



Guidance for Preparing Louisiana Provider Self-Assessment

In preparing for the on-site review, TPI-US asks the provider to put together a four to five page document which evaluates approved traditional and alternate pathways against the four domains in the TPI-US Louisiana On-Site Review Framework. This narrative document will help the review team to understand the provider's analysis of each pathway's strengths and areas for improvement, the evidence the provider uses in coming to these self-assessment judgments, and any improvement steps that may be underway.

Identify the structure of teacher preparation programming provided at your institution. Include all approved undergraduate and alternate pathway(s), associated programs (certification areas), and their governance structure within your institution. For university providers, if other colleges are involved in educator preparation for pathway(s)/program(s), note this within the structure provided. (Organizational chart, list, or other graphic organizer format may be used for this section.)

For providers who offer more than one pathway (i.e., traditional undergraduate, Master of Arts in Teaching, Practitioner Teacher, Certification-only), this report may be completed

- 1. cumulatively for all operating pathways OR*
- 2. singly for each approved pathway.*

Identify the pathway(s) and associated program(s) included in this report. Optional: Provide description of organizational structure, context, and/or unique characteristics for the pathway(s) and program(s) included in this report.

DOMAIN 1: Quality of Selection

Context and Rationale: This domain addresses the provider’s responsibility to select candidates that show potential and/or fit for the teaching profession. This can be demonstrated in a variety of ways including standardized tests, pre-admission GPA, auditions, interviews, etc.

1. **Strengths:** Please describe each pathway’s strengths in selecting candidates for admission, making reference to Indicator 1.1 in the *Louisiana Teacher Preparation On-Site Review Handbook*. In discussing these Selection strengths, we ask that you:
 - identify critical distinctions between selection into each pathway
 - briefly explain the evidence used for this self-assessment and
 - point to or identify any links to documents or other evidence¹ about selection strengths that will be made available to the review team;

There is no need for a detailed discussion of this evidence here as long as the team can access this evidence during the review.

2. **Self-identified Areas for Improvement:** Please indicate any areas for improvement that may be needed in the quality of selection for each pathway in relation to Indicator 1.1, and give a brief explanation of the evidence used for this self-assessment. Once again, it would be helpful to identify the supporting evidence that the team will be able to review on site.

3. **Current Action Steps:** If a pathway has identified one or more areas for improvement above for Selection, please tell us what actions are currently underway to address them and the impact these actions are having or are likely to have on improvement.

¹ Evidence used in this domain is listed in the preparation checklist on page 23 of the handbook.

DOMAIN 2: Quality of Content Knowledge and Teaching Methods

Context and Rationale: This domain focuses on how well the provider, within each pathway, ensures teacher candidates acquire content knowledge and key teaching methods and skills needed to be an effective educator. Review focuses on coursework and related experiences offered by the provider to develop the content knowledge and teaching skills of teacher candidates and the impact these bring to improving student learning. Multiple sources of evidence are used to make this judgment; one of these sources is direct observation of teacher candidates so that the review team understand how successfully coursework and related program content convey key content knowledge and teaching methods to all teacher candidates in the inspected program.

1. **Strengths:** Please describe each pathway's strengths in Content Knowledge and Teaching Methods, making reference to Indicators 2.1 – 2.3 in the *Louisiana Teacher Preparation On-Site Review Handbook*. In discussing these strengths, we ask that you briefly explain the evidence² used for this self-assessment and point to any documents or other evidence about strengths that will be made available to the on-site review team; there is no need for a detailed discussion of this evidence here as long as the team can access this evidence during the on-site review.

2. **Self-identified Areas for Improvement:** Please indicate any areas for improvement that may be needed in the quality of Content Knowledge and Teaching Methods in relation to Indicators 2.1-2.3, and give a brief explanation of the evidence used for this self-assessment. Once again, it would be helpful to identify the supporting evidence that the team will be able to review on site.

3. **Current Action Steps:** If the provider has identified one or more areas for improvement above for Content Knowledge and Teaching Methods, please tell us what actions are currently underway to address them and the impact these actions are having or are likely to have on improvement.

² Evidence used in this domain is listed in the preparation checklist on page 27 of the handbook.

DOMAIN 3: Clinical Placement, Feedback, and Candidate Performance

Context/ Rationale: The final clinical experience (one-year residency) offers candidates the opportunity to apply the knowledge acquired through program coursework, prior field experiences, and other activities. As such, it is essential that all candidates receive high-quality supervision and feedback. While candidate performance during observation is a central piece of evidence for this domain, the review team is **not evaluating teacher candidates** through these observations: team members are judging the teaching and learning that results from the program’s efforts to develop the knowledge and teaching skills of all candidates, **not the teacher candidate who is observed by the review team**. Evidence is gathered and judgments made within the wider goal of understanding program results and how these results are achieved. While the final clinical experience is central to the domain, the review team will include evidence on earlier clinical experiences where appropriate.

1. **Strengths:** Please describe each pathway’s strengths in Clinical Practice, Feedback, and Candidate Performance making reference to Indicators 3.1 – 3.3 in the *Louisiana Teacher Preparation On-Site Review Handbook*. In discussing these strengths, we ask that you briefly explain the evidence³ used for this self-assessment and point to any documents or other evidence about strengths that will be made available to the review team; there is no need for a detailed discussion of this evidence here as long as the team can access this evidence during the on-site visit.

2. **Self-identified Areas for Improvement:** Please indicate any areas for improvement that may be needed in the quality of Clinical Practice, Feedback, and Candidate Performance in relation to Indicators 3.1-3.3, and give a brief explanation of the evidence used for this self-assessment. Once again, it would be helpful to identify the supporting evidence that the team will be able to review on site.

3. **Current Action Steps:** If the provider has identified one or more areas for improvement above for these components of the program, please tell us what actions are currently underway to address them and the impact these actions are having or are likely to have on improvement.

³ Evidence used in this domain is listed in the preparation checklist on page 36 of the handbook.

DOMAIN 4: Quality of Program Performance Management

Rationale/ Context: This domain examines the extent of and process by which provider leadership—*at all levels*—utilize data to continually improve the quality of teacher preparation and outcomes for all teacher candidates. This quality assurance extends from using multiple sources of information to monitor the performance of individual candidates and cohorts of candidates, and taking steps to improve the pathway(s) on the basis of this information, to monitoring the quality of course content and teaching as well as attention to coursework-clinical connections and faculty knowledge about how well teacher candidates are able to apply what they are learning. On-site review also focuses on the quality and accuracy of data used by the provider to assess its own performance, in particular whether observation score data collected and reported by program supervisors is an accurate reflection of observed candidate practice and shows developing skills across time through successive observations.

1. **Strengths:** Please describe each pathway’s strengths in Program Performance Management making reference to Indicator 4.1 in the *Louisiana Teacher Preparation On-Site Review Handbook*. In discussing these strengths, we ask that you briefly explain the evidence⁴ used for this self-assessment and point to any documents or other evidence about strengths that will be made available to the review team; there is no need for a detailed discussion of this evidence here as long as the team can access this evidence during the on-site review.

2. **Self-identified Areas for Improvement:** Please discuss any areas for improvement that may be needed in the quality of Program Performance Management in relation to Indicator 4.1, and give a brief explanation of the evidence used for this self-assessment. Once again, it would be helpful to identify the supporting evidence that the team will be able to review on site.

3. **Current Action Steps:** If the provider has identified one or more areas for improvement for Program Performance Management, please tell us what actions are currently underway to address them.

Please note that the working definition of program management and leadership for on-site review means that responsibility for program quality and ongoing improvement is not solely in the hands of those in formal leadership positions (such as deans, department chairs, or managers in areas like clinical supervision). Faculty and staff responsibility for program quality and ongoing improvement goes beyond their individual courses and other program activities to encompass the program as a whole.

⁴ Evidence used in this domain is listed in the preparation checklist on page 43 of the handbook.