning and assessment opportunities related to data-driven instruction and assessment. Key assignments include unit plans, lesson plans, and the end of program portfolio.

- The program did not provide evidence that candidates receive sufficient instruction, practice opportunities, and support related to data-driven instruction. Candidates develop a general understanding of assessment – that all instruction should have one or more formal or informal assessments as well as some assessment strategies. It was not evident that candidates learn to design instruction by first collecting data on student learning, using data from student learning to modify practice, and using data from multiple sources in their instruction.

Recommendations:

- Review the full expectations of PREP-RI standard 1.4, RIPTS 9, and AASL 1.2 as a basis to conduct a program curriculum analysis of the expectations of data-driven instruction and assessment and the current curriculum. Seek partners, particularly clinical educators, to help conduct this

review. Based on the findings of this review, revise the program curriculum, clinical experiences, and program assessments to ensure alignment to these expectations.

- Require that candidates receive explicit instruction in the core principles, concepts, and purposes of assessment, including selecting and implementing assessments, analyzing data from a variety of sources, and using data and assessment information to modify instruction and practice, at the student, class, and school level consistent with the role of school librarians.

1.5 Technology	Meets Expectations
The program curriculum ensures that candidates develop proficiency across a full range of technology and technology tools both for school librarians and to support PK-12 student learning needs.	

- The program prioritizes technology as a tool for school librarians to manage school libraries and as an instructional tool and support for student learning. The program weaves both purposes technology throughout each of the required courses, including how to design and implement lesson and unit plans that feature appropriate types and levels of technology.

- Candidates develop websites and Libguides early in the program and build on this knowledge as they refine and develop their practice in clinical placements. LSC 530: Text and E-Tools, LSC 531: Information Resources and LSC 527: Digital Information Literacy provide candidates explicit instruction and practice in how to select, use, modify, and seek technologies that can support their libraries, colleagues, and students.

- The program assesses candidates on their effective use of technology through lesson and unit plans they develop, through evidence they submit as part of the program portfolio, and through observations of practice in clinical placements.

- Program completers and candidates reported that they understand the need for effective, appropriate, and accessible technology and gain this understanding through their course and clinical placements and learning experiences.

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum provides candidates limited opportunities to develop awareness and proficiency in the areas of equity, diversity, and working with families in diverse communities.	

- The program reported that issues of equity and diversity are program priorities and that readings, discussions, and tasks in all courses focus on these issues. The program also provided evidence to the review team of several readings, tasks, and reflections that focus on or include a theme of equity and diversity and how these issues are integrated into program assessments.

- Although the program shared multiple examples of readings and discussions, the review team noted that the program does not sufficiently emphasize issues of equity and diversity. The program referenced two readings and a class discussion as the extent of the focus in the practicum course. Other course requirements focus on general issues of awareness of equity and diversity such as varied library collections and meeting the needs of all learners. The program did not provide evidence of specific strategies for meeting the needs of English Language Learners, students with disabilities, or working with families in diverse communities through the multiple roles of school librarians.

- Candidates do not have sufficient time to develop their understanding of diversity, equity, and working with families in diverse communities. The program only requires that candidates spend two hours observing a school librarian in an urban library setting.

- The program curriculum previously required that candidates take a course on multiculturalism in school libraries. Since the last program approval visit, the program has made this course has an elective. The review team did not understand the program's justification: Candidates "who may work in urban areas" might select this course whereas others "can study a particular interest." This justification suggests that only school librarians in urban settings require an understanding of multiculturalism.

Recommendations:

- Review the expectations for diversity, equity, and working with families in diverse communities in the PREP-RI standards, the RIPTS, and the AASL standards. Conduct a review of the program curriculum design and clinical experiences to identify gaps between these expectations and the current design. Invite clinical partners and other stakeholders to participate in this review and to make recommendations for revisions to the program, curriculum, and clinical experience design.

- Ensure that issues of equity, diversity, and working with families in diverse communities are priorities across the program design and course sequence. Provide explicit instruction and practice in evidence-based practices that are effective in working with English Language Learners, students with disabilities, and families in diverse communities.

- Integrate issues of equity, diversity, and working with families in diverse communities into the program assessment system to ensure that only candidates who demonstrate proficiency in these areas progress through the program.

- Re-examine the program design decision to make multiculturalism in school libraries an elective course in light of the expectations of this standard. Seek feedback from program stakeholders and other partners as to the best approach to integrate fully issues of equity, diversity, and working with families in diverse communities throughout the program.

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.	

- The program reported that it provides opportunities for candidates to learn about important Rhode Island educational initiatives during the last course in the program, LSC 596: School Library Media Practicum and Seminar. During this course, candidates take a Rhode Island initiatives quiz in Taskstream consisting of 15 recall-level questions. This quiz does not assess candidate understanding of initiatives or candidate ability nor does it assess the knowledge, skills, and practice embedded in initiatives.

- Beyond LSC 596, candidates learn about CCSS for literacy in several courses and design instruction to meet these state standards. Candidates reported that they learned about other state educational initiatives such as issues of bullying, teacher evaluation, and SLOs during their practicum placements from faculty meetings, colleagues, and their clinical educators.

Recommendations:

- Conduct a review of important Rhode Island educational initiatives, specifically those relevant to school librarians. Additionally, consult with clinical partners to identify school and district policies and initiatives relevant to school librarians to integrate into the program curriculum. Revise the program curriculum to ensure that these initiatives are integrated throughout the program curriculum and clinical experiences and not solely addressed in the last course in the program.

- Review the program assessment system to integrate appropriate Rhode Island educational initiatives and require that candidates demonstrate substantial understanding of these initiatives to advance to student teaching and to receive recommendation for certification beyond the current self-assessment that occurs at the end of the program.

- Ensure that all candidates understand the process, components, and rubric language embedded within educator evaluation systems used in the state. Consider adopting or adapting performance assessments that are already widely used in Rhode Island and other states.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The design of the program's clinical preparation does not ensure that all candidates experience clinical practice that is sufficient in depth, breadth, diversity, and coherence.	

- The program's clinical preparation design requires all candidates to complete a pre-practicum experience as part of LSC 520: School Library Media Services during the fall semester of the final year in the program. During this course, candidates are required to conduct six hours of observations. Candidates must visit at least three schools (one elementary, one middle, and one high school) and two visits must be in urban settings.

- In addition to the observations, candidates are also required to volunteer during the pre-practicum course for 30 hours at the two sites that will serve as their student teaching placements in the upcoming spring semester.

- During the student teaching placements, candidates are required to serve as full-time student teachers for six weeks at an elementary site and six weeks at a secondary site. During the student teaching placements, candidates are required to increase gradually their responsibilities until assuming full responsibility for the school librarian role.

- The program provides general guidelines for the pre-practicum observations and volunteer hours as well as specific and detailed guidelines for the expectations for student teachers during the practicum placement. The program provides a detailed student teaching/internship handbook.

- Program completers and candidates reported that the clinical experiences are a key part of the program. During clinical experiences, candidates apply what they learn in their courses while meeting the needs of PK-12 students and receive support and feedback from clinical educators.

- The current design is not sufficient to meet the needs of all candidates, particularly those candidates who are not certified teachers or who have limited experience in schools. Additionally, the program waives some clinical experiences for candidates currently serving as emergency-certified librarians, thus reducing program coherence and design and reducing opportunities for candidates to gain clinical experience at both the elementary and secondary levels.

- The program design does not ensure that candidates experience a diversity of placements. Despite the requirement to conduct observations in an urban setting, several candidates' experiences do not reflect this requirement. Additionally, the requirement to conduct a two-hour observation in an urban setting is not a sufficient or a meaningful learning opportunity to ensure that candidates experience clinical preparation in a variety of settings.

Recommendations:

- Provide additional pre-practicum hours that require substantial, specified, and assessed learning tasks beyond the current requirement for 60 hours of volunteer time. These hours should begin early in the program and increase in complexity and scope as candidates progress in the program and should align to critical learning tasks and program assessments.

- Revise clinical experience requirements to ensure that all candidates experience substantial clinical preparation in a variety of settings, including diverse settings, and at both the elementary and secondary level, to practice and develop their abilities to meet the needs of all students, including students and families in diverse communities.

- Develop established policies and practices that address how candidates on emergency teaching certificates experience clinical preparation, including alternate placements and learning activities that will address scheduling constraints and the expectations for clinical preparation that is of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, and coherence.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Approaching Expectations
The program has not fully structured clinical experiences in a way that enables candidates to demonstrate increasingly positive impact on students' learning.	

- The program introduces candidates to the importance of having an impact on student learning in LSC 520: School Library Media Services as well as through course instruction that focuses on teaching for learning (AASL Standard 1) and the RIPTS, particularly those standards that focus on effective teaching to improve student learning. However, as noted above, the focus on teaching for learning embedded in the RIPTS and AASL standards are not a program curriculum strength.

- Candidates first have the opportunity to be in clinical placements in the last year of the program in LSC 520: School Library Media Services, and the extent of the focus on impact on student learning in these settings is through observations and reflections on the efficacy of practitioners, rather than actually learning and practicing to have an impact.

- Candidates do not have an opportunity to demonstrate actual impact on student learning until their student teaching placement in the last semester of the program. The program reported that it monitors candidate impact on student learning during the practicum experience through

a six-week program outline that candidates develop as an overview of their teaching, specific tasks that candidates complete during student teaching (such as developing and reflecting on lesson plans), and evaluations by clinical educators and program faculty.

- Candidate work and interviews with candidates demonstrated a range in candidate understanding of and ability to impact student learning. Whereas some candidates used a variety of instruction and assessment strategies based on the needs of their students, others did not use assessment data nor monitor impact on learning to demonstrate impact.

Recommendations:

- Collaborate with clinical partners to determine and design appropriate measures of candidate impact on student learning. Establish clear expectations for the collection and analysis of data throughout the program and articulate expected levels and evidence of impact on student learning. Provide explicit instruction in how candidates are to use measures of impact on student learning to inform their continuous growth as school librarians.

- Clearly communicate the 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 at both practicum placements.

- Integrate explicit instruction, feedback, and assessment in how to demonstrate an impact on student learning throughout the program curriculum so that all candidates are well prepared to meet these expectations during clinical placements.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Meets Expectations
The program has established strong clinical partnerships and placements that are mutually beneficial to the program, program candidates, and its partners.	

- The program identifies as its clinical partners the clinical educators and practicing school librarians who host candidates during pre-practicum and practicum placements as well as the School Librarian Association of RI, of which the program coordinator is a member of the board.

- The program reported that the clinical educators and practicing school librarians are valuable contributors to the program who provide clinical placements for candidates as well as effective supervision and support. Clinical educators reported that they value the connection to the program and benefit from the opportunity to learn from and with program candidates.

- The program provided a list of more than 50 placements and clinical educators that have hosted or are prepared to host program candidates since 2014. These placements are both in Rhode Island and nearby states due to the regional nature of the program.

- The program also reported that the School Librarian Association of Rhode Island is a valued partner. The association not only provides a means to stay informed about issues pertaining to Rhode Island schools and school librarians but also serves as an effective means to communicate and share updates about the program, its candidates, and to seek input on program design and revisions.

- A current partnership activity that the program is providing to school librarians across the state is a grant-funded Media Smarts Library program that serves to increase the capacity of school librarians in Rhode Island in the areas of digital and media literacy.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Meets Expectations
The program has clear criteria for clinical educators and ensures that candidates receive support from clinical educators who meet these expectations.	

- The program uses criteria from the School of Education for the recruitment, selection, and retention of clinical educators. These criteria, which were revised in spring 2017, include having at least three years professional experience in the certification area, earning educator evaluation ratings of highly effective, being able to work effectively with adult learners, and being able to provide "solicited and spontaneous, in-depth observation and feedback to the candidate (both written and verbal) on a regular basis using program and partner assessments." These criteria are consistent with RIDE's expectations for clinical educators.

- The program reported that it uses a variety of means to recruit potential clinical educators, including general outreach efforts, interaction with the School Librarian Association of Rhode Island, and through grant-funded activities. As stated above, the program identifies more than 50 current and recent clinical educators who have hosted candidates or are interested to do so.

- The program monitors the quality of clinical educators using an annual evaluation process conducted by the program coordinator. The evaluation criteria are based on School of Education expectations as well as the RIPTS and AASL standards.

- The program does not rely on the School of Education training process for clinical educators. It conducts an annual training for clinical educators as well as refresher trainings on an intermittent basis. In addition to the training, the program has developed a detailed handbook for the student teaching placement that includes the roles and responsibilities of clinical educators. Both the training and the handbook provide guidance on assessment instruments that clinical educators must use, including the observation tool that aligns to the RIPTS and AASL standards. Clinical educators conduct observations and evaluations 3 times during the student teaching placement.

- In addition to training and the handbook, the program conducts ongoing and regular outreach to all clinical educators to make sure they meet expectations and are prepared for their roles. Clinical educators reported that they value the connection to the program, the training they receive to support candidates, and the growth they experience as clinical educators.

- The program should continue to work with clinical educators to ensure that all clinical educators receive face-to-face training. Revised trainings should have an additional focus on the systematic analysis and use of data for impact on student learning as detailed in this report.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Meets Expectations
The program assessment system aligns to the professional standards, is clear to candidates, and determines candidate progress in the program.	

- The program clearly communicates the assessment system to candidates prior to admissions and throughout the program through the program website, practicum guidelines, program courses, and through regular and ongoing communication with program and clinical faculty.

- The program admission process aligns to the URI graduate school process and includes letters of recommendation, a personal statement, an interview, and specified requirements including a minimum undergraduate 3.0 GPA and a commitment to meet the RIPTS and AASL standards as future school librarians.

- In order to advance to student teaching, candidates must complete required coursework with a minimum GPA of 3.0 and a B or higher in LSC 520: School Library Media Services, complete a pre-practicum field experience of 60 hours, complete six observations at specified grade levels, complete two assessment tasks that show progress towards the RIPTS and AASL standards, and earn a passing score on the Praxis content test for school librarians.

- The assessment system prioritizes candidate performance as prospective school librarians to progress through the preparation program and is aligned to the expectations of the RIPTS and AASL standards. Candidates receive consistent and effective feedback, both formal written feedback and informal counseling and guidance, that is based on their progress in the program, the expectations of the RIPTS and AASL standards, and that supports candidates growth.

- The program uses rubrics for the major program and course assessments, some of which have clearly defined performance levels and alignment to the RIPTS and the AASL standards. The program should continue its work to revise all program rubrics to ensure that all align to the RIPTS and the AASL standards and include clearly defined levels of performance.

- As the program addresses recommendations from PREP-RI 2.2, impact on student learning, the program should clearly articulate the expected impact on student learning that candidates should demonstrate prior to and during the practicum experiences to ensure that candidates understand, are assessed, and meet these expectations to progress through the program.

3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Approaching Expectations
The recommendation for certification assessment decision point does not ensure that only candidates who demonstrate proficiency in the full range of RIPTS and AASL standards progress to certification.	

- The program has clear criteria for the recommendation for certification assessment decision point. These criteria include a minimum overall GPA of 3.0 and a B or higher in the practicum course, a Rhode Island state initiatives self-assessment, successful completion of student teaching, a professional portfolio, passing the Praxis Teaching and Learning test, and passing a comprehensive examination.

- The professional portfolio serves as a catalogue of evidence that candidates compile as they progress through the program. To complete the portfolio, candidates select one or more artifacts that demonstrate their actions to meet the expectations of the RIPTS and AASL standards and include a justification for their assertions. The program provided two versions of rubrics for the portfolio: a version in the practicum guidelines contains a numbered scale (0-3) and an on-line version contains detailed quality levels on a 5-point scale aligned to the RIPTS and AASL standards.

- To successfully complete student teaching, candidates must meet expectations on several observations conducted by clinical educators and the clinical supervisor. Clinical educators observe and evaluate candidates six times (thrice at each placement), and the clinical supervisor observes and evaluates candidates twice (once at each placement). As with the portfolio rubric, the practicum guidelines contain a version of an observation rubric that contains no performance descriptors and an online version includes detailed performance descriptors aligned to the RIPTS and AASL standards.

- The program provided evidence that it trains clinical educators in the assessment system, including how to observe, evaluate, and provide feedback on candidate performance. The program also reported that the clinical supervisor consults with clinical educators to understand and resolve any discrepancies that occur. Clinical educators reported that they understand the assessment system, including the on-line system, and are able to work effectively within the system.

- Although the program assessment system is explicit and contains multiple criteria, program completers and candidates near the end of the program reported and demonstrated inconsistent knowledge, understanding, and performance in several areas of the RIPTS and AASL standards as discussed in this report despite successfully progressing through the assessment system. Clinical educators echoed these concerns and reported that while candidates typically have strong librarianship skills, some struggle with the teaching and learning skills and capacities expected of school librarians on day 1.

Recommendations:

- Review the criteria for recommendation for certification, including the purpose, validity, and reliability of each assessment. Examine if the current criteria are the most appropriate and effective in accurately assessing candidate performance in relations to the RIPTS and AASL standards. The criteria for recommendation should focus on actual candidate performance in PK-12 schools rather than candidate knowledge and reflection.

- Consider if additional performance assessments, beyond the current observation and evaluation instruments, are necessary to ensure that only candidates who meet the expectations of the RIPTS and AASL standards receive recommendation for certification. Explore if earlier in program performance assessments are necessary to prepare candidates to meet the full expectations of these standards during the program and in their clinical preparation.

- Work with clinical partners and other stakeholders to explore how collectively the program curriculum, clinical preparation, and assessment system can ensure that all candidates who receive recommendation for certification, regardless of previous experience in schools, are fully prepared to meet the teaching and learning expectations of the RIPTS and AASL standards.

- Complete the work to revise all program rubrics with clear performance level descriptors and alignment to the RIPTS and AASL standards. Provide additional training and calibration activities for all clinical and program faculty to ensure that they assess candidate performance consistently using the rubrics.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program conducts employer surveys intermittently and the surveys have not generated sufficient or actionable information for program improvement.	

- Prior to the 2016-2017 academic year, the program, through the School of Education, intermittently surveyed employers of program graduates. As reported by the program, these surveys were not fully effective and generated low response rates that did not provide valid information for program improvement. Surveys conducted between 2010 and 2016 for the library media program generated three responses.

- The program reported that, during the 2016-2017 academic year, the School of Education re-surveyed employers through a revised survey and more targeted format. The more recent survey generated similarly limited results – four respondents. The program did not provide the total n-size necessary to determine the percentage of respondents to either set of surveys.

- The program asserted that the low response rates was due in part to the limited time candidates spend in student teaching – six weeks at an elementary and six weeks at a secondary site. However, the program sent surveys to employers of candidates, not to principals of schools that hosted student teachers.

- Based on the limited number of responses, it is not possible to accurately gauge employer satisfaction nor use this information for program improvement. However, the program should reflect on its response to one of two open-ended comments that an employer wrote. The employer recommended additional training in classroom management for program candidates as the librarian teaches classes in all grades "including special needs self-contained classes." In its response to this comment, which the program provided in an evidence organizer, the program assumed that students in self-contained classes were students with severe and profound disabilities and countered that if "schools were going to give new school librarians severe and profound special education students ….the school should provide training for the educator" rather than recognizing the program's responsibility to prepare all candidates to meet the needs of all students on day 1. The program did state in its response that it made minor changes to two classes to address students on the autism spectrum, but it is not clear that this response is most appropriate or relevant.

- For the 2015-16 school year, the aggregate performance of University of Rhode Island program completers working in Rhode Island schools was comparable to the aggregate performance distribution for all recent completers in Rhode Island schools. However, RIDE reports this data at the *provider* level instead of the *program* level. Therefore, few conclusions about the effectiveness of completers from the Library Media Specialist program can be made.

Recommendations:

- Since the expectations for this component have increased at the program level, and since the small size of the program produces few graduates, the program should explore and implement additional strategies and more effective surveying to solicit annual feedback from program employers to support program improvement.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program conducts program completer surveys intermittently and the surveys have not generated sufficient or actionable information for program improvement.	

- Prior to the 2016-2017 academic year and similar to the employer survey, the School of Education, on behalf of the school library media program, surveyed program completers of all advanced and graduate programs. The program reported that that it sent surveys annually as well as a follow up survey two years after program completion. The program did not provide evidence of responses or response rates to these surveys for the school library media program.

- During the 2016-2017 academic year, the School of Education revised the completer survey on behalf of the school library media program and sent the survey to all program completers for 2016. Six of 12 program completers responded.

- The responses to the revised survey show that program completers are generally happy with the program and their preparation, while some reported being less than well-prepared for their roles as well as concerns about the quality of some of the clinical placements.

Recommendations:

- Similar to the recommendation for 4.1, the program should recognize the increased expectations at the program level to collect information from program completers annually. The program should work with the School of Education to identify effective means to collect information annually from program completers to support program improvement efforts.

Middle Grades Education Program

The Middle Grades program is an extension program available to accepted elementary or secondary education students in the School of Education. Candidates enrolled in elementary or secondary programs may enroll in the middle grades program with program permission.

The middle grades program of study significantly overlaps with the secondary program. As a result, secondary program candidates need to take only one additional course—EDC 400: Middle School Curriculum, Assessment and Methods—to complete the middle grades program of study. Elementary education candidates must take four additional courses.

The program design consists of five required experiences, including an adolescent classroom management course, a clinical experience in secondary education, a course in middle school curriculum assessment and methods, and then student teaching and a student teaching seminar.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Meets Expectations
The program aligns to the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS). Candidates experience a consistent curriculum and have sufficient opportunities to develop proficiency in the RIPTS.	

- Most syllabi show alignment between RIPTS standards and course work and outcomes.

- Candidates feel very prepared to meet professional standards. In particular, reviewers noted that candidate received strong preparation in developing instructional opportunities that reflect an understanding of how children learn and develop (Standard 3) and creating a supportive learning environment (Standard 6).

- Although candidates have opportunities to develop proficiency in the RIPTS, reviewers noted that candidates would benefit from additional opportunities focused on higher order thinking skills (Standard 5), assessment strategies (Standard 9), and interacting with parents (Standard 11).

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Meets Expectations
The program curriculum aligns to the Association for Middle Level Education (AMLE) standards. Candidates have multiple opportunities to develop proficiency in the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the expectations of the standards.	

- In evidence organizers, program leadership reported that coursework aligns to the Association for Middle Level Education standards. The program provided an analysis of the program courses showing that the program addresses all standards. During EDC 400: Middle School Curriculum, Assessment and Methods, candidates complete a middle level competencies journal in EDC 400 aligned to the AMLE standards. During student teaching, the clinical supervisor, with feedback from the clinical educator, evaluates candidate proficiency in middle level competencies using a rubric aligned to the AMLE standards.

- Syllabi review and candidate interviews revealed that candidates received a strong base in their elementary or secondary programs that included a focus on how to meet the needs of middle grades students. EDC 415: Adolescents and Classroom Management, which is a required middle

grades course, focuses on student-centered instruction and classroom management practices that candidates can apply in a middle school setting.

- The program requires middle school candidates to have a college major, minor, or concentration of 21 semester hours in a content area. This requirement helps ensure that all candidates have sufficient content knowledge to teach in the middle grades.

- The program highlighted as a strength that both "EDC 400 instructors are fulltime middle school educators who situate their courses within the middle school setting." The EDC 400 course syllabus includes a focus on the AMLE standards as well as readings and activities that focus on characteristics and competencies of middle level teachers with a focus on teaming at the middle school level. Candidates reported feeling strongly prepared to teach in middle grades classrooms.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations
The program's curriculum and learning opportunities provide candidates sufficient opportunities to develop a deep understanding of student learning standards.	

- In interviews, candidates demonstrated familiarity with appropriate student standards (i.e. Common Core State Standards, Next Generation Science Standards, and the Rhode Island Grade Span Expectations) and could articulate major shifts in the standards by grade band level.

- In EDC 400: Middle School Curriculum, candidates complete a Team Curriculum Unit. This assignment requires candidates to work as a team to plan a series of lessons aligned to middle grades content standards. When writing the unit, teams must review multiple sets of content standards and identify the specific content standards that will frame the interdisciplinary unit, determine a culminating activity, and develop lesson plans.

- Although the program generally meets the expectations for Component 1.3, the program should evaluate the current curriculum to ensure that candidates have sufficient opportunity to develop proficiency in implementing standards-based lesson and using those skills to assess student progress toward proficiency in Rhode Island student standards.

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

- The program reported that the candidates had multiple opportunities to develop proficiency in data-driven instruction, both in their elementary or secondary courses of study and in their middle grades courses. Elementary candidates take EDC 452: Evaluation of Elementary and Middle School Students and secondary candidates take EDC 371: Educational Measurements; both courses are the primary courses where candidates learn about data-driven instruction. One course period within EDC 400: Middle School Curriculum focuses on assessment and evaluation.

- Candidates develop a general understanding of assessment, but the program does not include a clear, intentional focus on the use of data to inform instruction. Candidates acknowledge that all instruction should have one or more formal or informal assessments. However, it was not evident that candidates learn to design instruction by first collecting data on student learning, using data from student learning to modify practice, and using data to from multiple sources to inform their instruction.

- Candidates access and reflect upon data from InfoWorks in EDC 102: Introduction to American Education, which candidates take as part of their elementary or secondary program coursework. Other than this assignment, reviewers found limited evidence of candidates learning and practicing how to use data from sources other than assessments to improve student learning and instructional practice.

Recommendations:

- Review and revise course syllabi and candidate experiences to integrate additional opportunities to learn about and practice using assessment to inform instruction.

- Consult with clinical partners and other stakeholders to identify important middle-school-specific and content-specific assessments that candidates should be familiar with prior to program completion. Ensure candidates have opportunities to not only collect data using these assessments but also practice using data to track student progress and inform future teaching.

1.5 Technology	Approaching Expectations
The program expects candidates to use technology both as teachers and as students. However, candidates have limited opportunities to develop proficiency in designing, implementing, and assessing digital age learning experiences and assessments to support student learning.	

- The program reported that it expects candidates to use technology in lesson planning, unit planning, and classroom observations during student teaching. Other required assessments focus on candidate use of technology for personal purposes, such as creating a digital professional knowledge base.

- The program reported in an evidence organizer that it assesses candidate knowledge of the ISTE standards using a quiz on Taskstream; however, the minimum expected performance level and the quiz's relationship to the assessment system were unclear to reviewers.

- Candidate work samples and lesson plans revealed that candidate utilization of technology tends to focus on engaging students and keeping their interest. Reviewers saw only a few examples where candidates used media in class to meet specific student needs. Overall, reviewers did not observe in site visits, lesson plans, or candidate work the strategic use of technology to improve instruction or close instructional gaps.

Recommendations:

- Engage clinical partners to determine current best practices for incorporating current technology in the classroom. With these partners, identify current instructional technologies and resources for implementing, assessing, and supporting student learning.

- Review and revise course syllabi and candidate experiences to ensure candidates receive assessment results and feedback on their implementation of digital age experiences and assessments.

- Ensure program and clinical faculty members are proficient in using, designing, and implementing digital age learning experiences. Embed opportunities within courses for candidates to learn about and practice designing digital age learning experiences.

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum provides candidates limited opportunities to develop proficiency in the areas of equity, diversity, and working with families in diverse communities. Candidates develop basic skills for working with a diverse range of learners.	

- When asked to provide a chart identifying which courses address Component 1.6 of the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation, the program did not identify any opportunities for candidates to learn about English learners or families. The program reported that middle grades candidates have opportunities to develop proficiency in equity through unit planning and lesson planning assignments during the middle school curriculum course and during student teaching.

- Generally, the middle school program relies on the elementary and secondary programs to ensure development of knowledge and skills needed to work with English learners and students with disabilities. Reviewers noted that EDC 400: Middle School Curriculum includes some focus on Response to Intervention as well as one class focused on learning styles and diversity that includes instruction on differentiation, but the focus is very limited.

- Candidates reflect on their own biases through reflections across their coursework, but do so particularly in EDC 415: Adolescents and Classroom Management. In that class, candidates learn about an extensive breadth of diversity considerations (gender, socio-economic, race, disability, language proficiency). The readings identified in the syllabus are modern, varied, and encourage candidates to consider student difference from a place of strength. That said, the course emphasizes empathy, non-judgment, and care without focusing on practicing measures around engaging and supporting a variety of student learners.

- The program does not provide candidates with opportunities to learn about or develop proficiency in working with families.

Recommendations:

- Collaborate with the elementary and secondary programs to identify potential gaps in curriculum and opportunities for candidates to develop proficiency in issues of equity.

- Review and revise course syllabi and expectations to ensure that candidates receive instruction and engagement in culturally responsive teaching early in the candidate experience and extend the learning intentionally throughout the entire candidate experience.

- Review and revise course syllabi and expectations for candidates to incorporate high quality, authentic opportunities for candidates to develop proficiency in working with students with disabilities, English learners, and working with families. Teach candidates strategies for working with families in diverse communities.

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.	

- The program reported that candidates learn about important Rhode Island educational initiatives in multiple classes and field experiences. In interviews, candidates could articulate several ways that they implement Rhode Island initiatives in their clinical work. However, candidates also noted that they wish they knew more about the Rhode Island educator evaluation system.

- The program assesses candidate proficiency in Rhode Island educational initiatives through a fifteen-question multiple-choice quiz on Taskstream. This quiz does not assess candidate understanding of initiatives or candidate proficiency in the knowledge, skills, and practices embedded in key Rhode Island initiatives.

Recommendations:

- Work with clinical partners and other stakeholders to identify which initiatives are most important for middle grades candidates to learn about during their program of study. These initiatives should not just be RIDE-led initiatives but also the key initiatives occurring in schools, districts, and statewide. Identify the knowledge, skills, and practices embedded in those key initiatives, and then revise coursework and clinical experiences appropriately.

- Ensure that all candidates understand the process, components, and rubric language embedded within educator evaluation systems used in the state. Consider adopting or adapting performance assessments that are already widely used in Rhode Island and other states.

- Review the course sequence to see where and how the program introduces initiatives to ensure candidate understanding and ability to demonstrate proficiency appropriately builds over time. Assess candidate proficiency in Rhode Island educational initiatives in ways that are more authentic and in-depth than a multiple-choice quiz.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Approaching Expectations
Candidate preparation includes multiple experiences that build over time including the opportunity to student teach in a middle grades setting, but not all candidates experience a range of educational environments or assume the full range of intensity of responsibilities of the position for which they will be certified.	

- As part of EDC 331: Clinical Experiences for Secondary Education, candidates must interview their clinical educator, write three reflective journal entries, and complete a personal

assessment knowledge base. The practicum teacher also completes an evaluation of the candidate.

- All middle grades candidates complete a practicum and a student teaching experience in the middle grades. Candidates noted that they have multiple opportunities to work with middle grades students and that they felt prepared to work in middle grades settings. Candidates' clinical preparation exceeds the minimum number of practicum hours needed for middle grades certification, but the program must revise the current structure to comply fully with RIDE requirements.

- The current structure for student teaching in the middle grades differs based on whether a candidate is pursuing the elementary or secondary extension. Elementary candidates complete their middle school student teaching experience as a six-week extension to their twelve-week elementary student teaching assignment. Secondary candidates split their 14-week student teaching into a seven-week middle grades placement and a seven-week secondary grades placement. This current practice prevents candidates from meeting secondary grades certification requirements, which specify a continuous 12-week student teaching assignment.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Approaching Expectations
The program has not fully structured clinical experiences in a way that ensures candidates demonstrate increasingly positive impact on students' learning.	

- The program has begun to measure candidate impact on student learning. The program has identified one primary measure and identified a few other opportunities, but it was unclear the extent to which these other opportunities focus on candidate impact on student learning. The program does not include impact measures from early clinical experiences as well as later clinical experiences.

- The primary measure of impact on student learning is the Informal and Formal Assessment of Learning task, which the program reports "*may* be completed in the middle schools setting" [emphasis added]. This assessment requires candidates to prepare and administer informal and formal assessments to students, mark and submit student work, write rationales for selection of criteria within assessments, and provide commentary on candidate work. The assessment also requires candidates to aggregate and disaggregate data as well as focus on what the student teacher learned about three or four representative students. However, since not all students complete this in their middle grades placement, not all candidates measure or demonstrate impact on students' learning.

- The program submitted additional assignments as "examples of guidance and tools that programs provide to candidates to encourage them to assess impact on student learning": the reflective journaling assessment from practicum, the middle level interdisciplinary unit assessment, the middle level reflective journaling assessment, and the ELL interview assignment. These assignments minimally connect to student assessment and focus on candidate reflection rather than analysis of middle grades student outcomes.

- The Mid-Term and Final Evaluation on candidates' use of assessment to guide instruction and report progress. Performance-level descriptors for Components 5.4 and 5.5 focus on candidate ability to use "a wide range of assessments to guide planning and make adjustments to

teaching" as well as providing "comprehensive information about students' progress and improvement plans to students, families, and support personnel." In addition, the Middle level Competencies assess candidate use of assessment strategies and data to inform instruction.

- During site visits, review team members observed clinical supervisors giving feedback to candidates, but the feedback did not tie the observation back to student standards or student learning.

Recommendations:

- Collaborate with clinical partners to identify or design appropriate measures of candidate impact on student learning that focuses on the middle grades. Establish clear expectations for the collection and analysis of data throughout the program and articulate expected levels and evidence of impact on student learning. Provide explicit instruction in how candidates are to use measures of impact on student learning to inform their continuous growth.

- Clearly communicate the 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 throughout their clinical placements.

- Integrate explicit instruction, feedback, and assessment in how to demonstrate an impact on student learning throughout the program curriculum so that all candidates are well prepared to meet these expectations during clinical placements.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has begun efforts to improve the quality of program-district partnerships. Programs and clinical partners use common assessment tools to evaluate candidate performance, but current efforts are insufficient in ensuring rater calibration and PK-12 clinical educator input into decisions about candidate progression.	

- The Office of Teacher Education (The Office of Teacher Education) primarily leads the outreach and organization of student teaching placements. The Office of Teacher Education has begun efforts to develop stronger and more clearly articulated partnerships between the program and K-12 districts. For example, a new partnership agreement with Chariho, Exeter-West Greenwich, and South Kingstown documents efforts to systematize student teaching placements and increase URI-district collaboration. In an interview with clinical partners, some acknowledged that URI is open to true collaboration. Partners also noted that the program has been responsive to individual district requests.

- For clinical experiences prior to student teaching, the clinical educator completes a practicum evaluation. The program reported that the practicum clinical educator must recommend the candidate for student teaching. However, it is unclear from syllabi and evaluation what the expected level of performance is and how the practicum evaluation informs the course grade. The practicum evaluation does not include differentiated performance level descriptors.

- The program and clinical educators use common observation and evaluation tools to evaluate and provide feedback during the middle grades student teaching placement. The clinical educator and clinical supervisor complete separately either the mid-term or final evaluation

before discussing it with the candidate. At a minimum, the clinical educator and the clinical supervisor must each complete a classroom observation. These are key assessments used to inform candidate progression to student teaching and certification, thus providing clinical educators some input into the decision making process regarding the progression of candidates to certification.

- Programs and clinical partners do not have common expectations for candidate performance or for the level of detail and quality of feedback given to candidates. Candidates shared in an interview that they received superficial feedback from their clinical supervisors. Similarly, clinical partners noted that the feedback from the clinical supervisor does not align to the expectations of Rhode Island teachers as captured in the Rhode Island Model Teacher Evaluation System. A review of written feedback given to candidates also revealed variation in quality; some forms included evidence justifying the rating, while other forms did not include any written feedback for some criteria. Generally, reviewers saw little written constructive feedback in observation and evaluation forms uploaded to Taskstream.

Recommendations:

- Build upon recent efforts to engage with district partners and identify agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness. Determine how programs and clinical partners will track and analyze data from agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness.

- Clarify expectations for candidate performance and calibrate expectations regularly. Communicate expectations for oral and written feedback and develop mechanisms to ensure that the quality is consistent across clinical supervisors and clinical educators. Consider adopting or adapting performance assessment tools used in districts.

- Identify additional opportunities for clinical educators to have input into decisions about candidate progression within the program.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Approaching Expectations
The program has begun revising both the criteria for the recruitment of clinical educators and the processes to select clinical educators. Current practices, especially those related to training clinical educators, do not ensure that all candidates receive a high quality clinical experience.	

- The program uses the School of Education's criteria for selecting clinical educators. These criteria, which were revised in spring 2017, include having at least three years professional experience in the certification area, earning educator evaluation ratings of highly effective, being able to work effectively with adult learners, and being able to provide "solicited and spontaneous, in-depth observation and feedback to the candidate (both written and verbal) on a regular basis using program and partner assessments." These criteria are consistent with RIDE's expectations for clinical educators.

- The Office of Teacher Education and program faculty work with partner districts to secure practicum and student teaching placements. URI leadership noted that recruitment and placement efforts vary by district. Traditionally, URI has used faculty networking, professional associations, workshops and professional development to identify potential clinical educators and then reached out to the districts requesting that a specific educator serve as a clinical

educator. When working with some districts, URI sends a request for a clinical educator and then the superintendents and principals determine or recommend who would be the strongest clinical educator.

- Clinical partners acknowledged URI's recent efforts to improve the recruitment and selection of clinical educators but noted a desire to establish a more standardized process besides common criteria. One partner noted the need to better incentivize RI's best teachers to become clinical educators, and another noted that stronger communication about the student teacher's strengths and needs would help ensure a stronger match between the clinical educator and student teacher.

- In an evidence organizer, the program reported that all clinical educators must attend a training or receive a one-on-one training from a clinical supervisor each fall, but other evidence conflicted with this statement. The submitted clinical educator data file showed that only the clinical educators of student teachers completed a training; none of the clinical educators for practicum courses completed a training. Clinical supervisors reported that training is not required and that many of them had not attended a training in several years.

- The sample cooperating training agenda provided by URI includes a welcome and overview, an orientation to Taskstream, informational breakout groups discussing required forms and expectations, an evaluation of sample video lessons using an observation form, and a mentoring workshop. 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.

Recommendations:

- 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 clinical supervisors. During training and subsequent calibration sessions, communicate clear expectations for feedback (when, how, what detail) and ensure that clinical educators, school and district leaders, and clinical supervisors have shared expectations for candidate performance.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has an assessment system in place that is clear to candidates and stakeholders. However, the current implementation and monitoring of the assessment system does not ensure that only candidates meeting expectations progress through the assessment system.	

- The program assessment system has three major decision points: readiness for admission, readiness for student teaching/internship, and readiness for recommendation for certification. The program uses multiple systems, including Taskstream and Filemaker, to track candidate information and performance over time. As demonstrated through interviews, candidates,

faculty, and clinical educators were aware of key assessments and noted that they had access to Taskstream.

- During the admissions process, the program evaluates candidates' GPA, basic skills proficiency, admissions portfolio application, and admissions interview. Candidates must meet overall GPA Requirements (2.75 or higher for undergraduate candidates and 3.0 for graduate candidates), and undergraduate candidates meet minimum expectations on a required test (Praxis CORE, SAT, or ACT). At the point of admission, the program also assess candidates' interpersonal and communication skills, work experience and community service with children/adolescents, and multicultural/diversity awareness.

- The program reports that, prior to student teaching, candidates must successfully pass the Praxis II PLT and content tests, complete the unit plan assignment in EDC 430, and be evaluated as ready for student teaching by his or her clinical educator in the practicum evaluation. In addition to these critical assignments, candidates and faculty can access additional assessments in Taskstream. Candidates who do not meet performance expectations on the Praxis tests or unit plan assignments must retake the assessment(s) until achieving a passing score. If a candidate does not receive a recommendation from the clinical educator to progress to student teaching, "a conference with the clinical educator is held to determine specific steps to ensure the candidate is ready for student teaching."

- The review team noted that the middle grades unit planning assignment is a strength of the middle grades program because it provides candidates an authentic teaming experience requiring co-planning and creating shared instructional practices.

- Candidate assessment begins early in the program and includes written and oral formative feedback, although the quality of feedback varies. Expectations of candidates build over time.

- Program faculty members assess candidate assignments in Taskstream using rubrics, but the design and implementation of the rubrics reduces the rigor of the assessment system. Performance level descriptors in some rubrics did not address the skills, knowledge, and/or dispositions noted by the standard or indicator. In some places, there was not a clear developmental sequence from level to level. While reviewing candidate work samples, reviewers noted that often the rubric rating did not match the actual performance of the candidate. Reviewers saw significant variations in terms of quality of candidate work samples, but all candidates still received passing grades.

- Reviewers noted that some rubrics do not assess depth of capacity and in some cases do not even assess candidate ability or capacity; reviewers observed that rubrics often emphasized completion of an assignment without any consideration of candidate learning or ability. Rubrics also sometimes lacked differentiation in performance levels. The assessment system emphasizes completion of reflective journals during early clinical experiences rather than candidate performance.

Recommendations:

- Collaborate with clinical partners to identify ways to assess and provide feedback on candidate performance with PK-12 students in early clinical experiences.

- Review and, where appropriate, revise course assessment rubrics to ensure that each indicator of the rubric has clearly differentiated levels of performance align to the indicator. Avoid addressing multiple areas within the same indicator.

- Adopt or adapt performance assessments that are already widely used in Rhode Island and other states. Seek feedback on the selected tool and work with clinical partners to clarify expectations and performance. Hold trainings and calibration sessions to ensure program faculty, clinical educators, and clinical supervisors have a common understanding of performance expectations and can use tools with fidelity. Share examples of practice with candidates to help them understand what expected performance looks like for each indicator of rubrics.

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

- The program is very transparent about assessment purposes, processes, and outcomes. Candidates, clinical educators, and program faculty are aware of expectations for recommendation to certification.

- As articulated in the student teaching handbook, the program assesses candidate performance during student teaching based on their instructional unit, Informal and Formal Assessment of Learning task, four observations of teaching, midterm evaluation and final evaluation of the student teacher by the clinical supervisor and the clinical educator. During EDC 485: Seminar in Student Teaching, candidates must also complete a Professional Development Plan and a RI Initiatives Quiz.

- Clinical educators and clinical supervisors are both responsible for evaluating the performance of candidates. The program requires that all candidates be observed at least four times—twice by the clinical supervisor and twice by the clinical educators. The program does not expect the reviewers to observe each standard in each observation, but "each standard must be addressed by each observer at least once."

- When reviewing evidence in Taskstream, the review team noted multiple incomplete or late completion of observations. In some cases, the clinical educator posted the first observation late in the semester.

- According to the assessment system overview, candidates must perform at the "meets standard" level on all observations and on the final evaluation during student teaching. However, program leadership does not monitor candidate performance at the indicator level. Instead, the Outcomes Assessment and Accreditation Specialist monitors overall performance on key assessments and flags for the program when performance falls below an overall cut score.

- The program reported that it conducts "checks on inter-rater reliability for critical performance tasks, review of rubrics, training sessions for adjunct faculty and clinical educators using the

evaluation instruments, and identification of areas with consistently weaker performance." However, both candidates and clinical partners noted discrepancies between clinical supervisor and clinical educator ratings and feedback. Additional efforts are needed.

Recommendations:

- Review candidate assessment measures in conjunction with the RIPTS and professional association standards to ensure that measures accurately assess candidate proficiency in all of the knowledge, skills, dispositions, content, and content pedagogy needed to be a successful educator.

- Adopt or adapt observation tools that the field is already using or revise current tools to better align with what the field uses to ensure all indicators are observable in every observation. Provide training, facilitate calibration opportunities, and monitor assessment implementation to ensure that assessment results are fair, accurate, and consistent across candidates. Clarify expectations for feedback to ensure that candidates receive observation results and feedback in a timely manner.

- Revise monitoring processes to include monitoring of candidate performance at the indicator level to ensure that the program recommends only candidates who fully meet expectations for certification.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Meets Expectations
The provider surveys employers annually and has made efforts to increase survey responses.	

- The School of Education surveys employers annually and then disaggregates data by program. The survey is constructed to yield actionable information. Response rates to the survey have historically been low—between 10 percent and 15 percent. In response to principal feedback, provider leadership revised the employer survey in Fall 2016 to make it mobile and handheld friendly, administered the survey by program, sent reminders, and provided principals with a chart including a list of program completers and where they are currently teaching. When implementing these changes, survey responses increased from nine to 21 of 200. URI should monitor the success of its recent survey changes and continue to improve survey response rates. URI should also consider including more questions that are open-ended to allow for more specific, substantive feedback for program improvement.

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

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The provider surveys program completers annually but does not have strategies in place to track post-completion employment for completers working outside of Rhode Island public schools.	

- The School of Education collects information from program completers via an exit survey administered to all candidates at the end of student teaching and via a survey it sends to completers two years after they complete their program. The surveys are constructed to yield actionable information.

- Prior to 2012, exit survey response rates were around 50-60 percent. The School of Education has since moved the survey from SurveyMonkey to Taskstream and made it a seminar requirement. As a result, response rates are now approximately 95 percent.

- The two-year-out survey originally contained 44 questions. URI recently streamlined the survey to include 27 questions. At the time of the visit, URI had sent out the latest edition of the survey a month prior with the intention of sending out reminders every three months through the summer of 2017. The program reported, "Response rates are optimistically high at this point in the data collection."

- At the time of the visit, the program did not have in place strategies and systems to track post completion employment for candidates who pursue employment in states other than Rhode Island.

Recommendations:

- Encourage program completers to continue a line of communication with the program/provider with respect to employment status and measures of employment success.

Secondary Grades Education Program

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

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Meets Expectations
The program aligns to the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS). Candidates experience a consistent curriculum and have sufficient opportunities to develop proficiency in the RIPTS.	

- Candidates experience a consistent curriculum. All candidates take a sequence of thirteen courses, including two foundations courses, five methods courses, a seminar, and five field experiences. Candidates can also opt to take EDC 400: Middle School Curriculum, Assessment, and Methods. Two required courses—EDC 430: Methods and Materials in Secondary Teaching and Practicum Experience and EDC 484/485: Practicum and Seminar in Student Teaching—have content-specific sections of the course.

- Students in the MA/TCP program take many of the same classes as undergraduates, but they take different introductory and psychology of learning courses and nine credits of content courses. Students completing the Master's Degree must also take two additional courses (EDC

529: Foundations of Educational Research and EDC 574: Current Trends in Secondary Education) and a comprehensive exam.

- Most syllabi show RIPTS standards and content standards aligned to course work and outcomes. Candidates feel very well prepared to meet professional standards. Based on syllabi review, candidate interviews, and site visits, reviewers noted that candidates develop deep content knowledge (Standard 2) and learn how to create a supportive learning environment (Standard 6).

- Although candidates have opportunities to develop proficiency in the RIPTS, reviewers noted that candidates would benefit from additional opportunities focused on higher order thinking skills (Standard 5), assessment strategies (Standard 9), and interacting with parents (Standard 11).

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Meets Expectations
The program ensures candidates take extensive coursework in their field of study and develop pedagogical-content knowledge and skills consistent with expectations in professional association standards.	

- All candidates studying secondary education must have a major in a content area. Advising sheets help ensure that candidates that a range of classes in their content area. For example, candidates specializing in English must take ENG 201: Principles of Literary Study, a course from each of five historical periods, and three additional electives. Secondary social studies candidates' coursework must include history courses from a range of historical periods and civilizations, a seminar in history, two political science courses, and one course each in economics, geography, and anthropology.

- Program leadership reported that Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) currently nationally recognize all secondary licensure programs. The program submitted crosswalks demonstrating that courses address professional association standards.

- Candidate interviews, sample lessons plans, and site visits demonstrated that candidates have strong content knowledge and ability to consider knowledge of content area standards alongside student standards. In addition, clinical educators noted that a strength of the secondary program is the content knowledge of the candidates. Candidates also expressed high confidence in their development of knowledge and skills in their fields of study.

- The program assesses candidate proficiency in content and content pedagogy through a content evaluation of a unit plan in EDC 430: Methods and Materials in Secondary Teaching. The rubric used for this assessment is content-area-specific and grounded in professional association standards. The university supervisor also completes a content evaluation during student teaching. However, the program did not require a content evaluation of candidates specializing in mathematics at the time of the visit. Program leadership noted that it plans to refine curriculum and assessments to ensure alignment to the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics standards in spring and summer of 2017. As needed, the program should continue to update its curriculum and assessments based on professional association standards.

- The program should continue providing opportunities for candidates to participate in professional development opportunities outside of the university, especially in social studies (e.g. National Council for Social Studies workshops and Rhode Island Historical Society workshops).

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations
The program curriculum and learning opportunities provide candidates sufficient opportunities to develop a deep understanding and proficiency in of student learning standards.	

- The program reported—and syllabi confirmed—that the program integrates instruction on the student learning standards and unit planning tasks into methods courses. In addition to learning about student standards in the area of their content area, all candidates learn about the Common Core State Standards and reading across content areas as part of EDC 448: Literacy Practices for Content Subjects.

- Candidates demonstrate a strong working knowledge of student standards. Candidates used standards in their lesson plans both in submitted work samples and during site visits. In interviews, candidates could articulate major shifts in the standards by grade band level.

- Although the program generally meets the standard for 1.3, the program should evaluate the current curriculum to ensure that candidates have sufficient opportunity to develop proficiency in implementing standards-based lessons and using those skills to assess student progress toward proficiency in Rhode Island student standards.

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

- The program reported that candidates had multiple opportunities to develop proficiency in data-driven instruction, beginning with EDC 312: Educational Psychology and continuing through student teaching. All candidates take EDC 371: Educational Measurements, which provides candidates basic information about assessments (standards, targets, objectives) and covers a variety of assessments, including performance assessments, multiple choice items, essays, and standardized testing. As part of this course, candidates develop and administer both a performance assessment task and a multiple-choice test.

- During interviews, candidates demonstrated a basic understanding of data-driven instruction and assessments. Candidates talked about looking at school and district data in EDC 102: Introduction to American Education and talked about the assessment tasks integrated into EDC 371: Educational Measurements. Candidates late in their program could list several informal practices for tracking student learning (e.g. entry/exit tickets, thumbs up/thumbs down), but only one candidate discussed how they used data to change their practice. Candidates did not clearly articulate how they tracked student progress over time and then made instructional decisions from that data. It was not evident that candidates learn to design instruction by first

collecting data on student learning, using data from student learning to modify practice, and using data from multiple sources in their instruction. The program does not include a clear, intentional focus on the use of data to inform instruction.

- Candidates have insufficient opportunities to learn about and practice collecting and using data from sources other than assessments. In EDC 102: Introduction to American Education, candidates write a paper based on their reflection on data collected from KidsCount, InfoWorks, and other source. Other than this assignment, reviewers found limited evidence of candidates learning and practicing how to use data from sources other than assessments to improve student learning and instructional practice.

Recommendations:

- Review and revise course syllabi and candidate experiences to integrate additional opportunities to learn about and practice using assessment to inform instruction, especially in English and social studies. Ensure that the program clearly communicates the data-based instruction cycle and ensures that all candidates learn, practice, and receive feedback on their use of the data-based instruction program to progress in the program.

- Consult with clinical partners and other stakeholders to identify important assessments and quantitative data points (e.g. STAR, Lexile levels) that candidates should be familiar with upon program completion. Ensure candidates have opportunities to not only collect data using these assessments but also practice using data to track student progress and inform future teaching.

1.5 Technology	Approaching Expectations
The program expects candidates to use technology both as teachers and as students. However, the candidates have limited opportunities to develop proficiency in designing, implementing, and assessing digital age learning experiences and assessments to support student learning.	

- The program reported that it expects candidates to use technology in lesson planning, unit planning, and classroom observations during student teaching. That said, reviewers found minimal evidence that professors provide explicit instruction and modeling to candidates related to designing digital age learning experience. In an evidence organizer, the program reported that EDC 430 is "the primary course that utilizes how to use technology for teaching and learning," but this course is late in the program sequence.

- Candidate work samples and lessons plans revealed that candidate utilization of technology tends to focus on engaging students and keeping their interest. In only a few instances did reviewers see candidates using media in class to meet specific student needs. Overall, reviewers did not observe strategic use of technology to improve instruction or close instructional gaps in site visits, lesson plans, or candidate work.

- The program also reported that it assesses candidate use of technology using an ISTE-based student teaching rubric at the completion of student teaching. Other required assessments focus on candidate use of technology for personal purposes, such as creating a digital gradebook and creating a digital professional knowledge base.

Recommendations:

- Engage clinical partners to determine current best practices for incorporating current technology in the classroom. With these partners, identify current instructional technologies and resources for implementing, assessing, and supporting student learning.

- Review and revise course syllabi and candidate experiences to ensure candidates receive assessment results and feedback on their implementation of digital age experiences and assessments.

- Ensure program and clinical faculty members are proficient in using, designing, and implementing digital age learning experiences. Embed opportunities within courses for candidates to learn about and practice designing digital age learning experiences.

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum provides candidates limited opportunities to develop proficiency in the areas of equity, diversity, and working with families in diverse communities. Candidates develop basic skills for working with a diverse range of learners.	

- Candidates reflect on their own biases through reflections in several of their while primarily focusing on issues of bias and equity in EDC 415: Adolescents and Classroom Management. In this class, candidates learn about an extensive breadth of diversity considerations (gender, socio-economic, race, disability, language proficiency). The readings identified in the syllabus are current, varied, and encourage candidates to consider student differences from a place of strength. That said, the course emphasizes empathy, non-judgment, and care without focusing on practical measures around engaging and supporting a variety of student learners.

- Candidates develop basic skills for working with students with disabilities through a required special education course, EDC 402: Teaching Students with Special Needs in Inclusive Classes. As part of the class, candidates must write a lesson plan for five students—one student with a disability in the candidate's practicum placement and four hypothetical students with a disability.

- When asked to provide a chart identifying which courses address Component 1.6 of the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation, the program did not identify any opportunities for candidates to learn about English learners or families. A deeper analysis of syllabi and conversations with candidates revealed that a few courses address instruction of English learners and working with families. For example, in EDC 448: Literacy Practices for Content Subjects, candidates receive some instruction on how to address the needs of English learners and must interview an English learner as a class assignment.

Recommendations:

- Review and revise course syllabi and expectations to ensure that candidates receive instruction and engagement in culturally responsive teaching early in the candidate experience and extend the learning intentionally throughout the entire candidate experience.

- Review and revise course syllabi and expectations for candidates to incorporate high quality, authentic opportunities for candidates to develop proficiency with working with students with disabilities, English learners, and working with families.

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

- The program reported that candidates learn about important Rhode Island educational initiatives in multiple classes and field experiences. For example, the program requires candidates to take the SLO modules on the RIDE website as part of EDC 485: Seminar in Student Teaching. In interviews, candidates could articulate several ways that they implement Rhode Island initiatives in their clinical work. However, candidates noted that they wish they knew more about the Rhode Island educator evaluation system.

- The program assesses candidate proficiency in Rhode Island educational initiatives through a fifteen-question multiple-choice quiz on Taskstream. This quiz does not assess candidate understanding of initiatives or candidate proficiency in the knowledge, skills, and practices embedded in key Rhode Island initiatives.

Recommendations:

- Work with clinical partners and other stakeholders to identify which Rhode Island initiatives are most important for secondary grades candidates to learn about during their program of study. Identify the knowledge, skills, and practices embedded in those key Rhode Island educational initiatives, and then revise coursework and candidate experiences appropriately.

- Ensure program and clinical faculty members are proficient in Rhode Island educational initiatives.

- Identify ways to assess candidate proficiency in Rhode Island educational initiatives in ways that are more authentic and in-depth than a multiple-choice quiz.

- Ensure that all candidates understand the process, components, and rubric language embedded within educator evaluation systems used in the state. Consider adopting or adapting performance assessments that are already widely used in Rhode Island and other states.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Approaching Expectations
Clinical preparation shows a coherent approach to candidate preparation that includes multiple experiences that build over time. However, not all candidates experience a range of educational environments or assume the full range and intensity of responsibilities of the position for which they will be certified.	

- Based on input from a Secondary Program Curriculum Advisory Group that included clinical educators and data from candidates and current program completers, the program revised its course of study so that undergraduate candidates have a clinical experience each semester after

admissions. The program also pairs each clinical experience with two theory courses. This approach to clinical preparation is coherent and emphasizes the full range of the RIPTS. Both candidates and program faculty noted that this structure is beneficial and a strength of the program.

- Candidate clinical preparation includes a pre-professional field experience, three clinical experiences taken concurrently with coursework, and student teaching. The program reported that candidates spend 135 hours in the field prior to student teaching. Sample checklist items for practicum experiences include working with a small group of students, creating/assisting with learning centers, co-teaching, or doing a demonstration lessons. Reviewer analysis of exit surveys revealed that completers wish they had more experience teaching lessons prior to student teaching.

- The program reports that candidates spend 14 weeks in student teaching, but reviewers noted that those weeks include school vacations. During student teaching, nearly all secondary candidates spend seven weeks in a middle school placement and seven weeks in a high school placement because they are enrolled in the middle grades extension program. Although the duration of student teaching meets the minimum required by Rhode Island certification requirements (12 weeks), the splitting of student teaching between two placements does not comply with RIDE regulations. Splitting student teaching does not give candidates sufficient continuous time in a high school setting. In addition, the program does not require candidates to assume the full course load and responsibilities of their clinical educator. As currently structured, these expectations do not ensure that candidates experience the full range and intensity of responsibilities of the position for which they are certified.

- During student teaching, candidates must assemble an electronic portfolio that includes an instructional unit plan, the informal and formal assessment of learning task, results of four observations conducted by the clinical supervisor and clinical educator, and the midterm and final evaluation of the student teacher completed by the clinical supervisor and the clinical educator.

- The program designed the course of study to include clinical placements in a diverse range of settings, but the program has insufficient procedures in place to track candidate placements over time to ensure all candidates experience a diverse range of placements. The program reported, "Secondary candidates are placed in an urban setting for their first field experience" and "in diverse middle schools" and "in a high ESL populations [*sic*] school" during practicum experiences. However, the clinical placement file revealed multiple instances where candidates never had an experience in an urban classroom beyond the pre-professional field experience that candidates complete before program admissions.

Recommendations:

- Revise student teaching placements so that all secondary candidates have a twelve-week consecutive experience prior to completing the practicum requirements associated with the middle school extension.

- Revise the student teaching handbook and other communications related to student teaching to include a standard timeline that includes clear expectations for candidates to assume the full

range of responsibilities for an extended period during student teaching, including the full teaching schedule of the clinical educator.

- Develop procedures to review each candidate's clinical placements to ensure that all candidates experience a diversity of placements during the course of their clinical preparation including placements in diverse settings beyond the pre-professional placement in EDC 102.

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

- The program has begun to measure candidate impact on student learning. The program has identified one primary measure and identified a few other opportunities, but it was unclear the extent to which these other opportunities focus on candidate impact on student learning. The program does not include impact measures from early clinical experiences as well as later clinical experiences.

- The program measures candidate impact on student learning primarily through the Informal and Formal Assessment of Learning Task completed during student teaching. This assessment requires candidates to prepare and administer informal and formal assessments to students, mark and submit student work, write rationales for selection of criteria within assessments, and provide commentary on candidate work. The assessment also requires candidates to aggregate and disaggregate data and reflect on the learning of three or four representative students. There is no evidence that the program and clinical partners mutually designed this or any other measure of candidate impact on student learning.

- The program submitted additional assignments as "examples of guidance and tools that programs provide to candidates to encourage them to assess impact on student learning": The Performance Assessment Task and Rubric (PATAR), the Multiple-Choice Assessment Task (MCAT), and the ELL Interview. These assignments connect to student assessment but do not focus on candidate impact on student learning. For example, for the Performance Assessment Task and Rubric (PATAR), candidates must develop a performance task aligned to student standards, administer it, provide graded work samples, and then reflect "the fairness of the task for diverse learners…concluding with suggestions on how to improve the assessment."

- The Mid-Term and Final Evaluation assess candidates' use of assessment to guide instruction and report progress. Performance-level descriptors for Components 5.4 and 5.5 of the rubric focus on candidate ability to use "a wide range of assessments to guide planning and make adjustments to teaching" as well as providing "comprehensive information about students' progress and improvement plans to students, families, and support personnel."

- During site visits, review team members observed clinical supervisors giving feedback to candidates, but the feedback did not connect observed candidate practice to student standards or student learning.

- The review team did not find evidence that the program uses data from early clinical measures of candidate impact on student learning to inform future candidate preparation.

Recommendations:

- Collaborate with clinical partners to determine and design appropriate measures of candidate impact on student learning. Establish clear expectations for the collection and analysis of data throughout the program and articulate expected levels and evidence of impact on student learning. Provide explicit instruction in how candidates are to use measures of impact on student learning to inform their continuous growth as secondary grade educators.

- Clearly communicate the 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 their clinical preparation.

- Integrate explicit instruction, feedback, and assessment in how to demonstrate an impact on student learning throughout the program curriculum so that all candidates are well prepared to meet these expectations during clinical placements.

- Incorporate a focus question for student teaching observations that develops a strong habit for all adults, clinical educators, student teachers, and clinical supervisors, to bring the conversation directly to understanding the impact of instruction on student learning.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has begun efforts to improve the quality of clinical partnerships. The program and clinical partners use common assessment tools to evaluate candidate performance, but the program does not ensure rater calibration or ensure that PK-12 clinical educators have input into decisions about candidate progression.	

- The Office of Teacher Education (The Office of Teacher Education) primarily leads the outreach and organization of student teaching placements. The Office of Teacher Education has begun efforts to develop stronger and more clearly articulated partnerships between the program and K-12 districts. For example, a new partnership agreement with Chariho, Exeter-West Greenwich, and South Kingstown documents efforts to systematize the placement of student teachings and increase URI-district collaboration. In an interview with clinical partners, some acknowledged that URI is open to true collaboration. Partners also noted that the program has been responsive to individual district requests.

- For clinical experiences prior to student teaching, the clinical educator completes a practicum evaluation. The program reported that the practicum clinical educator must recommend the candidate for student teaching. However, it is unclear from syllabi and evaluation what the expected level of performance is and how the practicum evaluation informs the course grade. The practicum evaluation does not include differentiated performance level descriptors.

- The program and clinical educators use common observation and evaluation tools to evaluate and provide feedback during student teaching. The clinical educator and clinical supervisor complete separately the mid-term and final evaluations prior to discussing with the candidate. At a minimum, the clinical educator and the clinical supervisor must each complete two classroom observations. These are key assessments used to inform candidate progression to student teaching and certification, thus providing clinical educators some input into the decision making process regarding the progression of candidates to certification.

- Programs and clinical partners do not have common expectations for candidate performance or for the level of detail and quality of feedback given to candidates. Candidates shared in an interview that they received superficial feedback from their clinical supervisors. Similarly, clinical partners noted that the feedback from the clinical supervisor does not align to the expectations of Rhode Island teachers as captured in the Rhode Island Model Teacher Evaluation System. A review of written feedback given to candidates also revealed variation in quality; some forms included evidence justifying the rating, while other forms did not include any written feedback for some criteria. Generally, reviewers saw little written constructive feedback in observation and evaluation forms uploaded to Taskstream.

Recommendations:

- Build upon recent efforts to engage with district partners and identify agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness. Determine how programs and clinical partners will track and analyze data from agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness.

- Clarify expectations for candidate performance and calibrate expectations regularly. Communicate expectations for oral and written feedback and develop mechanisms to ensure that the quality is consistent across clinical supervisors and clinical educators. Consider adopting or adapting performance assessment tools used in districts.

- Identify additional opportunities for clinical educators to have input into decisions about candidate progression within the program.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Approaching Expectations
The program has begun revising both the criteria for the recruitment of clinical educators and the processes to select clinical educators. Current practices, especially those related to training clinical educators, do not ensure that all candidates receive a high quality clinical experience.	

- URI's School of Education has Criteria for Clinical educators that all initial teacher programs use. These criteria, which were revised in spring 2017, include, but are not limited to, the following: "Be a certified educator with a minimum of three years professional experience in appropriate certification area and show a demonstration of earning high effective [*sic*] on educator evaluations"; "be able to work effectively with adult learners"; "use professional knowledge and current best practices to guide the support given to the candidate"; and "provide solicited and spontaneous, in-depth observation and feedback to the candidate (both written and verbal) on a regular basis using program and partner assessments." These criteria are consistent with RIDE's expectations for clinical educators.

- The Office of Teacher Education and program faculty work with partner districts to secure practicum and student teaching placements. URI leadership noted that recruitment and placement efforts vary by district. Traditionally, URI has used faculty networking, professional associations, workshops and professional development to identify potential clinical educators and then reached out to the districts requesting that a specific educator serve as a clinical educator. When working with some districts, URI sends a request for a clinical educator and then the superintendents and principals determine or recommend who would be the strongest clinical educator.

- Clinical partners acknowledged URI's recent efforts to improve the recruitment and selection of clinical educators but noted a desire to establish a more standardized process besides common criteria. One partner noted the need to better incentivize RI's best teachers to become clinical educators, and another noted that stronger communication about the student teacher's strengths and needs would help ensure a stronger match between the clinical educator and student teacher.

- In an evidence organizer, the program reported that all clinical educators must attend a training or receive a one-on-one training from a clinical supervisor each fall, but other evidence conflicted with this statement. The submitted clinical educator data file showed that only the clinical educators of student teachers completed a training; none of the clinical educators for EDC 250 or subsequent practicum courses completed a training. Clinical supervisors reported that training is not required and that many of them had not attended a training in several years.

- The sample cooperating training agenda provided by URI includes a welcome and overview, an orientation to Taskstream, informational breakout groups discussing required forms and expectations, an evaluation of sample video lessons using an observation form, and a mentoring workshop. 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 practices are insufficient.

Recommendations:
- 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 clinical supervisors. During training and subsequent calibration sessions, communicate clear expectations for feedback (when, how, what detail) and ensure that clinical educators, school and district leaders, and clinical supervisors have shared expectations for candidate performance.

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has an assessment system in place that is clear to candidates and stakeholders. However, the current implementation and monitoring of the assessment system does not ensure that only candidates meeting expectations progress through the assessment system.	

- The program assessment system has three major decision points: readiness for admission, readiness for student teaching/internship, and recommendation for certification. The program uses multiple systems, including Taskstream and Filemaker, to track candidate information and performance over time. As demonstrated through interviews, candidates, faculty, and clinical educators were aware of key assessments and noted that they had access to Taskstream.

- During the admissions process, the program evaluates candidates' GPA, basic skills proficiency, admissions portfolio application, and admissions interview. Candidates must meet overall GPA Requirements (2.75 or higher for undergraduate candidates and 3.0 for graduate candidates),

and undergraduate candidates meet minimum expectations on a required test (Praxis CORE, SAT, or ACT). At the point of admission, the program also assess candidates' interpersonal and communication skills, work experience and community service with children/adolescents, and multicultural/diversity awareness. Graduate and TCP candidates must also have a minimum GPA of 3.0 in their content major.

- The program reported that, prior to student teaching, candidates must successfully pass the Praxis II PLT and content tests, complete the unit plan assignment in EDC 430, and be evaluated as ready for student teaching by his or her clinical educator in the practicum evaluation. In addition to these critical assignments, candidates and faculty can access additional assessments in Taskstream. Candidates who do not meet performance expectations on the Praxis tests or unit plan assignments must retake the assessment(s) until achieving a passing score. If a candidate does not receive a recommendation from the clinical educator to progress to student teaching, "a conference with the clinical educator is held to determine specific steps to ensure the candidate is ready for student teaching."

- Candidate assessment begins early in the program and includes written and oral formative feedback, although the quality of feedback varies. Some observation forms included narrative descriptions of the observation, while other observation forms provided insufficient evidence to justify a particular rating. Reviewers saw little constructive feedback documented in observation or evaluation forms.

- The assessment system emphasizes completion of reflective journals during early clinical experiences rather than candidate performance. Therefore, the program makes decisions about candidate progression to student teaching based on limited data about the candidate's performance working with K-12 students.

- Program faculty members assess candidate assignments in Taskstream using rubrics, but the design and implementation of the rubrics reduces the rigor of the assessment system. Performance level descriptors in some rubrics did not address the skills, knowledge, and/or dispositions noted by the standard or indicator. In some places, there was not a clear developmental sequence from level to level. Reviewers noted when reviewing candidate work samples that often the rubric rating did not match the actual performance of the candidate. Reviewers saw significant variations in terms of quality of candidate work samples, but all candidates still received passing grades.

- Reviewers noted that some rubrics do not assess depth of capacity and in some cases do not even assess candidate ability or capacity; reviewers observed that rubrics often emphasized completion of an assignment without any consideration of candidate learning or ability. Rubrics also sometimes lacked differentiation in performance levels. The assessment system emphasizes completion of reflective journals during early clinical experiences rather than candidate performance.

Recommendations:

- Audit candidate work samples to identify discrepancies between candidate performances and ratings assigned. Use audit findings to inform additional revisions to the assessment system.

- Collaborate with clinical partners to identify ways to assess and provide feedback on candidate performance with PK-12 students in early clinical experiences.

- Review and, where appropriate, revise course assessment rubrics to ensure that each indicator of the rubric has clearly differentiated levels of performance align to the indicator. Avoid addressing multiple areas within the same indicator.

- Hold trainings and calibration sessions to ensure program faculty, clinical educators, and clinical supervisors have a common understanding of performance expectations and can use tools with fidelity. Share examples of practice with candidates to help them understand what expected performance looks like for each indicator of rubrics.

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

- The program communicates clearly assessment purposes, processes, and outcomes. Candidates, clinical educators, and program faculty are aware of expectations for recommendation to certification.

- As articulated in the student teaching handbook, the program assesses candidate performance during student teaching based on their instructional unit, Informal and Formal Assessment of Learning task, four observations of teaching, midterm evaluation and final evaluation of the student teacher by the clinical supervisor and the clinical educator. During EDC 485: Seminar in Student Teaching, candidates must also complete a Professional Development Plan and a RI Initiatives Quiz.

- Clinical educators and clinical supervisors are both responsible for evaluating the performance of candidates. The program requires that all candidates be observed at least four times—twice by the clinical supervisor and twice by the clinical educators. The program does not expect the reviewers to observe each standard in each observation, but "each standard must be addressed by each observer at least once."

- When reviewing evidence in Taskstream, the review team noted multiple incomplete or late completion of observations. In some cases, the clinical educator posted the first observation late in the semester, thus limiting the potential use of the feedback to inform future practice and support.

- According to the assessment system overview, candidates must perform at the "meets standard" level on all observations and on the final evaluation during student teaching. However, program leadership does not monitor candidate performance at the indicator level. Instead, the Outcomes Assessment and Accreditation Specialist monitors overall performance on key assessments and flags for the program when performance falls below an overall cut score. Given current practice, some candidates may perform significantly below standard on one or more indicators but still progress within the assessment system.

- The program reported that it conducts "checks on inter-rater reliability for critical performance tasks, review of rubrics, training sessions for adjunct faculty and clinical educators using the evaluation instruments, and identification of areas with consistently weaker performance." However, both candidates and clinical partners noted discrepancies between clinical supervisor and clinical educator ratings and feedback.

Recommendations:

- Review candidate assessment measures in conjunction with the RIPTS and professional association standards to ensure that measures accurately assess candidate proficiency in all of the knowledge, skills, dispositions, content, and content pedagogy needed to be a successful educator.

- Adopt or adapt observation tools that the field is already using or revise current tools to better align with what the field uses to ensure all indicators are observable in every observation. Provide training, facilitate calibration opportunities, and monitor assessment implementation to ensure that assessment results are fair, accurate, and consistent across candidates. Clarify expectations for feedback to ensure that candidates receive observation results and high quality feedback in a timely manner.

- Revise monitoring processes to include monitoring of candidate performance in Taskstream at the indicator level to ensure that the program recommends only candidates who fully meet expectations for certification.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Meets Expectations
The program surveys employers annually and has made efforts to increase survey responses.	

- The School of Education surveys employers annually and then disaggregates data by program. The survey is constructed to yield actionable information. Response rates to the survey have historically been low—between 10 percent and 15 percent. However, in response to principal feedback, provider leadership revised the employer survey in Fall 2016 to make it mobile and handheld friendly, administered the survey by program, sent reminders, and provided principals with a chart including a list of program completers and where they are currently teaching. When implementing these changes, survey responses increased from 9 to 21 of 200. URI should monitor the success of its recent survey changes and continue to implement strategies to improve survey response rates. URI should also consider including more questions that are open-ended to allow for more specific, substantive feedback for program improvement.

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

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program surveys program completers annually but does not have strategies in place to track post-	

completion employment for completers working outside of Rhode Island public schools.

- The School of Education collects information from program completers via an exit survey administered to all candidates at the end of student teaching and via a survey it sends to completers two years after they complete their program. The surveys are constructed to yield actionable information.

- Prior to 2012, exit survey response rates were around 50-60 percent. The School of Education has since moved the survey from SurveyMonkey to Taskstream and made it a seminar requirement. As a result, response rates are now approximately 95 percent.

- The two-year-out survey originally contained 44 questions. URI recently streamlined the survey to include 27 questions. At the time of the visit, URI had sent out the latest edition of the survey a month prior with the intention of sending out reminders every three months through the summer of 2017. The program reported, "Response rates are optimistically high at this point in the data collection."

- At the time of the visit, the program did not have in place strategies and systems to track post completion employment for candidates who pursue employment in states other than Rhode Island.

Recommendations:

- Encourage program completers to continue a line of communication with the program/provider with respect to employment status and measures of employment success.

- Continue to implement strategies to increase survey response rates.

Special Education Program

The Special Education program is a graduate-level program that contains a track for either elementary or secondary special education. Candidates can complete the program in three semesters (full-time) or five (part-time). Candidates complete 36 credits in the program across nine courses and four field-based experiences.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Meets Expectations
The program curriculum aligns fully to the RIPTS and builds upon candidate's prior knowledge as teachers to apply these standards consistent with the role of a special educator.	

- Candidates are required to be a certified teacher prior to admission and the program presumes a working knowledge of the RIPTS based on previous preparation and licensure assessments.

- Program curriculum and syllabi align to the RIPTS. The program emphasizes the application and differentiation of the standards for the role of a general education and special education teacher. Program tasks and assessments such as lesson plans, case studies, curriculum-based measures (CBM) and observation and feedback of candidate performance in clinical placements support and require candidates to develop and apply knowledge of the RIPTS consistent with the role of a special education teacher.

- Candidates were confident in their knowledge of the RIPTS and could speak to how their practice was consistent with the expectations of the standards and how these were reinforced throughout their preparation. Clinical educators reported that candidates were well prepared for their role as special education teachers and had a good foundation in teaching and learning.

- Particular areas of strength for the program curriculum were working collaboratively with schools and families (RIPTS 7) and reflecting on practice and assuming responsibility for professional development (RIPTS 10). The program should examine whether it provides sufficient focus on critical thinking and problem solving (RIPTS 5), and RIPTS 10, knowledge of professional standards and ethics (RIPTS 10).

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum aligns partially to the CEC standards. Candidates develop limited capacity to teach and adapt instruction across content areas.	

- The program reported that the program curriculum aligns fully to the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) standards. The program curriculum, courses, and program materials include references to the CEC standards including where the program introduces the standards, how candidates should apply the CEC standards in their work, and where the program assesses the CEC standards.

- The program also reported that a major organizational structure for the program, 8 program-spanning assessment tasks, ensure the program curriculum is fully aligned to the CEC standards as the eight assessments are based on the standards, introduced and integrated throughout the sequence of the program, and require candidates to demonstrate proficiency in the standards to progress through the program.

- Collectively, the program curriculum design and assessment system ensure coverage of most CEC standards and require that candidates develop proficiency in most areas of the standards. The case study (Task 3) requires candidates to conduct ongoing analysis of student learning needs and supports. The Functional Behavioral Analysis (FBA) and Positive Intervention Behavior Plan (Task 6) requires candidates to learn about effective and appropriate behavior interventions. The language acquisition task (Task 8) ensures that candidates learn about and implement instruction to support student language acquisition and learning.

- The program curriculum does not ensure that candidates develop the knowledge and skills or have opportunities to practice adapting instruction across all content areas. Most course-based learning and course and program assessments prioritize literacy instruction and adaptations in literacy. While there is a small focus on mathematics instruction, it is not at a level that requires substantial learning or practice. The review team did not see evidence of a programmatic focus on other content areas including science, and social studies,

- The review team noted that there are several areas of strength in the program curriculum related to CEC standards. The program curriculum addresses strongly learner development (Standard 1), assessment (Standard 4), professional learning (Standard 6) and collaboration (Standard 7) were well represented. The program also provides candidates multiple opportunities for candidates to develop proficiency in these area. However, the review team observed that the program curriculum did not as thoroughly address curricular content knowledge (Standard 3) and instructional planning and strategies (Standard 5). Specifically, the singular focus on literacy limited candidate ability to learn and develop proficiency in adapting and implementing effective instruction across the full range of PK-12 content areas.

Recommendations:

- Review the program curriculum, and identify and revise specific courses, learning tasks, and assessments to ensure that candidates receive specific and substantial instruction and opportunities for clinical practice in the theory, research, and specialized instruction in mathematics, science, social studies, and disciplinary literacy.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum provides some opportunities for candidates to design and implement instruction consistent with student learning standards, but not across the full range of content areas.	

- As with the RIPTS, the program presumes that candidates have a background in and working knowledge of PK-12 student learning standards as certified teachers. The program builds upon this background through course and field-based experiences. However, while the program requires that candidates develop and adapt at least one mathematics lesson, the program focuses primarily, if not exclusively, in the area of literacy.

- The program aligns many course syllabi, learning tasks, and assessments to the CCSS literacy standards. Candidates receive explicit instruction and practice in how to adapt instruction and select resources and technologies that support students to succeed in school and meet expected student learning standards. In EDS 500, Inclusive Educational Practices, candidates develop lesson plans that integrate the CCSS. In EDS 511, Literacy and Language Acquisition, candidates

develop and teach weekly lesson plans that integrate the CCSS while tutoring students who struggle in reading at a local middle school.

- In addition to adapting instruction, the program provides candidates explicit instruction, practice, and assessment in how to support students to meet student learning standards and behavior expectations through support services such as the IEP, RTI, and MTSS processes. In EDS 512/520, Elementary and Secondary Program Management, candidates review of variety of student learning and behavioral data to develop and implement learning and intervention plans. In EDS 503, Positive Behavior Supports, candidates write an FBA and PBIP to meet the academic and behavior needs of students.

- Consistent with PREP-RI Component 1.2, the program did not provide evidence of how program instruction, clinical practice, and program assessment align to the CCSS expectations in mathematics, the NGSS or the RI GSE's for social studies.

Recommendations:

- Review and revise the program curriculum, learning tasks, and assessments to ensure that candidates are provided sufficient instruction, opportunities for clinical practice, and are assessed on their ability to adapt instruction and provide services to students across the full range of student learning standards, including mathematics, science, and social studies.

1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations
The program prioritizes data-based instruction and services. Candidates develop proficiency in the data collection, analysis, usage, and improvement cycle.	

- The program curriculum, courses, clinical experiences, and assessments are founded on the presumption that effective special education practices are based on the collection, usage, and analysis of data to design, adapt, implement, and deliver instruction and services. Candidates receive explicit instruction, opportunities to practice, and are regularly assessed on effective data-driven instruction and special education services.

- Candidates learn about the data-driven cycle through early-in-program courses such as EDS 500, Inclusive Instructional Practices, as they are required to monitor the progress of students on IEPs and to develop appropriate lesson plans based on this data. In 502/513, Assessment for Elementary and Secondary Special Educators, candidates learn a variety of formal and informal assessment strategies, implement a variety of standardized assessments, and use various progress-monitoring data to recommend accommodations and modifications based on data. In EDS 503, Positive Behavior Supports, candidates learn and apply similar focus on data from the RTI process to recommend behavioral interventions.

- Candidates develop their understanding and use of data-based instruction and services in the supervised practicums that occur in the first year of the program which align with program courses and provide effective clinical settings to implement and receive feedback on candidate use of learning and behavioral data. The student teaching placement provides candidates with an extended opportunity to collect, analyze, and use data to design, adapt, and implement instruction and behavior support services under the supervision of practitioners and program faculty. EDS 512/520, Leadership and Program Management, prepares candidates to practice

and learn to use data at the classroom and school-level and in the multiple roles expected of special educators.

- The program assessment system ensures that candidates develop proficiency in data-driven instruction and services as several assessments require and focus on the use of data. Task 4, midterm and final evaluation during internship, requires candidates to demonstrate that they use a variety of data sources, in collaboration with colleagues and families, to develop instruction and interventions. Task 6, the FBA and PBIP, require ongoing evaluation of multiple sources of data to design an intervention plan as does Task 7, IEP Development.

- Program faculty, clinical educators, program completers, and candidates reported that the focus on data-driven practices is a strength of the program curriculum and design.

1.5 Technology	Meets Expectations
The program provides course-based and clinical experiences that ensure candidates develop proficiency in instructional, adaptive, and augmentive technology.	

- Similar to the program's focus on data-driven instruction, the special education program equally recognizes, values, and communicates the importance of technology for special education teachers – both as a tool that candidates use and as an instructional support and adaptation that PK-12 students require. The program reported that it views technology as a means to "level the playing field" and conveys this message through the program design and curriculum.

- Rather than offer a specific course on technology, the program integrates use of technology in each course and clinical experience. In EDS 500: Inclusive Instructional Practices and EDS 501: Collaboration and Co-Teaching, faculty members provide candidates with explicit instruction in multiple technologies and applications that are necessary to design, adapt, and implement instruction and interventions. Candidates are then required to develop lesson plans that integrate these technologies based on the needs of specific students they will work with.

- During later courses, candidates further develop their knowledge and proficiency with technology specific to assessment, behavior, and program management. During the supervised practicum experiences and the student teaching experience, candidates are required to implement and use the technology they learn about in courses and develop lesson plans that specifically integrate appropriate technology based on the needs of their students and their instruction.

- The program assesses candidates on their knowledge, use, and integration of technology through course and program assessments including weekly lesson plans and observations, and several of the program assessments including the comprehensive exam (Task 2), the case study (Task 3), and the midterm and final evaluation during student teaching (Task 4).

- Candidates and program completers reported that the depth of their knowledge and training in the use of technology prepares them to learn about, assess, and importantly use and discover new technologies. Candidates and program completers reported that they were well prepared to identify student needs that require additional technology beyond what is currently available. They also reported having the skills and the knowledge needed to seek out appropriate

technology to meet these needs. As an additional support to candidates, the program should consider identifying in course syllabi and learning objectives specific technologies that the course will introduce, provide instruction on, and assess.

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.	

- As a special education program, the program reported that it recognizes and values its role to prepare all candidates to meet the needs of all learners as both an ethical as well as legal obligation. The program curriculum builds from this assertion and fully integrates inclusive practices with respect to equity, diversity, and working with families in diverse communities throughout the program curriculum, clinical preparation in urban settings, and the assessment system.

- The first two courses in the program EDC 500: Inclusive Educational Practices and EDC 501, Collaboration and Co-Teaching establish a clear and strong focus on issues of equity and diversity. In these courses, candidates learn about biases and challenges that confront students and families in diverse communities. Candidates interview families with students who have special needs. The program explicitly teaches candidates strategies to work with students with special needs, English language learners, students with diverse backgrounds, and students with varied learning styles.

- Subsequent courses and field experiences provide additional opportunities for candidates to learn, practice, and be assessed on their use of inclusive practices. Throughout the program, the curriculum prioritizes 'people-first language' and the avoidance of words and terms that imply disability, limitations, or negative connotations. As with issues of data-driven instruction and technology, several program assessment tasks, including task 2, comprehensive exam, task 3, case study, task 5 lesson plan observation, and task 7 IEP development, prioritize and ensure that candidates develop proficiency in meeting the needs of all students and working with families in diverse communities as they progress through the program.

- The program also requires candidates to learn to work with colleagues in schools including administrators, general education teachers, and para-professionals through classroom services and the IEP, RTI, and MTSS processes to maximize inclusive learning opportunities for all students and to promote issues of equity and diversity.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Meets Expectations
The program builds upon candidate's knowledge as teachers of RI initiatives and develops their understanding of those initiatives that are applicable to special education.	

- As certified teachers, candidates enter the program with a knowledge of Rhode Island initiatives from the perspective of a general education teacher. The program curriculum reinforces this knowledge while building upon it to focus on special education-related areas.

- The program curriculum integrates the RTI and MTSS processes. Candidates learn about developing IEPs in course-based experiences then work in clinical placements to evaluate student learning and behavioral needs and support them through the RTI process, including working with families and other educators. Candidates learn about the MTSS process and about the various levels of support are available for PK-12 students.

- Candidates learn about the comprehensive literacy plan, PLPs, and the educator evaluation system and SLOs consistent with the role of special education teachers through course and field-based learning experiences. The review team observed a limited focus on the 'no bullying' initiative efforts and suggest additional focus be provided in this area.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Meets Expectations
Program clinical experiences are extensive, varied, and effectively designed to ensure that candidates develop the knowledge, skills and capacities of special education teachers.	

- The program integrates clinical experiences throughout. Clinical experiences include three practicum experiences totaling approximately 80 hours of clinical experience during the first year in the program and a 15-week student teaching experience in the second year of the program.

- The practicum experiences align intentionally to specific courses and serve as field settings to implement and practice skills, strategies, and assessments featured in courses. These alignments include observing and reflecting on various co-teaching models, implementing lesson plans, and providing literacy tutoring. Through these early clinical experiences, candidates implement and practice specific skills and strategies that they learn in their coursework while receiving supervision and feedback on their practice.

- The 15-week student teaching experience is the culminating clinical placement and provides candidates the opportunity to work with students, colleagues, and families on an ongoing basis. Since candidates have already had previous structured clinical experiences, the program expects candidates to extend their learning and to practice and readily assume the full responsibilities of a special educator. Candidates are responsible for lesson planning, instruction, assessments, and working with school staff to meet the needs of their students, including student services such as the IEP and RTI process and meeting with families and school staff.

- The program requires that candidates experience clinical preparation in a variety of settings and across the grade spans associated with their certification. As such, at least one of the clinical placements must be in an urban setting and candidates are required to work with students across various grade levels during the four clinical placements.

- Program completers and candidates reported that the amount, variety, and close alignment between their courses, their assessments, and the field-based learning opportunities fully prepare them for the role of special educator. Based on observations and reports from clinical educators and candidates, the program should consider having practicum experiences earlier in the semester than they are currently scheduled. Since candidates are certified teachers, they may be ready for and benefit from earlier and increased opportunities to practice in the field.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Meets Expectations
Candidate impact on student learning is a program priority. The program structures clinical experiences to ensure that candidates design, implement, and assess instruction based on student learning needs.	

- The program has begun to measure candidate impact on student learning. The program has identified one primary measure and identified a few other opportunities, but it was unclear the extent to which these other opportunities focus on candidate impact on student learning. The program does not include impact measures from early clinical experiences as well as later clinical experiences.

- The program curriculum focus on data-based instruction is apparent in the program's equal emphasis on impact on student learning through the design and implementation of clinical experiences. The program has established and communicated the expectation that all work with students must focus singularly on improving learning and other student outcomes, including evidence of the learning and growth.

- Candidates learn about multiple forms of assessment, data collection, and analysis in program courses. Candidates apply these practices in the clinical placements as they review multiple sources of data to develop and implement lessons and services. Candidates are also required to reflect on the effectiveness of their lessons and instruction, including students who did and did not meet lesson objectives. Candidates are required to identify and implement changes in instruction and services based on this analysis.

- Program faculty and clinical educators observe and assess candidate impact on student learning during the clinical placements and provide targeted, detailed, and ongoing feedback for improvement through program assessment instruments that include student-learning gains as a measure of performance.

- As referenced above, several of the program assessment tasks prioritize data-based instruction and having a positive impact on student learning including the CBM, FBA and PBIP, the IEP assignment, and the case study. Each assessment requires candidates to increasingly demonstrate impact on student learning as a measure of progress in the program.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Meets Expectations
The program has established clinical partnerships and placements that are mutually beneficial to the program, program candidates, and its partners.	

- The program has identified several clinical partnerships. These partnerships, by design, benefit the program, candidates, and clinical partners. The partners include: PK-12 schools, districts, and their staff where candidates are placed for clinical experience; a local middle school that provides a setting for literacy tutoring experiences in EDS 511: Literacy and Language Acquisition; families of the students who receive these tutoring services, as well as special education directors and families of students with special needs who participate in course-based interview and feedback experiences.

- The program and program candidates benefit from high quality and diverse placements within which to prepare special education teachers. The clinical partners benefit from additional

instructional and support resources, professional learning, and the opportunity to continue to grow and influence the profession. Clinical partners spoke highly of the program, program faculty, candidates, and the impact of the program.

- The program reviews clinical assessments with its partners, solicits their feedback on the effectiveness of the assessments, and provides evidence of changes made based on this feedback. Clinical partners reported that they were well integrated into the assessment of candidates and understood the instruments and their roles. The program has also recently collaborated with a local school district to review program curriculum and assessments to receive additional practitioner-based input on program design.

- To ensure the continued strength of the clinical experiences, the program should continue to seek out additional partners and field placements in a variety of settings, at a variety of levels, and in a variety of special education delivery models to provide necessary learning opportunities for candidates to experience a full array of instructional settings and grade levels.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Meets Expectations
Clinical educators are an important part of the program design and assessment process and effectively support candidate learning and progress in the program.	

- The program has identified several criteria for clinical educators. These include being a highly effective teacher, have at least three years' experience in a special education setting, provide instruction consistent with the CEC and RIPTS standards, and work mostly with students in inclusive settings. These criteria are consistent with RIDE's expectations for clinical educators.

- The program reported that they identify and select clinical educators through outreach efforts with superintendents, principals, and special education directors to identify exemplary special education teachers who meet these criteria. Several current clinical educators are graduates of or are affiliated with the special education program.

- The program reported that it holds an annual training to review program and clinical requirements, to share assessment instruments, to provide program updates, and to solicit feedback. The clinical educators who have attended these trainings reported that they are an important opportunity to learn about the program, to receive calibration on assessment instruments, provide feedback, and learn about the on-line assessment system.

- Clinical educators also reported that the program faculty members are very available by phone or email to answer questions, provide support, or arrange for additional meetings as necessary to address concerns or meet with clinical educators and candidates.

- The program provided evidence that program faculty evaluates clinical educators annually. However, it was not evident how the program uses this information to make retention decisions for clinical educators. The program should explore additional ways to ensure that all clinical educators attend the annual training as a requirement for hosting a candidate and further develop the clinical educator evaluation process.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Meets Expectations

> The program assessment system aligns fully to the CEC standards and impact on student learning. A performance-based assessment system guides decisions about candidate progression.

- The program clearly communicates its assessment system to candidates prior to admissions and throughout the program. Communication types include the program website, internship handbook, program courses, and regular and ongoing communication with program faculty.

- The program admission process aligns to the URI graduate school and includes letters of recommendation, a personal statement, an interview, and specified requirements including a minimum undergraduate 3.0 GPA and holding at least initial teacher certification.

- In order to advance to student teaching, candidates must complete all required coursework with a C or better and maintain a minimum overall GPA of 3.0. Candidates must also complete at least 80 hours of clinical experience, receive a passing score on the ETS Praxis content test for special educators, and successfully complete several program and course-based assessment tasks including the FBA and PBIP (Task 6) and the language acquisition lesson plan and observation (Task 8).

- As indicted above, the program prioritizes student learning in program design, clinical experiences, and program assessments. Most of the major program assessments include clear expectations to identify current levels of student learning and need, identify appropriate learning and behavioral instruction and supports based on this analysis, and then require candidates to determine the most appropriate next steps for students based on this data and analysis.

- Candidates receive formal and informal written and oral feedback from program and clinical faculty on their course and field-based activities based on the CEC standards and the RIPTS. The feedback is detailed, explicit, and highlights areas of success and areas for improvement. Candidates reported that the feedback they receive provides clear direction for improvement and supports their growth in the program.

- The overall program assessment system and the recommendation for student teaching decision point is designed to ensure that only candidates who demonstrate proficiency and performance consistent with the program criteria and the CEC standards and RIPTS are able to progress to student teaching. The program has identified specific actions that candidates must pursue if submitted work or field-based performances do not meet the expectations necessary to progress to student teaching.

3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Meets Expectations
The program recommends candidates for certification based on a clearly communicated assessment system that ensures that successful candidates meet the full expectations of the CEC standards.	

- The program has explicit criteria for the recommendation for certification assessment decision point. These criteria include successful completion of all courses with at least a grade of C and an overall minimum GPA of 3.0, successful completion of all CEC-aligned performance tasks, completing all clinical requirements, successfully completing a comprehensive exam, and meeting the state-required score on the Praxis content test for special education teachers.

- As referenced throughout this report, the assessment system and the recommendation for certification decision is anchored in eight program-spanning assessment tasks that collectively align to the full range and expectations of the CEC standards. These tasks include the Praxis content test for special education teachers, an end of program comprehensive exam, a case study focusing on impact on student learning, a mid-term and final evaluation of student teaching, lesson plan observations, an FBA and FBIP, the development of an IEP, and a language acquisition lesson plan observation.

- Each of the eight tasks have explicit criteria, instructions, and performance expectations embedded within detailed and clear rubrics. Program faculty members introduce the tasks in specified courses throughout the program. Some tasks require candidates to complete them within a single course, while others require candidates to complete ongoing work, usually within the context of clinical practice. With the exception of Tasks 6 and 8, the program assesses all tasks at the recommendation for certification decision point. Candidates typically complete and submit work for the tasks electronically, upload it to an online system, and receive feedback through the online system.

- The full-time program faculty reported that they calibrate assessment decisions by jointly scoring several assessments and by working with adjunct faculty and clinical educators to review and monitor assessment results and feedback. The program also provides training and ongoing support to clinical educators to ensure that they understand and can effectively use program assessment instruments.

- Program faculty, clinical educators, program completers, and candidates reported that the assessment system is based on performance of the CEC standards and that candidates who complete the program are fully prepared on day 1 to serve as special education teachers.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program conducts employer surveys intermittently and the surveys have not generated sufficient or actionable information for program improvement.	

- Prior to the 2016-2017 academic year, the program, through the School of Education, intermittently surveyed employers of program graduates. As reported by the program, these surveys were not fully effective and generated low response rates that did not provide valid information for program improvement.

- The program reported that, during the 2016-2017 academic year, the School of Education re-surveyed employers through a revised survey and more targeted format. The more recent survey generated increased results: six of 19 employers for a 32% response rate.

- The responses indicated that employers are generally pleased with program candidates and report them to be average to excellent on a five-point rating scale. The employers also provided several open-ended responses that elaborated on the generally positive responses while providing several suggestions for improvement.

- For the 2015-16 school year, the aggregate performance of University of Rhode Island program completers working in Rhode Island schools was comparable to the aggregate performance

distribution for all recent completers in Rhode Island schools. However, RIDE reports this data at the *provider* level instead of the *program* level. Therefore, few conclusions about the effectiveness of completers from the Special Education program can be made.

Recommendations:

- Since the expectations for this component have increased at the program level, and since the small size of the program produces few graduates, the program should explore and implement additional strategies and more effective surveying to solicit annual feedback from program employers to support program improvement.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program conducts program completer surveys intermittently and the surveys have not generated sufficient or actionable information for program improvement.	

- Prior to the 2016-2017 academic year and similar to the employer survey, the School of Education on behalf of the special education program, surveyed program completers of all advanced and graduate programs. The combined instrument asked candidates 31 closed and open questions regarding candidate's satisfaction with the program and their level of preparedness. The program did not provide evidence of responses or response rates to these surveys.

- During the 2016-2017 academic year the School of Education, on behalf of the program, revised the completer survey and sent the survey to all program completers since the program's start in 2012. The program provided analysis of this updated survey that showed 19 responses but did not provide the overall n-size necessary to determine the percent of responders.

- The responses to the updated survey show that program completers are generally happy with the program and their preparation, most response being in the top 2 of 5 categories on a 5-point rating scale. All of those surveyed responded that they felt very well prepared for the roles as special educators. Several respondents commented on the limited number and diversity among the faculty and limited facilities for their program.

Recommendations:

- Similar to the recommendation for 4.1, the program should recognize the increased expectations at the program level to collect annually information from program completers. The program should work with the School of Education to identify effective means to collect information annually from program completers to support program improvement efforts.

Support Professional Certification Areas: Findings and Recommendations

Reading Specialist Program

The Reading Specialist program is a graduate-level program that leads to an M.A. in reading. Candidates typically complete in three years on a part-time basis. Candidates must earn 31 credits across ten courses that include classroom-based learning and clinical experiences. Candidates must be certified educators to enter the program with at least three years of educational experience prior to program completion.

The program curriculum includes nine types of courses – four initial courses in the program focus on basic reading content knowledge; three courses focus on developing expertise as reading specialists; and two courses towards the end of the program focus on the professional role of a reading specialist. Although this is the recommended sequence, due to the small nature of the program and part-time status of candidates, not all candidates follow this exact sequence.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Not Applicable
Rhode Island does not have state-specific standards for support professionals.	

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Meets Expectations
The program curriculum aligns fully to ILA standards. Candidates have multiple opportunities to develop proficiency in the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the expectations of the standards.	

- The International Literacy Association (ILA) standards, the multiple roles of reading specialist, and foundational practices in reading instruction and support are included in the first tier of courses. Diagnosing, intervening, and helping students with reading challenges are the focus for the second tier of courses. This tier also includes the primary clinical experience, a yearlong afterschool reading clinic. Developing coaching skills and managing reading programs are the focus for the third tier of the program.

- The program curriculum's design helps ensure that collectively, through the program courses, clinical experiences, and major assessments, candidates are provided opportunities to learn about, practice, reflect on, and develop expertise in each of the ILA standards.

- Course syllabi and candidate learning activities clearly articulate the expected standards. As candidates progress through the program, they develop an increasing awareness and understanding of the ILA standards. The program Wikispace serves as an important organizational tool for candidates to track their progress in the program, in meeting the expectations of the ILA standards, as well an effective vehicle to access program resources.

- The program curriculum and design is equally strong across the following ILA standards: foundational knowledge (Standard 1), curriculum and instruction (Standard 2), assessment and evaluation (Standard 3), diversity (Standard 4), and creating a literate environment (Standard 5). While candidates have yet to serve in the role of reading specialists, the program should look for additional ways and opportunities to strengthen candidate exposure and expertise in professional learning and leadership (Standard 6).

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations
The program curriculum builds upon candidate's knowledge of PK-12 student learning standards as certified teachers to apply this knowledge to the role of a reading specialist.	

- The program curriculum focuses on preparing candidates to help PK-12 students develop literacy skills, including reading across content areas, in student learning standards for all core content areas: the CCSS for literacy and numeracy, the NGSS, and RI GSEs for social studies.

- Since candidates are certified teachers, the program presumes a working knowledge of the student standards from a general education perspective while focusing attention on issues specific to reading difficulties including comprehension, vocabulary and language, text structure, and other skills and strategies necessary to read informational and specialized texts.

- Candidates are required to design and implement lessons that specifically incorporate strategies and resources to help students meet a variety of student learning standards. Candidates must then analyze and reflect on the effectiveness of their interventions to plan for next steps. Program and clinical faculty observe and provide feedback on candidate progress towards helping students meet the expected student learning standards in clinical settings.

- The classroom research assessment (Task 2) and case study report (Task 6) require candidates to observe student-learning needs, develop instruction to help students make gains in these areas, and monitor progress of their students.

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 and programmatic decisions.	

- The program curriculum requires candidates to confront all instructional interactions with students from a perspective of a data collection, analysis, implementation, reflection, and revision of practice. This data-based approach is the focus of early-sequence courses at a more abstract and theoretical level and then reinforced at a practical, hands-on level in the diagnostic, intervention, and clinical experiences.

- Candidates learn about a variety of informal assessment strategies and formal and standardized assessments in their courses and apply these in clinical settings with students. Candidates are required to evaluate the appropriateness of assessment approaches based on student need, available resources, and regularly changing and updated assessment instruments.

- Throughout the year-long clinical experience, candidates design and implement weekly lesson plans based on a student's current learning needs, monitor growth over time, and as necessary, make changes to instruction based on initial implementation. As with student learning standards, the program provides candidates with specific and ongoing feedback from clinical educators as to the effectiveness of their practice and areas for improvement.

- The diagnostic analysis task (Task 3), videotape analysis (Task 4), transcript analysis (Task 5), and case study report (Task 6) all are predicated on the data collection, analysis, and use cycle that permeates the program.

- The coaching experience task (Task 7) and leadership log (Task 8) require candidates to look at data from the reading program and leadership perspectives, thus furthering candidate ability and awareness of the use of data to support student learning.

- Program faculty, completers, and candidates reported that data-based instruction is a foundational element of the program and a key capacity for reading specialists. Program completers and candidates reported that through their preparation they are well prepared to identify and use multiple sources of data to diagnosis and meet student reading challenges.

1.5 Technology	Meets Expectations
Candidates learn about and develop proficiency in a broad range of technology and technology applications that are necessary to meet the needs of PK-12 students as reading specialists.	

- In addition to technology expectations articulated in the ILA standards, the program also identifies the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) standards as programmatic design elements and completion requirements. Consistent with both sets of standards, candidates are required to learn about and develop expertise in technology as a tool for reading specialists and as an instructional support for students.

- The program explicitly teaches technology to candidates to use as technology users and requires them to demonstrate competency in technology tools and applications such as blogs, Wikis, webcasts, online research engines, presentation technologies, and applications for evaluating reading resources and instructional materials.

- The program also teaches candidates how to use technology to support student learning and require candidates to demonstrate competency with technology tools such as smartboards, video and audio tools, book writer, and multiple applications featured throughout the program for candidates to explore, evaluate, and use in their clinical placements.

- Course syllabi and assessments, program assessments, and clinical experiences include expectations regarding technology. A program completion requirement is that candidates must demonstrate meeting the ISTE standards as a component of their leadership experience log.

- The program reported that it recognizes the importance of technology use and integration to support digital literacy among reading specialists and PK-12 students. This recognition has resulted in the recent inclusion of the ISTE standards in the program design, further technology integration throughout the program, and working with the School of Education to develop and implement a digital literacy certificate to further increase opportunities for PK-12 educators.

1.6 Equity	Meets Expectations
Candidates develop a deep understanding throughout their preparation of issues of equity, diversity, and meeting the needs of students and families in coursework and through clinical experiences.	

- The program curriculum focuses on meeting the reading needs of all students and, as such, the program faculty reported that equity is a natural focus. The program also reported that it

teaches, assesses, and requires candidates to focus on student strengths and individual attributes rather than to focus on negatives or challenges that students may present.

- Candidates learn about specific issues of diversity and equity in EDC 527: Language Study for Reading Teachers, EDC 532: Methods of Interventions for Struggling Readers, EDC 563: Teaching Reading to Multicultural Students, and EDC 565: Advanced Reading Research Seminar.

- The program curriculum also requires candidates to develop and implement specific strategies to meet the needs of students who are English Language Leaners, students with dyslexia, students who live in poverty, and students with special needs. Candidates are required to work with students from diverse backgrounds in their yearlong clinic and in additional fieldwork conducted through program courses and assessments. Candidates also work with student's families to whom they provide tutoring during the clinic experience.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Meets Expectations
The program builds upon candidates' knowledge of RI initiatives and develops their knowledge and understanding of those initiatives that are applicable to reading specialists.	

- As certified teachers, candidates enter the program with a knowledge of Rhode Island initiatives from the perspective of a general education teacher. The program curriculum reinforces this knowledge while building upon it to focus on reading specialist-related areas.

- The program curriculum strongly aligns to the expectations of the Rhode Island Comprehensive Literacy Plan in the areas of literacy and literacy intervention. Candidates also further their initial understanding of PLPs to focus on data collection, analysis, and use to guide the development of literacy plans as reading specialists. Candidates learn about the PARCC assessments and about how reading specialists can support student success in these assessments.

- Candidates build on their knowledge of the Rhode Island Educator Evaluation system as teachers for their roles as reading specialists. They receive information on SLO process for support professionals. While they do not evaluate teachers, the program provides instruction on effective feedback consistent with the evaluation system and requires candidates to practice giving colleagues feedback on practice to prepare them for the role of reading specialists as coaches.

- Candidates also learn about and receive assessments through course and program assessments on their knowledge of strategies and processes to support students who are English Language Learners, students with dyslexia, including recent Rhode Island legislation on instructional support for students with dyslexia, and students with special needs in the RTI, IEP, and MTSS processes.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Meets Expectations
The program provides sufficient, varied, and coherent clinical experiences aligned to coursework and support candidates to develop skills and knowledge consistent with ILA Standards.	

- The program clinical experiences include course-based learning opportunities and a yearlong reading clinic that collectively meet or exceed the required 300 hours of clinical preparation required for this program. The program integrates clinical experiences in a variety of settings throughout the program. The course-based experiences provide candidates opportunities to practice skills and strategies aligned to individual courses. The yearlong reading clinic, in which candidates tutor students with reading challenges, serves as the culminating field experience.

- The clinical experiences begin early in the program through learning activities such as a transcript analysis project (Task 5) and a diagnostic analysis project that candidates typically complete in the candidates' home school and work with students and their families. Later-in-program clinical experiences require candidates to work in their home schools as well as other schools to complete coaching and leadership requirements such as shadowing reading specialists, presenting professional development sessions, and serving on committees.

- The afterschool reading clinic provides an extended and extensive field-based learning experience in which candidates apply their foundational knowledge and develop skills, strategies, and expertise as reading specialists. During the clinic, candidates work in the full range of roles expected of reading specialists – diagnosing reading challenges, developing and implementing interventions, monitoring outcomes, and revising instruction as needed while also completing several program assessment tasks. Candidates also engage the reading specialist-as-coach role as well as interacting with parents as part of the reading clinic.

- To help candidates practice in a variety of settings, the program requires candidates to complete several of the course and program-based learning activities in schools that differ from their home schools. The program also matches candidates with a student from a grade range different from the grade they teach.

- Candidates and program completers reported that the clinical experiences are a critical learning and proving ground that require not only mastering the full range of skills and competencies as reading specialists but also beginning to engage the roles of coach and leader.

- To strengthen the clinical experiences, the program should continue to explore additional ways to have candidates engage in field experiences in school-based and afterschool reading clinics as well as clinics and placements that occur in urban settings.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Meets Expectations
The program grounds program learning opportunities and clinical experiences in the need to impact student learning positively and candidates effectively demonstrate impact on student learning.	

- Building off of the programmatic focus on student learning standards and data-based instruction, the program design and clinical experiences center on the need for candidates to approach all work with students from the lens of positively impacting student learning.

- Each of the clinical experiences requires candidates to assess student-learning needs, develop interventions and supports based on student data, and then monitor their impact on learning. The program teaches candidates the expectations of this cycle, assesses candidate ability to impact learning, and provides ongoing feedback to their effectiveness and areas of growth.

- Candidates learn a variety of assessment strategies and instruments to identify student-learning needs. Course and program assessment tasks require candidates to practice and develop skills at collecting data at the individual and class level. Candidates are also required to learn and practice collecting and analyzing data as prospective reading coaches and leaders in schools.

- The classroom task (Task 2) embodies the expectations for impact on learning. Candidates begin this project in year 1 of the program by identifying candidate and learner needs and continue over three additional semesters to develop and implement strategies to meet these needs. Candidates are required to prove their impact through multiple levels and types of data ultimately resulting in a presentation at a research forum.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations
Clinical partnerships and placements provide candidates a limited opportunity to practice the full range of practices and services expected of reading specialists.	

- The program identifies its primary clinical partners as the parents and families of the students who participate in the afterschool reading clinic. The program asserts that the program and candidates benefit from the opportunity to help candidates develop their capacities as future reading specialists. The program also asserts that the parents and families benefit from the additional reading support their students receive as well as targeted feedback and strategies provided to the students and families.

- The program reported that the structure of the reading clinic has and continues to evolve. In previous years, the clinic was held in local schools and, in 2013, the program specifically partnered with a local elementary school that was supported with grant funding. The program reported that the 2013 model was particularly effective since the candidates completed their fieldwork in a school setting and were better able to interact with school staff and students' families. The current iteration of the clinic occurs on the URI campus and families drop-off and pick up their students at the clinic.

- The review team observed that the afterschool reading clinic is an important opportunity for candidates to grow in the multiple roles of reading specialists. It was also evident that parents and students benefit from this experience. The program has worked hard to maximize the various structures of the clinic by ensuring candidates have opportunities to work with parents, work with students from a different grade range, and practice providing coaching experiences for each other.

- Despite the diligent efforts of the program, the current iteration of the afterschool reading clinic is not a fully authentic or robust learning experience for candidates to practice and develop the full range of the ILA standards. Equally important, the current structure of the afterschool-reading clinic also does not ensure that the program engages with or that candidates benefit from clinical partners consistent with the expectations of this component.

Recommendations:

- Review the expectations for PREP-RI component 2.3, including the expectation that programs develop and maintain mutually beneficial partnerships that share responsibility for designing

and refining clinical partnerships and practice, establish agreed-upon indicators of effectiveness, and making partnership decisions.

- Explore additional structures for the afterschool clinic that would maintain the tight program design that occurs in the campus setting but also provide authentic, diverse, and varied learning experiences that occur in PK-12 schools, including access to students from various backgrounds and interactions with PK-12 faculty and staff.

- Establish defined partnerships either through a revised clinic structure or with other stakeholders, including professionals in the reading field, who can work with the program to provide practitioner input into program design, instruction, assessment, clinical preparation, and partnership decisions for program improvement.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Approaching Expectations
Clinical educators provide effective supervision and feedback to candidates but additional clinical supervision and resources would further strengthen the program and build candidate capacities.	

- The program reported that it does not employ clinical educators outside of two program faculty members who supervise the afterschool reading clinic. As such, the program reported that it does not select, prepare, support, and retain clinical educators who meet the expectations of this component, including working with adult learners in coaching and supervision skills.

- The review team reviewed evidence and observed that the program faculty members are effective in their roles as clinical educators. Faculty members provide effective, timely, and targeted feedback that guides candidate growth. The faculty members also recognize the need to and are skilled in providing adult-focused coaching and supervision to program candidates.

- The review team has two concerns with this component. Absent explicit criteria for the role of clinical supervisors and evaluation mechanisms, future faculty members may not similarly be as skilled or qualified for this position. Additionally, while the current faculty members provide expert academic-based feedback and supervision, candidates do not receive practitioner-based feedback and supervision similar to what they would receive in a PK-12 setting.

Recommendations:

- Establish explicit criteria for the role of clinical educator in the afterschool reading clinic, including an evaluation and retention process, to ensure candidates continually have access to high-quality clinical educators who meet the criteria.

- Establish a clinical supervision structure and process that capitalizes on the current model in which candidates receive expert, program-based feedback while also including practitioner-based feedback to best support candidate growth and clinical preparation.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Meets Expectations
The program assessment system aligns fully to the ILA standards and impact on student learning. The	

program determines candidate progress using a performance-based assessment system.

- The program clearly communicates the assessment system to candidates prior to admission and throughout the program through the program website, program Wiki, program courses, and through regular and ongoing communication with program faculty. The program Wiki, in particular, serves as an effective "public bulletin board" to capture assessment system requirements, instruments, and resources. Notably, candidates use the Wiki as a means to share resources with colleagues, an important role for reading specialists as coaches.

- The program admission process aligns to the URI graduate school process and includes letters of recommendation, a personal statement, an interview, and specified requirements including a minimum undergraduate 3.0 GPA and holding at least initial teacher certification.

- In order to progress to internship, the afterschool reading clinic, candidates must successfully complete foundational, knowledge-based courses: EDC 527: Language Study for Teachers of Reading, EDC 562: Methods of Intervention for Readers Who Struggle, EDC 564: Diagnosis of Reading Difficulties, and EDC 565: Advanced Reading Research Seminar. (Note, due to the part-time nature of the program, not all candidates proceed through this exact sequence.) Additionally, candidates must successfully complete two program assessments, a reflective research portfolio and a transcript analysis project.

- The program and the assessment system prioritize that candidates demonstrate a positive impact on student learning. Prior to advancing to internship, candidates must complete specific measures of impact on learning, including a field-based research report, a case study report, and a diagnostic analysis and a videotape analysis task. Additionally, multiple course-based projects and assessments require that candidates include measures of student learning to progress to the internship and advance to certification.

- The assessment system uses consistent and clear standards-based task and project rubrics that articulate expected levels of performance. Program faculty members provide clear, consistent, timely, and effective standards-based feedback to help candidates grow and improve their practice. The assessment system and several of the program assessment tasks in particular require candidates to complete tasks over time as they compile increasing evidence of performance, competence, and task completion.

3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Meets Expectations
The program recommends candidate for certification based performance within a clearly communicated assessment system that ensures that successful candidates meet the full expectations of the ILA standards.	

- The program has explicit criteria for the recommendation for certification assessment decision point. These criteria include successful completion of all courses with an overall minimum GPA of 3.0, successful completion of all ILA-aligned performance tasks, completing all clinical requirements, and by successfully completing a comprehensive exam.

- The program has identified eight program-spanning assessment tasks that collectively align to the full range and expectations of the ILA standards. These tasks include a reflective research

portfolio, a classroom research project, a diagnostic analysis project, a videotape analysis project, a transcript analysis project, a case study report, a coaching experience project, and a leadership experience project. Embedded in the leadership experience project, candidates must also provide evidence of meeting the ISTE standards.

- Each of the eight assessment tasks have explicit criteria, instructions, and performance expectations embedded within rubrics. Candidates complete and submit work electronically or in hard copy depending on the task. The program designed the tasks so that candidates would start them in an early-in-program course and work on them through several subsequent courses. Some of the tasks include a revision process that enables candidates to submit drafts for feedback and then complete the final submissions.

- The full-time program faculty reported that they calibrate assessment decisions by jointly scoring several assessments and by working with adjunct faculty and clinical educators to review and monitor assessment results and feedback.

- Program faculty, clinical educators, program completers, and candidates reported that the entire program design and assessment system emphasizes the expectation that by program completion, a successful candidate will have demonstrated competence on the full range, depth, and breadth of the ILA standards. Program completers and candidates near the end of the program reported that they were very well prepared to serve as reading specialists by the program and assessment system.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program conducts employer surveys intermittently and the surveys have not generated sufficient or actionable information for program improvement.	

- Prior to the 2016-2017 academic year, the program, through the School of Education, intermittently surveyed employers of program graduates. As reported by the program, these surveys were not fully effective and generated low response rates that did not provide valid information for program improvement.

- The program reported that, during the 2016-2017 academic year, the School of Education re-surveyed employers through a revised survey and more targeted format. The more recent survey produced a single response, which does not provide valid information for program improvement.

- For the 2015-16 school year, the aggregate performance of University of Rhode Island program completers working in Rhode Island schools was comparable to the aggregate performance distribution for all recent completers in Rhode Island schools. However, RIDE reports this data at the *provider* level instead of the *program* level. Therefore, few conclusions about the effectiveness of completers from the Reading Specialist program can be made.

Recommendations:

- Since the expectations for this component have increased at the program level, and since the small size of the program produces few graduates, the program should explore and implement additional strategies and more effective surveying to solicit annual feedback from program employers to support program improvement.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program conducts program completer surveys intermittently and the surveys have not generated sufficient or actionable information for program improvement.	

- Prior to the 2016-2017 academic year and similar to the employer survey, the School of Education on behalf of the reading specialist program, surveyed program completers of all advanced and graduate programs. The combined instrument asked candidates 31 closed and open questions regarding candidates' satisfaction with the program and their level of preparedness. The program provided responses from the years 2010, 2013 and 2015. The program also reported that it did not receive any responses in 2011, 2012, 2014, and 2016.

- The response rates for the years that did receive completed surveys varied from six for 2010, three for 2013, and one for 2015. The program did not provide the total overall n-size for each year necessary to determine the percent of responders. The responses varied considerably by year and respondent.

- During the 2016-2017 academic year the School of Education, on behalf of the program, revised the completer survey and sent the survey to all program completers since 2010. The program provided analysis of this updated survey that showed 15 responses but did not provide the overall n-size necessary to determine the percent of responders.

- The responses to the updated survey show that program completers are generally happy with the program and their preparation, most response being in the top 2 of 5 categories on a 5-point rating scale. Most responded that they felt well prepared for the roles as reading specialists. Several respondents commented on limited number and diversity among the faculty, the limited diversity of the PK-12 students they worked with in the afterschool reading clinic, and limited facilities for their program.

Recommendations:

- Similar to the recommendation for 4.1, the program should recognize the increased expectations at the program level to collect information annually from program completers. The program should work with the School of Education to identify effective means to collect information annually from program completers to support program improvement efforts.

Provider-Level Findings and Recommendations

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

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

- URI leadership reported that it uses high school visits, college fair visits, and other partnerships efforts to recruit students to the university, but these have not been sufficient to recruit a variety of candidates to the school of education at the teacher and support provider level.

- Approximately 20 percent of all recent URI admitted students identify as non-White[2]; this percentage is reflective of the diversity of Rhode Island. However, only approximately 10 percent of recent URI's education candidates identify as non-White. Similarly, approximately 40 percent of URI's recently admitted students are male, but only 25 percent of URI's recently admitted education candidates are male. The lack of diversity is particularly noticeable in early childhood, library media and reading specialist programs, where all current candidates identify as white females.

- URI reported that its Talent Development Program "recruits students with college potential, admits students through a rigorous summer program, provides students with an assigned academic advisor, and retains students with financial and other assistance" to URI. In an interview, URI staff spoke highly of this program and its success.

- URI described multiple partnerships with schools (e.g. Paul Cuffee Charter School, Highlander Charter School, and Urban Collaborative Accelerated Partnership) and community organizations (e.g. College Crusade) aimed at recruiting "participating students to URI and the teaching profession." In addition, URI noted that it offers "general education courses aimed at encouraging first and second year students to consider a career in education" and offers a Living Learning Community where incoming freshman interested in becoming teachers live together. However, when asked which of these recruitment efforts have been most successful in recruiting candidates to education, staff members did not provide a clear response. Many of the recruitment efforts identified by URI are the same ones identified in the 2008 visit. However, candidate diversity is still largely the same, calling into question the effectiveness of such initiatives.

- The provider has clear admissions requirements in place to ensure that it admits high quality candidates. The admissions process includes a review of GPA and basic skills assessments as well as an interview and application process that "assesses the student's goodness of fit for the program and teaching profession. The provider has also created a conditional acceptance policy and process for the 2016-17 school year.

- The provider identified multiple supports that the university and provider provide to candidates. Supports include academic assistance through the Academic Enhancement Center, an elective

---

[2] Candidates identifying as Hispanic/Latino, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, Asian, African American, American Indian/Alaskan Native, or Two or More Races.

course focused on preparing candidates for the Praxis CORE test, the multicultural center, the Living Learning Community, and scholarships.

- The provider reported that it capitalizes on current students by involving them in recruitment efforts and multicultural events. For example, the student group D.R.I.V.E. hosts overnight programs for middle and high school students with diverse backgrounds. In an interview, program leadership described asking current graduate students to share their experiences during presentations aimed at recruiting new candidates. However, it was not clear how programs capitalize on the diversity of the program by integrating the different backgrounds and experiences that a diverse group of candidates brings to the program.

Recommendations:

- Develop systems to track and assess the quality of recruitment efforts in order to identify which strategies have been successful and which have not been successful in attracting diverse candidates.

- Review historical and current efforts to recruit a diverse candidacy. Recognize that past efforts have not been successful and that the provider needs to address and resolve systematically across all programs.

- Consider how to leverage and customize successful university-level recruitment efforts to recruit and support diverse educator candidates.

- Continue to engage with current and prospective stakeholders to identify current roadblocks to increased representation of diverse candidates in educator preparation programs.

- Conduct an analysis of the educator preparation programs at the University of Rhode Island and determine which programs are more effective in recruiting, admitting, and supporting diverse candidates. Build on the strategies of these more successful programs.

- Work with the recently hired diversity officer to learn more about effective recruitment and admissions policies that other colleges and universities have implemented.

3.2 Response to Employment Needs	Approaching Expectations
The provider has made some effort to modify program offerings in response to employer needs and has made some effort to seek and provide candidates with current data about employment prospects.	

- In recent years, URI has added new programs and modified some programs in response to employer needs identified through RIDE meetings and other conversations with district and school leaders. Based on demand in the field for more special educators and TESOL/dual language educators, URI created a M.A. program in TESOL and Dual Language Immersion, added a part-time program option in special education, and began allowing undergraduate students to begin coursework in special education and TESOL/dual language instruction.

- Provider leadership reported—and candidates confirmed—that URI shares some employment data during admissions and during EDC 102: Introduction to American Education. URI provided a PowerPoint on shortages in special education shared with candidates as part of their Special Education program and also reported that Library Media and Reading Specialist faculty communicate employment data and prospects with candidates in classes, advisement sessions, and/or on their website.

- Although the provider shares some employment data with current URI students, it did not provide evidence of a comprehensive and systematic process to collect and share information with prospective and current candidates regarding employment prospects within RI, the region, or in hard-to-staff areas.

Recommendations:

- Develop a process and determine the individuals responsible to conduct, on an annual basis, a needs assessment for employment prospects in Rhode Island and the region including hard-to-staff areas and schools. Include in this process annual consulting with clinical partners to determine their employment needs—both certification areas and prospective educator skills and capacities.

- Require each program to report to the leadership of URI on an ongoing basis how it uses employment information to review and make changes to the program curriculum and learning opportunities reflective of the employment information.

- Build upon current efforts to share hiring data with candidates by sharing information with prospective candidates and in candidate advising.

- Continue efforts to identify and adapt current programs based on needs in the field. Work to ensure that candidates in surplus areas understand their employment prospects and encourage them to enroll in programs in hard to staff areas such as mathematics, science, special education, and library media specialist.

3.3 Admissions Standards for Academic Achievement and Ability	Meets Expectations
The provider and program admission 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 informal conditional acceptance.	

- URI School of Education leadership reported that all programs adhere to Rhode Island Department of Education expectations for candidate admissions including both individual and cohort requirements. Multiple provider and program documents confirmed that requirements for undergraduate candidates include an overall GPA of 2.75 and minimum performance on admissions test scores.

- The provider has a conditional acceptance policy in place for the 2016-17 year only. Candidates admitted through this policy may have an overall GPA of 2.5 to 2.75 but must meet or exceed all other URI School of Education expectations on admission tests, multicultural and diversity

awareness, and work experience and community service. Candidates admitted through conditional acceptance must improve their GPA prior to student teaching to achieve a GPA of 2.75. The provider monitors candidate progress and uses candidate advising to provide support.

3.6 Additional Selectivity Criteria	Approaching Expectations
The provider has identified some dispositions and additional selectivity criteria but it is not clear that these are substantive, based on research, or critical to educator effectiveness.	

- The provider did not provide a clear, coherent list of additional selectivity criteria that the provider tracks over time. Instead, provider leadership submitted multiple sets of dispositions and additional selectivity criteria to the review team: a set of four criteria used at admissions, a set of seven dispositions contained within the School of Education's Diversity Vision, and dispositions highlighted in candidate performance assessments. In interviews, provider and program leaders could not clearly articulate the dispositions or the research base supporting them.

- The provider provided inconsistent evidence of awareness of dispositions and the research base undergirding them. It was not evident to the review team that the currently identified dispositions are research-based, significant, and critical to being a successful educator. Many of the dispositions identified by URI are expected skills or behaviors rather than dispositions. Examples include "interrelating ideas and information within and across subject areas," "communication skills, and "follows school policies and procedures." In an interview, a faculty member noted that dispositions assessed at admissions included "organization" and "whether candidates can submit their portfolio on time".

- The provider has developed systems to track candidate performance on dispositions. Through its Taskstream system, the provider is able to run reports on candidate performance on its identified dispositions. However, it is not clear how the provider and its programs use the reports. It also is not clear how the provider works to ensure programs assess the dispositions throughout the program and how those dispositions are valued in program assessment systems beyond admissions.

Recommendations:

- Revise current dispositions and additional selectivity criteria based on an analysis of research and engagement with clinical partners and other stakeholders. Ensure that the selected dispositions and additional selectivity criteria are research-based, current, valid, consistent with the needs of Rhode Island schools and communities, and critical to educator effectiveness.

- Identify a set of professional dispositions and additional selectivity criteria that programs will assess at admissions and monitor throughout the program. Ensure that candidates receive feedback on dispositions and additional selectivity criteria at multiple points in the program. Require candidates to demonstrate proficiency in professional dispositions prior to recommendation for certification.

- Train all faculty and staff on the dispositions and additional selectivity criteria. Ensure that all candidates, faculty, and staff members know and can describe the dispositions and additional criteria that are essential to be an effective educator.

Standard 5: Program Quality and Improvement

5.1 Collection of Data to Evaluate Program Quality	Meets Expectations
The provider has established effective data systems to systematically and annually collect a variety of data on program curriculum and assessment as well as candidate and program completer performance.	

- The provider has established a Unit Assessment System (UAS) to coordinate the collection of data for all educator preparation programs at URI. The UAS uses several data management systems including Peoplesoft, Filemaker, and Taskstream, to collect data and produce reports that are shared within and across preparation programs, the School of Education, the The Office of Teacher Education, and other stakeholders at the university for continuous improvement efforts.

- Taskstream serves as the primary data collection system for curriculum and assessment information and outcomes. The provider reported that it has used this system for more than 6 years and with this longevity has been able to build and implement the system to meet program and provider needs. Taskstream houses all major program assessments. Program faculty and clinical educators enter candidate performance results directly into the system. Program and clinical faculty reported that they understand the Taskstream system, can access and use the system, and that it is an effective data management tool.

- The provider uses the Filemaker system as the data management system to track and collect information on candidate placements, testing data, clinical educator data, and GPA monitoring. The provider reported that the Filemaker system is an effective system that allows it to collect data and generate reports to monitor and manage candidate and clinical educator placement and performance data. The provider also reported that this data collection system ensures that candidates do not progress beyond assessment or placement checkpoints unless candidates meet the requirements for each checkpoint.

- The provider uses an online survey system to manage the employer and program completer survey process.

- In addition to the data management systems, the provider also accesses and collects data from the Rhode Island Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) Index to determine hiring, retention, and performance data to guide provider and program design and improvement. The provider also reported that it views external review processes from the Rhode Island Department of Education and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher of Education as data sources for improvement.

- As the provider and its programs continue to examine, expand, and refine current data collection systems, it should explore effective means to collect data on the type, amount, and consistency of feedback from program and clinical faculty.

5.2 Analysis and Use of Data for Continuous Improvement	Approaching Expectations
The provider has established and implemented systems, structures, and processes to analyze data but does not consistently use the data for continuous improvement.	

- The provider effectively uses the data collection systems it has established to analyze data and produce outcome and performance reports. The provider shares these reports with leadership, programs, and faculty across the School of Education. These data reports include assessment system outcomes analyses, program completer and employer satisfaction results, clinical educator quality reports, and candidate placement and certification testing results.

- The provider reported that it collects and analyzes data for two purposes: to evaluate the progress of individual candidates in the programs and to support improvement efforts for each of its programs. Many programs and program faculty reported that they are aware of and use the multiple reports and analyzed data generated by the data collection systems to understand current program and candidate performance levels and to identify areas for improvement and revision.

- The provider shared evidence of multiple programmatic changes made in recent years based on the collection, analysis, and use of data. The changes include course content revisions, the expansion and reorganization of clinical preparation experiences, revised assessments systems and instruments, clinical educator training and supports, access to technology and resources, and changes to program faculty and staff.

- The provider has also used data based on employer needs and changes in Rhode Island PK-12 student demographics to develop additional programs and revise current programs. These include developing a recently approved ESL certification program, working to expand certification options for candidates in the elementary program, and developing a program to increase digital literacy for Rhode Island teachers. The provider also shared evidence of similar changes to current programs to help candidates be more responsive to employer needs through revised course offerings and additional and targeted clinical experiences.

- Although the provider has established for collecting data and can cite examples on how it uses data, not all programs equally and systematically use data for continuous improvement and as the basis for program revisions. For programs housed in colleges other than singularly within the School of Education, it was not evident that there is a systematic and collaborative sharing and use of data for program improvement. The provider recognized these concerns and reported that it is working through the recently revived Council of Teacher Education to support consistent and collaborative use of data for continuous improvement.

Recommendations:

- Continue the efforts to work through the Council for Teacher Education to establish and implement consistent data sharing and use practices across all educator preparation programs. Establish expectations, mechanisms, and processes to ensure that all programs, regardless of organization structure and program faculty, systematically use data from multiple sources on program and candidate outcomes to drive provider and program improvement.

- Build on the multiple and systematic data collection and reporting systems currently in place to develop a data-based structure to identify, track, and communicate across all programs current and future areas of program improvement and the data that supports such changes.

- Work with program leadership and faculty across all programs to move beyond aggregate assessment data to analyze data on feedback from program and clinical faculty. Develop processes and systems to calibrate and ensure consistent, clear, and effective feedback based on the appropriate professional standards and candidate performance.

- Support programs that use similar assessments and rubrics to work together to analyze candidate assessment results to support the consistent and reliable use of such assessments.

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

- The provider and its programs meet all RIDE data reporting requirements and timelines for the EPP Index. The provider includes an easy to access link to the EPP Index on its website. In addition to the link, the program also includes a link to a survey seeking feedback on the provider and the information on program and candidate outcomes contained in the Index.

- In addition to the EPP Index, the provider also includes on its website general statistical information about program completer performance and employment outcomes. The provider also provides easy access to recent accreditation reports from the Rhode Island Department of Education and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Educators.

- In addition to reporting the required data, the provider has conducted an extensive data analysis of program and candidate outcome measures contained in the EPP Index. The provider reported that it has gained important insight into program completer certification and employment patterns and will continue to use information from the Index and other sources to inform and guide its program revision and improvement efforts.

5.4 Stakeholder Engagement	Approaching Expectations
The provider and its programs inconsistently engage stakeholders in program evaluation and improvement efforts.	

- The provider reported that it engages stakeholders at both the program and provider level and that gathering feedback from stakeholders and community partners is a priority for their continuous improvement efforts.

- At the program level, the provider reported that stakeholder engagement and feedback occurs through direct outreach and interaction between program faculty, clinical supervisors, clinical partners, and clinical educators, often through the clinical preparation components of the programs. The provider also reported that programs engage with stakeholders through content-

area associations, networks, and initiatives as well as through surveys that programs conduct of their clinical placements and their constituents.

- Several programs have established ongoing collaborative efforts to support and engage programs and their stakeholders including the Elementary program and the GEMSNET project, the Library Media Program and a Library Media Smarts grant effort, the all grades Music Education program partnering with the Rhode Island Music Educators Association, and the Special Education program hosting a CEC conference and workshops.

- The provider reported that School of Education leadership and staff engage stakeholders in multiple ways throughout the year. The provider shared evidence of networks with local PK-12 school districts and HR offices to better understand school and district needs, partnerships with other educator preparation providers to further outreach and communication with schools and districts, participation in the school superintendent's association, quarterly meetings with the Rhode Island Department of Education, other education providers, and assistant superintendents, as well as numerous ongoing and ad-hoc outreach efforts that focus on engaging stakeholders and attempting to integrate them into the improvement process.

- Although the provider and its programs engage stakeholders in multiple ways, the engagement at the provider level has been inconsistent and appears to be reactive. Current engagement lacks specific focus and direction. The review team did not see evidence of a concerted, systematic, provider-level organizational approach to stakeholder engagement that was connected to data collection and use, program evaluation, and continuous improvement.

- At the program level, similar to PREP-RI Component 5.2, stakeholder engagement varied considerably across programs. Some programs regularly and effectively engaged their stakeholders in critical and constructive program evaluation and improvement efforts as a part of program design and philosophy. Other programs either missed opportunities to engage with stakeholders or did not proactively seek out stakeholders to support continuous improvement.

Recommendations:

- Continue the recent, productive, and varied stakeholder engagement efforts at the provider level. Work with provider leadership and the programs to develop a systematic organizational approach to stakeholder engagement that identifies the purpose, best strategies, and expected outcomes from stakeholder engagement. Communicate your purpose and goals for stakeholder engagement to current and potential stakeholders.

- Work with program leadership and faculty to identify expected and appropriate forms of stakeholder engagement for all programs including purpose, best strategies, and expected outcomes. Establish processes to document and report on expected outcomes.

- At the provider and program level, proactively seek out, invite, and engage stakeholders that can provide critical and specific input on program evaluation and improvement based on the unique expertise of the group or individuals. To support these outreach efforts, develop and implement common processes to document and communicate stakeholder feedback and changes made to provider and program design based on this feedback, including data sources to support the feedback and changes.

5.5 Diversity and Quality of Faculty	Approaching Expectations

The provider ensures that most faculty members have the appropriate qualifications for their field. The diversity of the School of Education and program faculty does not reflect the diversity of Rhode Island.

- The provider reported that it has multiple systems and processes to ensure that all candidates receive preparation from a diverse and qualified faculty. Program candidates generally reported that their professors, advisors, and supervisors were very effective in their roles as teachers, provided necessary counseling and advisement, and supported them in their clinical placements with guidance and feedback for improvement. Although faculty and the provider could speak about how faculty stay current, reviewers noted that not all faculty demonstrated deep understanding of PK-12 student standards.

- The provider reported that the hiring, evaluation, tenure, and promotion process ensure a qualified faculty. The provider hires new faculty members through a university-wide established hiring process that requires terminal degrees, documented scholarship, and academic excellence. The provider evaluates non-tenured faculty every year and evaluates tenured faculty, depending on rank, either every two or every four years. The evaluation criteria include demonstrated ability to teach, contribution to student growth, scholarship, and service. Candidates also evaluate faculty members through an end-of course survey that focuses on teaching strategies and student learning outcomes.

- The provider shared evidence of recent hires for the School of Education that were made to fill program faculty positions that had occurred due to retirements, program growth, and program redesign. The provider also shared evidence of several vacant faculty positions that it has sought unsuccessfully to fill to meet the demands of growing and changing programs.

- The provider reported that the institution has recently created a position, Director of Diverse Faculty and Staff Recruitment and Retention, that supports each hiring committee to identify and recruit qualified individuals from diverse backgrounds. The provider shared evidence that this positon and other institution-wide efforts, including the university strategic plan, have modestly increased faculty diversity at the institution. Currently, 19 percent of faculty members at URI are from diverse background whereas in 2011, 16 percent of faculty were from diverse backgrounds.

- The provider was not able to provide evidence that recruitment and retention efforts within the School of Education and the educator preparation programs has significantly impacted faculty diversity for these programs. Currently 92 percent of faculty members within the School of Education and the preparation programs identify as white; this percentage was 93 percent in 2012. The review team also was concerned with the significant disparity between faculty diversity across the university when compared to the School of Education and the preparation programs.

- The provider did not provide evidence that it effectively and systematically capitalizes and builds upon the diversity of its faculty to value the different backgrounds and experiences that a diverse faculty brings. The provider shared fact sheets that are available to students that provide an overview of student and faculty backgrounds and evidence of several multicultural

events that take place on campus throughout the year. However, these did demonstrate substantive and effective efforts to capitalize on faculty diversity.

- Through a review of curricula vitae and faculty qualifications, the review team found most faculty members fully qualified for their roles, that they model effective teaching practices, that they maintain currency for their roles, and that they are knowledgeable in their fields. The review team had some concerns about content qualifications and changing roles for a few faculty members in several of the undergraduate teacher preparation programs.

Recommendations:

- Continue to work with the institution-wide efforts to increase the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty within the School of Education and the educator preparation programs. Work to increase diversity among the School of Education to a level comparable to the institution and reflective of the diversity within Rhode Island.

- Prioritize increasing the faculty diversity of the School of Education and the educator preparation programs beyond current levels. Explore and implement additional and innovative recruitment and retention strategies beyond those currently used to fill vacant positions.

- Continue to seek authority to fill the vacant and requested positions identified by the School of Education and seek to recruit candidates from diverse backgrounds for these positions.

- Work with provider and program leadership to develop and implement comprehensive and ongoing efforts across the School of Education and the preparation programs to capitalize on the diversity of program faculty and candidates.

- Continue efforts to increase the diversity of the total faculty, lecturers, adjunct faculty, instructional staff, and supervisors through the hiring and retention process to provide candidates with faculty, instructional staff, and supervisors reflective of the diversity of Rhode Island and that further capitalize on the diversity of program faculty.

- Work with program leadership, the evaluation process, and feedback from candidates to ensure that all faculty members are fully qualified for their roles, including strong content knowledge for their fields and instructional responsibilities.

- Identify and offer opportunities for current faculty to maintain currency and deepen their expertise, particularly in the area of student standards.

5.6 Other Resources	Approaching Expectations
The provider has substantial yet insufficient resources to deliver effective educator preparation consistent with the expectations of the RI Standards for Educator Preparation.	

- The provider reported that the institution has recently conducted a significant reorganization of several colleges and programs, creating a newly centralized Alan Shawn Feinstein College of

Education and Professional Studies and Professional Studies. The provider reported that this reorganization should increase the size, prominence, and resource needs of the program.

- The provider currently uses resources to operate and support multiple educator preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate level. As has been reported throughout this report, many of 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.

- Multiple current improvement efforts are underway. It is not evident to the review team that resources are sufficient to support current improvement efforts and the additional actions identified in this report.

- The provider has made a strong and documented case that staffing for the assessment office, for partnership coordination, and for support staff for the School of Education, is significantly below levels necessary to meet current expectations. These expectations range from conducting daily operations, outreach and placement efforts, and short and long-term planning required to support the multiple and necessary systems, structures, and processes of the School of Education and The Office of Teacher Education.

- The provider has made an equally strong case that several vacant faculty positions are necessary and should be filled to ensure that programs and program candidates have sufficient and diverse faculty members. These include full-time tenure-track faculty members in secondary social studies and secondary special needs. In addition to these positions, if candidate enrollment across the educator preparation programs continues to increase consistent with current projections, additional faculty and staff members will be necessary to provide the same level of quality preparation to candidates.

- Program completers, candidates, and faculty members consistently reported that facilities for the programs including technology, classroom and meeting space, as well as the current dispersed nature of the School of Education across several buildings are inadequate and negatively impact the preparation that programs can provide to their candidates.

Recommendations:

- Provide additional resources sufficient to fund the School of Education's Strategic Goals 2016 to include additional resources and supports to integrate fully the multiple colleges and programs that house educator preparation programs to ensure coherence across all programs.

- Increase staffing for the assessment office, partnership coordination, and support staff for the School of Education and The Office of Teacher Education to ensure that there are sufficient staff members to address daily operations and short and long-term planning needs.

- Fill vacant faculty positions for the School of Education including a full-time tenure-track faculty member for secondary social studies and secondary special education.

- Work with the School of Education to identify and address the most pressing facilities, technology, and physical plant needs consistent with this report, the School of Education

Strategic Goals 2016, and feedback from program candidates, program completers, and program faculty.

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	No conditions

Provider Approval Term	Description	Conditions
	Approved with Conditions. Many provider components are rated 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 prior to the candidate

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

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

Component: Defines a distinct aspect of standard

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

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

Program completer: See *Completer*

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

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

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

Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS): 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