Review Team Performance Report

Providence College

March 18, 2018 through March 21, 2018

Table of Contents

Performance Review of Educator Preparation - Rhode Island

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

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

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

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

Report Purpose and Layout

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

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

---

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

The Program and Provider Component Findings and Recommendations sections contain specific information regarding provider and program performance for each component. The sections include a summary statement of the current level of performance for the component. The summary statement is followed by a brief list of evidence that details the performance level and where appropriate suggestions for improvement or commendations for notable practice. Components rated either Approaching Expectations or Does Not Meet Expectations also include recommendations for improvement that require necessary changes to ensure programs and providers meet the expectations of the Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation. Before the next PREP-RI visit, Providence College 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, Providence College (PC), offers seven RIDE-approved educator preparation programs. Most of the teacher preparation programs opened in 1979. (Music education opened in 2001 and secondary physics opened in 2006.) The building administrator program opened in 1986, the school counselor program in 1989, and the reading specialist program in 2006. The teacher preparation programs include undergraduate and graduate level programs and the non-degree teacher certification program (TCP). The building administrator, reading specialist, school counselor programs are graduate level programs. The educator preparation programs at PC were last reviewed in 2014 as part of the Rhode Island Program Approval Process (RIPA). The tables on the following pages list the programs and courses of study reviewed during this visit.

Providence College and its programs have made progress since the last RIPA visit. Some programs, particularly the school counseling and building administrators, have made recent changes to better prepare candidates to work successfully in today's schools. District partnerships spoke highly of Providence College candidates, and candidates generally felt that they were receiving adequate preparation in their programs. Despite some progress, Providence College and its programs must engage in additional efforts to ensure that the programs are preparing candidates to be ready on Day 1.

Teacher Certification Programs

Certification Program	Undergraduate	Graduate	Non-Degree
All Grades Education	B.A. in Music Education	-	-
	B.A. in Secondary Education (World Languages)[2]	M.Ed. in Secondary Education (World Languages)[2]	TCP in World Languages[2]
Elementary Education & Elementary Special Education	B.A. in Elementary Education & Elementary Special Education	-	-
Secondary Education	B.A. or B.S. in Secondary Education (Biology)	M.Ed. in Secondary Education (Biology)	TCP in Biology
	B.A. in Secondary Education (Chemistry)	M.Ed. in Secondary Education (Chemistry)	TCP in Chemistry
	B.A. in Secondary Education (English)	M.Ed. in Secondary Education (English)	TCP in English
	B.A. in Secondary Education (Mathematics)	M.Ed. in Secondary Education (Mathematics)	TCP in Mathematics
	B.A. in Secondary Education (Physics)	M.Ed. in Secondary Education (Physics)	TCP in Physics
	B.A. in Secondary Education (History)	M.Ed. in Secondary Education (History/Social Studies)	TCP in Social Studies/History
Special Education Program	-	M.Ed. in Special Education with a concentration in Elementary Special Education	-
	-	M.Ed. in Special Education with Concentration in Secondary Special Education	-

Administrator Certification Program

Certification Program	Undergraduate	Graduate	Non-Degree
Building Level Administrator Program	-	M.Ed. in Administration	-

---

[2] Languages are French, Italian, Spanish.

Support Professional Certification Programs

Certification Program	Undergraduate	Graduate	Non-Degree
Reading Specialist	-	M.Ed. in Literacy	-
School Counselor	-	M.Ed. in School Counseling	-

The review team conducted the review from March 18, 2018 through March 21, 2018. Review team members were:

- Dr. Peña Bedesem, Associate Professor at Kent State University
- Julie Lima Boyle, English Teacher at Coventry Public Schools
- Colleen Colarusso, Chief School Officer at Blackstone Valley Prep
- Janita Ducharme, Choral Director at Cumberland High School
- Karen Festa, Special Education Teacher at Narragansett Public Schools
- Dr. Chandra Foote, Dean at Niagara University
- Stacy Haines-Mayne, School Counselor at Chariho Public Schools
- Dr. Kathleen Headley, Senior Associate Dean at Clemson University
- Jennifer Hines, Elementary Teacher at Barrington Public Schools
- Dr. Craig Hochbein, Assistant Professor at Lehigh University
- Maria Hunter, Social Studies Teacher at South Kingstown Public Schools
- Andréa Javel, Senior Lecturer at Boston College
- Sue Toohey Kaye, Reading Specialist at Coventry Public Schools
- Melissa Labossiere, Talent Development Specialist at Pawtucket Public Schools
- Jessica Lavallee, Elementary ELA Specialist at Providence Public Schools
- Dr. Joseph Morgan, Assistant Professor at University of Nevada, Las Vegas
- Dr. Cheryl Moore-Thomas, Interim Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs and Diversity and Professor at Loyola University Maryland
- Mary Jane Utley, Science Department Chair and Teacher at Westerly Public Schools
- Dr. William Weber, Professor Emeritus at University of Toledo

Lisa Foehr, Lauren Matlach, Sarah Whiting, and Steven LaBounty-McNair 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

Indicate 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*
Elementary Education & Elementary Special Education	Approved with Conditions
Secondary Grades Education	Approved with Conditions
Special Education	Approved with Conditions
Administrator Program	
Building Level Administrator	Approved with Conditions
Support Professional Programs	
Reading Specialist	Approved with Conditions
School Counselor	Approved with Conditions

*Providence College must take immediate action to address TCP World Languages.

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	Providence College
Approval Term	Four years
Conditions	

- By December 2018, Providence College 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 March 2019, Providence College must decide if it will continue operating TCP World Languages. If it wishes to continue offering this pathway to candidates, the program must demonstrate to RIDE that it has taken substantial action to do the following:
  - Work with program faculty and currently practicing All Grades World Language teachers to ensure methods coursework provides a more explicit focus on methods for teaching World Languages aligned to the American Council on the Teaching of World Languages (ACTFL). Ensure that candidates understand, unpack, and develop proficiency in using the ACTFL World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages.
  - Modify clinical preparation to ensure that all candidates experience clinical placements across the PK-12 grade span.
  - Hire clinical supervisors who are qualified to prepare and support candidates to teach effectively All Grades World Language.

  If Providence College does not demonstrate sufficient progress by March 2019, RIDE will prohibit the college from admitting new candidates to the TCP World Languages pathway.

- The Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education and the President of Providence College must engage in quarterly check-ins on how the college, provider, and its programs have taken action to ensure that programs capitalize on the diversity of candidates and provide a welcoming and supportive experience to candidates. Specifically, Providence College must do the following:

  - Expedite the hiring of a new Vice President of Institutional Diversity, if one has not already been hired.

- By September 2018, work with RIDE to connect with researchers and other institutes of higher education with expertise and success in recruiting, retaining, and supporting diverse educator candidates.

- By January 2019, identify three high-leverage actions that Providence College will take within the next two years based on conversations with researchers and other institutes of higher education.

- By January 2019, provide documentation that academic advisors have attended the new training on inclusivity.

- By January 2019, begin engaging all provider faculty and staff in ongoing training focused on cultural competency and supporting underrepresented students.

- By Spring 2019, establish annual measures of school climate, diversity, and cultural competence. Collected data might include, but is not limited to, recruitment numbers, retention numbers, student and faculty perceptions, school climate survey data, and candidate engagement data. Track impact and change over time between now and the next visit and disaggregate data by program, race, and ethnicity. Review data regularly and adjust implementation of strategies and supports as needed.

- As applicable, engage in all cultural competence and equity workshops provided by RIDE.

- By December 2018, the provider must revise its processes and procedures for recruiting, selecting, training, and evaluating clinical educators and clinical supervisors. The revised process must ensure clinical educators and supervisors are highly effective in their practice and hold appropriate certifications. The processes must include calibration exercises and must ensure that clinical educators are prepared to work with adult learners, provide coaching to candidates, and provide feedback to candidates.

- By December 2018, the provider must design systems and processes for engaging in continuous improvement. Plans should identify how the provider will analyze program data to inform improvement, how the provider and its programs will prioritize and address recommendations in this report, and how the provider will engage stakeholders in program evaluation and program improvement efforts.

- During the 2018-19 school year, the provider must also take high-leverage actions toward program improvement:

  - The provider must formalize partnerships with districts by meeting with districts to establish mutually agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness and making a plan for tracking and analyzing data from agreed-upon indicators. Over time, the provider must demonstrate progress in establishing mutually beneficial partnerships.

- o The provider must develop and pilot measures to assess impact on student learning. The PREP-RI review team will expect to see at least two years of data from impact measures when it returns to Providence College in 2021-22.

- o The provider and its programs must revise its procedures and strategies for administering and analyzing data from employer surveys, collecting employment outcomes data, and tracking post-completion employment of program completers.

- RIDE will meet bi-annually with Providence College leadership to discuss progress made in in addressing recommendations of the PREP-RI report. Providence College will also publish annually a report that documents improvement efforts accomplished to date. The university will share a link to the report with the RIDE team.

- If Providence College makes insufficient progress, the Commissioner of Education reserves the right to establish more specific interim improvement benchmarks or to close programs not making sufficient progress.

Component Ratings

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

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

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

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

Component	Component Ratings		
Administrator and Support Professional Certification Area Programs	Building Level Administrator	Reading Specialist	School Counselor
1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Meets Expectations	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations
1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations

Component	Component Ratings		
Administrator and Support Professional Certification Area Programs	Building Level Administrator	Reading Specialist	School Counselor
1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations
1.5 Technology	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations
1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations
1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

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

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

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

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

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

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

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

Standard 4: Program Impact

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

Component	Component Ratings			
Teacher Certification Area Programs	All Grades	Elementary & Elementary Special Education	Secondary	Special Education
4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations

Component	Component Ratings		
Administrator and Support Professional Certification Area Programs	Building Level Administrator	Reading Specialist	School Counselor
4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations	Approaching Expectations	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	Elementary & Elementary Special Education	Secondary	Special Education
5.1 Collection of Data to Evaluate Program Quality*	Approaching Expectations			
5.2 Analysis and Use of Data for Continuous Improvement*	Does Not Meet Expectations			
5.3 Reporting and Sharing of Data*	Approaching Expectations			
5.4 Stakeholder Engagement*	Does Not Meet Expectations			
5.5 Diversity and Quality of Faculty*	Approaching Expectations			
5.6 Other Resources*	Approaching Expectations			

Component	Component Ratings		
Administrator and Support Professional Certification Area Programs	Building Administrator	Reading Specialist	School Counselor
5.1 Collection of Data to Evaluate Program Quality*	Approaching Expectations		
5.2 Analysis and Use of Data for Continuous Improvement*	Does Not Meet Expectations		
5.3 Reporting and Sharing of Data*	Approaching Expectations		
5.4 Stakeholder Engagement*	Does Not Meet Expectations		
5.5 Diversity and Quality of Faculty*	Approaching Expectations		
5.6 Other Resources*	Approaching Expectations		

Teacher Certification Areas: Findings and Recommendations

Elementary Education & Elementary Special Education Program

The undergraduate elementary education & elementary special education program prepares candidates in two certificate areas. The program includes fourteen required courses and five field experiences. Candidates complete two student teaching assignments—one in elementary education and one in elementary special education.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Meets Expectations
The program aligns to the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS). Candidates have the opportunity to develop proficiency in all RIPTS.	

- All candidates take the same courses and complete the same critical performance tasks. Performance tasks and course syllabi map to the RIPTS. Throughout the program, candidates demonstrate proficiency through lesson planning and implementation. During interviews, candidates were able to describe the RIPTS in detail and describe how they related to their practice.

- Based on syllabi review, interviews, and site visits, reviewers noted that the program prepares candidates well to create instructional opportunities that reflect a respect for the diversity of learners (Standard 4). Candidates also are well-prepared to create a supportive learning environment (Standard 6), to use formal and informal assessment strategies (Standard 9), and to reflect on their practice and assume responsibility for their own professional development (Standard 10).

- Although candidates receive preparation in Standard 7 through EDU 322 and partially through EDU 301, candidates voiced that they needed more preparation to communicate with families and access supports from community agencies prior to student teaching. Based on their review of syllabi, work samples, and site visits, reviewers noted that candidates would benefit from additional preparation in how to create instructional opportunities to encourage all students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, performance skills, and literacy across content areas (Standard 5).

- Candidates generally experience a consistent curriculum, but reviewers noted and candidates reported some pockets of inconsistency. Syllabi reveal some discrepancies when different professors teach the same course, particularly in EDU 270: Teaching Science and Mathematics in the Elementary School and, to a lesser extent, in some of the reading courses—particularly EDU 331: Teaching Language Arts and Social Studies in the Elementary School with the study abroad option. The program would benefit from reviewing and revising course syllabi to make them more consistent across course sections and instructors.

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Approaching Expectations

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

- The program provides candidates an opportunity to develop proficiency in most Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) standards. Course syllabi and assessments align well with the CEC standards. During interviews, candidates were familiar with the CEC standards and could describe them.

- Of the CEC standards, the review team noted that the program addresses strongly Learner Development and Individual Learning Differences (Standard 1), Learning Environments (Standard 2), Assessment (Standard 4), and Collaboration (Standard 7). The program addresses these standards in a variety of classes and clinical experiences. The program addresses Professional Learning and Ethical Practice (Standard 6) through reflection activities embedded in field experiences and through professional development, but the structure of professional development and reflection is not always clear. Although methods coursework addresses Curricular Content Knowledge (Standard 3), reviewers noted that the program does not address all components of this standard. In particular, candidates would benefit from greater emphasis on how to differentiate or adapt content instruction based on student needs and disabilities. While the program generally prepares candidates in Instructional Planning and Strategies (Standard 5), candidates would benefit from additional emphasis on using technologies to support instructional assessment, planning, and delivery for individuals with exceptionalities.

- The program does not emphasize the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) standards as much as the CEC standards. Although some instructors have aligned their course content to ACEI standard, the program does not align fully to ACEI standards in a way that assures all candidates experience the content and content pedagogy encompassed within all ACE standards.

- Of the ACEI standards, reviewers noted gaps in Development, Learning, and Motivation (Standard 1) and Curriculum (Standard 2). Reviewers noted that candidates may learn about development, learning, and motivation in some courses, but the emphasis on this foundational knowledge is insufficient. In addition, candidate preparation in content and content pedagogy is insufficient in terms of depth of preparation across the major content areas. EDU 270: Teaching Science and Mathematics in the Elementary School and EDU 331: Literacy and Social Studies Methods combine content areas and do not address the full range of knowledge and skills needed for each content area.

- The program and its candidates also acknowledged that some candidates struggle with passing the Praxis exams. For the class of 2017 and 2018, only 40 percent of candidates met the readiness-to-student teach requirement in May of their junior year; all candidates who did not meet the readiness-to-student teach requirements had not yet passed the required Praxis

exams. These data provide one indicator that candidates may need stronger preparation in content.

Recommendations

- Convene program leadership, program faculty, and district partners to redesign methods coursework. Consider whether the program would benefit from having a separate methods course in each elementary subject area (reading/ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies). Include learning opportunities and assessments to ensure that candidates have sufficient proficiency in content pedagogy across elementary settings. Additionally, find ways to integrate clearly methods for teaching students with disabilities in content area courses.

- Review Praxis test results and other data to identify potential gaps in candidate content knowledge. Convene program leadership, program faculty, and district partners to identify the content preparation needed for teaching elementary school. Revise coursework and candidate supports as needed to ensure that candidates have sufficient content knowledge to be a successful elementary educator.

- Convene leadership and program faculty to ensure that all faculty have a shared understanding of the ACEI standards. Ensure that the program aligns intentionally to professional association standards.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
The program curriculum provides some opportunities to learn about student standards and their critical importance to instructional planning and assessment. Candidates have a basic understanding of the standards but not at sufficient depth.	

- The program reported, "Candidates develop a deep understanding of student learning standards." During preparation, candidates receive exposure to student standards but do not have detailed opportunities to unpack the standards throughout their program. Content-specific courses (e.g. EDU 231: Methods and Materials in Teaching Reading and EDU 270: Teaching Science and Mathematics in the Elementary School) include the content-appropriate standards in the syllabus and allocate a course session focused on the standards. In interviews, site visits, and work samples, candidates demonstrated a basic understanding of student standards and a familiarity with developing lessons based on student content standards. However, candidates did not fully demonstrate an understanding and proficiency in implementing the student learning standard progressions at the elementary level. Additionally, lesson plans reviewed did not always align clearly with the standards stated within the plan.

- Candidates design and teach multiple lessons aligned to student standards prior to student teaching. The program's expectation that candidates teach multiple lessons across a variety of content areas is a strength, according to candidates and clinical educators.

- The program expects candidates to align lesson plans with the appropriate student content standards throughout their preparation. In EDU 231 and EDU 231L: Methods and Materials in Teaching Reading, candidates design and teach multiple literacy lessons aligned to the CCSS

standards. In EDU 270 and 270L: Teaching Science and Mathematics in the Elementary School, candidates teach multiple lessons aligned to the CCSS in mathematics and to NGSS. Candidates also design and teach lessons as part of EDU 331: Literacy and Social Studies Methods.

- The lesson observation form, which does not include a rubric, lists "appropriateness of objectives/competencies" as a consideration under Planning and Preparation. However, given the design of the lesson observation form, candidates do not consistently receive detailed feedback on the extent to which the lesson ensures that students make progress towards achieving the student standards identified in the lesson.

- Interviews, work samples, and site visits revealed that candidates did not fully grasp the rigorous expectations of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS), and RI Grade Span Expectations (GSEs). In particular, lesson plans had an inconsistent focus on higher order thinking and rigor.

Recommendations

- Ensure all faculty members have sufficient proficiency in new student content standards. As needed, provide additional professional learning to faculty to ensure they understand fully the rigorous expectations for students and the implications for current and future educators.

- Work with program faculty and clinical educators to incorporate additional resources and materials into the methods courses and clinical experiences designed to help students unpack, develop understanding of, and design rigorous instruction consistent with student standards and associated learning progressions. In subject-specific methods courses throughout the program, give candidates more time to unpack standards and develop a deep understanding of effective content pedagogies that will help students achieve the standards. Additionally, provide more opportunities for candidates to develop an understanding of how to differentiate instruction for diverse learners in accessing the rigorous expectations of the content standards.

- Ensure that candidate preparation emphasizes the critical importance of student standards and their role as a driver of lesson planning, assessment, and reflection. Require candidates to reflect on their developing proficiency in the use of student standards. Articulate clear expectations to faculty, clinical faculty, and clinical educators that candidates should receive feedback on the extent to which their lesson and assessments support mastery of rigorous student standards and, as needed, revise the observation tool to make this expectation more explicit.

- Ensure candidates know how to design, implement, and adjust instruction in ways that increasingly support elementary students to meet the expectations of the standards. Identify learning experiences for candidates to plan and implement content area lessons that build deep conceptual knowledge.

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

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

- Candidates also take a course that focuses on assessment. In EDU 390: Assessment of Individual Differences, candidates learn about Response to Intervention and Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, disproportionality in special education, goal setting, progress monitoring, diagnostic tests, curriculum-based measures, referral and eligibility, and assessment with young learners. In EDU 390 and EDU 418L (Teaching Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities), candidates conduct a diagnostic evaluation, collect weekly progress monitoring data, and teach a sequence of lessons aligned with an IEP goal.

- Prior to student teaching, multiple key assessments emphasize the collection and analysis of data, including the case study of an individual learner (EDU 231: Methods and Materials in Teaching Reading), an assessment plan (EDU 270: Teaching Science and Mathematics in the Elementary School), and a writing unit with reflections focused on assessment of student work (EDU 331: Literacy and Social Studies Methods). During student teaching, candidates complete a five-day assessment and instruction project that requires the use of and analysis of assessments (EDU 451: Elementary Student Teaching) and a case study where candidates progress monitor a student over six weeks (EDU 452: Elementary Special Education Student Teaching). Student work samples indicated that candidates received feedback on their performance on these assessments.

- Candidates learn about and use data from sources other than assessments to improve student learning. They use student work samples to plan lessons (EDU 231: Methods and Materials in Teaching Reading). In EDU 390: Assessment of Children with Individual Differences, candidates review and analyze the IEP of a student, interview special education and general education teachers about the student, observe the student, and analyze work samples as part of the case study assignment. Program leadership also highlighted that candidates use research to inform their instructional planning. While these are important learning opportunities, the program should continue to expand and integrate additional opportunities for candidates to learn about and practice using data from sources other than assessments to improve student learning and instructional practice.

1.5 Technology	Approaching Expectations
The program expects candidates to use technology, but 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. Not all candidates have a set of intentional experiences to use technology to support student learning.

- Program leadership submitted a crosswalk that highlighted where candidates learn about and practice using technology. Opportunities emphasize creating multimedia presentations and collaborating using Google suite and course management tools. Candidates learn about only a few content-specific technologies that can be used to enhance instruction. In EDU 331: Literacy and Social Studies methods, candidates plan a virtual field trip that can be used as part of a social studies class. A few courses highlight the use of Newsela to differentiate reading materials for students. Candidates learn about augmentative and assistive technology in EDU 125: Communication Development and Disorders and develop additional knowledge within EDU 418: Teaching Students with Mild Moderate Disabilities, but the program does not provide candidates with deep learning of how to use educational and assistive technology to enhance or support learning.

- During interviews, candidates spoke highly of EDU 470: Special Topics: Educational Technology, an elective course. Candidates who could not fit this course into their schedules were disappointed that they did not have access to similarly rich opportunities to learn about high quality instructional technology.

- Program leadership reported that it expects candidates to use technology in instruction and that their "lesson plan format highlights the use of technology to improve learning to enhance students' skills." Reviewers saw limited use of instructional technology in site visits and in work samples. In addition, technology is not an explicit part of lesson observation form. Work samples revealed limited if any feedback on candidate plans to use and candidate use of technology to improve learning.

- In an effort to increase candidate access to technology for use in teaching, the program recently purchased hardware for candidates to borrow and use in schools. However, during interviews, not all candidates were aware of the ability to borrow iPads purchased by the program.

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.

- Converse with candidates who have and have not taken EDU 470 to understand better what is most helpful about the course and what is missing from other courses. Work with the course instructor and clinical educators to identify opportunities to integrate aspects of the course into

the course sequence so that all candidates benefit from rich learning opportunities related to technology.

- 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 required courses for candidates to learn about and practice designing digital age learning experiences.

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

- The program reported that it is "committed to developing culturally responsive teachers." In EDU 301: Foundations of Education candidates learn about race in education, race and the achievement gap, poverty and the achievement gap, culturally responsive teaching, education as social justice, and family and community issues. Through the faculty meeting assignment, candidates engage in conversations around authentic equity-related scenarios that often surface in today's schools and school districts. In EDU 231: Methods and Materials in Teaching Reading, candidates learn culturally and linguistically responsive teaching in vocabulary instruction. In EDU 331: Literacy and Social Studies methods, candidates unpack their own biases by taking the Harvard Implicit Bias test, listening to podcasts, and key readings such as "Unpacking the White Backpack." In interviews, candidates spoke about how readings helped them understand their biases and how they use their understanding to think about how that may impact their lesson planning. Candidates also spoke highly of EDU 322: Collaboration: Home/School/Community because of its emphasis on culturally responsive practices.

- Candidates take multiple courses where they learn about the needs of students with disabilities and learn practices and strategies that are effective when working with students with disabilities. In particular, one section of EDU 418: Teaching Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities focuses on high leverage practices in special education recently identified by the CEC. Coursework includes multiple opportunities for candidates to learn, practice, and receive feedback on their understanding of special education. Key assessments are practice-based and emphasize planning, supporting, and assessing students with disabilities. Assessments include case studies, an individualized education plan, an assessment and intervention report, lesson plans, and a classroom management plan. Clinical field experiences focus on how to collect data and differentiate instruction to support the needs of students with disabilities.

- Candidates learn how to work with families during their program, but do so primarily in EDU 322: Home School Collaboration. In this course, candidates learn strategies for involving students, educators, related service personnel and family members in the special education process. Candidates also focus on strategies to improve communication and collaboration

between home, school, and community. As part of the course, candidates interview a parent to learn about the family member's experience with various aspects of the child's schooling. During interviews, candidates reported learning about strategies for working the families but stated that they have insufficient opportunity to develop proficiency through practical application of their learning prior to student teaching.

- Although the program prepares candidates well in other aspects of this component, reviewers found a limited focus on working with English language learners. A few courses, including in EDU 125: Communication Development and Disorders, EDU 231: Methods and Materials in Teaching Reading, and EDU 331: Literacy and Social Studies Methods, provide some instruction on working with English language learners. However, both candidates and clinical educators noted that candidates need additional support in learning specific strategies that are effective in working with English language learners and meeting their diverse needs.

Recommendations

- Work with clinical partners to identify best practices for working with English language learners. Review and revise course syllabi and clinical experiences to ensure that candidates receive instruction in best practices related to English language learners. Ensure candidates have opportunities to practice working with English language learners and receive specific, targeted feedback on their work with English language learners.

- Identify authentic experiences for working with families that the program can integrate into candidate's courses of study. Articulate clear expectations for candidates and clinical educators that candidates should practice working with families and ensure that candidates receive feedback from clinical supervisors or clinical educators regarding their work with families.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Meets Expectations
The program provides candidates multiple opportunities to learn about and become proficient in Rhode Island educational initiatives.	

- Throughout their coursework, candidates receive information about multiple educational initiatives, laws, and policies. For example, in EDU 285: Strategies for Classroom Management, candidates review RIDE resources on school discipline, Rhode Island's Safe School Act, the Rhode Island State Department of Education's guidance on the statewide bulling policy, and a RI data hub story on bullying. Candidates also review information on the RIDE website about social emotional learning and learn the Collaborative for Academic Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) Core Competencies. In multiple courses, candidates learn about personal literacy plans, IDEA, the comprehensive assessment system, and multi-tiered systems of support and RTI. In EDU 301: Foundations of Education, candidates propose a charter school that will address a civic/social problem that they identified. For this project, candidates review Rhode Island guidelines for charter schools, research charter schools in Rhode Island, and propose a charter school. The program also emphasizes educator evaluation.

- During student teaching, candidates attend professional development days on initiatives and practices implemented in RI partner schools. Candidates expressed in interviews that these days were beneficial in helping them learn more about key initiatives and connect it to their learning.

- During interviews, candidates spoke knowledgably about MTSS and RTI, the RI IEP, social emotional learning, and bullying. Student work samples showed evidence of candidates using important RI resources. For example, candidates used InfoWorks to research school performance and included PARCC released items in their lesson plans.

- Although reviewers thought the program met expectations for this component, the program should continue to refine how it assesses candidate proficiency in initiatives as well as in the knowledge and skills needed to implement initiatives effectively, particularly as they related to the roles of an elementary teacher and of an elementary special educator.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

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

- Clinical experiences begin first semester of the program with the first year field experience and continue throughout the program. Prior to student teaching, candidates complete 130 hours of field experiences. These experiences include a 20-hour first-year field experience where candidates work with students as a volunteer in a community library, three 20-hour practicum experiences in general education, and one 50-hour practicum experience in special education. Candidates complete two twelve-week student teaching experiences—one in elementary education and one in elementary special education. Collectively, candidate clinical preparation meets the required amount established by Rhode Island certification requirements.

- Most candidates have six or seven different school placements throughout their clinical preparation. The program tracks placements to ensure candidates experience a variety of development levels, geographic settings, and environments. In interviews, stakeholders praised the amount of clinical preparation that candidates receive as well as the diversity of placements. Reviewers noted that close to half of placements were in an urban setting as calculated by placement data provided by the program.

- The practicum experiences align intentionally to specific courses and serve as field settings to observe, implement and practice skills, strategies, and assessments featured in courses. Candidates often have to complete specific fieldwork assignments connected to what they are learning in their courses. For example, candidates teach science and mathematics lessons in an elementary school in EDU 270L, the practicum, while taking EDU 270: Teaching Science and Mathematics in the Elementary School. During practicum experiences, the professor is also the supervisor, which candidates reported was very beneficial because it helped professors link content in the coursework to the field experiences.

- Expectations for candidates increase over time. During the first-year field experience, candidates work mostly one-on-one with students. During the methods course practicums, candidates are placed in pairs in classrooms and gain experience working with groups of students and teaching lessons. During the special education practicum, candidates provide instruction aligned with IEP goals and implement screening, progress monitoring, and diagnostic assessments.

- Per the student teaching handbook, the program expects candidates to assume teaching responsibilities gradually, beginning with a week of observation and getting to know students followed by taking over responsibilities for one class and then adding on over the course of two to three weeks. The program expects candidates to assume all teaching duties and responsibilities for eight weeks before transitioning responsibilities back to the clinical educator, but clinical educators reported that most candidates were eager to begin assuming teaching duties prior to program-established timelines.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Approaching Expectations
The program has established a shared commitment to ensuring that all stakeholders use data to determine if students are learning but has not yet developed formal measures to assess candidate impact on student learning.	

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

- Candidates must complete a case study as part of their student teaching experience in special education. For this assignment, candidates prepare an evaluation report using a variety of sources of information and assessments. Candidates develop and implement a six to eight week response-to-intervention process for the case study student, including at least three instructional lessons and progress monitoring. Then, based on the results, the candidate proposes revisions to the student's IEP. However, the program does not assess candidates based on their impact on student learning.

- Candidates must also implement a five-day assessment and instruction plan. The program expects candidates to include assessments and "each day's lesson must be based on the assessment results from the previous day." Student work samples demonstrated that candidates collected assessment data and used the assessment to inform instruction accordingly. However, the program does not assess candidates based on their impact on student learning.

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

- Although the program does not measure impact on student learning and use the data to inform candidate preparation, reviewers noted a shared commitment between program leaders, clinical educators, clinical supervisors, and candidates to gathering and analyzing data to ensure

students are learning. In an evidence organizer, program leadership emphasized the many ways that it expects candidates to collect and use data to inform instruction. In interviews, clinical educators and candidates spoke about the importance of ensuring that candidate instruction resulted in student learning.

Recommendations

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

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

- Clearly communicate expectations and measures of candidate impact on student learning with clinical educators and candidates.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program has not established mutually beneficial PK-12 partnerships with clinical partners.	

- Although clinical partners reported that they benefit from serving as clinical placement sites for Providence College, neither the program nor clinical partners collect data on the partnership. Programs and clinical partners do not share responsibility for designing and refining clinical partnerships and practice. The program shared examples of partnership agreements and indicators of partnership effectiveness, but there was no evidence that the provider customizes these agreements based on the input of district partners.

- The Office of Partnership and Placements selects clinical placements for candidates in the undergraduate and TCP pathways. The office classifies partnership districts/schools into three tiers. As defined by provider leadership, Tier 1 partners are districts that the programs work with and communicate with regularly. The Office of Partnership and Placements creates and maintains formal partnership agreements with Tier 1 partners only.

- In the clinical partners data file, the provider articulated four indicators of partnership success: the college receives positive feedback about their candidates, candidates have positive impact on student learning as determined by clinical educators, teacher candidates have the opportunity to learn and implement best practices, and the district is able to find excellent candidates for open teaching positions. Generally, the indicators emphasize benefits to the program rather than to the district. These indicators are not present in partnership agreements. In interviews, clinical partners could not identify these indicators. The program does not track and analyze data from agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness and use the data at least annually to make improvement to the partnership.

- The program reported that the Office of Partnership and Placements meets yearly with Tier 1 clinical partners to check on the status of the partnership. However, these conversations seem to center around the continuous improvement of the placement process rather than mutually beneficial partnerships and the status of such a relationship.

- The program and clinical educators use common observation and evaluation tools to evaluate and provide feedback during student teaching. Clinical educators have some input in the decision making process regarding the progression of candidates through their involvement in assessing candidate practice in clinical settings.

- Although program and clinical educators use common tools, they do not share common expectations for candidate performance and feedback. A review of written feedback from faculty and clinical educators given to candidates revealed variation in feedback quality; some forms included detailed feedback while others did not.

Recommendations

- Work with clinical partners to establish formal partnership agreements that include agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness. Determine how programs and clinical partners will track and analyze data from agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness. Meet regularly with clinical partners to review data and to ensure that the partnership is mutually beneficial.

- Ensure that programs and clinical partners share common expectations for candidate performance. Engage in conversations with clinical partners about performance expectations they have for candidates and new hires, and adjust expectations as needed. Improve training to ensure that clinical educators, clinical partners, clinical faculty, program faculty, and candidates have common expectations for candidate performance.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Does Not Meet Expectations
As currently designed and implemented, the program's processes do not ensure that the program and its partners select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators.	

- The Office of Partnership and Placements uses a Request for Field Placement form. Candidates may request a particular school and/or a specific clinical educator. The clinical educator must agree to accept the teacher candidate and the district representative and school leader must sign off that the clinical educator meets minimum requirements: has three years of experience, has received a 4 as an overall effectiveness rating, and is recommended to work with/mentor a Providence College candidate. School and district leadership do not need to verify specifically that the clinical educator has the ability to work with adult learners, has sufficient coaching and supervision skills, or has the ability to evaluate and provide high quality feedback to candidates.

- Reviewers expressed concern about the quality of tools used to train clinical educators. Clinical educators must complete an online training, review the student teaching handbook, and then submit a survey after the training. Based on survey results, most clinical educators found the video and handbook informative and helpful, but the seven-minute cooperating teacher orientation is inadequate as a mechanism for training clinical educators. The video provides a general overview of how the clinical educator may gradually release responsibility to candidates, but it does not provide information about the use of assessment tools. Because the training is limited, clinical educators do not have an opportunity to engage in conversation with others, learn or review coaching techniques, or develop a deep understanding of the assessment tools used to assess candidates practice and calibrate their understanding with program expectations.

- The program also submitted a second training video focused on delivering feedback to candidates. The video, about 30 minutes in length, asks viewers to observe a student teacher using the observation tool. After the lesson, viewers observe a conversation between the clinical educator and the clinical supervisor and then watch a debrief between the clinical supervisor and the candidate. The feedback given to the candidate does not align to key areas for improvement and did not focus on content outcomes. Reviewers expressed concern about the inclusion of this lesson and feedback conference as a model. The video does not model the types of in-depth conversations focused on the quality of instruction that candidates would benefit from. The training video also does not provide suggestions for how clinical educators can ensure that they provide strong feedback to candidates in line with program expectations. Again, because the training is limited, clinical educators do not have an opportunity to calibrate with each other or develop a deep understanding of expectations for feedback. Given the training format, the program also does not have an opportunity to assess clinical educator skill in giving feedback.

- At the end of the placement, candidates complete an evaluation of their clinical educator using a survey. The survey asks candidates to rate how helpful their clinical educator was in various aspects of practice on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being least helpful and 5 being most helpful. Candidates also have the opportunity to complete three open-ended questions about whether she or he would recommend using the clinical educator again, the clinical educator's strengths, and the clinical educator's weaknesses. The college supervisor also completes two surveys—one focused on the clinical placement and one focused on the clinical educator. The clinical educator survey requires the clinical supervisor to identify how frequently (ranging from Always to Not at All) that the clinical educator modeled instruction, provided support, encouraged professional growth, etc. The provider translates these survey results into an overall score.

- The clinical educator data file revealed that, in some cases, the provider removed an educator from the list of approved clinical educators due to low evaluation scores. However, only a small percentage of currently approved clinical educators had any evaluation scores, even though most clinical educators have served as clinical educators for multiple years.

Recommendations

- Revise selection criteria for clinical educators to include skills in supporting adult learners and demonstrated ability to coach candidates.

- Establish an ongoing expectation for clinical educators and clinical supervisors to calibrate their observations, use of tools, and feedback to candidates. Create, facilitate, and monitor clinical educator access to these opportunities.

- Ensure that all clinical educators receive training on best adult learning practices. Require that all clinical educators retrain on a regular basis.

- 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. Ensure that candidates receive actionable, constructive feedback that attends to the quality and rigor of the candidate's instruction.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

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

- The program assessment system includes three major decision points: readiness for admission, readiness for student teaching, and recommendation for certification. At the end of each year, candidates receive a status letter outlining where candidates are in the process and what requirements they have and have not met for the upcoming checkpoint.

- During the admissions process, the program evaluates candidates' GPA, transcript, basic skills proficiency, professionalism observation scale, and key assessments from initial courses. Per the Assessment System Overview that the program submitted to RIDE, the minimum criteria for admission are a cumulative GPA of 2.75, a C or higher in all education courses and practicum experiences, a C or higher on the pedagogical performance tasks, and minimum scores on the SAT, ACT, or Praxis Core tests (based on RIDE's minimum admissions requirements). The program has a process for accepting students who do not meet minimum requirements, but RIDE has not approved this conditional acceptance policy.

- For the admissions pedagogical performance task, the candidates submit a lesson plan package that includes a graded lesson plan, a lesson reflection, an observation of instruction, and samples of student work related to the lesson. Candidates must score a C or higher on both parts in order to receive admissions. The review team noted that the inclusion of an assessment of candidate teaching performance at the point of admissions is a program strength, but acknowledged that the tools used to assess performance lack clarity of expectations.

- In order to proceed to student teaching, candidates must demonstrate an overall GPA of 2.75, a 2.00 or higher in all education courses, and a B or higher on all post-admission education practicum experiences. Given the emphasis on course grades, it is important to acknowledge how course grades are determined. Course and practicum grades are based on key assignments as well as professionalism and participation. The exact percentages vary by course and by instructor. For example, in one section of 270L, the entire grade is based on candidate lesson plans and teaching and, in another section of the same practicum, 70 percent of the grade is

based on classroom teaching and the other 30 percent is based on participation and professionalism.

- Prior to student teaching, candidates must also demonstrate passing scores on the Praxis Elementary subject tests, must demonstrate passing scores on the Praxis PLT K-6 test, and must demonstrate that they have taken the Praxis special education test. Candidates submit a dossier through which they must demonstrate passing scores on teaching domains 1-4 of evaluation rubrics for key assessments within methods courses and must meet or exceed standard on the professionalism observation scale on each observation report. The dossier includes work samples that the candidate selects. Candidates also submit a professional growth writing response that must be proficient on a reviewer scale.

- Reviewers noted that the current assessment system requires candidates to include a single instructional packet from one methods course at this checkpoint, which presents a limited view of candidate proficiency in a variety of standards and in a variety of content areas. The assessment system also relies on methods course grades, which presents inconsistencies if instructors lack calibration in how they assign course grades and assess candidate performance.

- According to program leadership, candidates who do not meet expectations at an assessment point work with the department chair, advisor, and Office of Assessment to develop a conditional plan that identifies action steps and supports. Sample supports include additional test preparation materials, tutoring through the PC Tutoring Center, and EDU 490, an independent study course for candidates who have not met pedagogical performance requirements or need additional experience in a clinical setting. In interviews, candidates were aware of these supports.

- Work samples demonstrated that candidates receive written feedback on key assignments, but the quality and depth of feedback is inconsistent. According to an evidence organizer, the program uses a consistent lesson evaluation beginning with EDU 231 and through both student learning experiences. This form is organized by teaching domains, but the program does not use a rubric to assess candidate teaching performance. The observation form includes space for handwritten notes and then asks the clinical educator or supervisor to rate each domain of instruction on a scale of 1 (F or Below Proficiency) to 5 (A or Exceeds Proficiency). The form does not clearly define what performance at each level looks like for each domain. As a result, assessment criteria are unclear and are not consistently applied.

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

Recommendations

- Review course syllabi and the assessment system to ensure that there is consistent emphasis on practice across courses and across course instructors. Ensure candidates receive consistent feedback on their practice.

- Convene clinical educators and faculty to revise the lesson observation form. Although the current observation form already aligns to the domains of teaching used in educator evaluation

systems, consider adopting or adapting a full observation rubric that is already widely used in Rhode Island and other states.

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

- Identify and pilot potential measures of candidate impact of student learning. Incorporate the measures into the assessment system.

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

- Prior to recommendation for certification, candidates must have an overall GPA of 2.75 or higher and must have a 2.00 or higher in all education courses. Candidates must have a passing score on the Praxis Special Education exam, must meet or exceed standard on the professionalism observation scale, and must have a professional growth writing response rated as proficient. Candidates must also score B- or higher in each of the two student teaching notebooks.

- Candidates complete a student teaching notebook for each student teaching placement. The student teaching notebook must include three lessons with the cooperating teacher's observations, three lessons with the supervisor's observations, journal entries, a videotaped lesson with video and commentary, the five day instruction and assessment project or the special education project (depending on placement), the cooperating teachers' final evaluations, and the supervisors' final professionalism evaluation. The program assesses key assignments included in the notebook using rubrics with clear performance-level descriptors. The program determines the overall student notebook grade based on the results of the rubrics.

- Reviewers expressed concerns about the recommendation for certification checkpoint that were similar to the concerns they had about the readiness for student teaching checkpoint. As currently implemented, the program does not have a consistent and collective view of performance levels across all settings, instructors, clinical educators, and supervisors. Candidates must score a 2.0 or higher in education courses but instructors assign weight assignments differently, even within the same course number. For example, reviewers noted discrepancies in different syllabi for EDU 301: Foundations of Education and EDU 322: Collaboration: Home/School/Community. In addition, the program determines if candidates are ready for certification based on a student teaching portfolio that includes observations, but, as mentioned earlier, the form does not clearly define what performance at each level looks like for each domain. Consequently, assessment criteria are unclear and are not consistently applied; reviewers noted a lack of calibration across assessors (i.e. clinical educators and clinical supervisors). Overall, reviewers were concerned that the current assessment point does not

ensure that the system measures candidate performance consistently across all settings, instructors, clinical educators, and field supervisors.

- Clinical educators and clinical supervisors are both responsible for evaluating the performance of candidates. According to the student teaching OneNote, the clinical supervisor and clinical educator must observe four lessons each. The clinical educator and clinical supervisor use the same observation form, which is divided into four domains of teaching (consistent with the *Framework for Teaching*). As mentioned earlier, the form does not clearly define what performance at each level looks like for each domain. Given the lack of clarity in the form, it is unclear that candidates recommended for certification demonstrate proficiency in all of the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards and in all of the critical concepts, principles, and practices identified as the content competencies for the elementary and elementary special education certification areas.

- Clinical educators receive an online video focused on use of the teacher observation tool and candidate feedback. However, as noted previously in this report, the video is not of high quality. The video does not include a strong model of feedback after a lesson. Although the video encourages viewers to practice using the tool during the video, there is no opportunity for conversation or further calibration. Clinical educators also do not receive training on how to use other tools, including the professionalism rubric, the mid-term evaluation, and the final evaluation. Given the lack of initial and ongoing calibration, the program does not ensure that the implementation of performance-based assessments yields fair, accurate, or consistent evaluation of candidate performance.

Recommendations

- Review course syllabi and the assessment system to ensure that there is consistent emphasis on practice across courses and across course instructors. Ensure candidates receive consistent feedback on their practice.

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

- Convene clinical educators and practicing faculty to revise the lesson observation form. Although the current observation form already aligns to the domains of teaching used in educator evaluation systems, consider adopting or adapting a full observation rubric that is already widely used in Rhode Island and other states.

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

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program has created an employer survey but administration of the survey has resulted in unacceptably low response rates.	

- Multiple programs collaborated in Spring 2016 to develop an employer survey. The survey is designed to yield some actionable information. It asks evaluators to assess the preparedness of program completers to implement nine teaching practices and five professional responsibilities. The survey also asks about candidate preparedness to use data. The survey asks candidates how prepared certified teachers are to demonstrate how they met student objectives and includes three open-ended questions where respondents can provide more detailed thoughts, impressions, and comments. However, if an employer has hired multiple program completers, there is no way for the program to disaggregate information by completer or by program.

- Program leadership reported—and reviewers agreed—that the program needs to improve survey response rates. Undergraduate and TCP leadership administered the employer survey in November/December 2016 and again in fall 2017 to any employer of a program completer who gave the program permission to contact his or her employer. In 2017, the program received one response, which limited the usability of the data for program improvement purposes. The program also reported that 24 percent of 2017 program completers enrolled in graduate school immediately after graduation, which further limits the employability data that the program can gather.

- The aggregate performance of Providence College program completers is 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 Education & Elementary Special Education program can be made.

Recommendations

- Follow up with program completers to understand why so many do not grant permission to survey employers. Review and revise communications about the employer survey. Consider emphasizing the importance of the survey prior to candidate exit and be more explicit about how the program will use data from the survey. Leverage strong personal relationships with candidates to ensure higher response rates.

- Explore and implement additional strategies to solicit annual feedback from program employers to support program improvement. Use the EPP database as an alternate source of employer contact information for completers working in state. Consider if there are alternate ways of finding out where out-of-state candidates are working, such as through social media or state certification verification portals.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Meets Expectations
The program administers program completer surveys annually and supplements completer surveys with exit surveys.	

- The Education Council, a committee of program directors at PC, designed a program completer survey in 2015. The survey is designed to yield actionable data about the program. The survey includes questions about employment status, perceived preparedness in a variety of competencies, and perceived quality of field placements. The survey also includes open-ended questions about program strengths, field experience strengths and areas for improvement, and suggestions for improvement.

- Undergraduate leadership administered the survey in 2015, 2016, and 2017. Response rates varied across years, ranging from 32 percent in 2015 to 45 percent in 2016. The program should continue to pursue additional strategies to increase survey completion since it is the primary way that it tracks employment of candidates, especially outside of Rhode Island.

- The faculty supplemented program completer surveys with student teaching exit surveys. The response rates were high (95 percent in 2016 and 83 percent in 2017). The 2016 survey included multiple open-ended questions. The questions focused on strengths and weaknesses of the program, the assessment system, and culturally responsive teaching. Candidates also had the opportunity to rate on a scale of 1 to 5 the effectiveness of services and resources used by candidates. The 2017 survey had a different focus and asked candidates to share their plans after graduation, rate how prepared they felt in key practices, and then provide narrative feedback on strengths and weaknesses of the program. Both surveys included space for respondents to provide additional comments or suggestions.

- The program also administered a four-question survey to clinical educators about how they define culturally responsive teaching, what they look for in candidates when looking for cultural responsiveness, and the strengths and weaknesses of Providence College's preparation of candidates who are culturally responsive.

Secondary Grades Education Program

The Secondary Grades Education Program includes three pathways: undergraduate, graduate (Providence Alliance for Catholic Teachers, or PACT), or non-degree (Teacher Certificate Program, or TCP). Candidates enrolled in TCP may also earn a graduate degree if they complete additional assignments within their TCP courses and complete five additional courses from the M.Ed. in Urban Teaching program. Candidates may specialize in biology, chemistry, English, mathematics, physics, or social studies.

In the undergraduate pathway, housed within the School of Professional Studies, candidates take six three-credit courses and one one-credit course. Candidates complete four 25-hour practicum experiences tied to specific courses. Student teaching is a fourteen-week placement in a secondary school setting.

In the TCP pathway, housed within School of Continuing Education, candidates take six three-credit courses and two 30-hour practicum experiences. Student teaching is a 12-week placement in a secondary school setting.

The PACT pathway is a two-year residency program housed within the School of Professional Studies. Candidates take nine courses over the course of two summers and complete four semesters of internship as a teacher of record.

Given the multiple pathways, the sections below communicate general findings first and then provide specific information about each pathway.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

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

- The program provides candidates opportunities to develop proficiency in the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions encompassed in most, but not all, of the RIPTS. Course syllabi, key assignments, and program documents consistently demonstrate alignment to the RIPTS. However, the undergraduate, TCP, and PACT pathways each address RIPTS at varying depth. Reviewers noted that candidate preparation in the RIPTS is notably stronger in the PACT pathway.

- The three secondary education pathways act as three independent programs; leadership of the three pathways currently do not collaborate on a regular basis. As a result, candidate experiences within the secondary program vary and candidates do not experience a consistent curriculum. Secondary education candidates take similar courses across pathways but the quality of courses and placements vary by pathway and by instructor. Analysis of course syllabi revealed inconsistencies in course content, assignments, and expectations for candidates.

Undergraduate:

- Pathway leadership reported that the program is based on the RIPTS. Pathway leadership submitted a crosswalk showing that coursework addresses all RIPTS, but reviewers noted that the pathway addresses the RIPTS at varying depth.

- During interviews, candidates could not speak to specific RIPTS but noted that they were familiar with them. They cited examples of where professors addressed the RIPTS in their courses, such as in EDU 206: Principles of Secondary Education, where candidates read the RIPTS. In lesson plans, candidates must identify which RIPTS the lesson reflects.

- During interviews, candidates expressed that coursework focused on theory and writing papers. They expressed concern that coursework does not focus sufficiently on preparing them to teach and implement the practices embedded within the RIPTS.

- Within the undergraduate pathway, candidates generally experience a consistent curriculum. All candidates take the same series of courses.

- Candidates were generally well prepared to create learning experiences using a broad base of general knowledge (Standard 1) and to reflect on their own practice (Standard 10). However, candidates lacked a sufficient content knowledge base to create learning experiences that reflect an understanding of the central concepts, structures, and tools of inquiry in the disciplines/content areas they teach (Standard 2). Candidates would also benefit from additional support in creating instructional opportunities to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, performance skills, and literacy across content areas (Standard 5).

TCP:

- Pathway leadership submitted a crosswalk showing that coursework addresses all RIPTS, but reviewers noted that the pathway addresses the RIPTS at varying depth.

- Pathway leadership reported that all candidates take courses together, which ensures consistency across levels within the program. The program said that, on the rare occasion where two TPC courses have multiple sections, the program assures consistency by implementing the key assessments consistently across sections. Candidates, however, reported different experiences. During an interview, TCP candidates described very different experiences within EDU 410/EDU 808: General Methods. The focus of the course varied, with one group of candidates reporting that they spent extensive time reviewing student content standards and the other group reporting that the instructor did not focus on student standards but did provide explicit instruction in technology.

- The Mid-term and Final Evaluation Form includes explicit alignment to the RIPTS. The candidate and clinical educator each complete the form midway through student teaching and then compare their evaluations. At the end of student teaching, the clinical educator completes the form again and reviews the ratings with the student teacher and the clinical supervisor.

- Candidates were generally well prepared to create learning experiences using a broad base of general knowledge (Standard 1) and to reflect on their own practice (Standard 10). However, candidates lacked a sufficient content knowledge base to create learning experiences that reflect an understanding of the central concepts, structures, and tools of inquiry in the disciplines/content areas they teach (Standard 2). Candidates would also benefit from additional support in creating instructional opportunities to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, performance skills, and literacy across content areas (Standard 5).

PACT:

- Reviewers noted that candidates in the PACT pathway receive strong preparation in the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards. In interviews, candidates spoke knowledgably and in depth about the RIPTS, what they mean, and how they relate to their practice.

- Over the course of their internship, candidates complete a portfolio that must demonstrate that they have acquired the knowledge, skills, and dispositions within the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards. Each semester, candidates update their portfolio and provide descriptions and evidence of the RIPTS. School principals also evaluate candidates on each standard using the Principal's End of Semester Report.

- Because of the cohort design, candidates within the PACT pathway experience a consistent curriculum. They take courses at the same time and with the same instructor. In one course, EDU 808: Methods of Secondary Education, candidates receive instruction from different instructors based on their content area, but they still experience comparable learning opportunities.

Recommendations

- Conduct a crosswalk across the three pathways. Examine course requirements, syllabi, and course expectations. Identify possible redundancies and opportunities to combine courses across pathways. Ensure that candidates receive comparable learning opportunities regardless of pathway and instructor, particularly within the undergraduate and TCP pathways since they already are very similar in structure.

- For undergraduate and TCP, review the current curriculum to see where and how candidates demonstrate their mastery of the RIPTS. Identify additional assignments and opportunities connected to teaching secondary students where candidates can develop the practices and skills embedded within the RIPTS. Ensure candidates receive feedback on their implementation of the skills embedded within the RIPTS.

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.	

- All pathways rely on academic majors, course requirements, or transcript analysis as evidence of content knowledge. Specific coursework requirements vary by pathway. Consequently, candidates have varying levels of content knowledge.

- The pathways handle methods courses differently and, as a result, candidate preparation in content and content pedagogy varies. The siloed nature of the secondary education pathways results in lost opportunities to provide consistent and content-specific pedagogical preparation. The undergraduate and TCP pathways offer general methods courses rather than provide subject-specific preparation in pedagogy; this preparation is inadequate. During site visits, reviewers observed undergraduate and TCP candidates make content errors during their instruction.

- In multiple instances, narratives in evidence organizers and responses from program faculty seemed to conflate RIPTS, professional association standards, and student standards. In interviews, candidates varied in their familiarity with professional association standards.

- Reviewers noted that secondary mathematics candidates generally had sufficient content knowledge (NCTM Standard 1). However, reviewers were concerned about candidate preparation in content pedagogy (NCTM Standard 3) in the undergraduate and TCP pathways. Candidates would also benefit from additional preparation in NCTM Standard 2b, NCTM Standard 4E and NCTM Standard 5b.

- In English, candidates generally demonstrated knowledge of English language arts subject matter content (NCTE Standards 1 and 2). However, reviewers were concerned about undergraduate and TCP candidate preparation in the remaining NCTE standards. For example, reviewers observed and examined lesson plans with incorrect standard alignment.

- Reviewers noted that secondary science candidates generally had sufficient content knowledge (NSTA Standard 1), especially in PACT. Within NSTA Standard 1, candidates would benefit from a deeper understanding of state and national curriculum standards, particularly in the undergraduate and TCP pathways. Across pathways, the program would benefit from additional emphasis on safety (NSTA Standard 4). TCP and undergraduate candidates would benefit from additional preparation in learning environments (NSTA Standard 3).

- In social studies, candidates are generally well prepared in history (NCSS Disciplinary Standard 1). Reviewers expressed concern that candidates, particularly undergraduate candidates, are not as well prepared in other disciplines (NCSS Disciplinary Standards 2-5). Looking at the undergraduate and TCP pathways, reviewers were concerned about the lack of a course or courses on teaching social studies (NCSS Programmatic Standard 2).

Undergraduate:

- Candidates in the undergraduate pathway must meet content area course requirements specified by the program. For example, secondary biology education candidates must take eight required courses (spanning topics of general biology, cell biology, general chemistry, organic chemistry, physics, and calculus), three biology electives with a lab, and four additional science electives.

- After reviewing the course requirements, reviewers expressed concern about the requirements for secondary social studies and English. The pathway requires candidates to take a series of history courses, but candidates do not need to take courses in other disciplines within the social studies, such as geography and economics. As a result, secondary social studies candidates may lack sufficient background to teach the full range of subjects addressed in secondary social studies. Reviewers also noted that English courses requirements might be too flexible for candidates studying secondary English. Candidates must take ENG 175: Introduction to Literature, ENG 304: History of the English Language, a writing course, three Pre-1800 courses and four post-1800 courses. Given this flexibility, candidates could potentially take courses focused only on British and Irish literature and never take an American literature course.

- All secondary education candidates take the same courses, including EDU 411-416, which is a secondary methods course. Up until recently, the methods courses were specific to the content area but, due to shifts in candidate enrollment, the methods course is now one general methods course. Reviewers noted that program faculty place much greater emphasis on the RIPTS than on professional association standards. During interviews, candidates reported that instructors did not differentiate by content area and candidates demonstrated limited if any understanding of subject-specific pedagogical concepts.

TCP:

- TCP leadership reviews candidate transcripts at admissions using a guidance document. For example, the guidance document specifies that candidates interested in secondary social studies should have two courses in U.S. History, two courses in Western Civilization, a world history course, a Rhode Island history course, an economics course, a geography course, and a government/civics/political science course. Candidates interested in secondary English must take six credits of writing, eighteen credits of literature (including an introductory class, two American literature classes, British literature, Shakespeare, and world/non-Western literature, and elective coursework. Reviewers then rate the Content Knowledge and Professional Goals as either acceptable with no conditions (2 points), acceptable with conditions (1 point), or unacceptable. Candidates who receive a rating of acceptable with conditions or unacceptable but generally meet other requirements may receive conditional admissions. Per the 2017-18 Assessment Handbook, sample conditions include completion of content area coursework before beginning education courses or completion of content area coursework before taking 300-level and 400-level education courses.

- Multiple TCP candidates reported that they struggled to pass the Praxis content exam required for certification, meaning that preparation in their content and content pedagogy may be insufficient. In some cases, candidates reported that they needed to teach themselves content

in preparation for the exam because they did not learn the content in their program or have previous necessary background knowledge.

- Like in the undergraduate pathway, TCP does not differentiate methods coursework by content area. Candidates take EDU 410/808: General Methods but no content-specific methods coursework. In an interview, faculty emphasized, "Good teaching is good teaching." Faculty did not think that content-specific courses were necessary. However, candidates reported that course instructors did not differentiate by content area. In interviews, candidates demonstrated limited if any understanding of subject-specific pedagogical concepts. For example, when asked to identify content-specific pedagogical concepts, candidates instead provided generic examples, such as depth of knowledge and exit tickets.

PACT:

- The PACT pathway requires admitted candidates to have a major in the content area and passing scores on the appropriate Praxis content test. It does not conduct additional analysis of possible content gaps in candidate content preparation. However, during interviews, candidates could clearly articulate concepts related to their respective content areas.

- Reviewers noted that candidates demonstrated proficiency in the critical pedagogical-content concepts, principles, and practices within the content area during interviews and site visits. During interviews, candidates spoke knowledgably about content-specific pedagogy and could give specific examples.

- All candidates in PACT take EDU 808: Methods of Secondary Education. This course introduces PACT teacher to "the central concepts, structures and modes of inquiry of their major discipline and the methods, procedures and strategies found to be effective in the teaching of their discipline at the secondary level." The course has multiple instructors, including one from each content area. Within the course, candidates prepare a year's outline of each course they will be teaching in the coming year, develop syllabi for each class that they will teach, and prepare a detailed unit plan for each class the candidate will teach in the coming year with support from their content-specific instructor. Candidates receive support and feedback from their content area instructor.

Recommendations

- Review the tools used to check content preparation. Collaborate across pathways and with clinical partners to identify the fundamental background knowledge candidates must have to be successful secondary educators in each content area. Work together to ensure consistency in content expectations across pathways and to ensure that candidates have sufficient content preparation.

- For TCP and PACT, consider creative ways to support candidates who may have gaps in their content knowledge or may have completed courses many years ago to ensure that they have sufficient content knowledge in their area of specialization.

- Begin to develop a more robust relationship with the arts and sciences content faculty. Develop a shared ownership of preparing future RI teachers. Ensure that arts and sciences faculty help make connections between course content and professional association standards.

- Convene leadership and program faculty from all three pathways to ensure that all faculty have a shared understanding of the professional association standards and how they differ from the RIPTS and student standards. Identify opportunities within coursework for candidates to develop a stronger working knowledge of professional association standards and practices.

- Convene program leadership and faculty from the TCP and undergraduate pathways, as well as district partners, to redesign methods coursework. Consider requiring undergraduate and TCP candidates to take the same methods courses, which would increase class size and enable the program to offer content-specific methods courses. Identify opportunities within other courses for greater differentiation by content area to ensure that candidates have more opportunities to develop and practice content-specific pedagogy over time. Consult with PACT pathway leadership to learn about how the PACT pathway ensures that candidates develop their pedagogical content knowledge and identify if the TCP or undergraduate pathways could adopt similar practices.

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

- Candidate preparation in standards-driven instruction varies by pathway. Reviewers noted that candidate preparation in standards-driven instruction was stronger in PACT than in the undergraduate and TCP pathways.

Undergraduate:

- Course and practicum syllabi often mention Common Core State Standards but rarely mention the Next Generation Science Standards or the Grade Span Expectations for Social Studies. For example, in EDU 401: Educational Measurement, candidates must "identify a Common Core State Standard in the unit and discuss with examples how you will assess students' knowledge of this standard." However, the assignment does not require secondary science or social studies candidates to identify the appropriate NGSS or GSE standards to include in the unit.

- In EDU 206: Principles of Secondary Education, candidates read the Common Core State Standards and Grade Span Expectations for homework, but there was no evidence that candidates unpack the standards and develop a deep understanding of the expectations within the standards.

- The Lesson Plan Critique and Observation Form includes a focus on use of student standards. Performance level descriptors at the Exemplary level include the following: "Standards references are accurate and clearly connected to lesson components;" "Content Standards are detailed and appropriate"; and "Adeptly designs and delivers instruction that helps all students

meet/or [*sic*] exceed Rhode Island's learning standards." However, reviewers noted discrepancies between the ratings candidates received and the actual alignment and use of standards in lessons.

- Through work samples and site visits, candidates demonstrated a basic understanding of Rhode Island student standards applicable to their certification and basic skills in how to design and implement lessons aligned to standards. Lesson plans and lessons observed during site visits revealed a lack of rigor. In some cases, candidate expectations for student performance did not reflect the expectations of the standards or the standards identified in the lesson plan did not match the lesson itself. Similarly, candidates did not consistently use assessments that enabled them to assess student progress towards proficiency in Rhode Island student standards.

TCP:

- Course syllabi often mention Common Core State Standards but rarely mention the Next Generation Science Standards or the Grade Span Expectations for Social Studies. Candidates reported that their preparation in student standards varied based on who their instructor was for EDU 410/EDU 808: General Methods. Some candidates talked about how their instructor gave them opportunities to unpack the standards and could talk about some of the differences within standards. Others demonstrated misunderstandings of student standards; for example, one candidate stated that the depth of knowledge wheel was part of the Next Generation Science Standards.

- Candidates receive ratings related to their use of student standards through the Lesson Plan Rubric and Narrative Feedback Form and the Lesson Observation Rubric and Feedback Form. Performance level descriptors at the Exemplary level include the following: "Standards references are accurate and clearly connected to lesson components;" "Content Standards are detailed and appropriate"; and "Adeptly designs and delivers instruction that helps all students meet/or [*sic*] exceed Rhode Island's learning standards." However, reviewers noted discrepancies between the ratings candidates received and the actual alignment and use of standards in lessons.

- Through work samples and site visits, candidates demonstrated a basic understanding of Rhode Island student standards applicable to their certification and basic skills in how to design and implement lessons aligned to standards. Similar to the findings for undergraduate candidates, lesson plans and lessons observed during site visits revealed a lack of rigor. In some cases, candidate expectations for student performance did not reflect the expectations of the standards. Similarly, candidates did not consistently use assessments that enabled them to assess student progress towards proficiency in Rhode Island student standards.

PACT:

- Pathway leadership reported—and candidates confirmed—that the pathway requires candidates to demonstrate understanding of and ability to implement student content standards in lesson plans, unit plans, case study reports, observations of teaching, action research, and participation in professional development. All candidates learn about student content standards in Rhode Island. Some candidates, depending on their placements, also learn

about and use the Learning Outcomes for the Diocese of Fall River, derived from the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks.

- In interviews, candidates spoke knowledgably about student content standards and applicable process standards. During a discussion, they provided very specific examples of student learning standards and identified where they learned the standards in their courses. During site visits, lessons and assessments aligned with student standards.

Recommendations

- Work with program faculty and clinical educators to incorporate additional resources and materials into courses and clinical experiences designed to help students unpack, develop understanding of, and design rigorous instruction consistent with student standards. In subject-specific methods courses, give candidates more time to unpack standards and develop a deep understanding of effective content pedagogies that will help students achieve the standards.

- Ensure that candidate preparation emphasizes the critical importance of student standards and their role as a driver of lesson planning, assessment, and reflection. Require candidates to reflect on their developing proficiency in the use of student standards. Articulate clear expectations to faculty, clinical faculty, and clinical educators that candidates should receive feedback on the extent to which their lesson and assessments support mastery of rigorous student standards.

- Ensure candidates know how to build instruction in ways that increasingly support students to meet the expectations of the 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 have multiple opportunities to develop proficiency in data-driven instruction, beginning early in the program and continuing through student teaching. The program expects candidates to include assessments in their lesson plans and to implement assessments during instruction. Reviewers noted that candidate preparation in data and assessment was stronger in PACT than in the other pathways. In the other two pathways, candidates develop only a general understanding of assessment and develop basic skills in using data.

- Across pathways, all candidates take an educational measurement course. As noted in detail below, the readings, course content, and assessments vary by course.

- Across pathways, candidates have insufficient opportunities to learn about and practice collecting and using data from sources other than assessments.

Undergraduate:

- Candidates learn assessment basics in EDU 401: Educational Measurement and EDU 401L: Educational Measurement field experience. The course introduces candidates to fundamentals of assessment, including elements of effective assessment, feedback, formative assessment, the achievement gap, validity, reliability, assessment item types, rubrics, alternate assessments, grading, formative assessments, summative assessments, and standardized tests. As part of the class, candidates must develop test items, develop a performance-based assessment, and analyze data after assessment administration.

- Although candidates access and use InfoWorks in multiple classes (e.g. in EDU 201: Educational Psychology and in EDU 301: Foundations of Education), they do not develop proficiency in identifying, gathering, and analyzing data from sources other than assessment to improve student learning and instructional practice.

- The Lesson Plan Critique and Observation Form includes multiple indicators focused on assessment. For the Lesson Plan Critique, candidates receive ratings on the quality of the "link between assessment and goals and between assessment and instruction," the quality of performance-based assessments and the extent to which they are aligned with RI standards, and the quality of alignment between the assessment and the instructional content. The observation form includes two criteria focused on assessment. Candidates receive ratings on whether they "check for understanding and use information to modify instruction or address misunderstanding". They also receive a rating on the extent to which they "provide to students formal and multiple informal opportunities to demonstrate mastery of objectives and [modify] instruction as needed".

TCP:

- Candidates take a different course than undergraduate candidates. Topics addressed in EDU 402/813: Educational Measurement include attributes of a professional learning community, formative assessment, summative assessment, data-driven educational decisions and standards-based grading, common tasks and calibration, developing rubrics, standardized testing, alternative assessments, performance-based tasks, and summative assessments. Course assessments include summaries of readings, lesson plan construction, unit plan construction, journal entries, classroom observations and an interview of an administrator.

- The Lesson Planning Rubric and Narrative Feedback Form includes three indicators focused on assessment. Candidates receive ratings on the quality of the "link between assessment and goals and between assessment and instruction," the quality of performance-based assessments and the extent to which they are aligned with RI standards, and the quality of alignment between the assessment and the instructional content.

- The Lesson Observation Rubric and Narrative Feedback Form includes six criteria focused on assessment. Candidates receive ratings on the consistency with which they use a variety of formative assessment strategies and make adjustments throughout the lesson, use a variety of self-assessment strategies, use information from formative assessments to revise subsequent

lesson plans, and provide accurate and individualized instructional feedback. Candidates also receive ratings on whether they use a variety of summative assessment strategies aligned with identified goals and objectives and on the extent to which they analyze data from summative evaluations to determine students' achievement of goals or objectives.

PACT:

- There is a more consistent emphasis on the use of data throughout PACT, as evidenced in syllabi and in interviews. During interviews, multiple stakeholders described candidate opportunities to develop skills in data and assessment. Through work samples and site visits, reviewers also saw evidence of feedback to candidates on how they could improve their use of assessment and data to inform instruction. Partly due to the residency nature of the program, candidates have ongoing opportunities to assess student learning, adjust instruction, and then reassess students.

- Candidates take EDU 813: Educational Measurement at the beginning of their second year. In the course, candidates learn about formative assessments, cognitive taxonomies, standardized assessments, basic statistics, performance assessment, self-assessment, and grading. Course assignments include creating a summative assessment to accompany a unit, embedding formative assessments into a unit plan, and constructing a performance assessment for a unit.

- Candidates also take EDU 847: Action Research in the Classroom in their second year. As part of this course, candidates must establish a research question, conduct a review of the literature, and then collect, analyze, and interpret student data over time.

- The PACT Lesson Review and Periodic Performance Review form includes criteria focused on assessment. Under Planning and Preparation, candidates receive a rating on the assessment plan. Under Presentation of the Lesson – Instruction, candidates receive ratings on assessment expectations, formative assessment, diagnosis of students, feedback to students, and students' self-assessment.

Recommendations

- Review and revise course syllabi and candidate experiences to integrate additional explicit instruction of methods and techniques for assessing student learning. Increase or improve 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 cycle.

- 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.

- Provide candidates additional instruction and clinical practice in how to collect and analyze student data from a variety of sources and across grade spans. Ensure candidates are familiar with how to assess student learning in their specific content areas. 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 expects candidates to use technology as teachers and as learners. 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 expects candidates to use technology in lesson plans and in instruction. Each pathway requires candidates to complete one or more assignments related to technology and includes technology in lesson plans and rubrics.

- In interviews, clinical educators noted that candidates are open to using technology and work with the technology that is available in their clinical placements. Some clinical educators noted that candidates have taught clinical educators about new technologies, but it is unclear whether candidates were already familiar with these resources or whether they learned them in their program.

- Faculty members provide limited instruction and modeling to candidates related to designing and implementing digital age learning experiences. In particular, candidates lack preparation in content-specific technologies that they can use to enhance student learning. In interviews, candidates could give examples of apps like Kahoot that can be used regardless of content area, but very few could give examples of science-specific or math-specific technologies. Candidates reported that they learned about content-specific technologies either on their own or from clinical educators.

Undergraduate:

- In an evidence organizer, leadership reported—and reviewers agreed—that the pathway has started to make the shift to focus more on digital learning but needs to "overcome some hurdles" and "shifts in thinking/practice." During interviews, faculty members emphasized candidate access (or lack thereof) to technology rather than how the program teaches candidates to leverage technology to improve student learning and assessment.

- The program identified multiple courses that address technology, but reviewers found limited evidence that the program clearly communicates expectations for candidate use of technology in instruction. On example is in EDU 206: Principles of Secondary Education, candidates must design a unit plan with a minimum of five lesson plans and at least one of the lessons must use technology to support student thinking. In that class, candidates must also create a wiki page as a final product.

- The Lesson Planning Rubric and Feedback Form includes technology as part of materials and focuses on whether materials and resources match selected strategies and instruction. In the Lesson Observation Rubric and Feedback Form, candidates receive a rating on the consistency with which they incorporate "appropriate teaching strategies and technological resources to support student exploration".

TCP:

- The program identified multiple courses that address technology, but reviewers saw a disconnect between the courses that faculty identified and the evidence in syllabi and work samples. Reviewers found limited evidence that the program clearly communicates expectations for candidate use of technology in instruction. In EDU 207: Principles of Secondary Education, candidates must design at least one lesson that requires candidates to implement technology as part of their unit plan.

- The Lesson Planning Rubric and Feedback Form includes technology as part of materials and focuses on whether materials and resources match selected strategies and instruction. In the Lesson Observation Rubric and Feedback Form, candidates receive a rating on the consistency with which they incorporate "appropriate teaching strategies and technological resources to support student exploration".

- Per the Assessment System Handbook, TCP expects candidates to include evidence that they use a variety of technology for instruction/teaching and learning in their Readiness to Student Teach Growth Plan. However, the rubric for the growth plan focuses on the quality of candidate writing and therefore does not result in actionable feedback to candidates on their use of technology.

PACT:

- The program reported multiple opportunities where the program supported development of candidate use of technology. During an interview, PACT leadership described how they help candidates determine what resources are available in their placements and how they support planning to use instructional technology. In EDU 790: Introduction to Teaching, the head of instructional technology from one of the PACT placement schools talks about digital education. In EDU 815: The Exceptional Child in the Regular Classroom, the instructor introduces candidates to resources like Google Translate, VoiceThread, and Duolingo and provides examples of how candidates can use these resources to support English learners in their classes.

- Candidates complete multiple assignments related to technology. In EDU 792: Principles of Secondary Education, candidates must provide a written report that explains how they "intend to make use of a selection of websites and other technological resources, for, firstly, your personal preparation, unit and lesson planning and presentation, assessment record keeping, classroom management and communication with students, families, and administrators and, secondly, for engaging students in active learning". In EDU 803: Teaching Internship 2, candidates must submit a case study report on their use of technology as a means of instruction, as a way for students to use in their learning, and as a means of assessment to support student learning.

- In lesson and unit plans, candidates must describe the resources, including technology, that they intend to use. The PACT Lesson Review and Periodic Performance Review does not include an explicit criterion focused on technology, but includes technology within the resources criterion:

"Effective, creative use of boards (black, white, smart); tablets; other technology; other resources; current, attractive, engaging displays on classroom bulletin boards."

Recommendations

- Ensure program and clinical faculty members are proficient in using, designing, and implementing digital age learning experiences.

- Collaborate with district partners to identify content-specific applications of technology that candidates should learn during preparation. Include greater emphasis on modeling and teaching candidates how to use content-specific applications of technology in methods coursework. Examples might include but are not limited to digital labs in science or graphing calculators and application in mathematics.

- Work with arts and sciences faculty to identify and develop a shared understanding of content-specific technologies that candidates should learn throughout their preparation. Where it makes sense, ensure that arts and sciences as well as education faculty model effective use and integration of content-specific technologies in lessons to enhance learning.

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.	

- All candidates, regardless of pathway, take a course that helps candidates develop a basic understanding of special education, disability types, and supports for students with disabilities. The program expects candidates to include accommodations and modifications in lesson plans, but reviewers noted that candidate work samples from all three pathways revealed a limited understanding of how to differentiate instruction and accommodate students with disabilities in the general education setting. For example, some work samples emphasized accommodating students' learning styles rather than using research-based practices to address specific learning needs of students.

- Candidate opportunities to reflect on their own biases and to develop proficiency in working with English language learners vary by pathway, with the PACT pathway having greater emphasis on these two critical areas.

- Through coursework and clinical experiences, candidates have limited opportunities to learn about, design, and implement strategies that are effective when working with families in diverse communities.

Undergraduate:

- The pathway does not emphasize cultural responsiveness in required coursework. Reviewers did not find sufficient evidence that candidates reflect on their own biases or worldviews in syllabi, work samples, or written narratives provided by pathway leadership. In an interview, one candidate cited an example of journal article that the class read in EDU 206: Principles of Secondary Education where students learned the importance of respecting student backgrounds, but this seemed to be an isolated example. EDU 211: Urban Education, an optional elective, covers topics including identity, diversity, hierarchy of needs, microaggressions, stereotype threat, culturally relevant pedagogy, and diversity as well as a service-learning component.

- In EDU 303: The Child with Special Needs in the Regular Classroom, candidates must respond to writing prompts focused on IDEA, a specific disability, and Attention Deficit-Hyperactivity Disorder. Candidates must research a community agency and the role it plays in lives of students with disabilities and must develop a lesson plan that is adaptable to a wide range of student abilities or student differences based on a specific area of disability. In interviews, candidates noted that this course would be stronger if it emphasized scenarios more and focused less on writing papers.

- During student teaching, candidates complete a case study of a student with "documented instructional needs and approved accommodations including, but not limited to, a gifted student or a student with an IEP, PLP or 405 plan" or an English language learner. The case study must include a plan for addressing instructional challenges, examples of modifications made to instruction and assessment, a reflection on effectiveness of modifications, and recommendations for future learning. However, the case study rubric emphasizes completeness of case study pieces rather than the candidates' selection and implementation of appropriate strategies and modifications to support the case study student.

- The lesson plan rubric includes two criteria focused on whether instruction "demonstrates a keen awareness of diversity of learners and expertly connects to interest and experiences of students" and whether "strategies, instruction, assessment, and materials are clearly matched to grade and strengths/needs of learners." The taught lesson rubric also includes two criteria focused on whether the candidate "executes a lesson that expertly accommodates diversity of learners and connects to cultural and learning differences of students" and whether the candidate "makes appropriate and detailed accommodations for specific needs of students." Review of candidate work samples revealed that candidates identified some student needs and identified/made some accommodations, but these accommodations were basic and did not reflect highly effective strategies for supporting learners' specific learning needs.

- Recent program completers surveys showed that completers consistently rated the statement "PC prepared me to work effectively with ELL students" as less accurate than other statements. In response to the surveys, undergraduate leadership reported that it has "been working on a proposed modification to our special education class that will shift it to a broader course on differentiation for student populations."

- In an evidence organizer, the program did not provide evidence that candidates develop and demonstrate practices that are effective when working with families and communities. Course syllabi revealed a lack of emphasis on strategies for working with families.

TCP:

- The pathway does not emphasize cultural responsiveness. Reviewers did not find sufficient evidence that candidates reflect on their own biases or worldviews in syllabi, work samples, or written narratives provided by pathway leadership.

- In EDU 304: The Exceptional Child in the Regular Classroom, candidates learn basic information about special education and learn some basic strategies for working with students with disabilities. Course assessments do not emphasize designing instruction for students with disabilities and instead include study guides, listening guides, a desk reference, and an interview of a parent of a child with a disability.

- Pathway leadership acknowledged—and reviewers agreed—that the program needs to prepare candidates better to work with students who are English learners. EDU 404/EDU 622: Reading in the Content Area includes three class sessions focused on English learners. Candidates complete a literacy project. Although the description says that candidates "will write a literacy lesson plan and then adapt it for ELL students", the detailed instructions say that candidates will write a lesson and then "take the same lesson, and modify it for a class that is below grade/reading level. Perhaps there are students with IEPs, chronic absenteeism, making- (*sic*) up credits, ELLs, etc." The assignment does not focus explicitly on differentiating instruction for English learners. .

- The curriculum does not emphasize effective strategies for working with families. In an evidence organizer, pathway leadership noted that candidates prepare a written letter to families as part of EDU 201/EDU 791: Educational Psychology. This assignment does not provide candidates an opportunity to develop proficiency in designing and implementing strategies that are effective when working with families.

PACT:

- PACT leadership noted that the pathway works to "raise the consciousness of candidates of people whose experiences are different than their own" from the first summer of the program and that it has worked to provide a more explicit and deliberate focus on culturally responsive teaching in the past two years. Syllabi, work samples, and interviews with candidates reveal that cultural responsiveness is a consistent thread throughout the program. In the first class, EDU 790: Introduction to Teaching, candidates hear from guest speakers on "Perspectives Teaching Immigrant and Inner City Students in a Regular School". In EDU 792: Principles of Secondary Teaching, candidates learn about culturally responsive thinking through three class sessions. Candidates complete a reflection and analysis paper that requires them to describe and analyze their 12 sources of cultural identity, discuss at least two cultural biases that they hold and how that might impact their instruction, articulate a plan for how they will address their own cultural identity instruction, and how they will incorporate students' cultures in their instruction.

- Although all secondary education candidates take a Foundations of Education class, the course in PACT (EDU 814) looks very different from the undergraduate and TCP class. The course has an explicit focus on equity, with course sessions devoted to the achievement/opportunity gap,

diversity in schools, teaching with awareness, and school-family-community partnerships. In book groups, candidates read seminal readings about diversity and equity. Candidates also write a reflection paper on how the candidate engages families and the community to support student learning and development.

- PACT leadership recently revised EDU 815: The Exceptional Child in the Regular Classroom to include a split focus. A professor in special education teaches the first half of the class and an adjunct faculty member with expertise in English language learners teaches the second half. In the latter half of the course, candidates learn theories of second language acquisition, the SIOP model, and specific strategies to support English learners to read, write, and acquire vocabulary. Candidates also learn how to use specific technologies, such as Google Translate, VoiceThread, and Duolingo, to support English language learners. Key assessments include creating or adapting a series of Sheltered English Instruction (SEI) strategy-focused lesson plans and a paper highlighting four to six SEI strategies and how candidates plan to use them in future teaching.

Recommendations

- In the undergraduate and TCP pathways, incorporate more opportunities for candidates to reflect upon and develop a deeper awareness of their own worldviews. Consider whether all candidates would benefit from making EDU 211: Urban Education a required course or if the program can embed some of the content from EDU 211 into other courses.

- Include greater focus on research-based practices in methods coursework. Provide explicit instruction and practice in evidence-based practices that are effective when working with English language learners and students with disabilities. Ensure candidates receive feedback on their differentiation of instruction and their implementation of strategies to support learning.

- Work with clinical partners to identify additional opportunities for candidates to work with families and school communities earlier in clinical preparation and during student teaching. Ensure candidates receive feedback on their work with 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 culturally responsive instruction, work with students with disabilities and students who are English language learners, and work with families.

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

- Candidates receive introductory information about some educational initiatives, laws, and policies through coursework. The specific initiatives addressed vary by pathway.

- Candidates develop a basic understanding of initiatives, as demonstrated through candidate interviews.

Undergraduate:

- Pathway leadership shared a crosswalk showing that coursework addressed multiple Rhode Island initiatives, including the Safe School Act/Bullying policy, the RI Diploma system, personalized learning, and special population initiatives. The program expects candidates to use InfoWorks multiple times during their program.

- The program includes some assessments of candidate understanding of key RI initiatives. Pathway leadership reported that candidates are required to write response papers after learning about RI's Safe School Act and Statewide Bullying policy and after learning about the RI Diploma System as part of EDU 201: Educational Psychology. In EDU 301: Foundations of Education, candidates review RIDE's charter school proposal guidelines and research community demographics on Infoworks before preparing their own charter school proposal.

TCP:

- Pathway leadership shared a crosswalk showing that coursework addressed multiple Rhode Island initiatives, including social emotional learning, high school graduation requirements, and personal literacy plans.

- The program reported that candidates present on a RI initiative of choice in EDU 410: General Methods, but this assignment is present in only one version of the syllabus. The syllabus for the other instructor does not include the same assignment. Other than this assignment, the provider reports that it supports and assesses candidate proficiency in RI initiatives mostly through lesson planning activities.

PACT:

- The PACT pathway provides candidates with limited exposure to RI initiatives. All candidates teach in Catholic schools, many of which are in Massachusetts, so they have limited opportunity to learn about RI initiatives in their clinical placements. In coursework, candidates read the Danielson framework, which undergirds teacher evaluation models in Rhode Island. In EDU 792: Principles of Secondary Education, candidates visit North Providence High School to learn more about RI initiatives, including the new secondary graduation requirements and pathways. After the visit, candidates write a paper on how standards/proficiency-based diploma system applies to [their] practice as a classroom teacher and how [they] will reflect it in the instructional and assessment strategies they utilize."

Recommendations

- Work with clinical partners and other stakeholder to identify which Rhode Island initiatives are most important for secondary education candidates to learn about during their program of study. Identify the knowledge, skills, and practices embedded in those key Rhode Island educational initiatives relevant to these certification areas. Intentionally embed state laws,

policies, and initiatives throughout the program to develop a deep understanding of these critical practices.

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

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

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

- In all pathways, clinical experiences begin early in the program and continue throughout. Clinical preparation meets or exceeds the required number of hours/weeks established by Rhode Island certification requirements. Reviewers noted that candidates in the undergraduate pathway benefit from a coherent series of clinical experiences in a range of environments. Candidates in the PACT program benefit from an extended full-time residency that far exceeds the minimum required amount of clinical preparation.

- The program works with candidates employed full-time or enrolled in the PACT pathway to find suitable placements. However, the program does not ensure that all candidates experience a range of educational environments or that they experience placements in various grade levels.

- Although requirements vary by pathway, candidates assume all teaching responsibilities gradually and for a significant period during student teaching.

Undergraduate:

- Candidates complete four 25-hour practicum experiences and a 14-week student teaching experience. Collectively, candidate clinical preparation exceeds the required amount established by Rhode Island certification requirements.

- All candidates complete at least one practicum at the middle school level. Most candidates experience placements in two or three different districts. However, reviewers noted that three recent candidates completed all clinical preparation in North Providence.

- The program design intentionally aligns course-based learning with field experiences to ensure that as candidates learn skills and strategies they have the opportunity to observe and implement them. Four courses—EDU 206: Principles of Secondary Education, EDU 401: Educational Measurements, EDU 303: The Child with Special Needs in the Regular Classroom, and EDU 411-16: Teaching in Secondary Schools—are paired with practicum courses. For each practicum, candidates have key assignments that require them to apply their learning from the accompanying course.

- Per the student teaching handbook, candidates assume responsibilities gradually, beginning with one to two weeks of observation and orientation and another one to two weeks of

transition where candidates begin to assume responsibility for courses and teaching responsibilities. Candidates assume full responsibility for a maximum of three classes in a block school schedule or four classes in a regular school schedule for approximately eight weeks. The program notes that candidates may not be able to take over AP courses due to specific policies.

TCP:

- Candidates complete two 30-hour practicum experiences and a 12-week student teaching experience. Collectively, clinical preparation meets the required amount established by Rhode Island certification requirements.

- Most candidates experience placements in two or three different districts. However, some candidates work on emergency or expert residency certificates and complete all of their clinical preparation in their school, which limits their exposure to a range of educational environments.

- TCP candidates do not experience placements in the full range of the certification area. Only 36 of 167 (22%) of recent TCP candidates completed at least one placement at the middle school level.

- Clinical handbooks clearly specify expectations for candidates. During Clinical I, candidates are expected to work with individual students, work with small groups of students, support collaborative group work, informally assess students and share assessment findings with the clinical educator, take attendance at least once, manage transitions within a class period at least once, and send a letter home to families. Candidates must also plan and teach a mini-lesson or portion of lesson as well as one whole class lesson. During Clinical II, the program expects candidates to repeat some activities from Clinical I as well as pre-teach, review or reteach a lesson, facilitate a class discussion, facilitate lab work or give a demonstration (if appropriate), practice grading student work, administering and scoring performance and product assessments, managing transitions, monitoring halls during transitions, prepare a bulletin board, and, if possible, help prepare for or attend a parent night/open house or update the class website.

- Per the student teaching handbook, TCP expects candidates to take over all teaching responsibilities gradually, beginning with a week of observation and orientation, adding teaching responsibilities over one to two weeks, and then assuming full responsibility for planning and teaching and other teacher-assigned responsibilities and duties for eight to nine weeks.

PACT:

- Candidates begin their program with a full week of structured observations in their PACT placement school prior to coursework. After a summer of coursework that includes some microteaching opportunities, candidates begin their two-year residency in a PACT school. As a teacher of record, candidates have significant clinical preparation that exceeds the required amount established by Rhode Island certification requirements.

- Given the residency nature of the program, candidates do not have the opportunity to work in a range of grades and environments. All candidates teach in Catholic schools with varying degrees of demographic diversity. Candidates do not experience teaching in other buildings, but they complete at least four observations of experienced educators within their building and submit reports after their observations.

Recommendations:

- For the undergraduate pathway, ensure that candidates receive clinical placements not just based on student preference or convenience. Work with candidates and the Office of Partnerships and Placements to ensure that candidates experience multiple settings. Candidates benefit from working in multiple districts.

- For TCP, work with clinical partners to revise clinical placements for TCP candidates. Ensure candidates have an opportunity to work within grades 7-8.

- For TCP and PACT, collaborate with school leadership when candidates are working full-time during their program. Identify opportunities for candidates to conduct observations outside of their own buildings and in different settings. Consider if candidates would benefit from after-school experiences or short-term projects that would enable them to benefit from working in another setting within grades 7-12.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program and its clinical partners do not structure coherent clinical experiences that enable candidates to increasingly demonstrate positive impact on PK-12 students' learning.	

- When asked to provide evidence to demonstrate that candidates have a positive impact on PK-12 students' learning, the program discussed how candidates learn about data and practice collecting data, but did not focus on impact on student learning. Each pathway identified one measure used to measure impact on student learning, but a closer study of assessment rubrics revealed a lack of focus on whether candidates had sufficient impact on student learning.

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

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

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

Undergraduate:

- Pathway leadership reported that it uses a case study during student teaching to measure impact on student learning. For the case study, candidates identify one student with documented instructional needs and approved accommodations and then write a 3-4 page essay describing the student, explaining why the candidate chose the student, and identifying the instructional challenges that the student faces. The candidates describes his or her strategy for addressing the challenges, reflects on effectiveness of modifications, includes commentary on lessons learned, and makes recommendations for the student's future learning. The candidate must also submit at least 10 work samples from the case study student. However, the case study rubric focuses on level of detail in the narrative and quality of reflection rather than candidate impact on student learning.

TCP:

- Leadership of the TCP pathway noted that candidates have multiple opportunities to design and implement assessments during EDU 402/813: Educational Measurements and their clinical experiences. However, these examples emphasize candidate practice rather than candidate impact on student learning.

- Candidates design, implement, and reflect on implementation of a unit plan during student teaching. In their unit commentary, "candidates are asked to include an analysis of the information obtained from formative and summative assessments and to describe the students' learning as a result of completing the unit." However, the rubric focuses on candidate analysis of data rather than actual impact on student learning.

PACT:

- EDU 847: Action Research in the Classroom requires candidates to develop an action research project that includes data collection and analysis to determine the effectiveness of an intervention. However, the rubric used to assess the action research project focuses more on report completion rather than candidate impact.

Recommendations

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

- Embed impact measures throughout the program. Find ways to develop opportunities for candidates and various stakeholders to identify, monitor, and refine this critical aspect of teaching.

- Clearly communicate expectations and measures of candidate impact on student learning with clinical educators and candidates.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program has not established mutually beneficial PK-12 partnerships with clinical partners.	

- Across pathways, clinical partners reported that they benefit from serving as clinical placement sites for Providence College. However, programs and clinical partners do not share responsibility for designing and refining clinical partnerships and practice. The program shared examples of partnership agreements and indicators of partnership effectiveness, but there was no evidence that the provider customizes these agreements and indicators based on the input of district partners.

- In the clinical partners data file, the provider articulated four indicators of partnership success: the college receives positive feedback about their candidates, candidates have positive impact on student learning as determined by clinical educators, teacher candidates have the opportunity to learn and implement best practices, and the district is able to find excellent candidates for open teaching positions. Generally, the indicators emphasize benefits to the program rather than to the district. These indicators are not present in partnership agreements. In interviews, clinical partners could not identify these indicators. The program does not track and analyze data from agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness and use the data at least annually to make improvement to the partnership.

Undergraduate and TCP:

- The Office of Partnership and Placements selects clinical placements for candidates in the undergraduate and TCP pathways. The office classifies partnership districts/schools into three tiers. As defined by provider leadership, Tier 1 partners are districts that the programs work with and communicate with regularly. The Office of Partnership and Placements creates and maintains formal partnership agreements with Tier 1 partners only.

- In the clinical partners data file, the provider articulated four indicators of partnership success and these indicators were consistent across all districts. These indicators are not present in partnership agreements. In interviews, clinical partners could not identify these indicators.

- The program reported that the Office of Partnership and Placements meets yearly with Tier 1 clinical partners to check on the status of the partnership. However, these conversations seem to center around the continuous improvement of the placement process rather than mutually beneficial partnerships and the status of such a relationship.

PACT:

- During interviews, clinical partners and clinical educators emphasized the mutually beneficial partnership between PACT and its clinical sites. In the principal employer survey, respondents noted multiple benefits of working with the PACT pathway, including establishing a pipeline of educators, the attention of PACT leadership to the needs of individual schools, the financial benefit through the stipend, and the contributions of candidates to the larger school

community.   During interviews, a clinical partner noted that it has hired multiple PACT candidates and has been very happy with their performance.

- Clinical partners have significant input into the selection and assessment of candidates. As part of admissions into PACT, candidates must interview with PACT leadership and with the partner school. During preparation, some educators from partner schools serve as course instructors. The principal of the partner school evaluates the candidate's practice at the end of each semester and the principal must submit a recommendation to the program prior to recommendation for certification.

- The partnership between PACT and the clinical site is unique. Per the partnership agreement, PACT provides clinical sites with qualified candidates to serve in full-time teaching placements and ongoing supervision of candidates through monthly site visits. PACT also offers opportunities for the mentor to participate in a credit bearing free course at no charge and professional development credits, but it was unclear whether the course still exists or how frequently sites use this potential benefit. In return, the clinical site provides candidates with a field placement, a mentor, a supervisor, and financial support. Part of the candidate's salary serves as a stipend for the candidate while the remainder goes to support the PACT pathway.

- Program leadership submitted a clinical partners data file that listed the agreed upon indicators of partnership effectiveness as satisfactory performance as a teacher and satisfactory school support. These indicators were the same across all schools, but there was evidence that some partnerships were on hold due to changes within the schools or dioceses.

Recommendations

- Work with clinical partners to establish formal partnership agreements that include agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness. Determine how programs and clinical partners will track and analyze data from agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness. Meet regularly with clinical partners to review data and to ensure that the partnership is mutually beneficial.

- Ensure that programs and clinical partners share common expectations for candidate performance. Engage in conversations with clinical partners about performance expectations they have for candidates and new hires, and adjust expectations as needed. Improve training to ensure that clinical educators, clinical partners, clinical faculty, program faculty, and candidates have common expectations for candidate performance.

- Establish clear and consistent communication channels between programs and clinical partners to ensure the integrity and effectiveness of the partnerships.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program's processes as currently designed and implemented do not ensure that the program and its partners select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators.	

- The processes for recruiting, selecting, preparing, and evaluating clinical educators varies between the undergraduate and TCP pathways and the PACT pathway. Across pathways, however, the current processes for selecting and training clinical educators is insufficient. In particular, the program does not calibrate expectations among clinical educators, clinical supervisors, and faculty.

Undergraduate and TCP:

- The Office of Partnership and Placements uses a Request for Field Placement form. Candidates may request a particular school and/or a specific clinical educator. The clinical educator must agree to accept the teacher candidate and the district representative and school leader must sign off that the clinical educator meets minimum requirements: has three years of experience, has received a 4 as an overall effectiveness rating, and is recommended to work with/mentor a Providence College student. School and district leadership do not need to verify specifically that the clinical educator has the ability to work with adult learners, has sufficient coaching and supervision skills, or has the ability to evaluate and provide high quality feedback to candidates.

- Clinical educators must complete an online training, review the student teaching handbook, and then submit a survey after the training. Based on survey results, most clinical educators found the video and handbook informative and helpful, but the seven-minute cooperating teacher orientation is inadequate as a mechanism for training clinical educators. The video provides a general overview of how the clinical educator may gradually release responsibility to candidates, but it does not provide information about the assessment tools. Because the training mechanism is passive, clinical educators do not have an opportunity to engage in conversation with others, learn or review coaching techniques, or develop a deep understanding of the assessment tools used to assess candidates practice.

- At the end of the placement, candidates complete an evaluation of their clinical educator using a survey. The survey asks candidates to rate how helpful their clinical educator was in various aspects of practice on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being least helpful and 5 being most helpful. Candidates also have the opportunity to complete three open-ended questions about whether she or he would recommend using the clinical educator again, the clinical educator's strengths, and the clinical educator's weaknesses. The college supervisor also completes two surveys— one focused on the clinical placement and one focused on the clinical educator. The clinical educator survey requires the clinical supervisor to identify how frequently (ranging from Always to Not at All) that the clinical educator modeled instruction, provided support, encouraged professional growth, etc. The provider translates these survey results into an overall score.

- The clinical educator data file revealed that, in some cases, the provider determined that a clinical educator is no longer approved based on low evaluation scores. However, only a small

percentage of currently approved clinical educators had any evaluation scores, even though most clinical educators have served as clinical educators for multiple years.

PACT

- Each PACT teacher receives a mentor teacher. The mentor "must be an experienced teacher, preferably in the same discipline as the PACT teacher and have time to observe teaching and meet with the PACT teacher on a regular basis." These criteria do not meet the expectations for clinical educators identified in Standard 2.4 of the PREP-RI rubric.

- The PACT pathway does not provide formal training to clinical educators. Instead, the Director and Assistant Director meet with each school-based supervisor at the beginning of each year to explain program expectations and procedures. The Director and Assistant Director continue to provide support to clinical educators throughout the year through monthly supervision visits.

- The PACT pathway does not have a formal evaluation process for its clinical educator. PACT leadership reported that they "review the quality of supervision and support available" during monthly visits to candidate placements. Per program leadership, "on occasion, it has been decided not to continue with a particular supervisor," but PACT relies on an informal process for evaluating and retaining clinical educators. The Director and Assistant Director maintain formal notes from conversations and meet regularly to compare notes and plan follow-up or support.

Recommendations

- Review Component 2.4 of the PREP-RI rubric and revise selection criteria for clinical educators. Ensure that the revised criteria include skills in supporting adult learners and demonstrated ability to coach candidates.

- Establish an ongoing expectation for clinical educators and clinical supervisors to calibrate their observations, use of tools, and feedback to candidates. Create, facilitate, and monitor clinical educator access to these opportunities.

- Ensure that all clinical educators receive training on best adult learning practices. Require that all clinical educators retrain on a regular basis.

- 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. Ensure that candidates receive actionable, constructive feedback that attends to the quality and rigor of the candidate's instruction.

- For PACT, develop processes for documenting more formally the recruitment, evaluation, and decision to retain a clinical educator.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

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

- The program assessment system varies by pathway. Across pathways, reviewers noted that candidate performance assessments are not consistently based on rigorous criteria that are clearly communicated to candidates and stakeholders. Work samples demonstrated that candidates receive written feedback on key assignments, but feedback is inconsistent.

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

Undergraduate:

- The program assessment system includes three major decision points: readiness for admission, readiness for student teaching, and recommendation for certification. At the end of each year, candidates receive a status letter outlining where candidates are in the process and what requirements they have and have not met for the upcoming checkpoint.

- During the admissions process, the program evaluates candidates' GPA, transcript, basic skills proficiency, professionalism observation scale, and key assessments from initial courses. Per the Assessment System Overview that the program submitted to RIDE, the minimum criteria for admission are a cumulative GPA of 2.75, a C or higher in all education courses and practicum experiences, minimum scores on the SAT, ACT, or Praxis Core tests (based on RIDE's minimum admissions requirements), a C or higher on key assessments from the early field experience, and ratings of Meets or Exceeds on the observation scale scoring rubric in professionalism. However, the Professional Observation Scale for Program Admission submitted has rating options of Unacceptable, Emerging, Proficient, and Distinguished—not meets or exceeds. The program has a process for accepting students who do not meet minimum requirements, but RIDE has not approved this conditional acceptance policy.

- In order to proceed to student teaching, candidates must demonstrate an overall GPA of 2.75, a 2.00 or higher in all education courses, and a B or higher on all post-admission education practicum experiences. Given the emphasis on course grades, it is important to acknowledge how course grades are determined. Course and practicum grades are based on course assignments, including exams, papers, reflections, and presentations. In some courses, class contributions make up a part of the grade. Candidates noted that many of the course assignments emphasized writing, reading, and research but did not emphasize practical application of learning in the classroom.

- Prior to student teaching, candidates must also demonstrate passing scores on the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching for Grades 7-12 and the relevant Praxis content knowledge exam. Candidates must meet or exceed standard on each observation report in professionalism. Candidates also submit a professional growth writing response that must be proficient on a reviewer scale.

- The program assigns each candidate a faculty advisor who reviews progress towards meeting each assessment point on a quarterly basis. According to program leadership, candidates who do not meet expectations at an assessment point may not proceed until the candidate has remediated the area of deficit. However, program faculty must obtain all assessment system records from the Assessment Director or Program Director prior to advising sessions. Because advisors do not have access to assessment system information, it is more challenging to determine how the candidate is progressing and to provide candidates with timely support.

- Current training practices are insufficient to ensure that performance assessments are consistently applied across candidates. Clinical educators are required to watch a seven-minute introductory video, review appropriate handbooks, and complete a survey as their training. Current program practices do not include calibration activities.

TCP:

- The program assessment system includes three major decision points: readiness for admission, readiness for student teaching, and recommendation for certification. At the end of each year, candidates receive a status letter outlining where candidates are in the process and what requirements they have and have not met for the upcoming checkpoint.

- During the admissions process, the TCP Coordinator and Dean of Continuing Education assess candidates' content knowledge and professional goals, written communication in English, GPA, letters of recommendation, and experience working with and/or teaching youth. The application review team rates each criterion using a rating scale of Unacceptable (0 points), Acceptable with Conditions (1 point), and Acceptable (2 points). Admitted candidates cannot receive any ratings of zero. The program has a conditional acceptance policy for candidates who do not fully meet course requirements, but RIDE has not approved the conditional acceptance policy.

- In order to proceed to student teaching, candidates must complete all required courses, maintain a minimum GPA of a B (3.0), take the Praxis content exam and the Praxis Principles of learning test, attain proficiency in clinical experiences, and complete a growth plan.

- The Readiness to Student Teach Growth Plan is a binder organized into five domains (Planning and Preparation, Instruction, Classroom Environment, Assessment and Improvement, and Professionalism/Broad Based Knowledge/Technology). The binder includes key assignments from courses--including lesson plans, a unit plan, a classroom management plan, and classroom assessments—as well as time logs from clinical placements, Praxis scores, and a reflection. Per the student handbook, the TCP coordinator reads the growth plan and provides candidates with a checklist, a completed reflection rubric, and narrative feedback. Candidates may resubmit pieces of the growth plan if they do not meet expectations. Although there is a rubric for the reflective writing prompt, there is a lack of clarity around how the TCP coordinator assesses the overall growth plan using the checklist.

- The program reported having several mechanisms for monitoring candidate progress, including informal communications between TCP faculty and the TCP coordinator, GPA checks, and the

Readiness to Student Teach Growth Plan. During interviews, TCP candidates reported meeting with the TCP coordinator occasionally to check in on progress towards meeting the requirements of each decision point.

- Current training practices are insufficient to ensure that performance assessments are consistently applied across candidates. Clinical educators are required to watch a seven-minute introductory video, review appropriate handbooks, and complete a survey as their training. Current program practices do not include calibration activities.

PACT:

- The Director and Assistant Director of the PACT pathway assess candidate performance after each semester to determine if the candidate should be able to continue in the program. The program also identifies four key decision points: admission to the program, approval to assume responsibility for classroom teaching, approval to proceed to the second year of the program, and recommendation for certification.

- As part of the application process, candidates must demonstrate an undergraduate GPA of at least 3.0, pass the Praxis Content test, complete an application, write three essays, and submit four letters of recommendation. The Director and Assistant Director interview all candidates to better understand candidates' conceptions of teaching, teacher-student relationships, teaching in a Catholic school, and then determine if they highly recommend the candidate, recommend the candidate, recommend the candidate with reservations, or do not recommend the candidate. The candidate must also interview with principals at placement schools as part of the admissions process.

- Given the residency nature of the program, candidates assume full responsibility for classroom teaching after the first summer of the program. In order to proceed to teaching, candidates must complete coursework at the required standard, demonstrate successful school experiences during the summer, and complete the Readiness to Teach Portfolio.

- The Readiness to Teach portfolio includes a "reflective overview" of what the candidate has learned about teaching and education as well as graded papers from courses that demonstrates learning. Candidates must also include full lesson plans for two lessons with reflections as well as a supervisor's critique of the two lessons. The portfolio also includes a brief reflection written by the candidate on his or her growth as an educator during the summer program.

- Work samples demonstrated that candidates receive feedback on key assignments. However, it is unclear how assignment grades are determined. During interviews, program leadership reported that the program is in the process of changing rubrics to assess candidate work to include greater specificity.

- Multiple stakeholders noted that frequent communication between candidates, principals, and faculty enables the program to intervene quickly when candidate performance is below expectations. Program leadership reported that it could make changes quickly and adjust as needed because it is a "small, nimble program." If a candidate is struggling, the program provides additional supports, such as additional announced and unannounced visits or a

Performance Improvement Plan. PACT leadership, the clinical educator, and the candidate all contribute to the development of the Performance Improvement Plan when appropriate.

- Although the program provided multiple examples of how they support candidates, the program did not demonstrate a systematic approach to monitoring and supporting candidate development throughout the program. Program leadership engage in multiple conversations about candidate performance—including through monthly observation and meetings with school administrators and supervisors—but do not document these conversations in a systematic way.

- The PACT pathway provides introductory information and support to clinical educators at each school site. Program leadership reported, "Because the program is dispersed over a region where a number of schools are approximately 100 miles away from Providence College it has been found to be impractical to arrange group presentations at the college." The program submitted multiple examples of materials shared with clinical educators during these personal on-site meetings, but these materials were mostly informational and introductory in nature— brochures, assessment tools, partnership agreements, etc. The program did not provide evidence of calibration activities to ensure that performance assessments are consistently applied across candidates.

Recommendations

- 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.

- Review and revise the candidate assessment system to ensure that candidates progress based on their teaching performance.

- Revise training and calibration mechanisms used with candidates, faculty, clinical faculty, and clinical educators. Ensure that all stakeholders have a shared understanding of performance assessments and monitor implementation to ensure that all stakeholders use assessment tools consistently.

- Collaborate with clinical partners to design, pilot, and integrate measures of candidate impact on student learning into the candidate assessment system.

- For the TCP pathway, provide greater clarity on how the program assesses the candidate growth form.

- For PACT, revise the assessment system to make the grading system more transparent to candidates, faculty, and clinical educators.

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

- The program assessment system varies by pathway. As currently implemented, the system does not ensure that all candidates recommended for certification demonstrate proficiency in the RIPTS, the RI Code of Professional Responsibility, and the pedagogical competencies, content competencies, and field competencies identified in certification regulations.

- Across pathways, the program does not provide sufficient training to faculty and clinical educators responsible for evaluating candidate performance.

Undergraduate:

- Prior to recommendation for certification, candidates must have an overall GPA of 2.75 or higher (classes of 2019 and beyond) and must have a 2.00 or higher in all education courses. Candidates must have a passing score on the relevant Praxis content knowledge exam, and must have passing scores on the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching 7-12 exam. Candidates must score B- or higher in their student teaching portfolio, score meets or exceeds standard on the observation scale scoring rubric, and submit a Professional Growth Writing Response rated as proficient.

- The student teaching portfolio includes a case study, unit plan, two observations completed by the clinical educator, two observations completed by the clinical supervisor, the final student teacher evaluation form completed by the clinical educator, a professional profile evaluation completed by the cooperating teacher, and a professional profile completed by the clinical supervisor. The student teaching handbook includes rubrics for each portfolio assignment.

- Clinical educators and clinical supervisors are both responsible for evaluating the performance of candidates. Clinical educators and clinical supervisors each evaluate two lessons and each complete a professional profile evaluation. The clinical educator also completes a final student teacher evaluation form, which counts as 25 percent of the student teaching grade.

- As mentioned earlier, the Lesson Plan Critique and Observation Form for Supervisors and Teachers includes differentiated performance-level descriptors for each criterion of the rubric. The rubric aligns explicitly to the RIPTS. Reviewers noted inconsistencies between the lesson plans and the ratings that candidates received. The Student Teacher Mid-term and Final Evaluation form aligns explicitly to the RIPTS and asks clinical educators to rate candidate performance on a scale from 0 (performance or proficiency in this area is not evident at all) to 2 (performance or proficiency is consistently evident). Due to a lack of training and inconsistent implementation, the current assessment system does not ensure that candidates recommended for certification demonstrate proficiency in all of the standards of the RIPTS.

- The program does not provide sufficient training to faculty and clinical educators responsible for evaluating candidate performance. The program provides clinical educators with a seven-minute orientation video, but the video is not enough. The program does not provide sufficient training and calibration to ensure that the implementation of performance-based assessments yields fair, accurate, and consistent evaluation of performance.

TCP:

- Prior to receiving recommendation for certification, candidates must have an overall GPA of 3.0. Candidates must earn at least a B- in EDU 455: Student Teaching in the Secondary School and must receive ratings of 3 or 4 on all areas of the final evaluations completed by the clinical educator and clinical supervisor. Candidates must also pass the Principles of Learning and Teaching (Grades 7-12) and their content-specific Praxis test.

- Clinical educators and clinical supervisors are both responsible for evaluating the performance of candidates during student teaching. The clinical educator and clinical supervisor each complete three formal observations using the Lesson Planning and Teaching Rubric and Feedback Form as well as the TCP Student Teacher Mid-Semester and Final Evaluation Form.

- As mentioned earlier, the Lesson Planning Rubric and Narrative Feedback Form includes differentiated performance-level descriptors for each criterion of the rubric. The rubric aligns explicitly to the RIPTS. Reviewers noted inconsistencies between the lesson plans and the ratings that candidates received. The Student Teacher Mid-term and Final Evaluation form aligns explicitly to the RIPTS and asks clinical educators to rate candidate performance on a scale from 1 (never) to 4 (most of the time). Due to a lack of training and inconsistent implementation, the current assessment system does not ensure that candidates recommended for certification demonstrate proficiency in all of the standards of the RIPTS.

- The program does not provide sufficient training to faculty and clinical educators responsible for evaluating candidate performance. The program provides clinical educators with a seven-minute orientation video, but the video is not enough. The program does not provide sufficient training and calibration to ensure that the implementation of performance-based assessments yields fair, accurate, and consistent evaluation of performance.

PACT:

- Prior to receiving recommendation for certification, candidates must demonstrate readiness by submitting an acceptable portfolio, passing the Praxis PLT, and receiving recommendations from their supervisor and principal. Program leadership uses these measures to determine readiness for day one of a teaching job.

- Candidates recommended for certification must demonstrate proficiency in all of the standards of the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards. After each semester of internship, the candidate updates the RIPTS checklist, which requires candidates to identify where and how they implemented each RIPTS and list items in the portfolio that demonstrates competency in implementing each standard and indicator.

- Candidates compile their portfolios across the four semesters, or two years, of internship. According to the PACT handbook, the portfolio is "a comprehensive and integrated portfolio of their professional service, academic learning, and their entry into the profession of the Catholic educator." The portfolio must include nine sections: Introductions, Context, Teaching, Observations of Teaching, Case Studies, Professional Development, Action Research Project, Coursework, and a Philosophy of Education.

- As noted above, the PACT pathway has clearly identified measures of performance for readiness for certification, but it is unclear how leadership evaluate the candidate portfolio. When asked during interviews, leadership reported that they would never let candidates get to the point of finalizing their portfolio if they did not think the candidate was ready for certification. In this regard, the portfolio seems to serve as a final documentation of candidate performance rather than as an assessment checkpoint.

- Clinical educators and clinical supervisors are both responsible for evaluating the performance of candidates. As mentioned previously, current training practices do not include calibration activities to ensure that implementation of performance-based assessments yield fair, accurate, and consistent evaluation of candidate performance.

Recommendations

- 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.

- Review and revise the candidate assessment system to ensure that candidates progress based on their teaching performance.

- Revise training and calibration mechanisms used with candidates, faculty, clinical faculty, and clinical educators. Ensure that all stakeholders have a shared understanding of performance assessments and monitor implementation to ensure that all stakeholders use assessment tools consistently.

- Collaborate with clinical partners to design, pilot, and incorporate measures of impact of student learning into the assessment system.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program uses surveys but administration of the undergraduate and TCP survey has resulted in no responses.	

- The undergraduate and TCP pathways and the PACT pathway use different tools and processes for surveying program employers. Although the tools are designed to yield some actionable data, the mechanisms used by the undergraduate and TCP pathways have been ineffective.

- The aggregate performance of Providence College program completers is 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 Grades Education Program can be made.

Undergraduate and TCP

- Multiple programs collaborated in Spring 2016 to develop an employer survey. The survey is designed to yield some actionable information. It asks evaluators to assess the preparedness of program completers to implement nine teaching practices and five professional responsibilities. The survey also asks about candidate preparedness to use data. The survey asks candidates how prepared certified teachers are to demonstrate how they met student objectives and includes three open-ended questions where respondents can provide more detailed thoughts, impressions, and comments. However, the survey does not specify whether the employer should complete multiple surveys for multiple programs; if an employer has hired program completers from PC's Elementary & Elementary Special Education, Secondary, and Music programs, there is no way for the program to disaggregate information by program.

- The provider administered the employer survey in November/December 2016 and again in fall 2017 to any employer of a program completer who gave the program permission to contact his or her employer. Undergraduate leadership also sent surveys to employers listed in the Educator Preparation Portal as employing Providence College program completers. However, neither approach resulted in returned surveys.

PACT

- Candidates are full-time teachers in placement schools. The program surveyed principals of placement schools that hired program graduates in Fall 2017. However, multiple years of survey data are not available.

- The survey was designed to provide the program with actionable feedback. The survey asked principals to rate how prepared PACT teachers are in eight teaching practices and five professional responsibilities. The survey also included multiple open-ended questions that provide respondents opportunities to provide explanations for ratings, additional perceptions of the program and its effectiveness to other programs, examples of how PACT teachers contribute

to schools besides teaching, and other comments of feedback. PACT received responses from 12 schools.

Recommendations:

- For undergraduate and TCP pathways, follow up with completers to understand why so many do not grant permission to survey employers. Review and revise communications about the employer survey. Consider emphasizing the importance of the survey prior to candidate exit and be more explicit about how the provider and/or program will use data from the survey.

- For undergraduate and TCP pathways, explore and implement additional strategies to solicit annual feedback from program employers to support program improvement. Use the EPP database as an alternate source of employer contact information for completers working in state. Consider if there are alternate ways of finding out where out-of-state candidates are working, such as through social media or state certification verification portals.

- For PACT, continue to implement the employer survey. Consider designing and implementing an additional survey, perhaps one administered three years after program completion, to learn more about candidate performance and evaluation outcomes over time.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The undergraduate and TCP pathways survey program completers annually but do not have strategies in place to track post-completion employment besides the survey. The PACT pathway tracks post-completion employment but has not yet developed a survey for program completers.	

- The provider has administered surveys to recent program completers with limited results. Neither pathway use strategies other than the survey to track post-completion employment and satisfaction.

- The PACT program does not administer a completer survey but has a system for tracking post-completion employment.

Undergraduate:

- The Education Council, a committee of program directors at PC, designed a program completer survey in 2015. The survey is designed to yield actionable data about the program. The survey includes questions about employment status, perceived preparedness in a variety of competencies, and perceived quality of field placements. The survey also includes open-ended questions about program strengths, field experience strengths and areas for improvement, and suggestions for improvement.

- The provider administered the survey in 2015, 2016, and 2017. Response rates have increased over time. Two of 14 undergraduate secondary education completers responded in 2015, eight of 15 responded in 2016, and five of seven responded in 2017. The program shared two examples of how it has used survey results to inform changes to the program. The program recently added more emphasis on working with English language learners and is in the process

of modifying the current special education class to be a class that focuses instead on differentiation for special student populations. Faculty have also worked to provide candidates with more information about certification requirements through advising and evening programs on certification requirements.

TCP:

- The Education Council, a committee of program directors at PC, designed a program completer survey in 2015. The survey is designed to yield actionable data about the program. The survey includes questions about employment status, perceived preparedness in a variety of competencies, and perceived quality of field placements. The survey also includes open-ended questions about program strengths, field experience strengths and areas for improvement, and suggestions for improvement.

- The provider administered the survey in 2015, 2016, and 2017. The analysis provided by TCP leadership did not include response rates or disaggregated data. The analysis noted two areas, instructional and educational technology, and working with students who are English learners, that completers would like to see addressed in more depth. TCP stated that it is exploring how to better support candidates in these areas through its continuous improvement activities.

PACT:

- PACT does not survey program completers but intends to in the future.

- The PACT pathway leverages its relationship with candidates and relevant organizations to maintain contact with program completers through informal communication and networking. The Director and Assistant Director attend multiple service fairs, conferences, and meetings out-of-state and try to meet up with program alumni during those events whenever possible. PACT leadership maintains an Excel spreadsheet of where alumni are currently working.

Recommendations

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

- Consider how to leverage thoughtfully online platforms, such as LinkedIn or Facebook, to invite people to join and establish program alumni professional networks over time.

- For undergraduate and TCP pathways, implement strategies to increase survey response rates and revise the survey to ensure that the program receives program-specific information about completers.

- For PACT, develop and administer an annual program completer survey to provide the program with additional data about candidate preparation. Use the data to inform program improvements.

All Grades Education Programs

The All Grades Education program includes courses of study in world language and music education.

The world language program offers three pathways: undergraduate, graduate (PACT), and non-degree (Teacher Certificate Program, or TCP). All pathways mirror the secondary programs.

The undergraduate world language pathway resides within the School of Professional Studies as a secondary program by Providence College. The course of study is the same for world language students as it is for secondary education students with one exception—an additional practicum at the elementary level. In the undergraduate pathway, candidates take six three-credit courses and one one-credit course. Candidates complete four 25-hour practicum experiences tied to specific courses. Student teaching is a fourteen-week placement in a secondary school setting.

In the TCP pathway, housed within School of Continuing Education, candidates take six three-credit courses and two 30-hour practicum experiences. Student teaching is a 12-week placement in a secondary school setting. This course of study is the exact same as the TCP course of study in secondary education. Candidates enrolled in TCP may also earn a graduate degree if they complete additional assignments within their TCP courses and complete five additional courses from the M.Ed. in Urban Teaching program.

The PACT pathway is a two-year residency program housed within the School of Professional Studies. Candidates take nine courses over the course of two summers and complete four semesters of internship as a teacher of record. The PACT pathway for All Grades World Language is the same as described for the Secondary Grades.

The music education pathway is an undergraduate pathway. The music department within the College of Arts and Sciences houses the music education program. The program is 48 credits total and includes 12 three-credit courses and three four-credit courses. Candidates complete 30 hours of classroom observation as well as three 28-hour practicum experiences. During student teaching, candidates spent eight weeks in an elementary placement and eight weeks in a secondary choral or instrumental placement.

Given the multiple pathways, the sections below communicate general findings across the all grades programs first and then provide specific information about each pathway for music education and world languages. With the exception of components 1.2 (Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy) and 2.1 (Field Experiences), the sections do not include findings for the PACT pathway for world language since this pathway exactly mirrors the PACT secondary pathway. Findings for this pathway can be found in that section of this report.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

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

- The program provides candidates opportunities to develop proficiency in the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions encompassed in most, but not all, of the RIPTS. Pathways address

RIPTS at varying depth, and this depth varies across the undergraduate, TCP, PACT, and music education pathways.

- The three world language education pathways act as three independent programs; leadership of the three pathways currently do not collaborate on a regular basis. As a result, candidate experiences within the world languages program vary and candidates do not experience a consistent curriculum. World language candidates take similar courses across pathways but the quality of courses and placements vary by pathway and by instructor. Analysis of course syllabi revealed inconsistencies in course content, assignments, and expectations for candidates.

Undergraduate World Language:

- Pathway leadership reported that the program is based on the RIPTS. Pathway leadership submitted a crosswalk showing that coursework addresses all RIPTS, but reviewers noted that the pathway addresses the RIPTS at varying depth.

- During interviews, candidates could not speak to specific RIPTS but noted that they were familiar with them. They cited examples of where professors addressed the RIPTS in their courses, such as in EDU 206: Principles of Secondary Education, where candidates read the RIPTS. In lesson plans, candidates must identify which RIPTS the lesson reflects.

- Within the undergraduate pathway, candidates generally experience a consistent curriculum. All candidates take the same series of courses.

- Reviewers noted that, generally, candidates were very reflective (Standard 10). However, candidates lack sufficient content knowledge base to create learning experiences that reflect an understanding of the central concepts, structures, and tools of inquiry in the disciplines/content areas they teach (Standard 2). Candidates would also benefit from additional support in creating instructional opportunities to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, performance skills, and literacy across content areas (Standard 5).

TCP World Language:

- Pathway leadership submitted a crosswalk showing that coursework addresses all RIPTS, but reviewers noted that the pathway addresses the RIPTS at varying depth.

- During interviews, candidates expressed that coursework focused on theory and writing papers. They expressed concern that coursework does not focus sufficiently on preparing them to teach and implement the practices embedded within the RIPTS.

- The Mid-term and Final Evaluation Form includes explicit alignment to the RIPTS. The candidate and clinical educator each complete the form midway through student teaching and then compare their evaluations. At the end of student teaching, the clinical educator completes the form again and reviews the ratings with the student teacher and the PC Clinical Supervisor.

- Pathway leadership reported that all candidates take courses together, which ensures consistency across levels within the program. The program said that, on the rare occasion

where two TCP courses have multiple sections, the program assures consistency by implementing the key assessments consistently across sections. Candidates, however, reported different experiences. During an interview, TCP candidates described very different experiences within EDU 410/EDU 808: General Methods. The focus of the course varied, with one group of candidates reporting that they spent extensive time reviewing student content standards and the other group reporting that the instructor did not focus on student standards but did provide explicit instruction in technology.

- Reviewers noted that, generally, candidates were very reflective (Standard 10). However, candidates lacked sufficient preparation in creating learning experiences using a broad base of general knowledge that reflects an understanding of the nature of the communities and world in which we live (Standard 1). The most significant gap in candidate preparation is that candidates lacked sufficient content knowledge base to create learning experiences that reflect an understanding of the central concepts, structures, and tools of inquiry in the disciplines/content areas they teach (Standard 2). Candidates would also benefit from additional support in creating instructional opportunities to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, performance skills, and literacy across content areas (Standard 5).

Undergraduate Music Education:

- Pathway leadership reported that the program aligns to the RIPTS. Pathway leadership submitted a crosswalk showing that coursework addresses all RIPTS, but reviewers noted that the pathway addresses the RIPTS at varying depth.

- During interviews, candidates noted that they learned about the RIPTS in MSC 230: Introduction to Music Education. As part of the course, candidates took a test to demonstrate memorization, rather than deep understanding, of the standards.

- Syllabi, work samples, and interviews revealed that candidates were well prepared to create learning experiences using a broad base of general knowledge that reflects and understanding of the nature of the communities and world in which we live (Standard 1). Overall, candidates also had a deep content knowledge base (Standard 2). Lesson plans and candidate lessons during site visits were age-appropriate lessons and included appropriate modifications of students with varied levels of preparedness (Standard 3). Although program completers wished that they received stronger preparation in classroom management, the review team saw evidence in syllabi, work samples, and site visits that music education candidates were well prepared to create a supportive learning environment (Standard 6).

- Candidates would benefit from additional preparation in working collaboratively with all school personnel, families, and the broader community (Standard 7) and using appropriate formal and informal assessment strategies (Standard 9).

- Because the program is small, candidates experience a consistent curriculum. There is only one section of each of the music methods and instrumental methods courses, so candidates receive the same information. Music education leadership reported that, for some classes where

multiple sections exist (i.e. EDU 221, EDU 301, and SWK 253), most music students participate in the same section together.

Recommendations

- Conduct a crosswalk across the three world language pathways. Examine course requirements, syllabi, and course expectations. Identify possible redundancies and opportunities to combine courses across pathways. Ensure that candidates receive comparable learning opportunities regardless of pathway and instructor, particularly within the undergraduate and TCP pathways since they already are very similar in structure.

- For undergraduate and TCP world language, review the current curriculum to see where and how candidates demonstrate their mastery of the RIPTS. Identify additional assignments and opportunities connected to teaching PK-12 students where candidates can develop the practices and skills embedded within the RIPTS. Ensure candidates receive feedback on their implementation of the skills embedded within the RIPTS.

- Ensure the program addresses all RIPTS at sufficient depth. Where needed, embed additional opportunities for candidates to develop proficiency in the knowledge, skills, and dispositions within the RIPTS.

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.	

- All pathways rely on academic majors, course requirements, or transcript analysis as evidence of content knowledge. Specific coursework requirements vary by pathway. Consequently, candidates have varying levels of content knowledge. In particular, the TCP world language pathway does not provide candidates sufficient opportunities to develop proficiency in the critical pedagogical-content concepts and practices within the content area.

- The world language pathways handle methods courses differently and, as a result, candidate preparation in content and content pedagogy varies. The siloed nature of the world language education pathways results in lost opportunities to provide consistent and content-specific pedagogical preparation. The undergraduate and TCP pathways offer general methods courses rather than provide subject-specific preparation in pedagogy; this preparation is inadequate, particularly in TCP. During site visits, reviewers did not observe candidates implementing best instructional practices.

- All world language pathways—undergraduate, TCP, and PACT—do not prepare candidates sufficiently to be able to teach in an elementary setting. The program has not transitioned sufficiently to be able to prepare candidates for the All Grades PK-12 certificate. The music education pathway prepares candidates adequately to teach PK-12.

- In multiple instances, narratives from evidence organizers and responses from program faculty seemed to conflate RIPTS, professional association standards, and student standards. In interviews, candidates varied in their familiarity with professional association standards.

Undergraduate World Language:

- Candidates in the undergraduate pathway must have a major in their world language of study.

- Pathway leadership submitted a crosswalk showing alignment between courses and the ACTFL standards. However, reviewers did not see evidence of all ACTFL standards in course syllabi and work samples.

- All secondary education candidates—including world language candidates—take the same courses, including EDU 411-416, which is a secondary methods course. Up until recently, the methods courses were specific to the content area but, due to shifts in candidate enrollment, the methods course is now one general methods course. Undergraduate candidates do not take a subject-specific methods course focused on teaching world languages in grades PK-12. The current curriculum emphasizes teaching at the secondary level and does not prepare candidates to teach in elementary grades besides through an additional practicum experience at the elementary level.

- Reviewers noted that program faculty place much greater emphasis on the RIPTS than on professional association standards. Candidate work samples demonstrated limited knowledge of ACTFL standards.

- Reviewers noted that the program generally prepares undergraduate world language candidates to be language proficient (Standard 1). However, reviewers were concerned about the lack of focus on language acquisition theories and knowledge of students and their needs (Standard 3) because candidates do not learn world language methods in their coursework. Candidates would also benefit from additional emphasis on integration of standards in planning and instruction (Standard 4).

TCP World Language:

- TCP leadership reviews candidate transcripts at admissions using a guidance document. In their respective world language, candidates must complete at least four semesters of the world language at the college level (or score Advanced Low or higher on the OPI exam), have least six credits in composition, six credits in literature, six credits in culture, and additional electives to achieve 30 credit hours. Reviewers then rate the Content Knowledge and Professional Goals as either acceptable with no conditions (2 points), acceptable with conditions (1 point), or unacceptable. Candidates who receive a rating of acceptable with conditions or unacceptable but generally meet other requirements may receive conditional admissions. Per the 2017-18 Admissions Handbook, sample conditions include completion of content area coursework before beginning education courses or completion of content area coursework before taking 300-level and 400-level education courses.

- Some candidates expressed frustration that they needed to take some additional world language coursework as a condition of their acceptance, but the courses were not available at Providence College. As a result, some candidates were taking classes at nearby institutions in order to build their content knowledge.

- Although pathway leadership reported that the program aligns to ACTFL standards, reviewers noted a lack of consistent emphasis on the ACTFL standards in coursework and candidate preparation. During debriefs after site visits, reviewers observed the clinical supervisor providing feedback that was not consistent with the expectations of the ACTFL standards. During interviews, candidates had limited if any awareness of the ACTFL standards.

- Like in the undergraduate pathway, TCP does not differentiate coursework by content area. Candidates take EDU 410/808: General Methods but no content-specific methods coursework. In an interview, faculty emphasized, "Good teaching is good teaching." Faculty did not think that content-specific courses were necessary. In interviews, candidates expressed frustration that they do not receive any methods courses focused on teaching foreign languages. Candidates described relying on their clinical educators, rather than their coursework, faculty members, or clinical supervisors, to learn best practices for teaching world language.

- Reviewers noted that the program generally ensures TCP world language candidates to be language proficient, although the lack of availability of some requisite courses on PC's campus is problematic for some candidates (Standard 1). Reviewers were very concerned about the lack of focus on language acquisition theories and knowledge of students and their needs (Standard 3) because candidates do not learn world language methods during their coursework. Reviewers were also concerned by the lack of emphasis on the integration of standards in planning and instruction (Standard 4).

PACT World Languages:

- The PACT pathway requires admitted candidates to have a major in the content area and passing scores on the appropriate Praxis content test. It does not conduct additional analysis of possible content gaps in candidate content preparation.

- All candidates in PACT take EDU 808: Methods of Secondary Education. This course introduces PACT teacher to "the central concepts, structures and modes of inquiry of their major discipline and the methods, procedures and strategies found to be effective in the teaching of their discipline at the secondary level." The course has multiple instructors, including one from each content area. Within the course, candidates prepare a year's outline of each course they will be teaching in the coming year, develop syllabi for each class that they will teach, and prepare a detailed unit plan for each class the candidate will teach in the coming year with support from their content-specific instructor. Candidates receive support and feedback from their content area instructor.

- Candidates in PACT receive strong preparation to teach at the secondary level, but this is insufficient for world language candidates. PACT's singular focus on preparing candidates to teach at the secondary level is unacceptable for world language candidates, who will be eligible to teach in Grades PK-12.

Music Education:

- Music education candidates take 26 credit hours in theory, history and literature, and a recital/project. Candidates take an additional 47 credit hours in music education. Coursework includes human development, piano, voice, composition, conducting, introduction to music education, and multiple methods courses.

- Syllabi, coursework, and site visits revealed that the program generally prepares candidates well in the competencies embedded within the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) standards. During interviews, candidates spoke knowledgably about their content and pedagogy. Clinical educators praised candidates and said that they were well prepared in music.

- Although candidates were generally very well prepared in Specialization Competencies (Standard C), reviewers noted that candidates would benefit from additional laboratory experience conducting larger classes and would benefit from increased focus on world or ethnic music.

Recommendations

- Review the tools used to check content preparation. Collaborate across world language pathways and with clinical partners to identify the fundamental background knowledge candidates must have to be successful All Grades educators in each content area. Work together to ensure consistency in content expectations across pathways.

- Convene leadership and program faculty from all three secondary and world language pathways to ensure that all faculty have a shared understanding of the professional association standards and how they differ from the RIPTS and student standards. Identify opportunities within coursework for candidates to develop a stronger working knowledge of professional association standards and practices.

- Convene program leadership and faculty from the TCP and undergraduate world language pathways, as well as district partners, to redesign methods coursework. Consider requiring undergraduate and TCP candidates to take the same methods courses, which would increase class size and enable the program to offer content-specific methods courses. Include greater focus on elementary content and content pedagogy in world languages. Identify opportunities within other courses for greater differentiation by content area to ensure that candidates have more opportunities to develop and practice content-specific pedagogy over time. Consult with PACT pathway leadership to learn about how the PACT pathway ensures that candidates develop their pedagogical content knowledge and identify if the TCP or undergraduate pathways could adopt similar practices.

- For music education, identify additional opportunities for candidates to practice conducting larger classes. Incorporate a greater focus on world or ethnic music in methods coursework.

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

- Across pathways, candidates demonstrated a general knowledge of standards. In interviews, candidates knew that they needed to cover the appropriate content standards and needed to align lessons with standards. However, they did not demonstrate a deep understanding of the expectations within student standards.

- Rhode Island does not have state-specific standards for world languages, but schools in Rhode Island tend to use the national student standards, the ACTFL World Readiness Standards for Language Learning. Candidates did not learn about these standards in their coursework and did not demonstrate a deep understanding of the standards through work samples, interviews, and site visits.

Undergraduate World Language:

- Course and practicum syllabi often mention Common Core State Standards but do not mention the ACTFL World Readiness Standards. For example, in EDU 401: Educational Measurement, candidates must "identify a Common Core State Standard in the unit and discuss with examples how you will assess students' knowledge of this standard." However, the assignment does not require candidates to identify appropriate ACTFL standards in their unit.

- In EDU 206: Principles of Secondary Education, candidates read the Common Core State Standards and Grade Span Expectations for homework, but there was no evidence that candidates unpack the ACTFL standards and develop a deep understanding of the expectations within the standards.

- Candidates receive ratings related to their use of student standards through the Lesson Pan Critique and Observation Form. Performance level descriptors at the Exemplary level include the following: "Standards references are accurate and clearly connected to lesson components;" "Content Standards are detailed and appropriate"; and "Adeptly designs and delivers instruction that helps all students meet/or [*sic*] exceed Rhode Island's learning standards." However, given the lack of emphasis on student standards, reviewers questioned whether candidates were receiving sufficient feedback on their use, or lack of use, of student standards.

TCP World Language:

- Course syllabi often mention Common Core State Standards but rarely mention the ACTFL World Readiness Standards. In an interview, candidates said that they struggled to find world language student standards. They knew about the WIDA ESL standards, but they relied on clinical educators to help them learn about world language student standards because the faculty did not have experience or background in world languages.

- Candidates receive ratings related to their use of student standards through the Lesson Pan Critique and Observation Form. Performance level descriptors at the Exemplary level include the following: "Standards references are accurate and clearly connected to lesson components;" "Content Standards are detailed and appropriate"; and "Adeptly designs and delivers instruction that helps all students meet/or [*sic*] exceed Rhode Island's learning standards." However, given the lack of emphasis on student standards, reviewers questioned whether candidates were receiving sufficient feedback on their use, or lack of use, of student standards.

- In interviews, candidates knew that standards existed and knew that they should use them to inform planning. During site visits, reviewers observed a lesson aligned to the candidate's identified objectives, but those objectives did not align to the ACTFL standards.

Music Education:

- Pathway leadership reported that candidates learn about both the National Core Arts Standards (NCAS) and the RI Grade Span Expectations (GSEs) in music. In interviews, candidates demonstrated a stronger understanding of the NCAS than the GSEs. This makes sense, given that RI districts should be fully implementing NCAS-aligned curriculum by the 2019-20 school year, but candidates will need to be familiar with the GSEs in the interim.

- Course syllabi do not emphasize student standards. Reviewers did not find evidence that candidates spend time unpacking standards or learning about how to use standards or assess student mastery in relation to the standards.

- Work samples and site visits revealed that candidates design instruction aligned to student standards. However, reviewers noted that there was not always a clear link between the identified assessments and measures of student learning and the standards listed on the lesson plan.

Recommendations

- Work with program faculty and clinical educators to incorporate additional resources and materials into the methods courses and clinical experiences designed to help students unpack, develop understanding of, and design rigorous instruction consistent with student standards. In subject-specific methods courses, give candidates more time to unpack standards and develop a deep understanding of effective content pedagogies that will help students achieve the standards.

- Ensure that candidate preparation emphasizes the critical importance of student standards and their role as a driver of lesson planning, assessment, and reflection. Require candidates to reflect on their developing proficiency in the use of student standards. Articulate clear expectations to faculty, clinical faculty, and clinical educators that candidates should receive feedback on the extent to which their lesson and assessments support mastery of rigorous student standards.

- Ensure candidates know how to build instruction in ways that increasingly support students to meet the expectations of the 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 have multiple opportunities to develop proficiency in data-driven instruction, beginning early in the program and continuing through student teaching. The program expects candidates to include assessments in their lesson plans and to implement assessments during instruction. Reviewers noted that candidate preparation in data and assessment was stronger in PACT than in the other pathways. In the other three pathways, candidates develop only a general understanding of assessment and develop basic skills in using data.

- All world language candidates take an educational measurement course. As noted in detail below, the readings, course content, and assessments vary by course.

- Across pathways, candidates have insufficient opportunities to learn about and practice collecting and using data from sources other than assessments.

Undergraduate World Language:

- Candidates learn assessment basics in EDU 401: Educational Measurement and EDU 401L: Educational Measurement field experience. The course introduces candidates to fundamentals of assessment, including elements of effective assessment, feedback, formative assessment, the achievement gap, validity, reliability, assessment item types, rubrics, alternate assessments, grading, formative assessments, summative assessments, and standardized tests. As part of the class, candidates must develop test items, develop a performance-based assessment, and analyze data after assessment administration.

- Although candidates access and use InfoWorks in multiple classes (e.g. EDU 201: Educational Psychology and in EDU 301: Foundations of Education), candidates do not develop proficiency in identifying, gathering, and analyzing data from sources other than assessments to improve instructional practice.

- The Lesson Plan Critique and Observation Form includes multiple indicators focused on assessment. Candidates receive ratings on the quality of the "link between assessment and goals and between assessment and instruction," the quality of performance-based assessments and the extent to which they are aligned with RI standards, and the quality of alignment between the assessment and the instructional content. When candidates teach lessons, they receive ratings on whether they "check for understanding and use information to modify instruction or address misunderstanding". They also receive a rating on the extent to which

they "provide to students formal and multiple informal opportunities to demonstrate mastery of objectives and [modify] instruction as needed".

TCP World Language:

- Candidates take EDU 402/813: Educational Measurement. Topics addressed in the course include attributes of a professional learning community, formative assessment, summative assessment, data-driven educational decisions and standards-based grading, common tasks and calibration, developing rubrics, standardized testing, alternative assessments, performance-based tasks, and summative assessments. Course assessments include summaries of readings, lesson plan construction, unit plan construction, journal entries, classroom observations and an interview of an administrator.

- The lesson plan rubric includes three indicators focused on assessment. Candidates receive ratings on the quality of the "link between assessment and goals and between assessment and instruction," the quality of performance-based assessments and the extent to which they are aligned with RI standards, and the quality of alignment between the assessment and the instructional content.

- The lesson observation rubric includes six criteria focused on assessment. Candidates receive ratings on the consistency with which they use a variety of formative assessment strategies and make adjustments throughout the lesson, use a variety of self-assessment strategies, use information from formative assessments to revise subsequent lesson plans, and provide accurate and individualized instructional feedback. Candidates also receive ratings on whether they use a variety of summative assessment strategies aligned with identified goals and objectives and on the extent to which they analyze data from summative evaluations to determine students' achievement of goals or objectives.

Undergraduate Music Education:

- Candidates do not take a class focused in assessment or data-driven instruction. In MSC 330: Teaching General Music, candidates read about assessment and evaluation. In MSC 332: Teaching Secondary Instrumental Music, candidates must develop a grading policy as one of their course assessments.

- In MSC 332L: Teaching Secondary Instrumental Music Practicum, candidates complete a case study of a PK-12 student. For the case study, the candidate must prepare a description of the student and determine the objectives and assessment data that the candidate will need to collect based on the student's needs or challenges. The candidate then designs and implements three lessons that include assessments. The candidate must "demonstrate, in detail, understanding of how the instructional opportunities developed and multiple sources of student data collected support the continuous development of the learner."

- During site visits, reviewers observed candidates informally assessing student performances and providing immediate feedback to students about their performance. However, in interviews, candidates did not demonstrate a deep understanding of assessment, its purposes, and its uses.

Recommendations

- Review and revise course syllabi and candidate experiences to integrate additional explicit instruction of methods and techniques for assessing student learning. Increase or improve 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 cycle.

- 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.

- Provide candidates additional instruction and clinical practice in how to collect and analyze student data from a variety of sources and across grade spans. Ensure candidates are familiar with how to assess student learning in their specific content areas. 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 expects candidates to use technology as teachers and as learners. 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 expects candidates to use technology in lesson plans and in instruction. Each pathway requires candidates to complete one or more assignments related to technology and includes technology in lesson plans and rubrics.

- Across all pathways except for PACT, the program emphasizes technology as a presentation tool rather than as a way to enhance student learning and assessment. Pre-visit evidence emphasized opportunities for candidates to present using PowerPoint, Prezi, and other presentation tools.

- Faculty members provide limited instruction and modeling to candidates related to designing and implementing digital age learning experiences. In particular, candidates lack preparation in content-specific technologies that they can use to enhance student learning. Candidates reported that they learned about content-specific technologies either on their own or from clinical educators.

Undergraduate World Language:

- In an evidence organizer, leadership reported—and reviewers agreed—that the pathway has started to make the shift to focus more on digital learning but needs to "overcome some hurdles" and "shifts in thinking/practice." During interviews, faculty members stated that candidates gain experience using technology through online coursework. Faculty members

reported that they try to model use of technology in class, but reviewers noted that current efforts are insufficient.

- The program identified multiple courses that address technology, but reviewers found limited evidence that the program clearly communicates expectations for candidate use of technology in instruction. On example is in EDU 206: Principles of Secondary Education, candidates must design a unit plan with a minimum of five lesson plans and at least one of the lessons must use technology to support student thinking. In that class, candidates must also create a wiki page as a final product.

- The Lesson Planning Rubric and Feedback Form includes technology as part of materials and focuses on whether materials and resources are well-matched to selected strategies and instruction. In the Lesson Observation Rubric and Feedback Form, candidates receive a rating on the consistency with which they incorporate "appropriate teaching strategies and technological resources to support student exploration".

TCP:

- The program identified multiple courses that address technology, but reviewers saw a disconnect between the courses that faculty identified and the evidence in syllabi and work samples. Reviewers found limited evidence that the program clearly communicates expectations for candidate use of technology in instruction. In EDU 207: Principles of Secondary Education, candidates must design at least one lesson that requires candidates to implement technology as part of their unit plan.

- The Lesson Planning Rubric and Feedback Form includes technology as part of materials and focuses on whether materials and resources match selected strategies and instruction. In the Lesson Observation Rubric and Feedback Form, candidates receive a rating on the consistency with which they incorporate "appropriate teaching strategies and technological resources to support student exploration".

- Per the Assessment System Handbook, TCP expects candidates to include evidence that they use a variety of technology for instruction/teaching and learning in their Readiness to Student Teach Growth Plan. However, the rubric for the growth plan focuses on the quality of candidate writing and therefore does not result in actionable feedback to candidates on their use of technology.

Undergraduate Music Education:

- The program reported, "Each course involves learning of the use of music as well as other types of technology". However, candidates develop only basic skills in designing, implementing, and assessing digital age learning experiences and assessment to support student learning.

- In MSC 303: Composition, candidates learn basic recording techniques and use of music notational programs. However, reviewers noted that the program does not assess candidate use of such technologies.

Recommendations

- Ensure program and clinical faculty members are proficient in using, designing, and implementing digital age learning experiences.

- Collaborate with district partners to identify content-specific applications of technology that candidates should learn during preparation. Include greater emphasis on modeling and teaching candidates how to use content-specific applications of technology in methods coursework.

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.	

- All candidates, regardless of pathway, take a course that helps candidates develop a basic understanding of special education, disability types, and supports for students with disabilities. The program expects candidates to include accommodations and modifications in lesson plans, but reviewers noted that candidate work samples from all four pathways revealed a limited understanding of how to differentiate instruction and accommodate students with disabilities in the general education setting. For example, some work samples included accommodations for students' learning styles rather than accommodations for specific learning needs.

- Candidate opportunities to reflect on their own biases and to develop proficiency in working with English language learners vary by pathway, with the PACT pathway having greater emphasis on these two critical areas.

- Through coursework and clinical experiences, candidates have limited opportunities to learn about, design, and implement strategies that are effective when working with families in diverse communities.

Undergraduate World Language:

- The pathway does not emphasize cultural responsiveness in required coursework. Reviewers did not find any evidence that candidates reflect on their own biases or worldviews in syllabi, work samples, or written narratives provided by pathway leadership. In an interview, one candidate cited an example of journal article that the class read in EDU 206: Principles of Secondary Education where students learned the importance of respecting student backgrounds, but this seemed to be an isolated example. EDU 211: Urban Education, an optional elective, covers topics including identity, diversity, hierarchy of needs, microaggressions, stereotype threat, culturally relevant pedagogy, and diversity as well as a service-learning component.

- In EDU 303: The Child with Special Needs in the Regular Classroom, candidates must respond to writing prompts focused on IDEA, a specific disability, and Attention Deficit-Hyperactivity Disorder. Candidates must research a community agency and the role it plays in lives of students with disabilities and must develop a lesson plan that is adaptable to a wide range of student abilities or student differences based on a specific area of disability. In interviews, candidates noted that this course would be stronger if it emphasized scenarios more and focused less on writing papers.

- During student teaching, candidates complete a case study of a student with "documented instructional needs and approved accommodations including, but not limited to, a gifted student or a student with an IEP, PLP or 504 plan" or an English language learner. The case study must include a plan for addressing instructional challenges, examples of modifications made to instruction and assessment, a reflection on effectiveness of modifications, and recommendations for future learning. However, the case study rubric emphasizes completeness of case study pieces rather than the candidates' selection and implementation of appropriate strategies and modifications to support the case study student.

- The lesson plan rubric includes two criteria focused on whether instruction "demonstrates a keen awareness of diversity of learners and expertly connects to interest and experiences of students" and whether "strategies, instruction, assessment, and materials are clearly matched to grade and strengths/needs of learners." The taught lesson rubric also includes two criteria focused on whether the candidate "executes a lesson that expertly accommodates diversity of learners and connects to cultural and learning differences of students" and whether the candidate "makes appropriate and detailed accommodations for specific needs of students." Review of candidate work samples revealed that candidates identified some student needs and identified/made some accommodations, but these accommodations were basic and did not reflect highly effective strategies for supporting learners' specific learning needs.

- In an evidence organizer, the program did not provide evidence that candidates develop and demonstrate practices that are effective when working with families and communities. Course syllabi revealed a lack of emphasis on strategies for working with families.

TCP World Languages:

- The pathway does not emphasize cultural responsiveness. Reviewers did not find any evidence that candidates reflect on their own biases or worldviews in syllabi, work samples, or written narratives provided by pathway leadership.

- In EDU 304: The Exceptional Child in the Regular Classroom, candidates learn basic information about special education and learn some basic strategies for working with students with disabilities. Course assessments do not emphasize designing instruction for students with disabilities and instead include study guides, listening guides, a desk reference, and an interview of a parent of a child with a disability.

- Pathway leadership acknowledged—and reviewers agreed—that the program needs to better prepare candidates to work with students who are English language learners. EDU 404/EDU 622: Reading in the Content Area includes three class sessions focused on English language learners.

Candidates complete a literacy project. Although the description says that candidates "will write a literacy lesson plan and then adapt it for ELL students", the detailed instructions say that candidates will write a lesson and then "take the same lesson, and modify it for a class that is below grade/reading level. Perhaps there are students with IEPs, chronic absenteeism, making-(*sic*) up credits, ELLs, etc." The assignment does not focus explicitly on differentiating instruction for English learners.

- The curriculum does not emphasize effective strategies for working with families. In an evidence organizer, pathway leadership noted that candidates prepare a written letter to families as part of EDU 201/EDU 791: Educational Psychology. This assignment does not provide candidates an opportunity to develop proficiency in designing and implementing strategies that are effective when working with families.

Undergraduate Music Education:

- Music education leadership noted that it uses one of two texts, *Teaching in the Urban Classroom* or *Urban Music Education*, to "allow further exploration about working with students who are diverse." Pathway leaders also emphasized the role of candidate journal entries to focus on working with diverse populations.

- All candidates take EDU 221: Introduction to Characteristics of Special Needs, where candidates learn basic information about special education and learn some basic strategies for working with students with disabilities. Reviewers noted that the three syllabi for this course varied. For example, one course syllabus mentioned working with families but not in the other course. All sections of the class require candidates to observe a classroom, but the other assessments varied by instructor.

- Candidates also take SWK 253: Human Behavior through the Life Plan. This class, geared towards social work students, covers human development. The syllabus indicated that one week addresses "the theme of identity development, including an exploration of the self within the context of the environment" and covers "themes of race, ethnicity, culture, class, gender, and sexuality." Another week focuses "primarily on family and the impact that family has on human behavior and individual development." However, it is unclear the extent to which candidates then translate this information into implications for their practice as educators.

- Candidates have limited opportunities to develop and implement strategies that are effective when working with families. Music education leadership acknowledged, "There is little opportunity for the actual [parent] contact in our courses." In interviews, candidates noted that they might attend a concert, but that was typically the extent of their interaction with families during their program. Leadership noted that texts used in coursework "cover working with all families and in all types of communities", but reviewers noted that this is insufficient.

Recommendations

- In the undergraduate and TCP pathways, incorporate more opportunities for candidates to reflect upon and develop a deeper awareness of their own worldviews. Consider whether all

candidates would benefit from making EDU 211: Urban Education a required course or if the program can embed some of the content from EDU 211 into other courses.

- Focus less on learning styles and more on research-based practices. Provide explicit instruction and practice is evidence-based practices that are effective when working with English language learners and students with disabilities. Ensure candidates receive feedback on their differentiation of instruction and their implementation of strategies to support learning.

- Work with clinical partners to identify additional opportunities for candidates to work with families and school communities earlier in clinical preparation and during student teaching. Ensure candidates receive feedback on their work with 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 culturally responsive instruction, work with students with disabilities and students who are English language learners, and work with families.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not provide candidates opportunities to develop a general understanding of Rhode Island educational initiatives and Rhode Island educational laws and policies.	

- Candidates do not develop a basic understanding of initiatives, as demonstrated through coursework and candidate interviews. Although the program reported that candidates receive introductory information about some educational initiatives, laws, and policies through coursework, candidates did not demonstrate awareness of such initiatives in interviews. Reviewers asked candidates to describe where they learned about key Rhode Island initiatives and did not receive a response. When reviewers asked about specific Rhode Island initiatives, candidates still could not provide additional detail.

Undergraduate World Language:

- Pathway leadership shared a crosswalk showing that coursework addressed multiple Rhode Island initiatives, including the Safe School Act/Bullying policy, the RI Diploma system, personalized learning, and special population initiatives. The program expects candidates to use InfoWorks multiple times during their program.

- The program includes some assessments of candidate understanding of key RI initiatives. Pathway leadership reported that candidates are required to write response papers after learning about RI's Safe School Act and Statewide Bullying policy and after learning about the RI Diploma System as part of EDU 201: Educational Psychology. In EDU 301: Foundations of Education, candidates review RIDE's charter school proposal guidelines and research community demographics on Infoworks before preparing their own charter school proposal.

TCP:

- Pathway leadership shared a crosswalk showing that coursework addressed multiple Rhode Island initiatives, including social emotional learning, high school graduation requirements, and personal literacy plans. During interviews, candidates and faculty were unable to discuss specific Rhode Island initiatives, even after reviewers provided further clarification about what they meant by Rhode Island initiatives.

- The program reported that candidates present on a RI initiative of choice in EDU 410: General Methods, but this assignment is present in only one version of the syllabus. The syllabus for the other instructor does not include the same assignment. Other than this assignment, the provider reports that it supports and assesses candidate proficiency in RI initiatives mostly through lesson planning activities.

Undergraduate Music Education:

- Pathway leadership reported that faculty "try to introduce and re-enforce teacher candidate understanding and use of the various Rhode Island laws and practices applicable to teaching music" throughout the curriculum. The program submitted a crosswalk stating that courses address the Basic Education Plan, ESSA, IDEA, bullying, special education initiatives, educator evaluation, and InfoWorks. Reviewers did not find evidence of thorough coverage of RI initiatives. Clinical educators also spoke about how they try to integrate RI initiatives into clinical placements, but these efforts seemed sporadic at best.   In interviews, candidates did not speak knowledgably about RI initiatives.

Recommendations

- Work with clinical partners and other stakeholder to identify which Rhode Island initiatives are most important for All Grades education candidates to learn about during their program of study. Identify the knowledge, skills, and practices embedded in those key Rhode Island educational initiatives relevant to these certification areas. Intentionally embed state laws, policies, and initiatives throughout the program to develop a deep understanding of these critical practices.

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

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Approaching Expectations
Candidates' clinical preparation is coherent and builds over time. Candidates in world languages do not receive consistent clinical preparation in elementary grades.	

- In all pathways, clinical experiences begin early in the program and continue throughout. Clinical preparation meets or exceeds the required amount established by Rhode Island certification requirements.

- The program works with candidates employed full-time or enrolled in the PACT pathway to find suitable placements.

- Although requirements vary by pathway, candidates assume all teaching responsibilities gradually and for a significant period during student teaching.

- Clinical preparation in world languages does not ensure that candidates experience a range of educational environments within the PK-12 grade span.

Undergraduate World Language:

- Candidates complete five 25-hour practicum experiences and a 14-week student teaching experience. Collectively, candidate clinical preparation exceeds the required amount established by Rhode Island certification requirements.

- One of the field placements, EDU 490: Methods of Teaching Language in Elementary School, is an elementary school placement.

- Most candidates experience placements in a range of three or four districts. All candidates have experience working at the elementary and high school levels, but only one of six current candidates had a middle school placement.

- The program design intentionally aligns course-based learning with field experiences to ensure that as candidates learn skills and strategies they have the opportunity to observe and implement them. Four courses—EDU 206: Principles of Secondary Education, EDU 401: Educational Measurements, EDU 303: The Child with Special Needs in the Regular Classroom, and EDU 411-16: Teaching in Secondary Schools—are paired with practicum courses. For each practicum, candidates have key assignments that require them to apply their learning from the accompanying course.

- Per the student teaching handbook, candidates assume responsibilities gradually, beginning with one to two weeks of observation and orientation and another one to two weeks of transition where candidates begin to assume responsibility for courses and teaching responsibilities. Candidates assume full responsibility for a maximum of three classes in a block school schedule or four classes in a regular school schedule for approximately eight weeks. The program notes that candidates may not be able to take over AP courses due to specific policies.

TCP World Language:

- Candidates complete two 30-hour practicum experiences and a 12-week student teaching experience. Collectively, clinical preparation meets the required amount established by Rhode Island certification requirements.

- Most candidates experience placements in two or three different districts. However, some candidates work full-time using emergency or expert residency certificates and complete all of their clinical preparation in their school.

- TCP candidates do not experience placements in the full grade range of the certification area, thus limiting candidates' exposure to a range of educational environments. Most candidates do not have any clinical placements in middle schools and no candidates have placements in elementary schools; this practice is unacceptable.

- Clinical handbooks clearly specify expectations for candidates. During Clinical I, candidates are expected to work with individual students, work with small groups of students, support collaborative group work, informally assess students and share assessment findings with the clinical educator, take attendance at least once, manage transitions within a class period at least once, and send a letter home to families. Candidates must also plan and teach a mini-lesson or portion of lesson as well as one whole class lesson. During Clinical II, the program expects candidates to repeat some activities from Clinical I as well as the following: pre-teach, review or reteach a lesson; facilitate a class discussion; facilitate lab work or give a demonstration (if appropriate); practice grading student work, administering and scoring performance and product assessments; manage transitions, and monitor halls during transitions; prepare a bulletin board; and, if possible, help prepare for or attend a parent night/open house or update the class website.

- Per the student teaching handbook, TCP expects candidates to take over all teaching responsibilities gradually, beginning with a week of observation and orientation, adding teaching responsibilities over one to two weeks, and then assuming full responsibility for planning and teaching and other teacher-assigned responsibilities and duties for eight to nine weeks.

PACT World Language:

- Candidates enrolled in the PACT world language pathway have the same clinical preparation as other PACT candidates. PACT candidates begin their preparation with a full week of structured observations in their PACT placement school prior to coursework. After a summer of coursework that includes some microteaching opportunities, candidates begin their two-year residency in a PACT school. As a teacher of record, candidates have significant clinical preparation that exceeds the required amount established by Rhode Island certification requirements.

- Given the residency nature of the program, candidates do not have the opportunity to work in a range of grades and environments. This arrangement is particularly problematic because candidates will be seeking an All Grades World Language certificate, which expects candidates to be prepared to teach students from PK to grade 12. Candidates teach only at the secondary level and do not have any experience in an elementary school setting; this practice is unacceptable. Candidates do not experience teaching in other buildings, but they complete at least four observations of experienced educators within their building and submit reports after their observations.

Music Education:

- Candidate preparation is coherent and provides candidates experience in across all grades (elementary, middle, and secondary) and in multiple settings. Candidates also receive

experience in a range of musical disciplines, including general music, vocal music, and instrumental music.

- Candidate clinical preparation begins in MSC 230: Introduction to Music Education, where candidates conduct 30 hours of classroom observations.

- The program design intentionally aligns course-based learning with field experiences to ensure that as candidates learn skills and strategies in their courses, they have opportunity to practice and receive feedback on their work with PK-12 students and staff. Candidates take three 28-hour practicum experiences that accompany methods courses. In MSC 330L: Teaching General Music, Elementary School, candidates team-teach lessons at Lillian Feinstein Sackett Elementary School in Providence. In MSC 331: General Music, Secondary School: Vocal, candidates observe instruction, begin working with students, and then teach at least two lessons at both North Smithfield High School in North Smithfield and at Martin Middle School in East Providence. In MSC 332L: Teaching Music, Secondary School: Instrumental, candidates teach lessons at North Smithfield Middle School and complete a case study.

- Student teaching is sixteen weeks long and includes two placements—one at the elementary level and one at the secondary level. Candidates assume teaching responsibilities gradually at each placement. Candidates "assume responsibility for planning and teaching the majority of the cooperating teacher's groups/classes" and "other teacher-assigned responsibilities/duties" for four of the eight weeks at each placement.

Recommendations:

- When candidates are working full-time in buildings through TCP or PACT, consider if there are opportunities for these candidates to have experiences outside of their own buildings and in different settings.

- For TCP and PACT, work with clinical partners to identify or design a clinical experience for world language candidates at the elementary level. Across all world language pathways, ensure candidates have an opportunity to learn about best practices for working with elementary students prior to their elementary clinical experience. Current after school and elementary language programs hold great potential as clinical experiences for candidates.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program and its clinical partners do not structure coherent clinical experiences that enable candidates to increasingly demonstrate positive impact on PK-12 students' learning.	

- When asked to provide evidence to demonstrate that candidates have a positive impact on PK-12 students' learning, the program discussed how candidates learn about data and practice collecting data, but did not focus on impact on student learning.

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

- The program has not established clear expectations for demonstrating positive impact on PK-12 students' learning. During interviews, multiple stakeholders could not describe expectations regarding impact on student learning. In fact, clinical educators and clinical educators shared few if any examples of how the program measures impact on student learning.

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

Undergraduate World Language:

- Pathway leadership reported that it uses a case study during student teaching to measure impact on student learning. For the case study, candidates identify one student with documented instructional needs and approved accommodations and then write a 3-4 page essay describing the student, explaining why the candidate chose the student, and identifying the instructional challenges that the student faces. The candidates describes his or her strategy for addressing the challenges, reflects on effectiveness of modifications, includes commentary on lessons learned, and makes recommendations for the student's future learning. The candidate must also submit at least 10 work samples from the case study student. However, the case study rubric focuses on level of detail in the narrative and quality of reflection rather than candidate impact on student learning.

TCP World Language:

- In its narrative, leadership of the TCP pathway noted that candidates have multiple opportunities to design and implement assessments during EDU 402/813: Educational Measurements and their clinical experiences. However, these examples emphasize candidate practice rather than candidate impact on student learning.

Undergraduate Music Education:

- When asked about candidate impact on student learning, program leadership discussed in evidence organizers and evidence about the intentional design of the program to ensure candidates receive regular feedback on their practice and assume additional responsibilities over time. The program expects candidates to assess candidates and adjust what they are teaching to support student needs.

- Candidates complete two case studies during their program. The case study requires candidates to prepare a description of the student's needs and then determine the objectives and assessment data that the candidate will need to collect to address candidate needs. Candidates design and teach three complete lessons that incorporate and reflect ongoing assessment of student performance. After implementing the lessons, candidates prepare a commentary that "portray a clear connection between the student's characteristics, performance on a variety of assessments administered, observations of work samples, lesson plans, and supporting data."

After reviewing the data, candidates identify recommendations for future development of the student. The college supervisor assesses the case study using a rubric that looks at the types of assessments used and their appropriateness, but the program does not assess whether the candidate had a positive impact on student learning.

Recommendations

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

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

- Clearly communicate expectations and measures of candidate impact on student learning with clinical educators and candidates.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program has not established mutually beneficial PK-12 partnerships with clinical partners.	

- Across pathways, clinical partners reported that they benefit from serving as clinical placement sites for Providence College. However, programs and clinical partners do not share responsibility for designing and refining clinical partnerships and practice. The program shared examples of partnership agreements and indicators of partnership effectiveness, but there was no evidence that the Office of Partnership and Placements customized these agreements and indicators based on the input of district partners.

- The program submitted a clinical partners data file with agreed upon indicators of partnership effectiveness. In the file, the provider articulated four indicators of partnership success: the college receives positive feedback about their candidates, candidates have positive impact on student learning as determined by clinical educators, teacher candidates have the opportunity to learn and implement best practices, and the district is able to find excellent candidates for open teaching positions. Generally, the indicators emphasize benefits to the program rather than to the district. These indicators are not present in partnership agreements. In interviews, clinical partners could not identify these indicators. The program does not track and analyze data from agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness and use the data at least annually to make improvement to the partnership.

Undergraduate World Language and TCP World Language:

- The Office of Partnership and Placements selects clinical placements for candidates in the undergraduate and TCP pathways. The office classifies partnership districts/schools into three tiers. As defined by provider leadership, Tier 1 partners are districts that the programs work with and communicate with regularly. The Office of Partnership and Placements creates and maintains formal partnership agreements with Tier 1 partners only.

- In the clinical partners data file, the provider articulated four indicators of partnership success and these indicators were consistent across all districts. These indicators are not present in partnership agreements. In interviews, clinical partners could not identify these indicators.

- The program reported that the Office of Partnership and Placements meets yearly with Tier 1 clinical partners to check on the status of the partnership. However, these conversations seem to center around the continuous improvement of the placement process rather than mutually beneficial partnerships and the status of such a relationship.

Undergraduate Music Education:

- The program collaborates closely with Providence, North Smithfield, and East Providence school districts for practicum placements. Faculty reported that it has worked closely with the practicum clinical educators for many years. However, the program does not have formal partnership agreements with North Smithfield or East Providence. Only Providence has a formal partnership agreement with Providence College.

- The student teaching coordinator and department faculty determine placements for student teaching. The program reported that candidates have the opportunity to visit two or three possible placements and give input on where they would like to student teach. The program also seeks feedback from the possible cooperating teacher as to whether they would like to work with the candidate. The program does not have formal partnership agreements or mutually developed or agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness with all student teaching placement districts.

Recommendations

- Work with clinical partners to establish formal partnership agreements that include agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness. Determine how programs and clinical partners will track and analyze data from agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness. Meet regularly with clinical partners to review data and to ensure that the partnership is mutually beneficial.

- Ensure that programs and clinical partners share common expectations for candidate performance. Engage in conversations with clinical partners about performance expectations they have for candidates and new hires, and adjust expectations as needed. Improve training to ensure that clinical educators, clinical partners, clinical faculty, program faculty, and candidates have common expectations for candidate performance.

- Establish clear and consistent communication channels between programs and clinical partners to ensure the integrity and effectiveness of the partnerships.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program's processes as currently designed and implemented do not ensure that the program and its partners select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators.	

- The processes for recruiting, selecting, preparing, and evaluating clinical educators varies between the undergraduate and TCP pathways and the PACT pathway. Across pathways, however, the current processes for selecting and training clinical educators is insufficient. In particular, the provider does not calibrate expectations between clinical educators, clinical supervisors, and the program.

Undergraduate World Language and TCP World Language:

- The Office of Partnership and Placements uses a Request for Field Placement form. Candidates may request a particular school and/or a specific clinical educator. The clinical educator must agree to accept the teacher candidate and the district representative and school leader must sign off that the clinical educator meets minimum requirements: has three years of experience, has received a 4 as an overall effectiveness rating, and is recommended to work with/mentor a Providence College student. School and district leadership do not need to verify specifically that the clinical educator has the ability to work with adult learners, has sufficient coaching and supervision skills, or has the ability to evaluate and provide high quality feedback to candidates.

- Clinical educators must complete an online training, review the student teaching handbook, and then submit a survey after the training. Based on survey results, most clinical educators found the video and handbook informative and helpful, but the seven-minute cooperating teacher orientation is inadequate as a mechanism for training clinical educators. The video provides a general overview of how the clinical educator may gradually release responsibility to candidates, but it does not provide information about the assessment tools. Because the training mechanism is passive, clinical educators do not have an opportunity to engage in conversation with others, learn or review coaching techniques, or develop a deep understanding of the assessment tools used to assess candidates practice.

- At the end of the placement, candidates complete an evaluation of their clinical educator using a survey. The survey asks candidates to rate how helpful their clinical educator was in various aspects of practice on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being least helpful and 5 being most helpful. Candidates also have the opportunity to complete three open-ended questions about whether she or he would recommend using the clinical educator again, the clinical educator's strengths, and the clinical educator's weaknesses. The college supervisor also completes two surveys— one focused on the clinical placement and one focused on the clinical educator. The clinical educator survey requires the clinical supervisor to identify how frequently (ranging from Always

to Not at All) that the clinical educator modeled instruction, provided support, encouraged professional growth, etc. The provider translates these survey results into an overall score.

- The clinical educator data file revealed that, in some cases, the provider determined that a clinical educator is no longer approved based on low evaluation scores. However, only a small percentage of currently approved clinical educators had any evaluation scores, even though most clinical educators have served as clinical educators for multiple years.

Undergraduate Music Education:

- Program faculty work closely with clinical educators for practicum placements.

- For student teaching, the Office of Partnership and Placements uses a Request for Field Placement form. Candidates may request a particular school and/or a specific clinical educator. The clinical educator must agree to accept the teacher candidate and the district representative and school leader must sign off that the clinical educator meets minimum requirements: has three years of experience, has received a 4 as an overall effectiveness rating, and is recommended to work with/mentor a Providence College student. School and district leadership do not need to verify specifically that the clinical educator has the ability to work with adult learners, has sufficient coaching and supervision skills, or has the ability to evaluate and provide high quality feedback to candidates.

- The program offers the online orientation video as optional trainings for new cooperating teachers. The program relies on the Music Student Teaching Handbook as a source of information and training for clinical educators. Clinical supervisors visit student teaching placements to meet with the student teacher and cooperating teacher to review the handbook and expectations during the first week of the placement. Faculty also reported that it engages in formal and informal calibration activities through regular visits and conversations.

- The program did not demonstrate that it collects and analyzes data on the effectiveness of clinical educators and makes appropriate retention decisions based on the evaluation data. Although music education leadership reported that it has regular conversations with candidates and clinical educators, it does not have a formal process in place for evaluating clinical educators. The clinical educator data file submitted to reviewers did not include any evaluation data.

Recommendations

- Review Component 2.4 of the PREP-RI rubric and revise selection criteria for clinical educators. Ensure that the revised criteria include skills in supporting adult learners and demonstrated ability to coach candidates.

- Establish an ongoing expectation for clinical educators and clinical supervisors to calibrate their observations, use of tools, and feedback to candidates. Create, facilitate, and monitor clinical educator access to these opportunities.

- Ensure that all clinical educators receive training on best adult learning practices. Require that all clinical educators retrain on a regular basis.

- 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. Ensure that candidates receive actionable, constructive feedback that attends to the quality and rigor of the candidate's instruction.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

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

- The program assessment system varies by pathway. Across pathways, reviewers noted that candidate performance assessments are not consistently based on rigorous criteria that are clearly communicated to candidates and stakeholders. Work samples demonstrated that candidates receive written feedback on key assignments, but feedback is inconsistent.

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

Undergraduate World Language:

- The program assessment system includes three major decision points: readiness for admission, readiness for student teaching, and recommendation for certification. At the end of each year, candidates receive a status letter outlining where candidates are in the process and what requirements they have and have not met for the upcoming checkpoint.

- During the admissions process, the program evaluates candidates' GPA, transcript, basic skills proficiency, professionalism observation scale, and key assessments from initial courses. Per the Assessment System Overview that the program submitted to RIDE, the minimum criteria for admission are a cumulative GPA of 2.75, a C or higher in all education courses and practicum experiences, minimum scores on the SAT, ACT, or Praxis Core tests (based on RIDE's minimum admissions requirements), a C or higher on key assessments from the early field experience, and ratings of Meets or Exceeds on the observation scale scoring rubric in professionalism. However, the Professional Observation Scale for Program Admission submitted has rating options of Unacceptable, Emerging, Proficient, and Distinguished—not meets or exceeds. The program has a process for accepting students who do not meet minimum requirements, but RIDE has not approved this conditional acceptance policy.

- In order to proceed to student teaching, candidates must demonstrate an overall GPA of 2.75, a 2.00 or higher in all education courses, and a B or higher on all post-admission education practicum experiences. Given the emphasis on course grades, it is important to acknowledge how course grades are determined. Course and practicum grades are based on course assignments, including exams, papers, reflections, and presentations. In some courses, class

contributions make up a part of the grade. Candidates noted that many of the course assignments emphasized writing, reading, and research but did not emphasize practical application of learning in the classroom.

- Prior to student teaching, candidates must also demonstrate passing scores on the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching for Grades 7-12 and the relevant Praxis content knowledge exam. Candidates must meet or exceed standard on each observation report in professionalism. Candidates also submit a professional growth writing response that must be proficient on a reviewer scale.

- The program assigns each candidate a faculty advisor who reviews progress towards meeting each assessment point on a quarterly basis. According to program leadership, candidates who do not meet expectations at an assessment point may not proceed until the candidate has remediated the area of deficit. However, program faculty must obtain all assessment system records from the Assessment Director or Program Director prior to advising sessions. Because advisors do not have access to assessment system information, it is more challenging to determine how the candidate is progressing and provide candidates with timely support.

- Current training practices are insufficient to ensure that performance assessments are consistently applied across candidates. Clinical educators are required to watch a seven-minute introductory video, review appropriate handbooks, and complete a survey as their training. Current program practices do not include calibration activities.

TCP World Language:

- The program assessment system includes three major decision points: readiness for admission, readiness for student teaching, and recommendation for certification. At the end of each year, candidates receive a status letter outlining where candidates are in the process and what requirements they have and have not met for the upcoming checkpoint.

- During the admissions process, the TCP Coordinator and Dean of Continuing Education assess candidates' content knowledge and professional goals, written communication in English, GPA, letters of recommendation, and experience working with and/or teaching youth. The application review team rates each criterion using a rating scale of Unacceptable (0 points), Acceptable with Conditions (1 point), and Acceptable (2 points). Candidates cannot receive any ratings of 0 to be admitted to the program. The program has a conditional acceptance policy for candidates who do not fully meet course requirements, but RIDE has not approved the conditional acceptance policy.

- In order to proceed to student teaching, candidates must complete all required courses, maintain a minimum GPA of a B (3.0), take the Praxis content exam and the Praxis Principles of learning test, attain proficiency in clinical experiences, and complete a growth plan.

- The Readiness to Student Teach Growth Plan is a binder organized into five domains (Planning and Preparation, Instruction, Classroom Environment, Assessment and Improvement, and Professionalism/Broad Based Knowledge/Technology). The binder includes key assignments from courses--including lesson plans, a unit plan, a classroom management plan, and classroom

assessments—as well as time logs from clinical placements, Praxis scores, and a reflection. Per the student handbook, the TCP coordinator reads the growth plan and provides candidates with a checklist, a completed reflection rubric, and narrative feedback. Candidates may resubmit pieces of the growth plan if they do not meet expectations. Although there is a rubric for the reflective writing prompt, there is a lack of clarity around how the TCP coordinator assesses the overall growth plan using the checklist.

- The program reported having several mechanisms for monitoring candidate progress, including informal communications between TCP faculty and the TCP coordinator, GPA checks, and the Readiness to Student Teach Growth Plan. During interviews, TCP candidates reported meeting with the TCP coordinator occasionally to check in on progress towards meeting the requirements of each decision point.

- Current training practices are insufficient to ensure that performance assessments are consistently applied across candidates. Clinical educators are required to watch a seven-minute introductory video, review appropriate handbooks, and complete a survey as their training. Current program practices do not include calibration activities.

Undergraduate Music Education:

- The program assessment system includes three major decision points: readiness for admission, readiness for student teaching, and recommendation for certification. At the end of each year, candidates receive a status letter outlining where candidates are in the process and what requirements they have and have not met for the upcoming checkpoint.

- During the admissions process, the program evaluates candidates' GPA, transcript, basic skills proficiency, professionalism observation scale, and key assessments from initial courses. Per the Assessment System Overview that the program submitted to RIDE, the minimum criteria for admission are a cumulative GPA of 2.75, a C or higher in all education courses and practicum experiences, minimum scores on the SAT, ACT, or Praxis Core tests (based on RIDE's minimum admissions requirements), a C or higher a lesson plan from the early field experience, and ratings of Meets or Exceeds on the observation scale scoring rubric in professionalism. However, the Professional Observation Scale for Program Admission submitted has rating options of Unacceptable, Emerging, Proficient, and Distinguished—not meets or exceeds. The program has a process for accepting students who do not meet minimum requirements, but RIDE has not approved this conditional acceptance policy.

- In order to proceed to student teaching, candidates must demonstrate an overall GPA of 2.75, a 2.00 or higher in all education courses, and a B or higher on all post-admission education practicum experiences. Given the emphasis on course grades, it is important to acknowledge how course grades are determined. Course and practicum grades are based on course assignments, including exams, performance tests, papers, lessons, and observations. Homework, attendance, and participation also factor into some course grades.

- Prior to student teaching, candidates must also demonstrate passing scores on the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching for Grades 7-12 and the relevant Praxis content knowledge exam. Candidates must meet or exceed standard on each observation report in professionalism.

Candidates also submit a professional growth writing response that must be proficient on a reviewer scale.

- The program reports that candidates meet with advisors at least twice a semester and that candidates talk regularly with faculty during classes. During advising, faculty members offer supports to candidates who may be struggling, such as working with a tutor through the Office of Academic Supports or working with a tutor in the music department. The program reported that it counsels out candidates who are struggling and do not show improvement. The Director of Assessment and the Program Director for Music Education also meet with teacher candidates before each assessment point to ensure that they understand requirements for progression.

- Current practices do not ensure that candidate performance assessments are consistently applied across candidates. The rubric used to evaluate candidate teaching performance does not include differentiated performance-level descriptors. Instead, it lists criteria and a description of each criteria and then asks the observer to identify performance as Target, Acceptable, Unacceptable, or No Opportunity to Observe. However, pathway leadership does not facilitate calibration activities to ensure that all stakeholders, including candidates, clearly understand what performance looks like at each level.

Recommendations

- 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.

- Revise training and calibration mechanisms used with candidates, faculty, clinical faculty, and clinical educators. Ensure that all stakeholders have a shared understanding of performance assessments and monitor implementation to ensure that all stakeholders use assessment tools consistently.

- Collaborate with clinical partners to design, pilot, and integrate measures of candidate impact on student learning into the candidate assessment system.

- For the TCP pathway, provide greater clarity on how the candidate growth form is assessed.

3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Approaching Expectations

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

- The program assessment system varies by pathway. As currently implemented, the system does not ensure that all candidates recommended for certification demonstrate proficiency in the RIPTS, the RI Code of Professional Responsibility, and the pedagogical competencies, content competencies, and field competencies identified in certification regulations.

- Across pathways, the program does not provide sufficient training to faculty and clinical educators responsible for evaluating candidate performance.

Undergraduate World Languages:

- Prior to recommendation for certification, candidates must have an overall GPA of 2.75 or higher (classes of 2019 and beyond) and must have a 2.00 or higher in all education courses. Candidates must have a passing score on the relevant Praxis content knowledge exam, and must have passing scores on the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching 7-12 exam. Candidates must score B- or higher in their student teaching portfolio, score meets or exceeds standard on the observation scale scoring rubric, and submit a Professional Growth Writing Response rated as proficient.

- The student teaching portfolio includes a case study, unit plan, two observations completed by the clinical educator, two observations completed by the clinical supervisor, the final student teacher evaluation form completed by the clinical educator, a professional profile evaluation completed by the cooperating teacher, and a professional profile completed by the clinical supervisor. The student teaching handbook includes rubrics for each portfolio assignment.

- Clinical educators and clinical supervisors are both responsible for evaluating the performance of candidates. Clinical educators and clinical supervisors each evaluate two lessons and each complete a professional profile evaluation. The clinical educator also completes a final student teacher evaluation form, which counts as 25 percent of the student teaching grade.

- As mentioned earlier, the Lesson Plan Critique and Observation Form for Supervisors and Teachers includes differentiated performance-level descriptors for each criterion of the rubric. The rubric aligns explicitly to the RIPTS. Reviewers noted inconsistencies between the lesson plans and the ratings that candidates received. The Student Teacher Mid-term and Final Evaluation form aligns explicitly to the RIPTS and asks clinical educators to rate candidate performance on a scale from 0 (performance or proficiency in this area is not evident at all) to 2 (performance or proficiency is consistently evident). Due to a lack of training and inconsistent implementation, the current assessment system does not ensure that candidates recommended for certification demonstrate proficiency in all of the standards of the RIPTS.

- The program does not provide sufficient training to faculty and clinical educators responsible for evaluating candidate performance. The program provides clinical educators with a seven-minute orientation video, but the video is not enough. The program does not provide sufficient training and calibration to ensure that the implementation of performance-based assessments yields fair, accurate, and consistent evaluation of performance.

TCP World Languages:

- Prior to receiving recommendation for certification, candidates must have an overall GPA of 3.0. Candidates must earn at least a B- in EDU 455: Student Teaching in the Secondary School and must receive ratings of 3 or 4 on all areas of the final evaluations completed by the clinical educator and clinical supervisor. Candidates must also pass the Principles of Learning and Teaching (Grades 7-12) and their content-specific Praxis test.

- Clinical educators and clinical supervisors are both responsible for evaluating the performance of candidates during student teaching. The clinical educator and clinical supervisor each complete three formal observations using the Lesson Planning and Teaching Rubric and Feedback Form as well as the TCP Student Teacher Mid-Semester and Final Evaluation Form.

- As mentioned earlier, the Lesson Planning and Teaching Feedback Form includes differentiated performance-level descriptors for each criterion of the rubric. The rubric aligns explicitly to the RIPTS. Reviewers noted inconsistencies between the lesson plans and the ratings that candidates received. The Student Teacher Mid-term and Final Evaluation form aligns explicitly to the RIPTS and asks clinical educators to rate candidate performance on a scale from 1 (never) to 4 (most of the time). Due to a lack of training and inconsistent implementation, the current assessment system does not ensure that candidates recommended for certification demonstrate proficiency in all of the standards of the RIPTS.

- The program does not provide sufficient training to faculty and clinical educators responsible for evaluating candidate performance. The program provides clinical educators with a seven-minute orientation video, but the video is not enough. The program does not provide sufficient training and calibration to ensure that the implementation of performance-based assessments yields fair, accurate, and consistent evaluation of performance.

Undergraduate Music Education:

- In order to receive recommendation for certification, candidates must demonstrate a cumulative GPA of 2.75 or higher, a 2.0 or higher in each music and education course, and a B- or higher on the student teaching course and portfolio. Candidates must demonstrate that they have passed the Praxis PLT 7-12 exam and must meet or exceed standard on professionalism observation scale rubrics. Candidates also complete a Professional Growth Writing Response rated as proficient using the reviewer scale.

- Clinical educators and clinical supervisors are both responsible for evaluating the performance of candidates during student teaching. In each student teaching placement, the clinical educator completes a minimum of four formal observations of teaching and the clinical

supervisor completes a minimum of three formal observations of teaching. The clinical educator, clinical supervisor, and candidate participate in a final evaluation conference where they review the clinical supervisor's final evaluation of the student teacher.

- Although the program benefits from having a small program, which enables faculty to engage in regular conversation with clinical educators, the program does not provide sufficient training to faculty and clinical educators responsible for evaluating candidate performance to ensure that the implementation of performance-based assessments yields fair, accurate, and consistent evaluation of performance.

Recommendations

- 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.

- Revise training and calibration mechanisms used with candidates, faculty, clinical faculty, and clinical educators. Ensure that all stakeholders have a shared understanding of performance assessments and monitor implementation to ensure that all stakeholders use assessment tools consistently.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program uses surveys but administration of the undergraduate and TCP survey has resulted in no responses.	

- The undergraduate and TCP pathways and the PACT pathway use different tools and processes for surveying program employers. Although the tools are designed to yield some actionable data, the mechanisms used by the undergraduate and TCP pathways have been ineffective.

- The aggregate performance of Providence College program completers is 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 Education Program can be made.

Undergraduate World Language, TCP World Language, and Undergraduate Music Education:

- Multiple programs collaborated in Spring 2016 to develop an employer survey. The survey is designed to yield some actionable information. It asks evaluators to assess the preparedness of program completers to implement nine teaching practices and five professional responsibilities. The survey also asks about candidate preparedness to use data. The survey asks candidates

how prepared certified teachers are to demonstrate how they met student objectives and includes three open-ended questions where respondents can provide more detailed thoughts, impressions, and comments. However, the survey does not specify whether the employer should complete multiple surveys for multiple programs; if an employer has hired program completers from PC's Elementary & Elementary Special Education, Secondary, and World Language programs, there is no way for the program to disaggregate information by program.

- The provider administered the employer survey in November/December 2016 and again in fall 2017 to any employer of a program completer who gave the program permission to contact his or her employer. Undergraduate leadership also sent surveys to employers listed in the Educator Preparation Portal as employing Providence College program completers. However, neither approach resulted in returned surveys.

Recommendations:

- Follow up with completers to understand why so many do not grant permission to survey employers. Review and revise communications about the employer survey. Consider emphasizing the importance of the survey prior to candidate exit and be more explicit about how the program will use survey data.

- Explore and implement additional strategies to solicit annual feedback from program employers to support program improvement. Use the EPP database as an alternate source of employer contact information for completers working in state. Consider if there are alternate ways of finding out where out-of-state candidates are working, such as through social media or state certification verification portals.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The undergraduate and TCP pathways survey program completers annually but do not have strategies in place to track post-completion employment besides the survey. The PACT pathway tracks post-completion employment but has not yet developed a survey for program completers.	

- All pathways except PACT use a program completer survey designed by the Education Council in 2015. The survey is designed to yield actionable data about the program. The survey includes questions about employment status, perceived preparedness in a variety of competencies, and perceived quality of field placements. The survey also includes open-ended questions about program strengths, field experience strengths and areas for improvement, and suggestions for improvement.

Undergraduate World Languages:

- The provider administered the program completer survey in 2015, 2016, and 2017. Response rates have increased over time. Two of 14 undergraduate secondary education completers responded in 2015, eight of 15 responded in 2016, and five of seven responded in 2017. The program shared two examples of how it has used survey results to inform changes to the program. The program recently added more emphasis on working with English language learners and is in the process of modifying the current special education class to be a class that

focuses instead on differentiation for special student populations. Faculty have also worked to provide candidates with more information about certification requirements through advising and evening programs on certification requirements.

TCP World Languages:

- The provider administered the program completer survey in 2015, 2016, and 2017. The analysis provided by TCP leadership did not include response rates or disaggregated data. The analysis noted two areas, instructional and educational technology, and working with students who are English learners, that completers would like to see addressed in more depth. TCP stated that it is exploring how to better support candidates in these areas through its continuous improvement activities.

Undergraduate Music:

- The provider administered the survey in 2015, 2016, and 2017. The analysis provided by music education leadership did not include response rates or disaggregated data. The narrative analysis submitted to reviewers identified two areas that need "continued consideration": balance of elementary and secondary placements and addressing classroom management more clearly across all content areas throughout the program.

Recommendations

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

- Consider how to leverage online platforms, such as LinkedIn or Facebook, to invite people to join and establish program alumni professional networks over time.

- For undergraduate and TCP pathways, implement strategies to increase survey response rates and revise the survey to ensure that the program receives program-specific information about completers.

- For PACT, develop and administer an annual program completer survey to provide the program with additional data about candidate preparation.

Special Education Program

The Special Education program (separate from the combined Elementary & Elementary Special Education undergraduate program) is a graduate-level program that contains tracks for elementary and secondary special education. Candidates complete nine courses and an internship.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Approaching Expectations
The program aligns to the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS). Candidates experience a consistent curriculum, but the program does not sufficiently check for mastery of RIPTS at admission and does not ensure mastery of RIPTS by program completion.	

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

- All candidates in the program already hold an elementary or secondary certification. The program relies on candidates' previous preparation in the RIPTS and does not include an explicit emphasis on the RIPTS. For example, the program did not submit a crosswalk between coursework and the RIPTS, but it did submit a crosswalk between courses and other important sets of standards.

- The program does not have a clear process in place to check for candidate proficiency in the RIPTS and to provide remediation if needed. The program reports that it checks for candidate proficiency in the RIPTS at the point of admission through the principal recommendation letter, but the program's admissions guidance and tools do not allow the program to accurately access candidate proficiency in all RIPTS. The program submitted questions for the principal letter of recommendation, but these questions focused on only four RIPTS. The application rubric looks only at whether the principal strongly endorses, moderately endorses, or vaguely endorses the candidate—not specific proficiency in the RIPTS. At admission, candidates also submit their prior teaching evaluation, but the rubric focuses on overall evaluation score rather than specific teacher competencies. Given the current scoring structure of the application rubric, candidates can score Not Acceptable in either the Recommendation Letter or Teacher Competency and still receive full admission without conditions.

- Although alignment to RIPTS is not explicit in syllabi and assignments, the review team found that candidates receive preparation in most, but not all, of the knowledge, skills, and competencies encompassed within the RIPTS. Candidates were particularly well prepared to create a supportive learning environment (Standard 6), use effective communication (Standard 8), and maintain professional standards (Standard 11). Reviewers noted that candidates would benefit from additional preparation in content knowledge (Standard 2) and assessment (Standard 9).

Recommendations

- Revise the admissions rubric to look more explicitly at candidate performance in specific competencies. Consider revising the template for the principal recommendation letter so that principals must directly answer the prompts provided by Providence College.

- Embed evaluation of candidate application of the RIPTS at different checkpoints throughout the program.

- Develop a plan for RIPTS remediation if applicants admitted into the program have limited knowledge of the RIPTS or if they need additional support in the knowledge, skills, and competencies embedded within the RIPTS.

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 Child (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, and where the program assesses the CEC standards.

- As previously mentioned, all candidates hold teaching certificates in elementary or secondary education. The program relies on previous certification and does not currently have a measure to determine if candidates have sufficient content knowledge. This finding is particularly relevant for secondary candidates, who have in-depth content knowledge in their content area of certification but may have no or significantly less preparation in other content areas.

- The program includes EDU 606: Teaching Reading Strategies to Students with Special Needs. In this course, candidates learn components of effective research-supported reading instruction, learn strategies for supporting students' reading, and learn about some informal assessments. As part of the course, candidates must complete a case study of an individual learner that includes an assessment of student performance, recommendations for instruction, and a lesson plan aligned to the learner's present level of academic performance.

- The program does not include a similar emphasis on math and science methods. In an evidence organizer, program leadership acknowledged that this is an area of improvement, stating, "The program will initiate the return of a math requirement in the program leading to certification, as well as more emphasis on secondary reading strategies in the reading course." During interviews, candidates agreed that there is less emphasis on math and science methods. Most candidates and program completers reported feeling confident in teaching in English language arts but felt less confident in teaching math, science, and social studies.

- During interviews, clinical educators and candidates noted that candidates had varying knowledge of general and specialized curricula to individualize learning for individuals with exceptionalities. Candidates attributed previous teaching experiences, the quality of clinical and internship placements, and depth of content area knowledge for this variance.

- Reviewers noted that candidates receive strong preparation in learner development and individual learning differences (Standard 1), learning environments (Standard 2), and professional learning and ethical practice (Standard 6). Candidates would benefit from additional emphasis on curricular content knowledge (Standard 3) and assessment (Standard 4).

105

Recommendations

- Assess candidate proficiency in content and content pedagogy and provide remediation and support to candidates who may be struggling with specific content areas. Consider whether elementary or secondary methods courses available in other programs may be useful to students who demonstrate a need in a particular content area.

- Integrate explicit instruction on how to support students effectively in specific content areas, but particularly in mathematics and science. Consider creating a mathematics methods course that focus on unpacking mathematics content standards, modifying curricula for students with disabilities, and specific strategies for supporting student understanding and proficiency (e.g. using manipulates).

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.	

- Program leadership stated, "Candidates are expected to enter the program with a background in and working knowledge of PK-12 Learning Standards as certified teachers." However, some candidates come to the program from other states that do not use the same student learning standards as Rhode Island. The program does not provide explicit instruction in the CCSS, NGSS, or GSEs.

- The program states that it extends candidates knowledge of standards through required lesson plans. Key assignments of the program include a three-day lesson plan using a multicultural literature selection, a lesson addressing metacognitive strategy use, a lesson using the SIOP model, and lessons during student teaching. However, there is not an explicit requirement that candidates develop lessons in mathematics, science, or social studies.

- Student work samples and site visits revealed that candidates had a basic understanding of how to design lessons that would help students with disabilities progress to proficiency in Rhode Island student standards. All lessons stated the standards that the candidate intended to address, but sometimes the activities and learning opportunities within the lesson would not help students sufficiently move toward proficiency. During site visits, reviewers noted discrepancies between the standards, objectives, tasks, and assessments in two of the three site visits.

Recommendations

- Review and revise the program curriculum to ensure that all candidates receive explicit instruction, clinical practice, and assessment and feedback in how to design, implement, and modify instruction across the full range of applicable learning 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 using data from multiple sources of information.	

- Candidates learn assessment basics for special educators in EDU 608: Assessment of Individual Differences. According to the syllabus, the course is "a beginning course in psychoeducational assessment for teachers in special education." The course includes information on the Wechsler Individual Achievement Test, norm-referenced tests, statistics, and some information on Response to Intervention.

- The program reported that candidates have multiple opportunities to practice collecting, analyzing, and using data through key assessments. Key assessments include written educational reports (EDU 608: Assessment of Individual Differences), an educational evaluation (EDU 636: Assessment/Curriculum for Mild/Moderate Disabilities in K-12 Settings), using vocabulary and fluency assessments to assess and monitor student progress (EDU 606: Teaching Reading to Students with Special Needs), administering transition assessments (for secondary candidates, EDU 613: Vocational Programming), writing an IEP (EDU 636: Assessment/Curriculum for the Student with Mild/Moderate Disabilities in K-12 Settings), developing a case study (EDU 606: Teaching Reading to Students with Special Needs), and analyzing a language sample (EDU 571: Communication Disorders). Candidates develop basic skills in selecting and implementing assessments to monitor student progress and develop basic skills in using assessment to evaluate and modify instructional practice. For example, during interviews, one candidate shared how she or he used NWEA data, and the Lexile levels generated from it, to inform how to group students for reading lessons.

- Candidates develop basic skills in identifying, gathering, and analyzing data from sources other than assessments to improve student learning and instructional practice. Candidates conduct parent interviews (EDU 649: Collaboration: Home/School/Community, EDU 599: Teaching Students with Autism), support personnel interviews (EDU 823: Introduction & Characteristics of Students with Special Needs, EDU 617: Behavior Strategies), and community resource visits (EDU 613: Vocational Programming), but these emphasize learning more about particular topics or resources rather than as a means to gather data that can be used to inform student learning and instructional practice.

- The program recently began requiring candidates to write and implement student learning objectives (SLOs). The SLOs have the potential to provide candidates with authentic opportunities to collect, monitor, and reflect on student progress over time.

Recommendations

- Ensure that candidates develop proficiency in monitoring student progress over time and using data to inform instructional practice. Ensure candidates have opportunities to collect data and monitor student progress over time.

- Integrate instruction and assessment of candidate proficiency in using sources other than assessments to improve student learning and instructional practice. Possible data sources include checklists, family interviews, attendance records, and office referrals.

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.	

- Documents submitted by the program emphasize candidate fluency in technology systems rather than using technology to enhance student learning. The crosswalk submitted by the program highlights multiple places where candidates use Google Docs, use PowerPoint/Prezi, and conduct research online. Faculty reported that candidates are already tech-savvy and seem to rely on candidate knowledge of technology. The program provides limited modeling of the use of instructional and assistive technologies.

- The program articulates expectations that candidates use technology. In the student handbook, the program states, "Student teachers are encouraged to incorporate the internet, a variety of visual aids as they present multi-sensory lessons to their special needs students." The observation rubric includes "Technology is incorporated into the lesson" in one of the performance-level descriptors for Engaging Students in Learning. However, in both places, the emphasis is on the presence of technology or the use of technology for presentation rather than the effectiveness of technology use to enhance learning or assessment.

- In interviews, candidates acknowledged that a lot of the technology use focuses on presentation. Candidates noted that, in EDU 649: Home/School Collaboration, candidates are required to research and present an application designed to foster collaboration. They noted that they learned a little bit about assistive technology in EDU 571: Communication Disorders, but they acknowledged that they would benefit from additional instruction in assistive technology.

Recommendations

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

- 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.

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

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

- Since this program is preparing candidates to be future special educators, there is an explicit focus on ensuring candidates learn strategies that are effective when working with students with disabilities. However, as noted elsewhere, candidates would benefit from additional instruction on how to modify curricula to support student learning.

- EDU 811: Special Education for Children from Diverse Backgrounds includes a focus on culturally responsive teaching. In the class, candidates complete a cultural autobiography that requires them to reflect on their own cultural background. Candidates learn about the importance of culture and culturally responsive teaching. They also receive an overview of disproportionate representation in special education.

- Reviewers found limited evidence of candidate preparation to work with English language learners. The syllabus for EDU 811 includes instruction of English learners, but this seems to be a limited focus of the course.

- EDU 649: Collaboration: Home, School, and Community includes a focus on parent communication and collaboration with the community. The final project for the class is designing a community event for families of students with disabilities. Candidates also are responsible for finding and presenting an application that could foster effective communication with families. However, candidates noted that they have limited opportunity to work with families and receive feedback on their work with families during their preparation.

Recommendations

- Work with clinical partners to identify additional opportunities for candidates to work with families and school communities earlier in clinical preparation and during student teaching. Ensure candidates receive feedback on their work with 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 culturally responsive instruction, work with students with disabilities and students who are English language learners, and work with families.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Approaching Expectations
The program provides limited opportunities 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. Candidates learn about important laws pertaining to special education. Reviewers found evidence of RTI and MTSS in multiple syllabi and noted that the program addresses social-emotional learning. However, candidates do not appear to be learning RTI at the depth expected of a special educator.

- Candidates had little or no knowledge of other key initiatives, including ESSA, PLPs, RICAS, and PARCC. In interviews, candidates reported that they were able to observe RTI meetings or contribute to writing a PLP during their field experiences, but this was not an expectation. In EDU 823: Introduction & Characteristics of Students with Special Needs, candidates are supposed to pick a RI initiative and write five bulleted statements to share with the class. This assignment is low-level and does not adequately assess candidate understanding of initiatives or candidate proficiency in the knowledge, skills, and practices embedded in key Rhode Island initiatives.

- The program recently introduced an expectation that candidates write student learning objectives (SLOs) during the program that align with RIDE guidance for SLOs. Candidates talked about their SLOs in interviews.

Recommendations

- Work with clinical partners and other stakeholders to identify which Rhode Island initiatives are most important for special education candidates to learn about during their program of study. Identify the knowledge, skills, and practices embedded in those key Rhode Island initiatives, and then revise coursework and candidate experiences appropriately. Identify important experiences that candidates should have during clinical preparation (e.g. joining RTI meetings) and communicate expectations to candidates and clinical educators clearly.

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

- Identify ways to assess candidate proficiency in Rhode Island educational initiatives that are more authentic and in-depth than currently in use.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Approaching Expectations
Clinical preparation is coherent and of sufficient length. However, multiple stakeholders expressed concern about the appropriateness of some placements.	

- The program has attempted to find an innovative way to provide candidates opportunities to meet clinical experiences while working full-time. This design includes clinical experiences hours associated with each class and student teaching during the summer. However, this arrangement has its limitations, as described below.

- Each course of the program includes required clinical experience hours. The program reported that candidates complete 60 hours of early field experience and 300 hours of internship (the equivalent of 12 weeks). Collectively, candidate clinical preparation meets the required minimum number of hours established by Rhode Island certification requirements.

- Expectations for clinical preparation intensify over time. Early experiences include observation, working one-on-one with students, and conducting an evaluation. Middle experiences include conducting interviews, writing IEPs, conducting case studies, and teaching lessons. During student teaching, candidates observe during the first week and then gradually assume teaching responsibilities by adding a content area each day.

- The program reported that candidates are required to practice in a variety of settings but the program does not have a proactive method of communicating expectations for and monitoring candidate placements. The program reported, "Two candidates were recently required to repeat a clinical placement in a different setting, as the placements did not meet the diversity or certificate level requirements." In interviews, candidates concurred that they conducted early field experience in a variety of placements but reported that the program did not communicate these expectations clearly at the start of their program. Candidates reported that the program did not clearly define "diverse" and did not explicitly state they could not use the same districts multiple times for their clinical experiences.

- Candidates complete a 100-hour internship as part of EDU 636: Assessment/Curriculum for the Student with Mild/Moderate Disabilities in K-12 Settings. Nearly all of these placements are in public school settings. Reviewers questioned the appropriateness of one of the candidate placements, since the placement seemed more appropriate for someone seeking a certification in All Grades Special Education – Severe Intellectual Disability.

- Candidates complete a 200-hour internship over the summer; nearly all candidates complete this internship in a private special education school. The summer internship enables candidates to complete their student teaching requirements while working full-time and gives them experience working in an alternative placement. However, during interviews, clinical educators noted that the PK-12 student experience is different over the summer than during the school year. As a result, candidates may not benefit as much from the experience.

- Multiple stakeholders said they wished candidates had more opportunity to student teach in a public school setting. Stakeholders noted resources, procedures, processes, and the types of and severity of disabilities can vary greatly between public school and alternative school placements.

Recommendations

- Establish a more systematic approach to candidate placements.   Ensure that candidates understand which clinical placements are and are not acceptable. Establish an approval and tracking process to ensure that candidates do not need to repeat placements due to a lack of diversity.

- Work with clinical partners, clinical educators, and candidates to determine a possible extended student teaching experience in a public school setting. Explore possible partnership arrangements and residency models that would allow candidates to complete their student teaching in a public school setting during the school year. At a minimum, explore whether it is possible to better split candidate's time between the public school and alternative school settings.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program and its clinical partners do not structure coherent clinical experiences that enable candidates to increasingly demonstrate positive impact on PK-12 students' learning.	

- In an evidence organizer, program leadership described multiple opportunities candidates have to collect and analyze data on student progress. However, the program does not track or monitor candidate impact data over time and use it to inform and improve candidates' ability to impact student learning in later clinical experiences. Program leadership reported—and reviewers agreed—"there is a need for a system that collects and measures data on candidate impact on student learning at multiple points in the program."

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

- Beginning this semester, the program requires candidates to write and complete a student learning objective that is consistent with the guidance available on the Rhode Island Department of Education website. During interviews, one candidate described using a weekly standardized probe to monitor impact on student learning through the student learning objective; another candidate described using the Summit platform, which has built-in rubrics that can be used to assess student progress over time. This assignment has the potential to be a useful measure of candidate impact on student learning moving forward.

Recommendations

- Consider how PK-12 schools define and measure impact on student learning and explore what impact on student learning means for preparation programs. Work with clinical partners to

develop a programmatic definition, an approach, and expected impact levels that the program can communicate to candidates, faculty, and clinical educators.

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

- Clearly communicate expectations and measures of candidate impact on student learning with clinical educators and candidates.

- Develop protocols and systems to review impact data from early clinical experiences and then use the data to inform further support for candidates to ensure that candidates improve in their ability to impact student learning in later clinical experiences.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program has not established mutually beneficial PK-12 partnerships with clinical partners.	

- Clinical partnerships are informal in nature in terms of outreach, feedback, and troubleshooting any issues. The program expects candidates to find their own placements for early clinical experiences. Candidates reported it was challenging at times to find the right placement, especially during the summer, but noted that professors were very helpful in finding placements when needed.

- In the clinical partners data file, the provider articulated four indicators of partnership success: the college receives positive feedback about their candidates, candidates have positive impact on student learning as determined by clinical educators, teacher candidates have the opportunity to learn and implement best practices, and the district is able to find excellent candidates for open teaching positions. Generally, the indicators emphasize benefits to the program rather than to the district. These indicators are not present in partnership agreements. In interviews, clinical partners could not identify these indicators. The program does not track and analyze data from agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness and use the data at least annually to make improvement to the partnership.

- Clinical educators reported that they meet with program leadership and have opportunities to discuss potential clinical placement changes. Clinical educators reported that leadership update handbooks annually, often based on clinical educator feedback. However, district and school leadership did not seem to have opportunities to engage in similar conversations.

Recommendations

- Establish formal partnerships and assist candidates with finding appropriate clinical placements. Meet with each district partner to develop a formal partnership agreement that articulates benefits to each partner, the roles and responsibilities of each partner, and how the program

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

- Work with clinical partners to establish formal partnership agreements that include agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness. Determine how programs and clinical partners will track and analyze data from agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness. Meet regularly with clinical partners to review data and to ensure that the partnership is mutually beneficial.

- Ensure that program and clinical partners share common expectations for candidate performance. Engage in conversations with clinical partners about performance expectations they have for candidates and new hires, and adjust expectations as needed. Improve training to ensure that clinical educators, clinical partners, clinical faculty, program faculty, and candidates have common expectations for candidate performance.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program's processes as currently designed and implemented do not ensure that the program and its partners select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators.	

- The program states that clinical educators must, at a minimum, have three years of experience in their field, hold Rhode Island certification in special education at the appropriate level, assume responsibility for his or her professional growth, and be available to attend an orientation. Clinical educators must also be able to "create instructional opportunities that reflect a respect for learners and an understanding of how students differ in their approaches to learning", be able to "create a supportive learning environment…", "assume responsibility for professional growth", and "hold RI certification in special education at the appropriate level". The criteria do not include ability to work with adult learners, coaching and supervision skills, or ability to evaluate and provide feedback to candidates.

- The program relies on written letters of recommendation and copies of teaching certificates as verification that clinical educators meet written criteria. While some leaders wrote to these criteria in the letters, other letters are more like verifications of credentials rather than letters of recommendation. The program did not have a rubric or other way of determining whether the clinical educator met the minimum criteria.

- The program attempts to leverage the small size of the program in order to offer convenient options to clinical educators. Clinical educators do not attend a formal training with other clinical educators. Instead, the program director or clinical supervisor meets with clinical educators at their school to review program and clinical requirements, assessment instruments, and handbooks.

- The program reported that the clinical supervisor and clinical educator observe the first lesson together in order to calibrate. However, program leadership reported that there is rarely a conversation after the observation to ensure calibration and there is not a clear procedure for

following up if the two observers lack calibration. There is currently no system in place to ensure ongoing calibration of clinical educators and clinical supervisors.

- Clinical educators noted that program leadership was very responsive when there were issues or concerns about student progress. In interviews, clinical educators shared examples of how they worked with program leadership to support and, if necessary, counsel out candidates who were struggling during student teaching.

- The program evaluates clinical educators using online surveys. Clinical supervisors and student teachers complete the surveys. The surveys ask questions about the extent to which the clinical educator supports the college program, has a supportive classroom and school, models appropriate practices, meets requirements regarding observations and evaluation, provides feedback, encourages growth, encourages creativity, and maintains professionalism.

Recommendations

- Revise selection criteria for clinical educators to include skills in supporting adult learners and demonstrated ability to coach candidates.

- Establish an ongoing expectation for clinical educators and clinical supervisors to calibrate their observations, use of tools, and feedback to candidates. Create, facilitate, and monitor clinical educator access to these opportunities.

- Ensure that all clinical educators receive training on best adult learning practices. Require that all clinical educators retrain on a regular basis.

- Review the current process for selecting clinical educators. Consider creating a recommendation form instead of a recommendation letter to ensure that the program receives all of the information it needs to make an informed decision.

- Review and revise the process used to conduct co-observations. Ensure that there is an opportunity for the clinical supervisor and clinical educator to engage in a debrief conversation and establish follow-up actions if there is a lack of calibration.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has established an assessment system. Current implementation does not ensure that candidates progress to internship based on rigorous, clear criteria that are consistently applied across candidates.	

- The program assessment system includes three major decision points: readiness for admission, readiness for student teaching, and recommendation for certification.

- At admissions, the program uses a rubric to assess applicant's application and personal statement, undergraduate transcript, interview, experience, recommendation letters, and

teacher competency. The program reports that, at a minimum, candidates must have a GPA of 2.75 or higher, a current valid elementary or secondary education teaching certificate, an organized, well-written application and personal statement, an understanding of how students learn and develop, proficiency in the RIPTS standards, and experience working with children or adolescents. However, as currently implemented, the admissions process enables candidates who do not meet minimum requirements in one or more areas to receive full acceptance into the program or to receive acceptance with mentoring. It is also unclear how the program assesses some criteria, since the recommendation letters may not provide the level of detail needed to address candidates' competency or knowledge of student learning and development. The program does not have a RIDE-approved conditional acceptance policy.

- In order to proceed to student teaching, candidates must demonstrate a GPA of 3.0 or higher, passing scores on Praxis II Core Knowledge and the Mild to Moderate Applications Test, a completed professional practice rubric, a two-page reflection on their development, and a completed portfolio. The portfolio must include evidence of the CEC standards and the Danielson Framework domains, an IEP rated proficient or distinguished, and an Educator Evaluation report rated proficient or distinguished. Evidence of the CEC standards "should be drawn from assignments, activities, and field experiences completed during the course of the program." Although there is a rubric for portfolio entries, the rubric focuses more on the quality of writing and presentation of evidence rather than teaching competency.

- The program noted that it intends to have a faculty committee review the assessment point leading to student teaching to find ways to streamline the portfolio and to anchor the portfolio in specific assessments to reduce variability across candidate portfolios.

- The program holds candidates accountable for requirements and expectations. Portfolio entries must be rated proficient or distinguished. Candidates may revise or improve an assignment with permission of the instructor's approval, but may do so only once. Program leadership reported that two candidates recently needed to redo clinical experiences because they lacked a range of experience and cited two examples where they counseled out two candidates who were not meeting expectations.

- Work samples demonstrated that candidates receive written feedback on key assignments, but feedback was inconsistent.

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

Recommendations

- As planned, review the assessment point leading to student teaching to find ways to streamline the portfolio and to anchor the portfolio in specific assessments to reduce variability across candidate portfolios.

- Establish clear expectations for candidate feedback. Ensure that all faculty, clinical faculty, and clinical supervisors provide candidates with actionable feedback.

- Ensure that programs and clinical partners share common expectations for candidate performance. Engage in conversations with clinical partners about performance expectations they have for candidates and new hires, and adjust expectations as needed. Improve training to ensure that clinical educators, clinical partners, clinical faculty, program faculty, and candidates have common expectations for candidate performance.

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

- Prior to recommendation for certification, candidates must have a GPA of 3.0 or higher and must submit a student teaching portfolio. The portfolio must include a description of the school, an educational evaluation report, three formal observations completed by the supervisor, three formal observations completed by the clinical educator, an IEP, a reflective journal, parent surveys, a final reflection, and a copy of the final evaluation.

- The program assesses multiple entries of the student teaching portfolio using clearly defined rubrics. The student teaching handbook includes rubrics for lessons, the IEP, the education report, and the special education journal. The mid-term and final student teacher evaluations list multiple criteria and require raters to score each on a scale of 0 (Unacceptable) to 4 (Highly Effective), but there is not a rubric with differentiated performance level descriptors.

- Clinical educators and clinical supervisors are both responsible for evaluating the performance of candidates. According to the student teaching handbook, the program expects the clinical educator and the clinical supervisor to observe one candidate lesson together. Then, the clinical educator and clinical supervisor each complete at least two additional formal observations of the candidate. The clinical educator and clinical supervisor use the same lesson rubric and observation form that is aligned to the *Framework for Teaching.* At the conclusion of student teaching, the clinical educator completes the Final Student Teacher Evaluation, which lists multiple criteria and requires the clinical educator to rate each on a scale of 0 (Unacceptable) to 4 (Highly Effective).

Recommendations

- Review and revise the tools used to assess the student teaching portfolio to ensure that they focus on candidate performance and include clear criteria for each performance level. Engage in calibration exercises to ensure there is a shared understanding of candidate performance.

- Ensure that programs and clinical partners share common expectations for candidate performance. Engage in conversations with clinical partners about performance expectations they have for candidates and new hires, and adjust expectations as needed. Improve training to ensure that clinical educators, clinical partners, clinical faculty, program faculty, and candidates have common expectations for candidate performance.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program has created a survey but the mechanism for administering the survey is ineffective.	

- Multiple programs collaborated in Spring 2016 to develop an employer survey. The survey is designed to yield some actionable information. It asks evaluators to assess the preparedness of program completers to implement nine teaching practices and five professional responsibilities. The survey also asks about candidate preparedness to use data. The survey asks candidates how prepared certified teachers are to demonstrate how they met student objectives and includes three open-ended questions where respondents can provide more detailed thoughts, impressions, and comments. However, the survey does not specify whether the employer should complete multiple surveys for multiple programs; if an employer has hired program completers from PC's Elementary & Elementary Special Education, Graduate Special Education, and Music programs, there is no way for the program to disaggregate information by program.

- Current program procedures require that program completers give permission to the program to contact their employers. No completers have granted permission for the program to survey employers, so the program has not collected any data from employers.

- The program reported that it is investigating the use of the Educator Preparation Portal database as an alternative source to access employer information, but only three recent GSE graduates are working in Rhode Island as special educators.

- The aggregate performance of Providence College program completers is 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 Graduate Program can be made.

Recommendations

- Follow up with completers to understand better why so many do not grant permission to survey their employer. Review and revise communications about the employer survey. Consider emphasizing the importance of the survey prior to candidate exit and be more explicit about how the program will use the survey data.

- Explore and implement additional strategies to solicit annual feedback from program employers to support program improvement.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program administers exit and program completer surveys. The program does not have strategies and systems to track post completion employment for the majority of its candidates who pursue employment.	

- Program leadership reported—and reviewers agreed—that the program does not sufficiently track post-completion employment and satisfaction for candidates. The program administered a program completer survey in January 2018 but did not have any responses at the time of the visit. Program leadership shared that it has recently begun to track personal e-mails in a database since many completers stop using their Providence College e-mails after graduation and hopes that that will improve response rates over time.

- The program completer survey asks about candidates' current employment and asks for information about completers' perceptions of their preparation in key aspects of Standard 1 of Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation. The survey also includes open-ended questions about clinical placements, strengths of the program, and suggestions for improvement.

- The program administers an exit survey immediately after completion of the graduate special education program. This survey asks for candidates to rate multiple items related to the faculty, the program director, the graduate courses, the graduate program, the Office of Graduate Studies, and general concerns. The survey included one open-ended comment box where candidates could provide additional information. In an evidence organizer, provider leadership noted that it had recently used the results of the survey to inform changes in program requirements related to IEPs based on feedback that completers were not feeling well prepared to write an IEP.

Recommendations

- Continue efforts to collect alternate contact information besides Providence College e-mails to see if using other e-mail addresses increase response rates.

- Consider developing alternate systems that enable tracking of post-completion employment and satisfaction. Contact the alumni office to see if the alumni office already collects information that might be useful.

Administrator Certification Areas: Findings and Recommendations

Building Level Administrator Program

The Building Administrator program is a graduate-level program that leads to an M.A. in Administration. Candidates typically complete the program in three to five years on a part-time basis. Candidates must earn thirty-six credits from twelve courses, organized into three strands. The final strand includes two semester-long internship courses.

Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Meets Expectations
1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy	Meets Expectations
The program of study and candidate learning experiences align fully to the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions of the RISEL and the PSEL and ensure multiple opportunities for candidates to develop school leadership practice consistent with these standards.	

- The Rhode Island Standards for Educational Leadership (RISEL, 2008) and the Professional Standards for Educational Leadership (PSEL, 2015) serve as the foundation for the program. All courses, program assessments, field experiences, and most candidate learning tasks are designed to incorporate, build upon, and ensure candidates have multiple opportunities to develop practice consistent with the standards-based expectations for school leaders.

- The program introduces the RISEL and PSEL standards to candidates during an orientation session including the role of the standards in the program, field, and assessment system design. Course instructors further emphasize the role of the standards, provide instruction to understand the standards, and require candidates to demonstrate meeting specific standards and indicators through course-based projects, assessments, and fieldwork.

- Candidates are required to communicate their developing understanding of the full range and expectations of the standards through biweekly reflections and through rationale statements that accompany major course and program assessments for the portfolio system.

- The program ensures a consistent curriculum through monthly faculty meetings, through faculty participation in the program design and development process, through consistent faculty for program courses, and through rotating faculty roles in the assessment system.

- While the program addresses the full range of the professional standards, it should look for further opportunities to integrate data-driven leadership and assessment practices (RISEL 2C), leading for equity and diversity (RISEL 5B), and connections between the school principal and the larger educational system (RISEL 6).

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations
The program prioritizes RI student learning standards and ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the standards appropriate for the role of school leaders.	

- The program presumes a working knowledge of student learning standards, as all candidates are educators with experience in schools working with students and student learning standards.

- Several courses emphasize student learning standards and provide explicit instruction and opportunities to learn about student standards from the perspective of school leaders including EDU 508: Program Evaluation—Systems Approach to School Improvement, EDU 522: The Administration of Leadership in the K-12 Schools, and EDU 532: Curriculum Design and Construction. In these courses, candidates are required to evaluate programs, understand accountability systems, and develop curriculum units consistent with a range of student learning standards.

- Through course-based field experiences and particularly in the internship, candidates complete and lead multiple projects that provide opportunities to lead schools and support student learning, including data analysis of student learning gaps, working with staff on the RTI process, and working with faculty to improve instructional practices.

- The program provides a consistent emphasis on educator evaluation as a vehicle to not only improve and support staff but also to monitor and build capacity to support student learning.

- The program further emphasizes impact on student learning through reflections that candidates are required to complete for major course assessments and internship projects that articulate how the candidate positively impacted student learning through their work.

- The program asserts that the admission requirement of either an effective or highly effective teacher evaluation also demonstrates knowledge and understanding of student standards. The program should re-examine this logic since an elementary candidate and secondary candidate would not likely share similar knowledge and understanding of the full range of standards. The program should consider additional learning opportunities and assessment practices to ensure that all candidates have knowledge of the full range of standards regardless of their previous grade level or content background.

1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
The program provides candidates multiple opportunities to collect and use data as school leaders but does not ensure that candidates develop proficiency in this area.	

- The program reports that the data-driven instruction and assessment are common and consistent themes throughout the program. The program provided evidence that candidates practice collecting, using, and analyzing data and assessment practices in several courses including EDU 501: Research, EDU 810: Data Analysis, Technology, and the Principal, EDU 508: Program Evaluation, EDU 512: School Community Relations, EDU 516: School Finance, EDU 522: The Administration of Leadership in K-12 Schools, as well as the two internship experiences.

- The program builds upon candidate previous knowledge of assessment and data-driven instruction by focusing on the school leader's role in analyzing individual and school-wide assessment data, working with staff to use data to identify gaps, sharing data with multiple groups and in multiple formats, and using data to make program decisions.

- Candidates complete course and field-based projects that require the use of multiple data and research sources at the student, school, and community level. Many of these projects are important opportunities for candidates to apply data to understand and address school-wide challenges of student learning, social-emotional climate, family outreach, and finance allocation.

- The review team did not observe a systematic, comprehensive, and programmatic approach to prioritize data and research to understand problems, use this understanding to consider and evaluate multiple approaches, and make and implement informed decisions and strategies. More frequently, candidates are assigned a specific task or required to implement a specific process rather than required to evaluate options and select data-based responses.

- Reviewers noted that candidates were encouraged to use data to understand problems, but did not often have sufficient opportunities to use data to identify a problem, determine a solution, and then use data to evaluate the effectiveness of the data. Candidates could not articulate, for example, why they would use personalized learning to address a school culture issue or why a parent night would be the best approach to increase family engagement in a community.

Recommendations

- Develop a program-wide approach to the use, collection, and analysis of data that requires candidates to evaluate claims and make data-based leadership decisions about educational practices, strategies, and initiatives based on valid sources of evidence. Integrate this approach across the program of study.

- Review and revise, as necessary, the program of study to ensure that candidates get sufficient exposure to and proficiency with empirically based readings and the critical evaluation of research in addition to the current reliance on books and readings on best practices in education common throughout the program. Focus especially on EDU 501: Fundamentals of Research, EDU 522: Organization and Leadership of Schools, and EDU 810: Data Analysis, Technology, and the Principal.

- Develop and implement practices to ensure that candidates use data to determine internship projects, that data is used to monitor progress towards meeting project goals, and that data is used to determine next steps for the candidate and the school.

1.5 Technology	Meets Expectations
The program recognizes the importance of technology for effective school and instructional leadership and ensures that candidates develop proficiency in technology throughout the program.	

- In addition to the professional standards, the program reported that courses align to the International Society for Technology in Education Standards for Administrators. Together with the technology expectations in the RISEL and PSEL, the program articulates a clear vision and prioritization for the role of technology to support, enhance, and improve learning.

- Technology use is embedded in each course, key course assessment, and internship project. Candidates enter the program with knowledge of technology consistent with their role as teachers and other education professionals and the program builds upon this to elevate their knowledge consistent with the expectations for school leaders.

- Candidates learn about many uses for technology for instructional leadership in EDU 810: Data Analysis, Technology, and the Principal including blended learning, flipped classrooms, and data systems. In EDU 504: Supervision of Personnel, candidates learn about social media, digital footprints, and relevant school policies. In EDU 513: Supervision of Instruction, candidates learn about and use educator evaluation systems, video to analyze practice, and multiple presentation platforms. Each course includes similar purposeful experiences.

- The program expects candidates to integrate technology in each of their course and field-based projects, including developing a school technology plan, evaluating the merits of electronic device policies, and developing budget presentations for various audiences. For each project, candidates must articulate how they have intentionally integrated technology into the project and how they have met the expectations of the ISTE standards. Technology proficiency is also included in the program assessment system, as six of the required coursework portfolio projects must show an integration of the ISTE standards.

- The review team found that the focus on technology for leadership and to improve instructional practice was a program strength. The review team agrees with the program's assessment that it should continue to increase ways to integrate better digital age thinking which the program identifies as "critical thinking, creativity, communication, and collaboration."

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
The program has integrated issues of diversity and equity throughout the program but lacks an overarching vision for equity and diversity and strategies to ensure all candidates develop proficiency.	

- The program reports that it integrates issues of diversity and equity throughout the program, that all courses address these topics, and that all field experiences require candidates to reflect on "differences, challenges, and strategies encountered in these settings."

- The program provided evidence of specific focus areas of diversity and equity in courses including issues of discrimination and equity in EDU 505: School Law, equitable practices for

school finance in EDU 516: School Finance, and working with families in diverse communities in EDU 512: School Community Relations.

- Candidates complete multiple course and field-based projects that focus on issues of equity, diversity, and working with families including case studies, data analysis projects, community outreach efforts, and budgeting to meet the needs of all learners. Candidates also must conduct multiple course and field-based learning experiences in a variety of settings and grade levels to have opportunities to work with diverse learners and families.

- The program did not provide evidence that there is a common, program-wide vision of diversity, equity and cultural competence shared with candidates. Nor did the program provide evidence that it requires candidates to reflect upon their own biases to develop a deeper awareness of their own worldviews and the experience of others. Absent this common understanding and awareness, candidates may complete projects and engage in field experiences without developing the cultural competence expected of this standard.

- The review team agrees with the program's statement, "Faculty have identified equity, diversity, and social justice as areas in need of further development." This gap in the program was evidenced when program candidates, more than midway in the program, reported that it was "eye-opening" to go to an urban setting for an observation. Another comment noted concerns about certain urban field placements and challenges when working with students and families from diverse backgrounds.

- In addition to these overarching concerns, the program provided limited focus in courses and project requirements for candidates to develop proficiency and strategies to work with students with special needs, students who are English language learners, and working with families as partners to support student learning and school success.

Recommendations

- Develop a comprehensive, program-wide vision for equity, diversity, and working with families in diverse communities. Integrate this vision throughout the program and courses, not as a project or distinct field experience, but as a common, foundational understanding shared by candidate and program faculty and staff.

- Develop a coherent sequence of instruction that builds from this vision and that threads across all courses and field-based learning opportunities. Ensure that the program of study focuses sufficiently on working with students with special needs, English language learners, and families as partners.

- Require candidates to reflect on their own biases so that they may better understand themselves, others, and how their own biases may interfere with their efforts to lead schools and work with families. Integrate these experiences throughout the program.

- Work with program faculty, staff, and candidates to develop further their cultural competency as well as oral communication regarding the vocabulary and nomenclature related to issues of poverty, diversity, and historically under-represented populations.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Meets Expectations
The program integrates many RI education initiatives and policies and ensures candidates develop proficiency in these initiatives and policies consistent with the role of school leader.	

- The program curriculum includes specific instruction on key RI education initiatives and policies essential to the role of school leader. Initiatives addressed include social emotional learning, bullying, emergency preparedness, blended and virtual learning, RI finance and reporting requirements, RI data and survey systems, educator evaluation processes, and state assessment systems.

- The program particularly emphasizes the RI educator evaluation system and its components including establishing student learning objectives and student support objectives, conducting formal and informal observations, providing feedback and coaching, and reporting responsibilities for school leaders. Reviewers noted a particular emphasis within EDU 513: Supervision of Instruction and EDU 504: Supervision of Personnel.

- The program requires candidates to complete multiple course and field-based projects that demonstrate developing skills and proficiency when working with the RI education initiatives and policies. The multiple field experiences spread across the program also provide candidates opportunities to observe, reflect upon, and practice working with these initiatives and policies.

- The program reports, and the review team agrees, that addressing RI education initiatives and policies is a strength of the program due in part to the practitioner nature of the faculty. All course instructors are current or former administrators in RI schools and districts.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Meets Expectations
The program requires candidates to complete extensive, developmentally appropriate, and coherent field experiences that build from course and program learning objectives and provide candidates opportunities to meet the expectations of the professional standards.	

- Candidates are required to complete several types of field experiences during their program of study. Each of the ten courses requires a full day, field-based learning experience. The program faculty and candidates determine the focus of these experiences and activities based on course need.

- During the last two semesters of the program, candidates complete two 250-hour internships, exceeding the minimum required 300 hours for certification. Five days during each semester are required, full-release days during which candidates complete field activities at sites other than the schools in which they work. The internship is an important opportunity for candidates to practice and lead, with guidance and supervision, authentic RISEL-based tasks and projects that are important to the school and the candidate's development.

- The program requires that the course-based field experiences occur at settings that are different in grade level and demographics from candidates' home school. The program also requires that the ten "off-site" days during their internship occur at schools different in grade levels and demographics from their home school.

- The program identifies four levels of engagement for program candidates during field-based learning and practice: 1) observing, 2) participating, 3) leading with oversight, and 4) independent leading and responsibility. The program expects that most course-based field experiences focus on levels 1 and 2, while later experiences are at levels 3 and 4.

- Program candidates report that the amount and variety of field experiences are critically important to their development. Candidates also reported benefitting from opportunities to meet as groups at field placements for targeted sessions, walkthroughs, and instructional rounds as well as the opportunity to prepare and host colleagues at their internship placements.

- The program has recently implemented a tracking system that aligns to the portfolio and internship assessment system to monitor that all candidates conduct field placements at the expected number and range of placements. The program should carefully monitor the rollout of this process and be prepared, if the current process is not sufficient or efficient, to work with program faculty and partners to develop an alternate system.

- The review team commends the program for its innovative and aggressive approach in securing the twenty release days as a requirement of program entry. The program should continue to look for additional strategies to develop further the apprentice-like nature of the program, which well supports candidate learning and development.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Meets Expectations
The program works with its partners to ensure that clinical experiences increasingly enable candidates to positively impact student learning consistent with the role of a school leader.	

- Early-in-program clinical experiences are organized around course topic and focus. These include attending data or family nights, interviewing principals about personnel issues, and observing challenges to student success in schools. For each experience, candidates are required to reflect on what they observed or participated in and analyze its impact on student learning.

- As candidates progress in the program, the experiences and expectations increase in complexity as does the candidate's ability to analyze and demonstrate impact on learning. These experiences include evaluating school or district-based programs, assessing community support organization effectiveness, conducting classroom observations, and attending school committee meetings and open houses. As with the early experiences, candidates are required to reflect and assess how these experiences impact student learning.

- The culmination of the program, the two-semester internship, includes six projects jointly determined by the candidate and their clinical educator.   The program requires that the projects are multi-faceted, authentic, provide opportunities to learn a skill or competency, and have an impact on school and student performance. Similar to earlier projects, candidates are

required to reflect and analyze how their work impacts school performance and student learning. The clinical educator and candidate meet weekly to review progress, including to review impact on student learning.

- The internship projects are wide-ranging, aligned to the RISEL and show intentional effort to connect candidates to school needs and improving school performance. These projects include revising school scheduling to improve student transitions, creating a school-wide professional development day, coordinating school data sessions, analyzing budgets for effective use of resources, and coordinating curriculum review processes.

- The review team noted that as candidates progress in the program they demonstrate increasing ability to understand their role as prospective school leaders and how all leadership actions impact school performance and student learning. The candidates also reported that as they progress in the program they develop confidence in their capacity to address challenges that emerge and positively contribute to their schools and students.

- The program should continue its efforts to strengthen further candidate impact on student learning including its plan to require one internship project to extend across two semesters to better monitor impact and that field experiences prior to internship more directly connect to student learning data.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Meets Expectations
The program has mutually beneficial partnerships that support clinical experiences and guide candidate development and progress in the program.	

- The program identifies its clinical educators as its formal partners. Clinical educators are typically building principals who agree to serve as mentors for candidates who work in their schools while they complete the program. The clinical educator recommends the candidate as part of the admission process and then agrees to several mentoring requirements that are discussed below in 2.4, Clinical Educators.

- Clinical educators work closely with candidates and program supervisors to design the internship experience and individual learning plan. The clinical educators also have an integral role in evaluating the progress of the candidate and use instruments developed by the program and shared with clinical educators. There is extensive, respectful, and mutually beneficial feedback between clinical educators and program faculty, staff, and leaders. Clinical educators report that their schools benefit from the additional leadership support they receive from candidates as well as the opportunity to grow their own prospective leaders.

- The program has several informal partnerships that support the program and guide its development. The program views its faculty, many of whom are current and former RI administrators, as partners in the program and co-equal designers. Notably, the faculty meet monthly for the purposes of program review, design, and faculty development.

- The program also uses program completers employed as administrators in the region as partners. Program leaders, faculty, and candidates report that they regularly rely on and use this network for placements, consultation, and feedback on program direction and growth.

- The program consults the RI Association of School Superintendents and individual superintendents as partners to present information on the program and seek feedback. As noted above, through these partnership efforts the program was able to secure twenty release days as a requirement for program entry. The program reports that feedback from this group was instrumental in increasing the program's focus on technology, management issues, and improved and additional authentic field-based leadership experiences.

- The program should consider if a more formal partnership structure would benefit the program. Although the program as currently led receives robust feedback and support, a partnership group that included representatives from all of its constituents, that meets on a regular basis, that is charged with a specific focus, and that uses data and other metrics to evaluate progress and plan for future growth would strengthen and systematize the improvement process.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Approaching Expectations
The program has effective clinical educators and program supervisors who are critical to candidate development. The program provides limited training and does not evaluate their performance.	

- As noted above, clinical educators are the building principals of candidates enrolled in the program. When a candidate seeks admission to the program, they must have support of their principal and their superintendent. By completing a recommendation form, the building principal implicitly agrees to serve as the clinical educator for the candidate.

- The training the clinical educator receives for their role comes through an orientation session, through an internship handbook, and through ongoing feedback and communication with the program supervisor. This communication happens during two formal observation sessions and additional sessions that occur to develop and review the individual learning plan.

- The program does not recruit clinical educators, nor does it have criteria for the role, other than that the clinical educator is a building administrator. Beyond the informal support of the program supervisor, the program does not offer any ongoing training or support for the clinical educator or evaluate their effectiveness. The program reported several instances in which it deemed a building principal as not appropriate for the role of clinical educator and worked with the candidate and school district to arrange a new placement.

- The program employs three program supervisors, one of whom also serves as a faculty member. Their role is to work with candidates and clinical educators to develop the individual learning plan, to help conduct the training for clinical educators, to conduct minimally two formal observations per semester that include debriefing with the clinical educator and candidate. Program supervisors also conduct internship seminars, provide formal and informal evaluation and feedback, and serve as a general support for candidates and clinical educators.

- The review team found that the amount and quality of supervision and feedback from clinical educators and program supervisors is an area of strength of the program. Candidates meet weekly, if not daily, with their clinical educators and have regular communication with program supervisors through biweekly reflections, seminars, and frequent formal and informal visits to schools. Candidates reported that they are well supported and guided by program faculty,

clinical educators, and program supervisors and that collectively these mentors are always willing and available to provide necessary support and guidance.

- The review team's concerns regarding clinical educators are the absence of explicit criteria for clinical educators, insufficient training for the role, including the development of the individual learning plan and candidate evaluation, and the absence of an evaluation process that generates data the program can use to improve subsequent experiences.

Recommendations

- Establish explicit criteria for clinical educators that include practice consistent with the professional standards and the ability and skills to coach, supervise, evaluate, and provide feedback to candidates consistent with program expectations. Develop an admission and assignment process that ensures that candidates only conduct internships in settings with clinical educators who meet these criteria.

- Develop and implement a formal and systematic training process that respects clinical educators' time and multiple responsibilities while also ensuring sufficient time and engagement to prepare fully clinical educators for their roles and responsibilities. Include in this training how to guide the development of individual learning plans based on data, how to evaluate candidates consistent with the expectations of the professional standards, and how to provide consistent and effective feedback to support candidate progress.

- Develop and implement an evaluation process to determine the effectiveness of clinical educators and a process to use this information to make future placement decisions.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has developed and begun to implement an assessment system that aligns to the professional standards, based on candidate performance, and determines candidate progress.	

- The program has conducted a significant redesign of it assessment system in the last two years. The program has increased admission criteria, emphasized monitoring of candidate growth, and added more authentic performance measures to the system. The program reports that it has piloted the new system during the 2017 and intends a full roll out in 2018.

- Admission to the program requires candidates to provide evidence of several criteria designed to demonstrate school leadership potential, including a personal essay on leadership, college transcripts, previous evaluations, professional recommendations, an interview, and an on-demand writing exercise. Candidates may complete up to two courses while pursuing admissions. The program reports that it no longer allows conditional admission.

- Candidates must successfully complete two assessment points based on portfolio reviews to be recommended for internship, one after five courses (mid-point) and a second after the completion of the required ten courses (end of coursework) to advance to internship. Both assessment points include a review of candidates' portfolios that they compile during the

program. Candidates are required to have artifacts in the portfolio that represent evidence of meeting the RISEL and ISTE standards and include reflections that justify the connection.

- The mid-point and end of coursework assessments follow a common process. In addition to successful completion of courses with a grade of B or higher, candidates complete self-assessments rating their proficiency in the RISEL and ISTE standards and reflect on their progress towards meeting the expectation of the standards with course and field-based evidence from their portfolio. Candidates present evidence of their progress to a faculty team who assess their performance and readiness using established criteria.

- The review team found the assessment system and recommendation for internship decision points to be thorough, coherent, and aligned to the standards. The review team also found that the program prioritizes candidate impact on student learning, including at the admission and recommendation for internship decision points. Candidates reported that the revised assessment system has prioritized growth towards meeting the standards, helps them better monitor and take charge of their improvement, and supports them to have a deep understanding of the professional standards and the role of school leader.

- The review team's primary concern with assessment system is that, as described by the program, the system is a "work in progress." The system design is valid and comprehensive and appears likely to ensure candidates progress in the program based on meeting the full expectations of the standards and based on their performance as school developing school leaders. The review team recognizes that considerable work remains to implement the assessment system design, to develop further rubrics, performance descriptors, and assessment documents and processes, and to monitor the roll out of the system to ensure alignment to the newly designed system.

Recommendations

- Continue the roll out of the assessment system. Continue to seek feedback from faculty, candidates, and partners to ensure that the system aligns to the standards and that progress in the program is based on candidate performance and impact on student learning.

- Continue to monitor the mid-point and end of course decision points, including the forms used, the specificity of performance descriptors for candidates and faculty ratings, and the level of feedback generated. Ensure that each are sufficient to drive candidate growth.

3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Approaching Expectations
The recommendation for certification decision point aligns to the professional standards, clearly communicated to candidates, and ensures most completers are ready to serve as school leaders.	

- The revised recommendation for certification decision point mirrors the mid-point and end of coursework decision points discussed in 3.4. Candidates must complete a self-assessment and reflect on their progress against the professional standards. Candidates present evidence of their progress to a faculty team who use similar instruments to the mid and end of course decision points to review progress and make recommendation decisions.

- Candidate progress for this decision point is based primarily on candidate performance during the internship, completion of the individual learning plan, and formal and informal observations by clinical educators and clinical supervisors during the internship. Candidates must also successfully complete the state licensure test for school leaders.

- Candidates report that they understand the recommendation for certification decision point and its criteria and that they receive this information during multiple forums, seminars, program documents, and through program and clinical faculty.

- The program provides consistent rubrics for candidate writing, oral presentation, and reflections. The program does not have similar rubrics or feedback expectations for content-based tasks which results in inconsistent feedback between faculty and staff. The program provides limited support, training, and processes for candidates to receive consistent feedback from clinical educators. Some clinical educators echo these concerns and report they struggle at times to understand the instruments and expectations for feedback.

- The individual learning plan process that guides the internship ensures that candidates complete multiple projects across the range of standards. As was noted in 1.4, the review team is concerned that not all candidates are ready on day one to assess challenges, use data and other evidence to make decisions, consult multiple options, and then select the most appropriate response to authentic problems that arise in schools. Several candidates and program completers reported similar concerns and the need to engage in "on-the-job" training during their first professional leadership positions.

- The review team observed that both inconsistent feedback from faculty, staff, and clinical educators as well as the open-ended nature of the individual learning plan process do not ensure that all candidates are fully prepared to meet the expectations of the professional standards at the recommendation for certification decision point. The review team recognizes that additional work remains to strengthen feedback instruments and processes and to better align the individual learning plan process to the full range of the professional standards.

Recommendations

- Review the individual learning plan process that occurs during the internship as well as earlier learning opportunities in the program for candidates to make data and evidence-based decisions when determining approaches to school challenges. Ensure that candidates are prepared and proficient in considering multiple options and choosing the most appropriate for the setting and circumstances necessary for school leaders on day one.

- Examine current feedback instruments and processes both during the internship for clinical educators and supervisors as well as throughout the program to ensure consistent feedback across field and course-based experiences beyond the current rubrics for oral presentations, writing, and reflections.

- Continue to monitor the roll out of the recommendation for certification decision point and monitor how the multiple criteria generate information of candidate performance and how the program integrates this information to make recommendation decisions.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not systematically collect information from employers of program completers for program improvement efforts nor does it monitor program completer data.	

- The program reports that it does not currently systematically collect information from program completer employers for program improvement. The program reports that it conducts informal outreach efforts to individuals, groups, and networks based on its many relationships with employers and administrators in the region. The program also reports that it intends to develop a systematic process to collect employer feedback.

- The program identified several improvements made to the program based on informal outreach efforts including increased release time for candidates and program content changes.

- The program does not review or analyze program completer performance data compared to the performance data of all completers for this certification area.

- For the 2016-17 school year, the aggregate performance of Providence College Building Administrator program completers working in Rhode Island schools was comparable to the aggregate performance distribution for all recent completers in Rhode Island schools.

Recommendations

- Develop and implement a systematic and annual process to collect feedback from program completer employers. Ensure that the system generates actionable information. Use this information with program faculty and other stakeholders for program improvement.

- Use data from the Educator Preparation Index to further understand program completer performance and guide program improvement efforts.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program has made limited efforts to collect, analyze, and use information from program completers for program improvement.	

- The program conducted a survey of program completers in 2016 and 2017. The survey asked ten closed questions with a rating scale and five open-ended questions. The questions are general in nature and ask about candidate satisfaction and areas for improvement. The program reported—and reviewers agreed—that the current survey design and implementation does not generate necessary information nor support program improvement. The program intends to revise the process in Spring 2018.

- The program does not have a process to track program completer information or employment status, nor does it review and analyze this information. The program reports that it intends to include this in the survey redesign process.

Recommendations

- Develop and implement a systematic and annual process to collect feedback from program completers. Ensure that the system generates actionable information, including employment status and program completers' perceptions of program effectiveness. Use this information with program faculty and other stakeholders for program improvement.

- Use program completer employment data to further understand program completer performance and guide 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 a M.Ed. in Literacy. Candidates typically complete the program in three to five years on a part-time basis. Candidates must earn thirty-six credits from eleven courses organized across three strands. Candidates also must complete internship experiences with elementary and secondary students and as a reading coach.

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 aligns fully to the ILA standards and course and field-based learning experiences ensure candidates develop proficiency in the full range of expectations for the standards.	

- The International Literacy Association standards (ILA 2010) serve as the foundation of the program. Program courses, field experiences, and the assessment system align intentionally to the full range of the standards, and the program design ensures that as candidates progress in the program they develop an increasing awareness, understanding, and proficiency.

- The program introduces candidates to the standards during the admissions process and through the program handbook and course materials. Course syllabi detail specific standards and indicators expected to be met through the course, course learning outcomes, field experiences, and assessments. Candidates continue to learn about the standards through program and portfolio meetings, workshops and advisement sessions.

- Candidates engage in several types of field experiences designed to provide exposure to and opportunity to practice consistent with the expectations of the standards. The "Best Practices courses" (i.e. EDU 830: Best Practice Primary Grades, EDU 840: Best Practices Intermediate Grades, and EDU 832: Best Practices Middle and Secondary grades) and EDU 836: Literacy Clinic are explicitly designed to provide opportunities for practice and feedback for the role of the reading specialist. EDU 842: Literacy Coach and EDU 837: Organization and Supervision of Literacy Programs provide intentional focus on coaching, working with adults, program design, and leadership embedded in the ILA standards.

- The program assessment system requires candidate to collect and compile course and field-based artifacts in a portfolio that show proficiency for each standard and indicator. As part of the artifacts, candidates must also include a reflection on their performance and growth opportunities in relation to the standards. During program assessment points, candidates also need to conduct a presentation and present evidence of growth against the standards.

- The program ensures consistent curriculum in part through quarterly faculty meetings. During these meetings, faculty members review program design, promote consistent learning

experiences across courses, calibrate faculty on the assessment system, and troubleshoot program and candidate issues.

- Candidates report that they learn foundational skills and practices in their early courses and practice and develop these skills in subsequent courses and field experiences. Candidates also report that the program design ensures that they are confident in their skills as reading specialists and are ready on day one for their roles. The review team concurs that the program design is intentional, comprehensive, and well designed to ensure candidate proficiency.

- The program should look for additional opportunities to integrate issues of diversity and meeting the needs of all learners (ILA 4) and creating a literate environment that includes technology and multiple tools and approaches to learning (ILA 5).

- The program should also work with its partners and faculty to prepare for and integrate the most recent iteration of ILA standards to ensure the program of study remains current.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
The program prioritizes CCSS for literacy but provides limited focus on other RI student learning standards and on how to support PK-12 students to meet these standards.	

- As a literacy program, the program appropriately has a strong focus on the English Language Arts components of the CCSS, including reading foundation skills, reading informational text and literature, and speaking and listening. Candidates learn about how to design instruction, diagnosis student learning needs, and provide services for struggling readers consistent with their roles as developing reading specialists. The program integrates the CCSS for ELA in many courses, projects, and field experiences that candidates complete.

- The Best Practices courses, EDU 767: Children's and Adolescent Literature and EDU 835: Meeting the Demands of the At Risk Learner in particular, require candidates to develop and design services aligned to the literacy elements of the CCSS. The program also assesses candidate proficiency to design and deliver instruction and services consistent with the expectations of these standards. During Strand III courses, literacy clinic, coaching, and organization and supervision of reading programs, candidates build upon their prior experience as teachers and their developing skills as reading specialists to further design and deliver instruction based on supporting students to meet learning standards.

- The program provides a limited focus on how to prepare PK-12 students to meet the writing expectations of the CCSSS. Several courses reference writing in literacy and other content areas but do so as a secondary focus for candidates. Candidates are required to take EDU 851: Teaching Writing K-12, but this course has a general approach to teaching writing and focuses on developing enthusiastic writers, looking at student work protocols, and candidate writing. The course lacks a clear focus on how to support PK-12 students to meet CCSS writing standards.

- The program provides an insufficient focus on how to support PK-12 students to read and understand disciplinary texts in multiple content areas. Some candidates chose to create lessons that include reading and literacy in math, the sciences, or social studies, but this is due to

candidate choice or requirements of their school or field-based settings. Instruction and explicit requirements for disciplinary literacy are not evident in program courses or assessments.

- The program provided no evidence that it addresses, instructs, or requires candidates to develop proficiency to support PK-12 students to meet student learning standards in mathematics, social studies, sciences, the arts, or other content areas consistent with the role of reading specialists. Course syllabi, program materials, and assessments do not reference these nor could faculty or candidates speak to how these are incorporated.

Recommendations

- Continue the program's strong focus on preparing candidates to support students to meet the expectations of the CCSS literacy standards, as a primary goal of the program.

- Review and strengthen the program's approach to supporting candidate proficiency in writing instruction sufficient to support students to meet learning standards. Consider whether a stand-alone course or a more integrated approach is most effective. Require candidates to provide evidence of proficiency of writing instruction in the assessment system.

- Explore with faculty, staff, and partners how student learning standards in additional content areas, CCSS for mathematics, NGSS for science, GSE for social studies, and other content standards should be integrated into the program consistent with the role of reading specialists.

- Provide additional instruction, practice, and assessment of candidates in disciplinary literacy in multiple content areas, including mathematics, science, and social studies, to ensure candidate proficiency to support PK-12 students to meet expected learning standards.

1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations
The program ensures that candidates prioritize assessment and data-based instruction to develop proficiency to collect, analyze, and use data from multiple sources.	

- Candidates learn about the critical role of multiple data sources and effective assessment practices for reading specialist throughout the program of study. Early in the program in Strand I courses, EDU 765: Models and Process of Literacy, and in EDU 763: Research in Literacy, candidates learn to evaluate research and data sources, consider multiple approaches to reading instruction, and how to apply this knowledge in PK-12 settings.

- The program emphasizes assessment and data-based instruction consistent with the expectations of ILA Standard 3, Assessment and Evaluation, throughout the remainder of program and field experiences. Candidates learn about and practice using multiple screening, diagnostics, and progress-monitoring instruments with PK-12 students. Candidates are required to analyze and use data from multiple assessments and sources to make instructional decisions.

- Candidates complete several case studies, including one in each of the Best Practice courses and the internship. In the case studies, candidates must identify student learning needs based on

multiple sources of data, propose and implement instruction based on this analysis, and determine the effectiveness of their approach and next steps for the learner.

- Candidates also are required to develop proficiency with school-wide data and assessment practices to support the improvement of school-wide reading programs through EDU 842: Literacy Coach, and EDU 837: Organization and Supervision of Literacy Programs. Through these course and field-based experiences candidates observe and analyze peer practice to prepare them to provide feedback and support to their colleagues as a prospective reading coach.

- The review team found that a strength of the program is how it has supported candidates to internalize the data-based cycle of instruction as the expected approach to working with students and staff. Candidates also have embraced this approach to their own practice and report that the program and assessment system requires them to monitor their own growth as developing reading specialists and seek pathways to improvement.

1.5 Technology	Approaching Expectations
The program provides limited opportunities for candidates to learn about, practice, and develop proficiency in using instructional technology and modeling digital age work as reading specialists.	

- The program includes a "Technology Statement" in the program handbook that references the importance of technology and the International Society for Technology Education (ISTE) Standards. The statement also discusses the "potential impact" technology has for classrooms and students, despite the proliferation and current expectations for regular use of technologies. The program includes in the revised assessment system expectations for candidate proficiency with technology but does not articulate how candidates are to learn and develop proficiency.

- The program introduces candidates to basic and common technologies in several courses throughout the program that include presentation tools and processes, communication applications, and electronic data and communication programs such as Google Docs, Padlet, presentation hardware and software, and multi-media websites and applications.

- Candidates also learn about and use several school and district-based data systems to complete course projects, collect, analyze student learning needs, and evaluate reading programs such as Infoworks, student information systems, and student assessment results.

- Beyond these basic and common practices, the program did not provide evidence that it integrates current, instructional, assistive, and analytical technologies throughout the course of study. During interviews, faculty were not able to describe how the program incorporates assistive technologies. An evidence organizer for this component prepared by the program indicated that only one course, EDU 767: Adolescent Literature included a consistent focus on technology use for reading specialists. The program recognizes these limitations and identifies both technology and digital age learning as areas for growth.

- The program also did not provide evidence that it supports candidates to learn about and model digital age learning, collaborating with digital tools and resources, and using a variety of media

and formats. Candidates reported that they did not develop strong skills in the use of technology unless their field placements were technology-rich and supported such learning.

Recommendations

- Consult with your partners, practicing educators, program faculty and candidates to understand the current, expected level of technology use and digital age practice for effective reading specialists. Conduct a program analysis to determine gaps between these expectations and current learning opportunities, faculty proficiency, and program resources. Develop and implement a plan to address these gaps.

- Include in the gap analysis specific, assistive technology that reading specialist should have knowledge and proficiency in and include these technologies and practices in the program.

- Integrate technology use and digital age learning practices consistent with the expectations of the ILA Standards, the ISTE Standards, and the RI Standards for Educator Preparation Programs throughout the program curriculum in a strategic and developmental approach.

- Work with Providence College and program partners to secure necessary technology resources to include in course instruction and to ensure opportunities for all candidates to practice and develop proficiency in, regardless of field placements.

- Further develop how the assessment system will monitor and ensure that all candidates develop proficiency in technology use and digital age practice.

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
The program provides candidates opportunities to learn about diversity and equity but does not ensure that candidates demonstrate cultural competence and culturally responsive practice.	

- The program provided evidence that opportunities to learn about diversity and equity are included in the program curriculum. EDU 765: Models and Practices of Literacy require readings about teaching in diverse communities. EDU 767: Children's and Adolescent Literature require candidates to explore literature from diverse communities, and EDU 835: Meeting the Demands of At Risk Learners provides explicit instruction on how to support students from diverse backgrounds and with varied needs.

- The program also requires candidates to engage in several field placements in multiple settings designed to support candidates to work with students from diverse backgrounds. These placements include partnerships with the Metropolitan Regional Career and Technical Center (MET High School) as part of EDU 767: Children's and Adolescent Literature and with International Charter School, a dual language school, as part of EDU 830: Best Practices Primary Grades.

- The program reported that, despite these opportunities, it recognizes that issues of equity and diversity are areas for growth. The evidence organizer for this standard identified courses that "build awareness" and courses that "focus on equity factors." The program did not provide

evidence that it has developed, communicates, or ensures that candidates develop a comprehensive understanding of individual biases, build on this understanding to develop a deeper understanding of others, and from this growth develop cultural competence and culturally responsive practice.

- Candidates reported that they learned about some issues of diversity in courses and field experiences but had limited opportunities to work with students and families from diverse backgrounds to develop proficiency. The review team concurs with this assessment and the limitations of the program design. The review team also found that there were limited opportunities for candidates to develop proficiency to work with English language learners and students with disabilities. The program requires candidates to complete a socio-cultural statement as part of the assessment system, but this activity does not appear to connect to candidate awareness of issues of diversity, equity and meeting the needs of all learners.

Recommendations

- Consult with your partners, practicing educators, program faculty and candidates to develop a program-wide, comprehensive approach to issues of diversity, equity, and cultural competence. Work with program faculty to integrate a comprehensive vision and approach for diversity, equity and cultural competence throughout the program curriculum.

- Provide candidates and faculty opportunities to focus on issues of implicit bias and provide additional opportunities for candidates to learn about and practice working with families from diverse communities.

- Expand opportunities for candidates to learn about issues of diversity and equity and to practice these skills and capacities in diverse settings. Ensure candidates learn and practice skills and strategies to meet the needs of English language learners and students with disabilities.

- Better integrate the social-cultural assessment instrument into the program of study to ensure that it serves as a valid and reliable means of assessing candidate knowledge and awareness.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Meets Expectations
The program integrates RI education initiatives and education policy throughout the course of study to ensure that candidates are prepared for their role as reading specialists.	

- The program intentionally and consistently integrates RI education initiatives and education policy throughout the program of study and course sequence, emphasizing those policies and initiatives most relevant to developing reading specialists.

- As most candidates are current educators, the program builds upon their working knowledge of schools and general education policy to ensure deeper knowledge and understanding of the RI Comprehensive Literacy Policy, Campaign for Grade Level Reading, personal literacy plans, the RTI process, and data sources available to RI educators to support student literacy growth.

- EDU 835: Meeting the Demands of At-Risk Learners includes seminars that focus on meeting the needs of English language learners, students with dyslexia and autism, and students who live in poverty, all priorities for RI schools and educators. These are important learning opportunities for candidates and the program s*hould* look for additional and systematic ways to incorporate these priorities throughout the program in addition to isolated seminars.

- The program reports that it references the ISTE standards throughout the program as an important RI educational initiative. As discussed in 1.5, the program should move beyond referencing the ISTE standards as topic to have knowledge of and to revise the program structure to ensure that candidates are prepared and proficient in technology and digital age learning consistent with the expectations of the standards.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Meets Expectations
The program design requires candidates to engage in multiple field experiences to ensure candidates develop proficiency as both reading specialists and reading consultants.	

- The program recognizes the importance of multiple, extensive, increasingly complex, field experiences in a variety of settings to ensure that candidates have the opportunity and support to develop skills proficient with the full range of the ILA standards. These experiences occur in candidates' "home schools," in extended course-based workshops that occur in PK-12 schools, in a semester-long internship working with elementary and secondary students, and include experiences focusing on both the reading specialist and reading consultant span of the ILA standards and RI certification.

- All but one course, EDU 763: Research in Literacy require a field experience. These course-based experiences appropriately increase in complexity as candidates progress through the program strands and develop deeper levels of skills and fluency for their roles. Early experiences require observations and reflections, middle of program expectations including conducting case studies and working over several weeks with individual students, later in program experiences require candidates to develop and implement ongoing instruction aligned to the expectations of the ILA standards and designed to meet the needs of struggling readers.

- The culminating field experiences in the program require candidates to engage in coaching and leadership roles embedded in the ILA standards including shadowing literacy coaches, observing and providing feedback to peers, evaluating and making recommendations for reading program improvements, and designing and delivering professional development sessions.

- The program design intentionally aligns course-based learning with field experiences to ensure that as candidates learn skills and strategies in their courses, they have opportunity to practice and receive feedback on their work with PK-12 students and staff. Because of the intentional program design, for several courses, EDU 767: Children's and Adolescent Literature, EDU 830: Best Practice Primary Grades, EDU 836: Literacy Clinic, and for some candidates, EDU 840: Best Practice Intermediate Grades, candidates are supervised and receive real-time feedback by course instructors in workshops with students that take place in PK-12 school settings.

- Program partners, faculty, and candidates report that the multiple, varied, and extensive field-based learning opportunities are a strength of the program. Candidates report that these experiences provide them confidence to practice with students and develop skills while receiving helpful guidance and direction for improvement. The program reports that it is in the process of expanding the course-based extended workshops for EDU 832: Best Practice Middle/Secondary and making the workshop model for EDU 840: Best Practice Intermediate Grades a requirement for all candidates.

- The program review team commends the program's aggressive and innovative approach to creating mandatory field experiences embedded in program courses. It should continue this work and implement the current plan for the additional two "Best Practice" courses. The program should also explore creating additional opportunities for candidates to practice the role of reading coach and program evaluator both during the coaching and supervision courses as well as earlier in the program in a developmentally appropriate manner. If necessary, the program should consider requiring additional field-based hours rather than subtract any hours from the reading specialist role that occurs during the literacy clinic.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Meets Expectations
The program design ensures that candidates increasingly demonstrate impact on PK-12 student learning as candidates progress through the clinical experiences.	

- After early in program clinical experiences in which candidate primarily observe and reflect on practice, the program design for all subsequent field experiences mirrors that of the expected approach for reading specialists when working with students: use a variety of assessments to determine need, develop and implement interventions based on the data, monitor progress, and determine next steps. Program leadership, faculty, and clinical educators communicate clearly to candidates this approach to field-based work.

- As part of EDU 767: Children's and Adolescent Literature and EDU 835: Meeting Demands of the At Risk Learner, candidates focus on the needs of individual students and design instruction to meet student needs. In the "Best Practice" courses, candidates develop case studies on individual students to determine learning needs based on a variety of data sets and then develop appropriate instruction and interventions. During the literacy clinic, candidates repeat this process with elementary and secondary students and develop information to share with families and teachers for continued improvement.

- The program courses focus strongly on multiple assessment instruments appropriate for reading specialists, and candidates apply these in their work with students. Candidates use the Qualitative Reading Inventory, Marie Clay's Observation Survey, and other school, district, and state instruments and assessments. Candidates use the information from the assessments to design lessons and provide services while they work in schools and with students.

- The program conducts surveys of families, teachers, candidates, and students in the "Best Practice" course and the literacy clinic to identify student learning needs and the impact candidates have made to address these needs. The program should look for additional ways to monitor candidate impact on student learning to strengthen further the program design and candidate proficiency to meet student needs.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Meets Expectations
The program has developed several partnerships that are integral to the program and mutually beneficial to the program, its candidates, the partners, and PK-12 students.	

- The program identifies two levels of partners: long-term and annual partners. The long-term partners are the placements sites developed for the course-based workshops and internship. The program places candidates at the MET High School for EDU 767: Children's and Adolescent Literature, at International Charter School for EDU 830: Best Practice Primary Grades and the International Charter School, at Holliman Elementary for EDU 840: Best Practice Intermediate Grades, and at North Smithfield Elementary School and Cranston West High School for EDU 836: Literacy Clinic. The annual partners are the home schools that candidates conduct field-based work for EDU 842: Literacy Coach and EDU 837: Organization and Supervision of Literacy Programs.

- Although not identified as partners by the program, the program regards program graduates who work in local schools as reading specialists as partners and resources for the program to provide formal and informal support, guidance, placement opportunities, and feedback on program design and direction. As is discussed in 2.4 below, many program faculty and staff are graduates of the program. As an additional way to strengthen and formalize this partnership, the program has created a Literacy Fellowship Program. The program invites accomplished reading specialists to apply for a fellowship position to serve as co-instructors and clinical educators for the literacy coaching course.

- The program and its long-term partners have worked closely and deliberately to create structures and processes that meet the needs of the program for access to clinical sites, that provide authentic and supervised developmental learning opportunities for candidates, and that provide individualized and additional learning supports for PK-12 students. As stated by a partner, the program and its candidates are an "important resource" at the school. The program and its partners work closely together to monitor the partnership and regularly consult on the performance of the partnership and possible changes and improvements.

- The program and its annual partners have a different but mutually beneficial relationship. The program conducts outreach to school sites through program leadership, clinical educators, and clinical supervisors to monitor the effectiveness of the partnership and areas for improvement. Program candidates conduct evaluations of school-based reading programs, work with school reading specialists support staff, and provide professional development for the schools.

- The program has informal means to track and monitor the effectiveness of the partnerships and has not established agreed-upon indicators of effectiveness. The program should explore how it could formalize all its partners into a collective whole that could provide overarching support, advice, and feedback for the program based upon agreed upon criteria of partnership effectiveness and to serve as a true collaborator and guide.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Approaching Expectations

The program utilizes several types of faculty and staff to supervise and support candidates in clinical placements but has limited processes to ensure that it recruits, evaluates, and retains high-quality clinical educators.

- The program faculty, staff, and clinical educators include three groups who in some instances serve multiple roles – program faculty who teach courses, program staff who supervise candidates and clinical educators in field placements, and PK-12 clinical educators who supervise candidates in the field. This component only deals with the latter two groups and focuses only on the internship experiences defined by the program in which clinical educators and supervisors work – EDU 836: Literacy Clinic, EDU 842: Literacy Coach, and EDU 837: Organization and Supervision of Literacy Programs. See the Provider findings, specifically Component 5.5, for more detail about the quality and effectiveness of faculty for the other portions of the program.

- For the literacy clinic, the course instructors serve as both course instructors who deliver the course content as well as clinical supervisors who observe candidate performance with PK-12 students and provide feedback and coaching. (Due to this structure, the program does not include PK-12 clinical educators for the literacy clinic.) For the organization and supervision course, the course instructor also serves as the clinical supervisor who supervises candidates in the field and their PK-12 clinical educators. The PK-12 clinical educators are reading specialists employed in the candidate's home school and charged to provide regular, and at times daily, support to the candidate.

- The program has not established minimal criteria for program clinical supervisors or PK-12 clinical educators to serve in their roles and ensure an expected level of quality. The program communicates to PK-12 clinical educators their expected responsibilities through an introductory letter. The program clinical supervisor conducts at least two observations of the candidate and their clinical educator during which the clinical supervisor checks on the progress of the candidate and offers and seeks feedback to the clinical educator.

- The program does not have a process to provide formal support for their roles or evaluate the effectiveness of program clinical supervisors or PK-12 clinical educators. The program does not have a clear process for retaining clinical educators.

- The review team found that candidates receive support from effective faculty and staff at all three levels (program faculty, program clinical supervisors, and PK-12 clinical educators). Candidates report that their success is largely due to the nearly tireless dedication, instruction, and support they receive from these individuals. Clinical supervisors and PK-12 clinical educators report that they appreciate the opportunity to work with the program and prepare the next generation of reading specialists. Clinical educators appreciate the guidance they receive from the program while some also recognize they could benefit from additional support.

Recommendations

- As a program, clarify the roles, responsibilities, and expectations for program faculty, clinical supervisor, and clinical educator. Clearly communicate these to the appropriate personnel so that they may understand their role and purpose.

- Establish minimal criteria for clinical supervisor and clinical educator grounded in the ILA standards. Develop processes to ensure that all candidates receive supervision and support from high quality individuals consistent with the criteria.

- Develop and implement a process that recruits, evaluates, and retains only clinical supervisors and educators who meet the established criteria and are proficient in providing support, feedback, and guidance to candidates consistent with the expectations of the ILA Standards.

- Develop and implement an ongoing support and training process designed for the role of clinical supervisor and clinical educator and includes at a minimum the ability to work with adult learners, coaching and supervision skills, and the ability to evaluate and provide feedback.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The newly designed and recently implemented program assessment system is grounded in the ILA standards and has potential to ensure that candidate performance in relation to the standards determines candidate progress in the program.	

- The program implemented a newly design candidate assessment system in Fall 2017. The system builds upon elements of the previous system while attempting to better connect the admissions process to the recommendation for internship and certification decision points, increase the focus from self-reflection to candidate performance, require candidates to identify areas for growth, and establish consistent criteria across the decision points.

- The program admits candidates to the program based on the review of several sources of evidence designed to show candidate performance and potential to meet the ILA standards. The sources of evidence include transcripts, teacher evaluations, letters of recommendation, professional statements, and an interview presentation on previous instructional practice and analysis of student work samples. An interview team uses a rubric to make admission decisions.

- The program admits candidates on a conditional basis for a variety of reasons including limited teaching experience, candidate writing proficiency, and dispositional concerns. The program reports that it has a mentoring process for conditionally admitted candidates that includes one-on-one mentoring sessions, support with course assessments, and monitoring during the assessment process. The program reported examples of conditional candidates who went on to succeed in the program and that it does not allow progress without meeting program criteria.

- The program conducts an interim review of candidate progress in the program at the completion of the first two courses in the program, the end of Strand I. This review includes a

portfolio review, summative reflection on candidate progress against ILA Standard 1, Foundational Knowledge, and evidence of required fieldwork.

- The recommendation for internship decision point occurs at the conclusion of Strand II and prior to the EDU 836: Literacy Clinic, EDU 842: Literacy Coach, and EDU 837: Organization and Supervision of Literacy Programs. To advance past the decision point, candidates need to earn a B or higher in all courses, compile a portfolio with evidence meeting specified ILA Standards and indicators at a proficient or distinguished level, complete a sociocultural statement, provide evidence of required project work, and conduct a presentation to a faculty review team of their progress and areas for growth. The review team uses a rubric and established processes to evaluate candidate progress and readiness to advance.

- The review team considers the new assessment system to have a coherent and valid design. The assessment system criteria align to the ILA Standards and prioritize candidate performance against the standards and positive impact on student learning. The assessment system prioritizes continuous assessment from admission through recommendation for certification and candidates receive consistent and frequent feedback on their progress.

- The program has developed assessment protocols and rubrics for major assessments in the assessment system that contain several performance levels – distinguished, proficient, and unsatisfactory/unacceptable. The protocols and rubrics do not provide clear and explicit descriptors for performance at each rating level for each indicator and may limit the effectiveness of the instruments to drive candidate progress and ensure the effectiveness of feedback to candidates on their performance.

- The review team also considers that the new assessment system will likely ensure that candidate performance in relation to the expectations of the ILA standards determine candidate progress in the program and recommendation for internship. The strong focus on the ILA standards in program courses continues in the assessment system through portfolios that candidates compile, reflections for each artifact that justify progress towards the standards, and the professional progress and growth presentation. Program faculty who teach Strand III courses participate in the Strand II assessment, thus furthering consistency across the assessment decision point strengthening opportunities and expectations for candidate growth.

- As noted above in 1.6, it was not clear to the review team how the program communicates, emphasizes, or supports candidates to develop the socio-cultural statement or how it contributes as constituted to the recommendation for internship decision point.

Recommendations

- Continue to implement the newly designed assessment system. Continue to work with faculty and partners to develop further the rubrics and performance descriptors used during the assessment events to ensure there is a clear alignment and communication between standards, performance descriptors, candidate performance, and assessment decisions. Monitor the implementation of the assessment system and make adjustments and changes that may be required based on implementation and candidate need.

- Develop a data tracking and evaluation process connected to the four assessment decision points and each input used to make assessment decisions. Use the data as a critical source of program improvement information to monitor the effectiveness of the assessment system and to inform changes to the program to improve candidate performance and progress.

- Review the role of the sociocultural statement both as an assessment instrument and in conjunction with feedback on indicator 1.6, Equity. Explore how this can be a more meaningful, comprehensive, and integral part of the program of study and the assessment system to ensure candidates are prepared to work with diverse learners and families.

3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Meets Expectations
The program recommends candidates for certification based on multiple performance-based assessments that ensure candidates demonstrate proficiency in the full range of ILA standards.	

- The recommendation for certification decision point parallels the recommendation for internship decision point and ensures that candidates demonstrate proficiency on all ILA Standards and indicators. Candidates submit a completed portfolio with artifacts and reflections for all standards and indicators. Candidates conduct a second portfolio presentation through which they have to demonstrate growth on their Strand III learning goals as well as develop a professional growth plan to extend beyond certification. In addition to passing the final three courses with a B or higher, candidates also must present evidence of successful completion of the state licensure test for reading specialists.

- The program communicates assessment system criteria to candidates through the admissions process, through program handbooks and portfolio forums, and through course and program-based advisement. The program recently presented the revised assessment system to candidates who entered the program under the previous system and the program reports that more than 90 percent of candidates selected to enter the new assessment system.

- The program uses quarterly faculty meetings to share news about the assessment system, to work with faculty to review, develop, and receive feedback on the new system, and for calibration exercises to promote consistent program and assessment system decisions and candidate feedback.

- Program faculty, candidates, program completers, and district partners report that by program completion candidates are fully prepared to serve as reading specialists on day one and meet the needs of schools and students.

- The program should continue to monitor ongoing evaluation of candidates to assure that the implementation of performance-based assessments yields fair, accurate, and consistent evaluation of candidate performance. The program should use data to inform changes and improvements to the recommendation for certification checkpoint over time.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not systematically or annually collect information from employers of program completers for program improvement efforts nor does it monitor program completer data.	

- The program reports that it does not collect information from employers of program completers for program improvement. The program reports that it intends to create an employer survey in conjunction with program faculty during 2018. The program reports that it expects it will receive significant responses to the survey because of positive relationships with its completers and their employers.

- The program does not review or analyze program completer performance data compared to the performance data of all completers for this certification area.

- Performance data for the 2016-17 school year for Providence College Support Professional programs was not reported. Therefore, it is not possible to compare Providence College program, completers with those from other providers.

Recommendations

- Develop and implement a systematic and annual process to collect feedback from program completer employers. Ensure that the system generates actionable information. Use this information with program faculty and other stakeholders for program improvement.

- Use data from the Educator Preparation Index to further understand program completer performance and guide program improvement efforts.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program collects information from program completers informally but does not have an annual and systematic process. The program uses informal feedback from completers and near-completers for program improvement.	

- The program engages with program completers through informal means including an annual graduation dinner, personal communications with program faculty and staff, and through other networking opportunities. The program does not have an annual or systematic process to collect feedback on program performance from program completers.

- The program administers an exit survey with candidates in their last semester of coursework that generates information for program performance and improvement. Combined with the informal feedback from completers, the program reported changes made based on this feedback including increasing opportunities for candidates to work with middle and secondary students during the clinic experience.

- The program reports that it intends to develop and implement an annual and systematic process to collect information from program completers to guide program improvement.

- The program does not have a process to track program completer information or employment status, nor does it review and analyze this information. The program reports that it intends to include this in the survey redesign process.

Recommendations

- Develop and implement a systematic and annual process to collect feedback from program completers. Ensure that the system generates actionable information, including employment status and program completers' perceptions of program effectiveness. Use this information with program faculty and other stakeholders for program improvement.

- Use program completer employment data to further understand program completer performance and guide program improvement efforts.

School Counselor Programs

The School Counselor program is a graduate-level program that leads to a M.Ed. in School Counseling. Full-time candidates typically complete the program in two years; part-time candidates typically complete the program in three to four years. Candidates must earn forty-two credits from fourteen required courses organized across three clusters. The program of study culminates in a series of field experiences including two semester-long internships.

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 aligns fully to the CACREP Standards and the program design supports candidates to develop proficiency in these standards through program courses, field experiences, and assessments.	

- The program of study is grounded upon the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP) standards, both the 2009 standards and the recently updated 2016 standards. Course syllabi, course projects, the portfolio assessment system, and field experiences each identify specific CACREP standards and indicators that candidates engage, practice, and demonstrate proficiency by program completion.

- In addition to the CACREP standards, the program places a strong emphasis on the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) *National Model, A Framework for School Counseling Programs* (2012) that serves as a guidance for school counseling programs in PK-12 schools.

- The program introduces candidates to the expectations of the CACREP standards and supports them to develop deep understanding of the standards through the admissions process, which features role-plays based on counseling scenarios, through program materials and handbooks, through course materials and faculty, and through advisement and portfolio review sessions. Several course syllabi, learning tasks, and key assessments also include the ASCA National Model.

- Early in program courses such as EDU: Principals of Guidance, EDU 541: Theories of Counseling, and EDU 558: Ethical and Legal Issues in Counseling specifically instruct students in the CACREP standards, the expectations for school counselors embedded in the standards, and how candidates should demonstrate increasing proficiency in the standards. All courses in the program provide specific references to the CACREP standards, the focus standards for the course, and key assessments candidate will complete aligned to the focus standards.

- The portfolio assessment system requires candidates to collect artifacts from course and field-based learning tasks that show evidence of proficiency for each CACREP standard and indicator by program completion. Included with each artifact are reflective statements in which candidates must explain and justify how the artifact shows proficiency in the expected area. Candidates report that the process of reflecting on the alignment between their projects and the standards solidifies their understanding and increasing development as counselors.

- The program of study includes three clusters of courses designed to guide candidates through program completion. Due to the enrollment of both full-time and part-time candidates, the program has a recommended sequence of course completion for both sets of candidates including prerequisites that candidates must complete prior to enrollment in certain courses, including the internship. The program reports that program sequence is a work in progress and requires further revision to ensure consistent and coherent learning experiences. Some candidates echoed this concern and reported that scheduling of courses limited the coherence of their learning and development. The program should continue this work and seek solutions to ensure all candidates experience a coherent and developmentally appropriate program of study.

- The program should integrate additional opportunities for candidates to learn about and develop proficiency in counseling and helpful relations (CACREP 5), group counseling and group work (CACREP 6), and assessment and testing (CACREP 7).

- The program has recently begun to explore, despite certification changes from 2012, additional supports to candidates who do not have an education background to meet the full expectations of the standards. The program has developed and is implementing a series of workshops as well as providing additional guidance to clinical educators for strategies to meet the needs of these candidates. The program should continue to implement these initiatives as well as work with program faculty, partners, and candidates to determine if additional supports are necessary, and if so, move deliberately to make further changes to the program of study.

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction	Approaching Expectations
The program prioritizes SEL student standards but does not include focus on other student learning standards including the CCSS, NGSS, GSEs for Social Studies and other content areas.	

- The program reports that the Social Emotional Learning (SEL) standards recently adopted by the RI Department of Education are the "foundational standards" for the program curriculum. The program provided evidence that it introduces the SEL standards in several courses throughout the program and that it requires candidates to develop projects and learning experiences for PK-12 students based on their developing understanding of the standards.

- Candidates learn about the SEL standards through several program courses including EDU 540: Principles of Guidance, which requires candidates to integrate SEL needs of students to recommend counseling strategies, evaluate student placement decisions, and critique school trauma plans. In EDU 541: Theories of Counseling candidates connect student learning needs and the SEL standards and articulate a personal theory of counseling consistent with the standards. In the two internship courses, EDU 561: Internship I and EDU 568: Internship II, candidates must demonstrate that their work with students and school staff reflects an understanding of the expectations of the SEL standards. EDU 829: Designing and Implementing a School Counseling Program requires candidates to evaluate and make recommendations for counseling practices and programs consistent with the SEL standards.

- The program did not provide evidence how it places a similar focus on other critical PK-12 student learning standards that all RI students are expected to meet, including the CCSS, NGSS, GSEs for Social Studies, and other content areas. Several courses and learning projects include references to the CCSS and their connections to the SEL standards, but at a superficial level. Additionally, several courses and activities include references to student learning standards embedded in the ASCA National Model, but these too are not developed or substantial.

- The review team found that candidates were knowledgeable of the SEL standards but did not have deep understanding of other student learning standards, how these standards should guide and inform their work, and how they could support students to meet these standards consistent with their role as prospective school counselors. Candidates reported that if they were knowledgeable of the student learning standards beyond the SEL standards it was due to their placements in high schools or their previous experiences as educators.

Recommendations

- Continue the program focus on SEL student learning standards as a key part of the program of study to inform the design and delivery of counseling services to meet student learning needs.

- Work with your partners and faculty to identify the appropriate role of other student learning standards in the program of study consistent with the role of school counselors.

- Review and revise the program curriculum and assessment system to ensure that all candidates are proficient in the full range of student learning standards prior to program completion.

1.4 Data-Driven Instruction	Meets Expectations
The program prioritizes data use and effective assessment practices and ensures candidates develop proficiency in both areas consistent with the role of school counselors.	

- The program clearly communicates to candidates that multiple forms of data from research, professional practice, program evaluation, and assessments are essential to the design and delivery of successful counseling services. Twelve of the fourteen program courses include a specific focus on data collection and analysis, research and program evaluation, implementing and learning from assessments, and faculty and candidate monitoring of emerging counseling practice for improvement and growth.

- Courses such as EDU 501: Fundamentals of Research, EDU 562: Assessment, Measurement, and Data in Counseling, and EDU 829: Designing and Implementing a Counseling Program ensure that candidates develop understanding and proficiency using data and assessment information from research, from using multiple instruments and interventions with individuals and groups, and from evaluating programs to make program-level decisions. Candidates reported the advocacy project in EDU 562: Assessment, Measurement, and Data as a key learning experience to connect student and school data to address issues of equity and access in schools.

- The program also ensures that candidates explore and develop proficiency with a variety of data sources including student learning, discipline, attendance, retention, graduation, and post-secondary placement data, as well as school-wide performance data. Candidates learn about, practice, and are assessed on their ability to use a variety of assessment instruments and strategies to identify student needs including standardized tests, needs assessments, personal inventories, case studies, and observation protocols.

- During the two internships, EDU 561 and EDU 568, candidates are required to conduct data analyses to determine specific needs for their school to guide the selection of projects that are completed and to inform case studies conducted each semester. As part of the second internship, candidates are required to complete a 40 Hour Project that the program identifies as a special project based in the counseling needs of the school and which will have lasting benefit for the school and its students. Many candidates and clinical educators spoke of these projects as important learning opportunities for candidates to engage with authentic data and develop data-based responses to student and school needs.

1.5 Technology	Meets Expectations
The program ensures that candidates learn to use multiple technology systems and tools to support student academic, social, and emotional growth as prospective school counselors.	

- The program of study intentionally integrates the use of technology as an essential tool to facilitate school counseling services as well as a vehicle for communication and collaboration. The focus on technology begins in program courses, builds through course-based projects, and culminates in the two internships in which the program expects candidates to use school-based technology and data systems to complete projects and meet school and student needs.

- The program introduces technology to facilitate school counseling services early in the program. The program introduces common school information systems and online tools for counselors in EDU 540: Principals of Guidance. In EDU 542: Career Information, candidates learn about and use online systems and programs for college and career planning such as WaytoGoRI, the College Board, and other regional and national platforms. Candidates continue to learn about and use multiple technology systems culminating in the internships through which candidates are expected and supported to use the full range of technology available to school counselors to develop, deliver, and evaluate counseling services and the counseling program.

- For technology as a communication tool and vehicle for collaboration, all courses and the assessment system assume a basic level of technological fluency in common systems such as presentation and sharing programs, applications, and systems. Some courses require candidates to incorporate multimedia sources, communicate online, and use technology-based data analysis and data sharing systems and platforms for course projects.

- Candidates reported that they are well prepared to use many online systems and tools they learn about in the program and that the internship experience is critical to have extended and authentic learning opportunities. Clinical educators report that they recognize an important role for them is to guide and support candidates to apply course-based learning to the technology systems and tools that are available in their schools and districts.

- The program reports, and the review team concurs, that there remain opportunities for the program to strengthen further this aspect of the program. The program should explore additional and more systematic uses of digital age communication and collaboration tools as a required and consistent aspect of all program courses. The program should review the entire program of study to determine if there are any gaps or redundancies in technology tools and systems and work with faculty to address these. The program should also explore if adopting a set of technology standards in addition to the limited technology references in the CACREP standards would help provide a pathway and direction for the program and its candidates.

1.6 Equity	Approaching Expectations
The program supports candidates to reflect on their own biases and demonstrate cultural competence but provides limited focus on strategies to work with students who are ELLs, students with special needs, and working with families in diverse communities.	

- The program requires candidates to explore their own backgrounds, cultures, and worldview through a variety of course-based activities. EDU 541: Theories of Counseling requires candidates to construct a personal theory of counseling based on self-reflection and an awareness of different groups and cultures. EDU 544: Counseling Pre-Practicum requires candidates to explore factors that contributed to their development as they approach working with students and families in schools. EDU 540: Principals of Guidance requires candidates to examine cultural competence and empathy when working with those different from themselves.

- Several program courses build upon this awareness and theoretical background to include specific strategies when working with individuals and groups. EDU 538: Developmental and Cross-Cultural Theories of Counseling requires candidates to consider how different groups may

influence the design and delivery of counseling services. EDU 645: Families in Crisis requires candidates to explore how different racial and ethnic groups respond to challenges and how best to support individuals and families in need. EDU 542: Career Information requires candidates to consider how group differences can influence college and career decisions.

- The review team did not observe a strong program-wide focus on specific skills and strategies to support candidates to meet the needs of students who are English language learners, students with special needs, and for candidates to work with families in diverse communities.

- The program reports that it recognizes opportunities for improvement in regards to issues of equity and diversity. Candidates who have experience in diverse settings expressed readiness and confidence to meet the needs of all students and families. Candidates with less experience were less confident. The program reported that it is seeking to increase opportunities for observations in urban settings to address these concerns, but a more systematic approach will be necessary to ensure proficiency for all candidates.

Recommendations

- Continue the program's focus on supporting candidates to reflect on their own biases and to develop the cultural competence necessary to meet the needs of all students and families.

- Review and revise the program curriculum to ensure that there are sufficient course and field-based learning opportunities to support candidates to become proficient in meeting the needs of English language learners, students with special needs, and working with families.

- Work with partners, faculty and other stakeholders to develop a common vision and approach to diversity shared across the program and permeates all courses and field experiences. Explore and implement systematic programmatic approaches and strategies to ensure all candidates are prepared to work in diverse settings rather than simply adding isolated opportunities to observe school counselor practice in urban schools.

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations	Approaching Expectations
The program provides candidates limited opportunities for candidates to learn about important RI education initiatives and policies consistent with the role of school counselor.	

- The program has a strong and appropriate focus on two RI education initiatives and policies: social emotional learning and college and career readiness. As discussed in 1.3, the program has prioritized SEL standards as a foundational element of the program and has included these standards as a common thread through many courses and projects. As also referenced several times, college and career readiness is also a program priority, including an entire course, EDU 542: Career Awareness, which focuses on preparing students for college and career success.

- Consistent with the focus on the ASCA National Model, the program also aligns to the RI Framework for Comprehensive School Counseling Programs, which builds upon the ASCA National Model. EDU 558: Ethical and Legal Issues in Counseling focuses on ethical and legal

issues primarily related to professional standards and federal law that parallel and are consistent with several RI education laws and policies.

- Several program courses provide limited focus for other initiatives, such as RI certification requirements, standardized testing, and RI data sources. The only assessment specific to RI education initiatives and policies is a reflection that candidates complete during the internship focusing on initiatives and policies they observe during the internship.

Recommendations

- Review and revise the program curriculum to identify and create systematic opportunities to integrate RI education initiatives and policies beyond SEL standards and college and career readiness and that are most relevant to the work of prospective school counselors.

- Integrate candidate knowledge of important RI education initiatives and policies into the program assessment system either through course or field-based learning task that ensure candidates develop knowledge and understanding prior to program completion.

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

2.1 Clinical Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program design includes a well-designed internship but does not ensure that candidates have extensive, varied, or coherent field experiences sufficient to meet the expectations of the CACREP standards.	

- Although the review team determined that the required hours of internship and the design of the internship supported a rating of Approaching Expectations, the review team has significant concerns with this indicator. Both the program's limited expectations for the amount, rigor, and variety of field experiences as well as the limited amount of substantial field-based learning opportunities prior to internship inherently impede the quality of the program and preparedness of candidates.

- The program requires candidates to complete field experiences for each of the program courses, for the two practicum courses, and for the two internship courses. The program requires candidates to spend one to two hours engaged in field experiences for courses prior to practicum, three hours for the practicum courses, and 150 hours for each internship.

- The program requires candidates to locate their own field placements, both course and internship-based. Candidates who are employed educators typically complete their field experiences in the schools in which they work. Candidates who are not employed and do not have a background in education must seek out placements through personal and other connections.

- The program requires that fifty of the total 300-hour internship be spent in another school in the same district as the internship site. The program does not require that candidates complete field work, course or internship-based, in a variety of settings.

- The program has recently initiated a requirement for candidates in EDU 544: Counseling Pre-Practicum, to conduct observations in three urban schools. The program reports the goal of the observation is to "experience classroom management, how to handle potential behavior problems, become familiar with diverse population of students" suggesting this is the norm in urban schools and not connecting these experiences to other program goals and outcomes.

- Course-based field expectations are minimal. Eight of the fourteen courses require only one hour of field experience. One requires one and a half hours. One requires two hours. Both practicum courses require three hours. Further, most of the field experiences simply require candidates to observe or interview school counselors. Some candidates complete these field experiences without entering schools and interview staff through phone calls. The practicum course requires three hours of field experience to conduct counseling sessions, but only one must be with a school-aged individual. Candidates reported counseling their friends and relatives instead. Collectively these do not represent developmentally appropriate, substantive and coherent field-based learning experiences.

- In addition to the lack of rigor, candidates do not experience or benefit from field placements in a variety of settings. Since the program allows candidates to complete all but fifty hours of their internship in their home schools, or adopted school for non-education candidates, candidates typically only experience these placements. Further, candidates are only required to complete the fifty internship hours in another school in their same district, thus further limiting opportunities to experience a variety of placements.

- It was not clear that the program has an effective process to monitor field experiences. The program does not require that candidates document course based-experiences. Candidates complete log and journal reflections as part of the internship to track field experiences but it was not evident that the program monitors this process and holds candidates accountable.

- Despite concerns about field experiences prior to internship, the review team found that the two internship experiences are substantial, important, and critical culminating learning experiences for the program or would have considered a lower rating for this indicator. The internship design, a contract between the candidate and clinical educator, identifies authentic and varied student and school-based tasks that support candidates to practice consistent with the full-range of the standards. Additionally, candidates complete a focused Forty Hour project designed to serve a lasting need of the school. Candidates reported that both the internship experience and Forty Hour project were essential opportunities to put in practice what they have previously learned in their courses.

Recommendations

- Work with program partners, faculty, and other stakeholders to review the current expectations for field experiences prior to practicum. Identify and include more substantial, developmentally appropriate, and coherent field-based experiences prior to internship.

- Increase the expectations for candidates in practicum courses to engage in authentic, substantial, school-based learning experiences that align to the CACREP standards and prepare candidates for the expectations and learning opportunities of the internships.

- Establish and implement a process to ensure that all candidates engage in meaningful and substantial field experiences in a variety of schools, grade levels, and placements to ensure that candidate experience diverse settings and do not primarily practice in their home schools.

- Establish and implement an effective process to track candidate field placements, both course and internship-based, to ensure candidates complete the expected number of hours and the expected types of placements.

- Develop a process to support candidates to locate and secure field placements in settings that are consistent with the expectations of the CACREP standards and that are involved in partnerships with the program.

2.2 Impact on Student Learning	Approaching Expectations
Candidates learn about positively impacting student learning but due to the design of the field experiences are not able to show impact until internship experiences.	

- As discussed above, the program design does not require candidates to complete substantial field experiences prior to internship. As such, the program has not identified measures of impact on student learning that build from early clinical experiences and progress throughout the program nor does it allow candidates to demonstrate such impact prior to the internship. Although the program reports theoretical and hypothetical examples of candidates consulting data and proposing solutions through course activities, these experiences do not meet the field-based expectations of this component.

- During the internship, as part of the internship contract and included in the Forty Hour project, candidates must identify specific projects and learning activities that are often based on school data and need, that are designed to support student social and emotional learning needs, that are aligned to CACREP standards, and that require candidates to show progress towards meeting these expectations. Since these experiences only occur towards the end of the program, the program does not use data from early clinical experiences to inform or improve candidates' subsequent ability to impact learning.

- The review team found that since candidates only experience this focus during internship, candidates miss important opportunities to practice and develop proficiency throughout the program to evaluate counseling strategies and interventions based on actual student needs, implement the interventions, determine impact on learning, and plan next steps.

Recommendations

- Consistent with the recommendations for 2.1, alter the program design to ensure that candidates experience authentic and substantial clinical experiences prior to internship to

ensure frequent and early opportunities to demonstrate impact on student learning through an assessment process of student needs, intervention options, and implementation.

- Develop a process to identify measures of expected impact on student learning that should occur from early field experiences and should increase during subsequent field experiences. Work with partners and stakeholder to develop these measures.

- Develop a process to collect and analyze data from measures of impact on student learning and use this information to improve candidate impact on learning in subsequent field experiences.

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has not established formal partnerships that share in the design of the program or in the process of program improvement.	

- The program identifies clinical educators who agree to host candidates during the program internship as its clinical partners. The program reported that on several occasions it has received anecdotal information from clinical educators that it has used toward program improvement including increasing the focus on the role of elementary school counselors and an expanded focus on the college application process in the program curriculum.

- The program shares common assessment instruments with clinical educators used to evaluate candidate progress in the internship and through program completion. Beyond the evaluation of the candidate during internship, clinical educators do not have a formal or established role to create agreed-upon indicators of partnership effectiveness nor work with the program to review data and improve partnerships.

- The program reported that it has presented to focus groups and school counselor associations for feedback and possible areas of improvement, but this was of a limited scope and duration.

- The review team found that one consequence of the absence of established partners is the limited placement options for program candidates to practice in multiple and varied settings. Candidates reported that they are required to find their own placement and often have to struggle with non-responsive schools and potential clinical educators. The program recognizes this limitation and has reported that it is seeking to establish more formal partnerships to support candidates and program improvement.

Recommendations

- Review the expectations for this component. Establish mutually beneficial partnerships that support program needs, including the need for candidate placements, and partner needs to improve student learning and deliver and improve counseling services.

- Collaborate with newly established partners to create agreed-upon indicators of program and partnership effectiveness and to make partnership decisions that are mutually beneficial.

- Develop and implement a process, in consultation with program partners, to review partnership data and outcome measures and make decisions based on this data for program improvement.

2.4 Clinical Educators	Approaching Expectations
The program has established minimal criteria for clinical educators and does not have sufficient processes to ensure that it selects, prepares, supports, and retains high quality clinical educators.	

- The program has established minimal criteria for clinical educators that are not consistent with the expectations of this component. These minimal criteria include a Master's degree in school counseling or a closely related field, at least three years' experience, participation in professional development in the last five years, knowledge of the ASCA model, and willingness to serve as a clinical educator for program candidates.

- The program provided evidence that it has conducted recruitment and training sessions for prospective clinical educators at school counselor conferences as well as through informal networking. The program also reports that it most often selects clinical educators when an educator in their school seeks admission to the program and seeks out a school counselor to serve in this role.

- The program has developed a clinical educator handbook that details expectations for the candidate, the clinical educator, and the expected learning opportunities that should comprise the internship and the internship contract. The program reported that it invited clinical educators who were not able to attend the recruitment and training sessions to participate in a session on campus. The program reports that it supports clinical educators for their roles through informal communications and through site visits conducted twice during the internship by the university supervisor.

- The program has an end of internship evaluation that candidates complete that address the quality of the placement and the effectiveness of the support they received from their clinical educators. The program did not provide evidence how it uses data from this evaluation to make retention decisions or to direct support for clinical educators.

- The university supervisor is a program staff member who leads the internship seminars, who has responsibility to conduct site visits, and who monitors candidate progress and the implementation of the internship contract. Notably, the university supervisor does not formally observe or assess the candidate during the internship.

- Program candidates reported that the clinical educators are critical to their success, generally supportive of their learning and development, and take personal interest in their growth. The program reports that they recognize the importance of clinical educators for candidate success and are exploring additional strategies to recruit and support clinical educators.

Recommendations

- Identify clear criteria for clinical educators based on the expectations of the CACREP Standards, the ASCA National Model, and ensure the criteria include the ability to work with adult learners, coaching and supervision skills, and the ability to provide coaching and feedback.

- Develop and implement a process to recruit and support clinical educators from a variety of settings, who meet established criteria, and are available to meet candidate placement needs.

- Develop and implement a process to train and support clinical educators beyond a one-time recruitment session. Ensure that the program and its partners prepare clinical educators fully for their roles including how to use assessment instruments, provide coaching, supervision, and feedback, developing the internship contact, and directing and monitoring candidate learning opportunities.

- Develop and implement a process to use evaluation data from clinical educators to make retention decisions to ensure that candidates receive support from high quality clinical educators.

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Assessment

3.4 Assessment Throughout Preparation	Approaching Expectations
The program has a comprehensive assessment system aligned to the CACREP standards that prioritizes course and project completion rather than performance-based assessments to determine candidate progress in the program.	

- The program has a comprehensive assessment system that includes an admission process, required candidate advisement sessions, a portfolio review process, and a final evaluation of candidate readiness for recommendation for certification. The program has established criteria for each of these assessment points and processes and provided evidence that the CACREP standards serve as the basis of the assessment system. The program reported that it is engaged in improving the assessment system to make it more interactive and performance-based.

- The admissions process includes multiple criteria such as college transcripts, letters of recommendation, a personal statement, an interview, and a role-play designed to elicit information about candidate's propensities towards school counseling. The program has recently added a personal inventory to assess candidate dispositions for school counseling further strengthening the admission process. The program uses an interview committee, rubrics, and standardized processes to make admissions decisions.

- The program reports that it allows for conditional admission if candidates do not meet the required GPA of 3.0 or higher. Candidates admitted conditionally are monitored through the advisory process, provided additional supports, and must attain a B or higher in their first two courses to continue in the program.

- To monitor candidate progress, the program requires candidates to meet with program leaders and advisors at established benchmarks: upon admission, after fifteen and thirty credit hours,

and prior to recommendation for certification. The program reports that the initial meeting is to review the program of study and assessment system. The program identifies the meetings after fifteen and thirty credit hours as "informal advisor portfolio reviews" for candidates to demonstrate progress in meeting the CACREP standards. The program conducts a final portfolio review near completion of the second internship.

- The program identifies the criteria for recommendation for internship decision point as completion of all required courses with a grade of B or higher, successful completion of the second portfolio review after 30 credit hours, and a two-page reflection that focuses on candidate progress and areas for growth as a prospective school counselor.

- Candidates develop the portfolio by collecting artifacts from course projects that align to CACREP standards and indicators. The artifacts include a reflection that justifies the connection between the project and the standard. Both the project and reflection have been previously assessed by course instructors. The program did not provide evidence that it specifies a number or range of CACREP standards and indicators that candidates must meet to progress past this decision point. The program uses a 'Portfolio Assessment Recording Sheet' to track artifacts, standards and indicators addressed, and the quality of the artifacts.

- The review team recognizes that the assessment system aligns to the CACREP standards and that the program is engaged in the review and improvement of the assessment system. This work should continue. The admissions process appears to be a valid system for admitting candidates with potential to succeed as school counselors. The recommendation for internship requires further revision as the decision point does not include performance-based assessments, the program has not designated minimal requirements for meeting CACREP standards, and the decision point does not prioritize candidate impact on student learning.

Recommendations

- Continue the work to further review and revise the assessment system in both the alignment of the system to the CACREP standards and in demonstrations of candidate performance to meet the expectations of the standards.

- Work with partners, program faculty, and other stakeholders to create and implement a performance-based assessment process for the recommendation for internship decision point that aligns fully to the CACREP Standards, prioritizes impact on learning, and ensures candidates demonstrate an established minimal level of proficiency to progress to internship.

- Establish which CACERP standards and indicators candidates must demonstrate proficiency to advance to internship and integrate this into the program of study and assessment system.

3.5 Recommendation for Certification	Approaching Expectations

The recommendation for certification decision point does not use valid and reliable performance-based assessments to ensure that candidates demonstrate proficiency in the full range of the CACREP standards and readiness as school counselors on day one.

- The recommendation for certification decision is based solely on two criteria – a final school counseling internship evaluation conducted by the clinical educator and a final review of the candidate's portfolio. The program does not require candidates to complete successfully the state licensure exam for school counselors.

- The clinical educator develops the internship evaluation over the course of the second internship. It requires clinical educators to rate candidate performance using a Likert scale across multiple topics including "Basic Work Requirements," "Ethical Awareness," "Knowledge of Counseling Approaches," "Interactions with Students, Staff, and Families," "Work Products," and "Technology." It also requires clinical educators to respond three open-ended prompts on candidate growth, the impact of the Forty Hour project, and any "areas of grave concern" that require further "development or improvement." Notably, the program has not aligned this instrument to the CACREP standards.

- The program director and university internship supervisor conduct the final portfolio review. Candidates are required for this review to have at least one artifact for each CACREP standard and indicator, at a proficient or distinguished rating. Candidates also must submit a four-page reflection as part of the final portfolio review that includes areas of growth, plans for continued development, and feedback on program quality.

- The program clearly communicates the assessment system to candidates through program handbooks, the website, and through program courses. The advisement process and orientation sessions further ensure candidates are aware of and understand the assessment system.

- The program reported that it has begun using program faculty meetings as important opportunities to share information about the assessment system, seek feedback for improvement, and to conduct calibration exercises to promote and encourage consistent evaluation and feedback on candidate work and progress.

- The review team has several concerns with this indicator regarding the process and content of this decision point and consequently considered a Does Not Meet Expectations rating for this indicator. As discussed in 2.4, the program does not have a rigorous and effective process to ensure that all clinical educators meet established criteria indicative of high quality clinical educators. Nor does the program have a substantive process to train and support clinical educators for their roles. However, the program delegates to the clinical educators substantial authority to make recommendations for the grade of the internship course, 80 percent, and to make singularly the recommendation for certification decision on behalf of the program. As noted in 2.4, university supervisors do not evaluate candidate performance during the two internships but only informally observe and share feedback with the candidate and clinical educator.

- Consistent with 3.4, the portfolio review process aligns fully to the CACREP standards and candidates are required to demonstrate 'knowledge' of the standards through artifacts and reflections that are compiled in the portfolio before and during the internship. Since there are limited opportunities for candidates to demonstrate performance consistent with the expectations of the standards prior to internship, and since there are no requirements that specific performance-based assessments or projects emanating from the internship are added to the portfolio, the final portfolio review does not ensure that programs have access to valid and reliable performance assessments that demonstrate candidates meeting the full expectations of the CACREP standards.

- Absent valid and reliable performance assessments in the portfolio system, and with the reliance on clinical educator recommendations who are informal partners but not members of the program, it is unclear why the program would not require passage of the state licensure tests as an additional possible, confirmation of candidate knowledge and performance consistent with the expectations of the standards.

Recommendations

- Review and revise the recommendation for certification decision point to include valid and reliable assessments of candidate performance to ensure the program only recommends for certification candidates who are proficient in and can demonstrate practice consistent with the full range of the CACREP Standards. Connect performance-based assessments from the recommendation for certification decision point, to the recommendation for internship decision point, to the revised admissions process.

- Review and revise the role of clinical educators in the assessment system, particularly the recommendation for certification decision point. Ensure that candidate internship performance is evaluated by fully trained individuals who demonstrate valid and reliable assessment decisions.

- Examine the current role of program faculty and staff in the recommendation for certification decision point and evaluate if this is the most effective use of programmatic resources. Examine the omission of the state licensure exam from the program assessment system and reconsider if the inclusion of this exam would strengthen program assessment decisions.

Standard 4: Program Impact

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes	Does Not Meet Expectations
The program does not systematically collect information from employers of program completers for program improvement efforts nor does it monitor program completer data.	

- The program reports that it does not systematically collect information from program completer employers for program improvement. The program reports that it is exploring processes and systems to collect information from employers.

- The program identified several improvements made to the program based on informal outreach efforts including increased focus on elementary school counseling, the college application process, and additional workshops during internship seminars.

- The program does not review or analyze program completer performance data compared to the performance data of all completers for this certification area.

- Performance data for the 2016-17 school year for Providence College Support Professional programs was not reported. Therefore, it is not possible to compare Providence College program, completers with those from other providers.

Recommendations

- Develop and implement a systematic and annual process to collect feedback from program completer employers. Ensure that the system generates actionable information. Use this information with program faculty, partners, and other stakeholders for program improvement.

- Use data from the Educator Preparation Index to further understand program completer performance and guide program improvement efforts.

4.2 Employment Outcomes	Approaching Expectations
The program has made limited efforts to collect, analyze, and use information from program completers for program improvement.	

- The program does not systematically or collect annually information from program completers for program improvement efforts. The program reports that it is exploring processes to collect annually this information.

- The program conducted a survey of the Rhode Island School Counselor Association in 2017 as preparation for the PREP-RI visit. The program also asked program completers to respond to the survey. The program received a significant number of responses to the survey which provided anecdotal suggestions for improvement, some of which the program has acted upon.

- The program does not have a process to track program completer information or employment status, nor does it review and analyze this information. The program reports that it intends to include this in the survey redesign process.

Recommendations

- Develop and implement a systematic and annual process to collect feedback from program completers. Ensure that the system generates actionable information, including employment status and program completers' perceptions of program effectiveness. Use this information with program faculty, partners, and other stakeholders for program improvement.

- Use program completer employment data to further understand program completer performance and guide 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.	

- Leadership reported—and reviewers agreed—Providence College needs "to develop a stronger diversity recruitment and retention strategy." Although the diversity of Providence College's student body has increased over time, most education programs at Providence College have not seen a similar increase.

- Providence College's overall applicant pool has grown dramatically, by 25 percent in recent years. The admissions office reported that there was an 11 percent increase in applications from candidates interested in pursuing elementary and elementary special education this year, which has enabled the college and the program to be more selective in admitting candidates.

- Leadership reported that it has extended its presence nationally, particularly in California, at high school visits and college fairs. However, provider-level efforts focus on recruitment to the university at large rather than to specific programs. In addition to college-wide recruitment efforts, each program engages in efforts to recruit candidates. With the exception of PACT, which seems to recruit from career fairs nationwide, programs tend to recruit from within Providence College and from within Rhode Island. Sample efforts included recruiting people from adjunct faculty members' districts, attending local college fairs, holding open houses, and attending events on Providence College's campus. The TCP program recently developed the Future Friar Referral Program where current candidates who refer new candidates receive a gift.

- The provider reported that Providence College and the Office of Admissions "have made it a strategic priority to diversify the PC undergraduate student body. Increasing student diversity is part of our strategic plan." However, while student diversity increased from 6 percent to 16 percent over the past five years, similar increases did not occur within education programs.

- About 10 percent of candidates admitted to education programs within the past five years identify as non-white. The percentage of male candidates admitted to education programs has also decreased over time, from 28 percent in 2014-15 to 16 percent in 2017-18. The lack of diversity is most stark in the reading specialist and elementary & elementary special education programs, where nearly all candidates identify as white females.

- The provider shared how it works to ensure that candidates have a variety of experiences while on campus through diverse clinical placements and study abroad opportunities. However, the provider could not articulate clearly how it integrates the different backgrounds and experiences of its students into its programs.

- Both Providence College leadership and candidates expressed concern about the extent to which underrepresented candidates, particularly candidates of color, are welcomed as part of

the Providence College community. Per the Providence College website, the Office of Institutional Diversity commissioned a campus climate assessment that surfaced themes of "divergent perceptions of campus climate," "perceptions of negative stereotyping," and "an expressed need for additional education awareness" in 2014. Evidence provided during interviews suggests that campus climate remains a concern. Reviewers heard multiple accounts of candidates who experienced discrimination, microaggressions, or macroaggressions during their preparation.

- During an interview, provider leadership noted that the college is working to determine what additional supports would be helpful to academic advisors. An interviewee described a general advising "crash course" as well as training on inclusivity for academic advisors in development. Reviewers acknowledged that these trainings would likely be helpful but also insufficient. It is also unclear the extent to which the Office of Institutional Diversity, which "supports the College's mission to create a rich learning, living, and working environment that affirms the essential dignity of every person," continues to operate. At the time of the visit, the cabinet-level position of Vice President of Institutional Diversity was vacant and the office staff included only by a Director of Education, Training, and Assessment and an administrative assistant.

Recommendations

- Consider how to leverage and customize successful university-level recruitment efforts to recruit and support diverse candidates. Consider targeted recruitment strategies to attract candidates interested in education.

- Research and consider adopting effective and promising recruitment and admissions policies that other colleges and universities have implemented. Engage in conversations with researchers and other deans to learn more about successful efforts and the actions that led to their success.

- Ensure all provider faculty and staff receive ongoing training focused on cultural competency and on supporting underrepresented students.

- Consider if it is feasible to expand current scholarship offerings to underrepresented candidates interested in pursuing education.

- Expedite the hiring of a new Vice President of Institutional Diversity. Collaborate with the Director of Multicultural Student Success, the Director of Academic Advising, and other critical leaders to determine additional supports needed to ensure that candidates of color feel supported during their time at Providence College. As needed, provide training to academic advisors and faculty to ensure that they are culturally competent and are prepared to support the diverse needs of all candidates.

- Establish annual measures of school climate, diversity, and cultural competence. Collected data might include, but is not limited to, recruitment numbers, retention numbers, student and faculty perceptions, school climate survey data, and candidate engagement data. Track impact and change over time between now and the next visit and disaggregate data by program, race, and ethnicity. Review data regularly and adjust implementation of strategies and supports as needed.

3.2 Response to Employment Needs	Does Not Meet Expectations

The provider does not demonstrate efforts to be responsive to community, state, regional, and/or national educator employment needs.

- The provider reported that it shares the Newly Certified Educators Report with candidates. Representatives from the admission office also said that they share some national trend information with candidates. However, in interviews, candidates were mostly unaware of their employment prospects upon program completion. PC did not provide evidence of a comprehensive or 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.

- The provider has engaged in some efforts to ensure that candidates have the information they need to become certified and employed after program completion. For example, the provider offers an ESL course that meets requirements for certification in Massachusetts and offers some information about the edTPA test for those seeking certification in New York.

- Some programs have adjusted programs, but programs do not systematically collaborate with clinical partners to identify changes to preparation.

- The provider and its programs do not identify changes that would make program completers more competitive for employment. During an interview, provider leadership shared that it asks its partner districts about their hiring needs. The provider tries to place candidates in schools where they might be more likely to be hired, but leadership noted that Providence College candidates often do not meet the district's needs.

- The provider does not consistently share with candidates information on the employment status of recent program completers. The provider and its programs expressed difficulty in trying to maintain contact with recent program completers for this purpose.

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 providers to determine their employment needs—both certification areas and prospective skills and capacities. Share this information with leadership, faculty, and candidates.

- Require each program to report to the leadership of PC 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 data with candidates by sharing information with prospective candidates and in candidate advising.

- Work to ensure that candidates in surplus areas understand their employment prospects and encourage them to enroll in programs in hard to staff areas.

- Work with alumni and advancement office representatives to develop and test strategies for maintaining contact with recent program completers.

3.3 Admissions Standards for Academic Achievement and Ability	Approaching Expectations
Provider and program admission requirements meet Rhode Island Department of Education expectations. The provider and its programs have established conditional acceptance policies, but RIDE has not approved these policies.	

- Program and provider minimum admissions requirements generally meet Rhode Island Department of Education expectations. Admission materials state that undergraduate candidates must demonstrate an overall GPA of 2.75 and minimum performance on admissions test scores and graduate candidates must demonstrate an overall GPA of 3.0 or higher.

- The provider has not submitted nor has RIDE approved a conditional acceptance policy, yet programs have established processes for admitting candidates who do not meet minimum criteria. At the undergraduate level, candidates admitted with conditions receive letters explaining their admissions status and meet to develop an action plan with the Director of Assessment. The reading specialist and school counselor programs conditionally accept candidates and monitor and support candidate performance until candidates meet expectations. In the graduate special education program, it is possible for candidates to not meet minimum requirements and still receive full admission; this is unacceptable.

- Upon conditional acceptance, candidates receive information about how to exit conditional acceptance policies and receive limited supports. Although programs know which candidates they have conditionally accepted, they do not have systems in place to track subsequent performance of candidates to evaluate the effectiveness of conditional acceptance policies.

Recommendations

- Conduct a review and audit all program-specific admissions policies, rubrics, and processes. Identify strengths and weaknesses of current processes and use that information to develop a formal, provider-wide conditional acceptance policy. Submit the conditional acceptance policy to RIDE for review and approval.

- Develop a process to track the progress of all candidates admitted through a conditional acceptance process. Include information about the candidate, the candidate's admissions status, the supports received, and candidate performance throughout the program. Implement formal periodic reviews of data to determine the effectiveness of conditional acceptance policies.

3.6 Additional Selectivity Criteria	Approaching Expectations

Individual programs have identified candidates' professional dispositions but the processes and tools used to assess candidate dispositions vary. The provider and its programs lack a systemic approach to assessing and supporting development of candidate dispositions over time.

- The provider did not share a clear, coherent list of additional selectivity criteria that the provider tracks over time. Instead, provider leadership submitted multiple documents that assess professionalism in some form. Examples included admissions interview prompts, portions of observation rubrics, and a professional profile form. Individual programs, rather than the provider, establish criteria for selectivity criteria. According to provider leadership, these criteria derive from the RI Code of Professional Responsibility and the teacher evaluation models used in Rhode Island.

- The processes and quality of tools used to assess candidate dispositions vary across programs. For example, the elementary and elementary special education program uses a Professionalism Scale at the Readiness to Student Teach checkpoint that aligns to the RIPTS and identifies key dispositions needed to implement effectively the RIPTS. For example, based on RIPTS Standard 7, which focuses on collaboration, the program identified collaboration, flexibility, positive attitude toward learners, and high expectations for learning and behavior as key dispositions. Each candidate receives a rating of 0 (Not applicable/Little to no evidence) to 3 (Exemplary Evidence). There is a different version of the form that the program uses at student teaching. Within the PACT pathway, candidates receive feedback on their professional growth through their observations. Criteria include "ability to reflect on own teaching", "attitude", "maintenance of records or grades", "communications with families," and "professional activities".

- Although the provider shared multiple examples of tools used to assess professionalism, the provider and its programs lack a system for assessing the same dispositions at multiple points over time. The provider has not developed systems to track candidate performance on dispositions over time.

- Reviewers noted one program, the school counseling program, has begun an innovative pilot of a new dispositional tool for admissions. New applicants complete the PC Graduate School Counseling Interpersonal and Social Empathy Index Admissions Survey (ISEI) online before their admissions interview. This survey provides information about candidates' micro-perspective taking, cognitive empathy, self-other awareness, affective response, and emotional regulation. The program is also considering using the ISEI as a pre-post assessment to examine growth in the five key dimensions.

- The provider and its programs do not consistently incorporate instruction and support for developing these dispositions and traits and provide feedback and support to assist candidates.

Recommendations

- Consider establishing a baseline set of dispositions that are important to assess throughout preparation to be an educator. As needed, allow programs to supplement these dispositions with additional criteria relevant to the certification area. This would enable the provider to better track dispositions at the program and provider level.

- Engage and consult with clinical partners and other stakeholders to ensure that the selected additional selectivity criteria are current, valid, and consistent with the needs of Rhode Island schools and communities.

- While revising assessment systems based on the results of the PREP-RI visit, clearly integrate the dispositions and selectivity criteria into candidate admissions, recommendation for student teaching/internship, and recommendation for certification. Consider adopting, adapting, or developing tools that programs can use consistently over time at multiple assessment points. Ensure that all assessors (e.g. clinical educators, clinical supervisors, and faculty) calibrate using the tools to assess candidate dispositions and selectivity criteria.

- Revise program curriculum to incorporate learning opportunities for candidates focused on the dispositions.

Standard 5: Program Quality and Improvement

5.1 Collection of Data to Evaluate Program Quality	Approaching Expectations
The provider and its programs collect some data on candidate and completer performance, but data collection is neither systematic nor comprehensive.	

- The provider reports that the PREP-RI process is the continuous improvement process for all educator preparation programs. The provider reports that it is common practice at Providence College for programs subject to external accreditation to rely on such processes rather than participate in the Providence College Continuous Improvement Program. As such, the provider reports that PREP-RI reviews and recommendations are the data source it uses to guide program improvement efforts.

- The provider also reports that the Assessment Office and Field Placement Office collect data from surveys, calibration exercises, the educator preparation index, and candidate assessment results and distribute these annually to program leaders for their review.

- Programs also formally and informally collect data from a variety of sources such as focus groups, candidate exit and completer surveys, outreach efforts to professional associations, and informal networking.

- Beyond these episodic and informal processes, the provider does not have a comprehensive, systematic data collection process that annually gathers information on program quality, coursework, the performance assessment system, and feedback to candidates. The provider

also does not have a process to collect data systematically and comprehensively on program completer performance and impact on student learning.

- The provider has a Director of Assessment, but the provider does not prioritize or collect data that would allow the provider and its programs to make targeted improvements based on data across the full extent of the programs. The provider reports that an impediment to data collection and use is the absence of a comprehensive data collection and management system.

- The review team found that an additional impediment to the collection and use of data for the teacher preparation programs is a comprehensive assessment system that includes common assessment instruments, criteria, and processes. Absent a comprehensive common system, programs are not able to aggregate and disaggregate data to identify areas for continuous improvement.

- The reliance on external data from the PREP-RI process and informal data collected by individual programs inhibits a data-based culture for provider and program improvement and prevents the provider and its programs from using comprehensive data to identify, make, and monitor targeted, data-based improvements.

Recommendations

- Work across all programs to establish and implement structures and processes to collect data on program quality and performance systematically and annually, including data on coursework, the performance assessment system, quality of feedback to candidates, and program completer performance.

- Work across all programs and with partners to identify specific data to collect annually and systematically that are critical to drive program evaluation and program improvement processes.

- Work with the teacher education programs to develop a common, comprehensive assessment process that includes consistent instruments, criteria, and processes to allow for the collection, aggregation, and disaggregation of data for continuous improvement.

- Work with Providence College to secure the necessary resources, including personnel, to collect systematic data for program improvement.

5.2 Analysis and Use of Data for Continuous Improvement	Does Not Meet Expectations
The provider and its programs do not use data to evaluate program and candidate performance and to inform a systematic program improvement process.	

- As noted in 5.1, the provider and its programs do not collect systematic data for program improvement. As such, the provider and its programs do not analyze and use systematic and comprehensive data for program improvement.

- In evidence and during the visit, the provider and its programs reported examples of improvements made by individual programs using informal data or comparison studies to identify and make improvements.

- The provider and its programs do not have a process to monitor improvements made by formal or informal data to ensure that intended changes occur and the efficacy of the implemented changes. The provider reported that the Education Council "reviews program approval standards and discusses opportunities for individual-programs" but the provider does not use the Education Council to lead a systematic approach the collection and analysis of data.

Recommendations

- Review the expectations of this component. Establish and implement a systematic and annual process to analyze data on program performance, perception data, and candidate outcomes.

- Develop and implement a process to use the results of data analysis to identify recommendations for program changes, resource allocation, and future improvements.

- Develop and implement a process to analyze data to evaluate the relationship between specific practices, candidate performance, and completer impact.

- Develop and implement a process to collect and analyze data on program improvement efforts to monitor the effectiveness of the changes.

5.3 Reporting and Sharing of Data	Approaching Expectations
The provider and its programs meet Rhode Island Department of Education reporting requirements but do not widely share this information with stakeholders.	

- The provider includes links to RI Educator Preparation Index, federal Title II reporting, and institution-wide completer outcomes such as employment, retention, and pass/fail rates on its website.

- The provider fulfills its data reporting responsibilities for state and federal requirements.

- The provider does not make any additional efforts to widely share or communicate program and completer performance, impact, and employment other than lists of where recent completers were hired for a small number of programs.

Recommendations

- Develop and implement a process to share widely program and candidate performance data and outcomes with stakeholders, partners, and the public.

5.4 Stakeholder Engagement	Does Not Meet Expectations
The provider and its programs do not have formal or systematic processes to engage stakeholders in program evaluation and program improvement efforts.	

- The provider reported that several programs conduct surveys of various groups including candidates, program completers, and clinical educators. The provider also reported that some programs conduct focus group sessions, meet periodically with professional associations, and engage with peers and colleagues through meetings and networking opportunities.

- The provider reported that it does not have an advisory committee but recognizes that such a committee could support program evaluation and improvement efforts. The provider also reported that it has not made any efforts to establish such a group.

- The review team found that partners appreciate Providence College and its programs. Partners perceived that some of the benefits of the partnership were having candidates in schools for clinical experiences, receiving supplemental education and remedial services, and having access to a pipeline of potential new employees. The review team also found that despite the positive relations between the provider and its partners, partners were unaware of and not involved in the evaluation and improvement process.

Recommendations

- Develop and implement a process to engage stakeholders in the ongoing program evaluation and improvement process.

- Work across all programs to identify stakeholders that have critical voices and perspectives and should be involved in the program evaluation and improvement process.

- Work with the programs and partners to identify and recruit specific individuals to participate in the program evaluation and improvement process in a structure and schedule that ensures a meaningful contribution to the program improvement process.

5.5 Diversity and Quality of Faculty	Approaching Expectations
Most program faculty are qualified for their positions and are supportive of candidates. Program faculty represent some of the diversity of RI. The provider does not effectively evaluate faculty to ensure high quality instruction.	

- Most program faculty are qualified for their positions and are supportive of their candidates. Candidates and completers across all program routinely discussed how faculty members were critical to their success, were always available for feedback and guidance, and often serve as dedicated advisors for their growth and development. Many program completers reported that the connection to program faculty does not end with graduation, but continues throughout their careers.

- Each program has a program director. Program faculty include full-time faculty and part-time, adjunct instructors. The teacher education programs have mostly full-time faculty. The Building Administrator and Support Professional programs have part-time program leaders and primarily adjunct instructors.

- The provider reported that since the last review visit in 2010, faculty diversity has nearly doubled and that three of the last four hires have resulted in a "diversity hire". The provider also reported that it recognizes the need to increase further the diversity of its faculty to reflect better the diversity of the state. Adjunct faculty do not represent the diversity of the state. Only two of 78 adjunct faculty members are persons of color.

- The provider reported that it recruits full-time faculty through the university hiring process. This process includes consulting with the university diversity office to ensure it seeks prospective faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds. The provider reported that individual programs hire adjunct faculty, usually through formal and informal networks that do not include efforts to seek individuals from diverse backgrounds. The provider reported that adjunct vacancies often arise with little notice, precluding efforts to seek diverse candidates. The review team did not find this to be a credible or insurmountable constraint.

- Faculty evaluation varies by employment category and status. The provider uses student evaluations only to evaluate tenured, full-time faculty and part-time adjunct faculty. Full-time tenure track faculty participate in the university evaluation process prior to attaining tenure. The review team found that in some programs, faculty members consistently received low ratings from student evaluations, but leadership had not taken actions to address the concerns.

- The provider reported that it recognizes the need to strengthen the evaluation process and is exploring adding a post-tenure evaluation process for full-time faculty. It did not report that it is considering additional elements for adjunct faculty. The review team learned that the provider and program establish a schedule for the evaluation process but it appears that the provider and program do not regularly follow these schedules.

- Because of how the Secondary and All Grades Undergraduate and TCP programs are structured, candidates do not always benefit from the expertise of content-specific faculty and clinical supervisors. Some faculty members and clinical supervisors do not have sufficient content background to support all candidates under their supervision.

- The provider and its programs did not provide evidence that it capitalizes on the diversity of its faculty to further strengthen the programs and value diverse backgrounds and experiences.

Recommendations

- Continue the current efforts to recruit and hire full-time faculty who are of high quality and reflective of the diversity of Rhode Island. Develop a working group including program faculty, staff, leaders, and partners to address the lack of diversity among adjunct faculty. Charge this group to identify causes, strategies, and processes, to make the adjunct faculty reflective of the diversity of Rhode Island. Implement the recommendations from this group.

- Create a post-tenure evaluation process that includes observation of practice and other measures to ensure all faculty remain current and of high quality. Expand this process to all adjunct faculty.

- Require and monitor all programs to implement the scheduled evaluation processes according to established schedules and to generate the expected artifacts and documentation.

- Work with program faculty and partners to capitalize on faculty diversity to demonstrate a provider-wide commitment to diversity and the value of diverse backgrounds and experiences.

5.6 Other Resources	Approaching Expectations
The provider reported that it generally has sufficient resources to operate quality programs.	

- The provider reported that it generally has the resources necessary to operate quality programs. It reported that the education programs are well-supported by the institution referencing full-time directors of field placement and assessment, administrative staff and graduate assessments, as well as transportation to field sites.

- As identified in 5.1, the provider and its programs do not have a data management system and recognize that their ability to collect and manage data is limited as a result. As also reported in 5.1, the provider may need additional staff to support, manage, and coordinate a systematic data collection system. Several programs report that they do not have sufficient instructional technology available that they can use to instruct and have candidates practice with during course-based learning.

- The review team's primary concern, and why the review team considered a Does Not Meet Expectation rating for this indicator, is twofold: the limited authority of the Dean of Professional Studies as a resource to drive program evaluation and improvement, and the current allocation of resources. Since some programs reside within different schools and departments, and since leaders of some programs do not report to the Dean, there is no clear hierarchical structure that allows the Dean or any singular entity to drive change across all programs. Absent such a structure, programs operate independently which can impede comprehensive, systematic, and accountable improvement processes.

- The review team's concern regarding resource allocation results from the delivery model of the teacher programs compared to the Building Administrator and Support Professional programs. The provider staffs teacher programs with full-time faculty and leaders and the Building Administrator and Support Professional programs with part-time leaders and faculty, many of whom work far greater than their contracted amount. However, as is evident from this report, the Building Administrator and Support Professional programs out-perform the teacher programs in many areas, despite the lower financial and human resources available for these programs.

Recommendations

- Work with the university to secure a data collection and management system sufficient to meet the needs of the programs and their data analysis and reporting responsibilities. Work with the university to secure the necessary staff and training to effectively implement and integrate the date collection and management system across all programs.

- Work with individual programs to identify and fill any gaps or limitations in available instructional technology or other resources to best support candidate learning.

- Work with university, department, and program leadership to review the current structure for all of the education programs at Providence College. Identify limitations to effective, coherent, and results-driven leadership inherent in the current process. Develop and implement a process or structure that addresses these limitations and ensures that provider leadership has the full authority to direct and lead program implementation and improvement across all programs.

- Review the current structure of faculty and leadership assignment for the education programs. Examine if the current alignment of full-time and part-time faculty across programs is the most appropriate and effective use of fiscal and personnel resources.

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, families, and the community.

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

STANDARD TWO: CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE

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

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

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

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

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

STANDARD THREE: CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STANDARD FOUR: PROGRAM IMPACT

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

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

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

STANDARD FIVE: PROGRAM QUALITY AND IMPROVEMENT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 PK-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