Louisiana Teacher Preparation On-Site Review Handbook

[Revised: June 2018]

This handbook sets out the protocols and evaluation framework for the teacher preparation on-site reviews from fall 2018 through spring 2020.

It provides instructions and guidance for teams conducting on-site reviews of teacher preparation programs and for the programs themselves. It sets out what on-site review teams will do and what programs can expect, and provides guidance for how review team members will make their judgments on the domains.

© 2018. Teacher Prep Inspection-US, Inc. All rights reserved.

In furtherance of its charitable purposes, Teacher Prep Inspection-US, Inc. (TPI-US) asserts full intellectual property rights to this Teacher Preparation On-site Review Handbook and to any work conducted by TPI-US through use of this Handbook. This includes the TPI-US process of teacher preparation on-site reviews and related records, reports, documents, products and other material sent in conjunction with this process.

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or using any information storage and retrieval system without permission in writing by Teacher Prep Inspection-US, Inc.

Table of Contents

Introduction 4
What is the purpose of TPI-US and on-site review? 4
How does on-site review promote improvement? 4
What are the principles of teacher preparation review? 5
On-site review handbook 6

Part 1. Instructions and guidance for programs 7
Before the on-site review visit 7
Provider planning and preparation 7
Documents the program should provide (two-three weeks prior to on-site review) 7
Documents the provider should provide (onsite) 8
Arranging the schedule 9
During the on-site review visit 10
Provider role and responsibilities 10
Final meeting with provider leadership 10
Notes on on-site review activities 10
The provider's engagement with review team members 11
After the on-site review visit 12
The final written report 12
Quality assurance and complaints 12
How are on-site reviews quality assured? 12

Part 2. Instructions and guidance for review team members 14
Before the on-site review 14
Review team members' planning and preparation 14
During the on-site review 14
Gathering and recording evidence 14
Observations of teaching and training 15
The use of data in on-site review 16
Meetings with stakeholders 17
Engaging with the provider's representative and leaders 17
Daily team meetings during the on-site review 18
Reaching final judgments 18
Providing feedback to the provider 18
After the on-site review 19
The on-site review report 19
The code of conduct for review team members 19

Part 3. The evaluation framework, criteria and score descriptors 21
Introduction 21
Judging the quality of a provider 21

Louisiana On-Site Review Framework 22

Glossary of Terms 49

Louisiana On-Site Review Glossary of Terms 57

Louisiana Stakeholder Interview Question Guide 59

Introduction

What is the purpose of TPI-US and on-site review?

1. TPI-US seeks to improve student learning through improving teacher preparation. On-site reviews provide states and programs with detailed insights into teacher preparation quality in order to foster program improvement and ensure that all new teachers support student learning from day one. TPI-US accomplishes this by working with state policymakers and with preparation program leaders and faculty to organize and conduct on-site review visits at university-based and other teacher education programs throughout the United States.

2. Reviews of teacher preparation programs perform three primary functions. They:

   - provide information to the state about the quality of training teacher candidates;
   - promote the improvement of individual programs through clear feedback against the evaluation framework in this handbook; and
   - help monitor the efficacy of program improvement efforts.

How does on-site review promote improvement?

3. On-site review can drive and support improvement in teacher preparation in a number of ways. It will support and promote a culture of continuous improvement by:

   - setting a high standard of performance and effectiveness by measuring teacher preparation against a clear, consistent evaluation framework based on fundamental principles of program quality;
   - securing robust and rigorous evidence for all aspects of the evaluation framework in order to provide clear feedback to the program, state, and about the quality of key aspects of teacher preparation programs;
   - clearly identifying strengths and areas for improvement;
   - providing reliable information and the impetus to act where improvement is needed;
   - recommending specific priorities for improvement for the teacher preparation program;
   - explaining and discussing on-site review findings with the leaders of the program; and
   - promoting rigor in the way that programs can evaluate their own performance, thereby enhancing their capacity to improve.

What are the principles of teacher preparation review?

4. Teacher preparation on-site reviews will:

- support and promote improvement by means noted above;
- Focus on:
  - taking account of stakeholders' views, including teacher candidates, program graduates, school principals and teachers, and program leaders and faculty, to inform judgments and the outcomes of on-site review visits;
  - triangulating evidence to ensure judgments capture typical aspects of the program across multiple pieces of relevant evidence; and
  - encouraging programs to take account of the needs of teacher candidates, schools, and the students served by both.
- Be transparent and consistent by:
  - making clear, evidence-based judgments;
  - reviewing and reporting with integrity; and
  - inviting program representatives to daily and final team meetings.
- Be accountable by:
  - reporting the review findings without fear or favor; and
  - writing clear, accurate, timely reports that provide programs and state agencies with an authoritative, independent assessment of the quality of preparation provided by the teacher preparation program.
- Communication with teacher preparation programs will:
  - provide high-quality and timely communication and feedback with program leaders throughout the on-site review visit;
  - make use, as far as possible, of the existing data, documentation and systems of the reviewed program and avoid placing unnecessary burdens on them; and
  - take account of the self-evaluation report provided by the program to seek particular evidence and alignment against the on-site review evaluation framework.

On-site review handbook

5. The remainder of this handbook is in three parts:

   - Part 1: Instructions and guidance for programs on preparation for and conduct of teacher preparation on-site review visits.
   - Part 2: Instructions and guidance for on-site review team members on preparation for and conduct of teacher preparation on-site review visits.
   - Part 3: Evaluation framework with criteria and score descriptors to guide review team members in judging the quality of training provided by the teacher preparation programs they inspect, and indicating the main types of evidence they are likely to collect and analyze. A glossary of key definitions to further provide clarity on key aspects of teaching and learning the on-site review will examine.

Part 1. Instructions and guidance for programs

Before the on-site review visit

Provider planning and preparation

6. Approximately 12 weeks prior to the team arriving, the lead review team member and a TPI-US Logistics Agent will provide a preparation At-A-Glance document to communicate with the provider about materials needed in advance of the visit, materials and activities needed when on site, and general logistics to help ensure smooth running of the on-site review process.

7. After the preparation At-A-Glance document is provided, the logistic agent makes his/her initial telephone call to the provider representative,[1] and he/she will provide an overview of the review process and ask for

   - information about the organization of the teacher preparation programs, including key staff names and responsibilities;
   - information about specific school placements of teacher candidates, recruitment and selection procedures and events taking place **during** the on-site review visit week;
   - background information that can be made available about teacher candidates including qualifications, relevant prior experience and their current level of performance;
   - information about program completers teaching in schools that currently have teacher candidates on placement or in other local schools;
   - details of school placements including socio-economic data, academic performance, and other key characteristics (addresses and key contact details);
   - information about expected faculty or staff availability during visit and other practical issues;
   - (if relevant to the particular on-site review visit) information about whether there are reasons for not being able to observe some teacher candidates or training sessions; and
   - location for an on-campus place where the review team can meet.

Documents the program should provide (two-three weeks prior to on-site review)

8. Self-Assessment: A brief document in which the program evaluates itself against the four domain criteria in the evaluation framework (part 3 of this handbook). TPI-US provides a template with further guidance on how to complete this brief document. Based on number

[1] The teacher preparation provider nominates the provider representative. She/he plays an important role in collaborating with the review team lead before and during the on-site visit. There will be ongoing professional dialogue with the provider representative about the context of the providers' work and the emerging findings before and during the on-site review.

of pathways (e.g., undergraduate, MAT) offered by a provider, leadership may choose to submit one document per pathway or one document inclusive of all pathways.

9. Prior to the on-site review, the team will need access to the following documents:

- ☐ Pathway requirements and/or typical degree plan or course catalog/prescription for each program to be reviewed
- ☐ Application for admission to the pathway/description of pathway selection process
- ☐ Handbook (or equivalent) for
  - Teacher candidates
  - Mentor Teachers
  - Program Supervisors
- ☐ Observation and feedback instrument(s) used by the provider for observation of teacher candidates
- ☐ Residency observation data on all required observations for most recent cohort
- ☐ Current cohort admissions data (i.e. GPA, SAT and/ or ACT data for ALL of a recent cohort)
- ☐ Syllabi for all courses that will be observed by the review team
- ☐ Syllabi for other key required courses whether or not observed during the visit:
  - ALL reading/ literacy courses (elementary and secondary)
  - ALL Math and/or math methods courses (elementary)
  - Other content methods courses (elementary)
  - Content area methods courses (secondary)
  - Classroom Management courses
  - Assessment courses

Documents the provider should provide (onsite)

10. At the beginning of the on-site review, the team will need access to a single, hard copy of each document above and also the following additional documents. These should be available to the review team in the meeting room that the provider sets aside for their work[2]:

- ☐ Completed observation and evaluation forms for all teacher candidates the team will observe
- ☐ Observation and evaluation data for recent cohort (if available—this may be via LiveText, etc.)
- ☐ Employer and/ or completer survey data (if available)
- ☐ Schedule of required courses meeting at time of on-site review
- ☐ Demographic data on candidates and local PK-12 students and teachers.

[2] Documents with personal information may be redacted or provided to the team with the understanding information will not be removed from the team room.

Arranging the schedule

11. The on-site review should include as many teacher candidate (resident) observations as possible. While the on-site review team size varies based on provider programming and enrollment, four review team members should be possible to see 12-15 residents. When arranging the schedule please do the following:

- ☐ Build in driving time to partner schools (cluster PK-12 based visit activities as much as possible).
- ☐ Provide review team members with the lesson plan developed by the teacher candidate (it can be provided at the beginning of the lesson).
- ☐ Schedule program supervisor and/or mentor teacher observations of teacher candidates at the same time they are observed by review team members as often as possible. Review team members need to co-observe the lesson then observe the feedback the program supervisor or mentor teacher provides following the lesson.
- ☐ Whenever possible, review team members would like to talk briefly with the candidate, classroom mentor teacher and/or the program supervisor about the lesson and feedback.

12. To support thorough triangulation of evidence, please also arrange the following at the PK- 12 partner schools whenever possible:

- ☐ Brief interviews[3] with recent program completers who have been employed as teachers in these schools. This can take the form of individual conversations or a 15-30 minute focus group with as many recent completers as are available. This can happen at the time of the school visit or on the provider campus.
- ☐ Interviews with principals and/or assistant principals to ask about their experience with completers hired to teach, and more generally with the program.
- ☐ Short interviews with school district HR directors to ask about their experience hiring and placing program completers and how their district works with program. These interviews can be in person or by telephone.
- ☐ Interviews or focus groups with program supervisors and/or classroom mentor teachers.

13. The on-site review includes gathering evidence about the content knowledge and teaching methods taught by program faculty. Review team members will observe required courses that are meeting during the review visit, whether they meet on campus or in a partner school or other location. Please ensure the team is scheduled to observe as many of the following as possible:

- ☐ Early reading/literacy courses (elementary)
- ☐ Mathematics content and methods courses (elementary)

---

[3] A Stakeholder Interview Question Guide is included as appendix to this document. The questions prompts are meant to serve as an initial list of potential questions to ask stakeholders. It is by no means exhaustive and on-site review teams must ensure that they ask questions that are appropriate and tailored to the specific context of each on-site review visit.

- ☐ Other content methods courses (elementary)
- ☐ Content area methods courses (secondary)
- ☐ Classroom management courses
- ☐ Assessment courses

14. Review team members also welcome the opportunity to talk with individual faculty or groups of program faculty about teaching and learning in the program.

15. Please also consider the following miscellaneous schedule needs:

- ☐ The team needs 30 minutes of preparation prior to the daily team meeting.
- ☐ The team needs approximately two hours of prep on the final day prior to the oral debrief.
- ☐ The team may adjust the schedule (in collaboration with the provider representative) to properly match team member expertise to given activities.

During the on-site review visit

Provider role and responsibilities

16. Each provider participating in an on-site review designates a provider representative to work directly with the logistics agent and lead team member prior to and throughout the visit. The provider representative is responsible for:

- ☐ Working with the logistics agent to organize the visit activities;
- ☐ Attending the daily review team meetings (held at the end of each visit day) in which the team members review what has been learned that day and discuss additional evidence needed for each of the four domains. ***As part of the commitment to transparency, the provider representative attends these meetings as an observer and will have the opportunity to provide clarification and additional evidence as needed.***

Final meeting with provider leadership

17. On the final afternoon (typically early Friday afternoon) the review team meets with the provider leadership (typically the dean/director, associate dean(s)/director(s), relevant department chairs and the provider representative) to give an oral report on the review findings. Please arrange a space to accommodate this meeting (typically 30-60 minutes).

Notes on on-site review activities

18. After receiving the information requested from the teacher preparation provider, the logistics agent will coordinate with the provider representative to select a sample of teacher candidates to observe teaching. Review team members will also try to arrange meetings with program completers who have recently completed the programs. Review team members will try to maximize the time available by visiting a number of teacher candidates and completers based in the same schools. The logistics agent must

check that the schools are not due to be visited as part of any other review process or have other significant scheduling conflicts such as state testing (so as not to burden the school or place unreasonable demands on their time).

19. The logistics agent will provide a form letter for each school that will be visited as part of the review visit for the provider to use. This communication will explain that a review team member will visit the school as part of the review of the teacher preparation provider. The logistics agent will work with the provider to identify the nature and timing of review visit activities to be undertaken in schools. These activities are likely to include observations of teacher candidates, discussions with candidates and program completers employed as teachers in the visited school, program supervisors of residents and mentor teachers, and time to read candidate files (where agreed with the candidate/school). Review team members would also like to spend time talking to the school Principal or AP about the programs (wherever possible).

20. The logistics agent will identify any provider-based class sessions (such as reading courses or teaching methods courses) and/or other events that they wish to observe, as well as any discussions with program faculty that may need to be arranged. Meetings may include discussions with individual faculty, meetings with the director or chair of a pathway or program(s), or with the provider's assessment coordinator. The lead review team member will inform the provider of these requests promptly to enable them to make the necessary practical arrangements.

21. The provider will confirm the visit schedule in discussion with the logistics agent and lead review team member and will set out the practical arrangements for the review team, including, for example, rooms, car parking and refreshments. Review teams are responsible for their travel to the campus, for lodging and meals during the visit, and for travel to schools or other locations during a visit. Provider staff typically do not accompany review team members for these activities.

The provider's engagement with review team members

22. Similar to review team members' own code of conduct (see Part 2), we would expect providers to contribute to an effective and accurate review by ensuring that team members can conduct their reviews in an open and honest way, and evaluate the programs objectively. We would ask that providers:

- apply their own codes of conduct in their dealings with review team members;
- enable team members to conduct their reviews in a professional manner;
- enable team members to evaluate the programs objectively against the evaluation framework;
- provide evidence that will enable review team members to report honestly, fairly and reliably about the programs;
- coordinate with review team members to minimize disruption, stress and red tape;

- ensure that the health and safety of review team members is not put at risk while they are on the provider's and/or school's premises;
- maintain a purposeful dialogue with review team members;
- ensure that members of faculty are aware that their content sessions should not be changed because review team members are present;
- draw any concerns about the review to the attention of the lead team member promptly and in a suitable manner;
- remain focused and engaged while observing team meetings, by for example, not taking phone calls or sending text messages; and
- understand the need for team members to observe teaching practice and talk to those they observe without the presence of a provider representative.

After the on-site review visit

The final written report

23. Following the on-site review visit, the lead team member will write a report with the main findings of the review. The findings will be consistent with those given verbally to the provider at the end of the on-site visit.

24. The lead review team member will forward a draft report to the provider for a factual accuracy check within approximately 21 working days of the end of the on-site review. The provider will have five working days to respond. The lead team member will respond to any provider comments about factual accuracy.[4]

25. The program will receive the final report (via e-mail attachment) within approximately 30 working days of the end of the on-site review visit.

Quality assurance and complaints

How are on-site reviews quality assured?

26. Responsibility for assuring the quality of the on-site review and the subsequent report lies with the lead team member and any attending TPI-US quality assurance representative. The lead team member is expected to set clear expectations for the review team and ensure that those expectations are consistently met. The lead team member must ensure that all

[4] In the unlikely circumstances where there is a score change or the text of a report has been subject to significant amendments made after the provider has completed its factual accuracy check, the lead team member will talk this through with the provider's representative.

judgments are supported by evidence and that the way in which the review is conducted meets the expected standard.

27. Following each on-site review, the team lead and, when present, TPI-US quality assurance representative will assess each team members' performance and provide written feedback. Each team member also self-assesses and provides the lead with feedback.

28. The provider will be invited to take part in a post-review survey so that provider leaders' views about the quality of the review can be obtained. This will contribute to the continued development of the on-site review process.

29. At regular intervals throughout the year, TPI-US also engages in a rigorous review of team performance data from the reviews conducted to date. This process is called "InStat," and the purpose is to foster continuous improvement for all those engaged in on-site review on behalf of TPI-US and for the organization itself.

Part 2. Instructions and guidance for review team members

Before the on-site review

Review team members' planning and preparation

30. The lead team member must prepare for the on-site visit by gaining a broad overview of the teacher preparation provider's recent performance. Analysis will include:

    - the last accreditation report and related data (where available and relevant);
    - available state data (where present and relevant);
    - evidence from other external evaluations;
    - the provider's self-evaluation of effectiveness against the Onsite Review Handbook evaluation framework; and
    - any information available on the teacher preparation provider's website.

31. The lead review team member will prepare and distribute a pre-visit briefing to the review team. The pre-visit briefing materials are for the team but key evidence gathering trails will be shared with the provider representative early in the on-site review process. The pre-visit briefing materials, for review team members, will include:

    - essential factual information about the teacher preparation provider and the timing of the visit relative to provider programming;
    - a brief summary of the pre-visit information and initial trails for focused evidence gathering; and
    - a clear indication of individual team members' roles and responsibilities.

32. It is essential that all team members spend time reading and assimilating the information contained in these materials so that they arrive well prepared for the review visit.

33. Prior to each visit, review team members will also participate in a "Pre-Visit Briefing Call" to discuss the evaluation framework and on-site review process.

34. Review team members must ensure they are fully ready to contribute robust and compelling evidence at team meetings and to provide feedback to provider representatives.

During the on-site review

Gathering and recording evidence

35. The lead review team member must deploy team members effectively to contribute to the thorough evaluation of the four key domains.

36. Team members must **triangulate** their evidence to determine the typicality of a given observation. This includes investigating and recording an evidence trail from several sources.

37. Team members must spend as much time as possible within the schedule gathering first- hand evidence. This includes observations of teacher candidates and *(wherever possible)* provider-based training delivered by program faculty.

38. Meetings with program completers employed as teachers should be conducted if this is possible and can be facilitated with schools. Review team members must compare their observations of teacher candidates with records of performance and other observations; talk to teacher candidates and program completers about the provider and how well it has prepared them; gauge candidate and completer understanding and engagement in their own professional development; and seek their views about their clinical experiences during enrollment.

39. Review team members must record evidence clearly and legibly on evidence forms ("EFs"), ensuring that all relevant sections of the form are completed for all evidence-gathering activities. Summary evaluation forms are used for recording analyses of data and the compilation of evidence that underpins key judgments, and for summarizing the main points of discussion when providing feedback to senior provider leaders.

40. Evidence forms are the main record of evidence that has been considered in the on-site review and will be scrutinized for quality assurance.

Observations of teaching and training

41. IMPORTANT NOTE: The key purpose of teacher candidate observations is to establish the impact of their teaching on students' learning and progress in order to evaluate the effectiveness by which the provider prepares its teacher candidates. Review team members are **NOT evaluating the teacher candidates** through these observations. The team will use evidence from these observations to identify strengths as well as any ways in which teacher training can be improved.

42. Observations and discussions with teacher candidates and/or mentor/supervising teachers or program supervisors must provide robust evidence to enable review team members to:

    - judge the accuracy of the teacher preparation provider's assessment of teacher candidates and of its self-evaluation;
    - thoroughly investigate issues from the pre-visit analysis;
    - gather evidence on how well teacher candidates teach and how well individual candidates and groups of candidates are prepared to be successful first-year teachers in public and approved non-public schools of the state; and

- devise detailed and specific judgments on provider strengths as well as any relevant recommendations on how to improve teacher candidates' teaching and the quality of training and feedback they receive.

43. The lead review team member will request that some or all teaching observations be jointly carried out with mentor teachers and/or program supervisors. Review team members will review any written lesson plan for lessons they observe *(where offered)*. They would also ideally review the following:

    - other teaching-related documents and resources (e.g. worksheets);
    - candidate self-evaluations and/or reflective journals;
    - records of feedback provided by mentor teachers and program supervisors, meetings with mentor teachers and program supervisors, and reviews of teacher candidates' performance goals;
    - any academic work that the provider is requiring candidates to undertake when on clinical placements; and
    - feedback and discussion with teacher candidates, former candidates, program supervisors and mentor/cooperating teachers.

44. The quality and professionalism of review team members' interaction with teacher candidates, program completers employed as teachers, program supervisors, and mentor/cooperating teachers is essential to the on-site review process – a process that is valued for the insights it provides – and is integral to the code of practice.

45. Review team members should be aware of the effect of their presence in lessons and in training sessions.

46. Review team members should only offer feedback to the teacher candidates if agreed by the provider leadership and the teacher candidate.

47. Observations about teaching and training sessions will identify the quality of teaching or training and how it could be improved. The observation will also identify main strengths and areas for improvement of the activity observed and give judgments in the context of the observation, focusing on:

    - students' learning and the teacher candidate's contribution to this – OR –
    - teacher candidate development and the faculty member's contribution to candidate development

The use of data in on-site review

48. On-site review incorporates a range of data about the provider's performance, especially the most recent assessment and tracking data on teacher candidate progress (where available)

as well as outcomes data for one or more recent cohorts of program completers and trends over time.

49. The data, including that provided by the provider, will be used to:

- check the accuracy of the provider's assessment of teacher candidates' ability to improve student learning;
- understand how the provider monitors and take steps to improve the quality of coursework and teaching;
- check the ways in which provider leadership and faculty use a wide variety of information to understand candidate and cohort performance and make improvements to programs; and
- assess how the provider monitors the quality of data collected to monitor its own performance.

Meetings with stakeholders

50. Review team members may conduct meetings or hold telephone discussions with individuals or small groups of:

- teacher candidates
- program completers employed as teachers
- program faculty who teach courses
- program supervisors
- mentor/cooperating teachers
- leaders within programs – e.g. those responsible for a subject area such as math or reading
- other stakeholders, including principals and district administrators.

Engaging with the provider's representative and leaders

51. On-site review has the strongest impact on improvement when the program understands the evidence and findings that have led to the judgments and recommendations for improvement. Lead team members will invite at least one provider representative to act as an observer at the formal daily and final on-site review visit team meetings. This will ensure that they:

- are kept up-to-date with how the review visit is proceeding;
- understand how the review team reaches its judgments;
- have opportunities to clarify how evidence is used to reach judgments; and
- are given the opportunity to present additional evidence.

52. The lead team member should meet with the provider's representative during the review visit to:

- provide an update on emerging issues and to enable the provider to provide any further relevant evidence;
- allow the provider's representative to raise any concerns, including those related to the conduct of the review visit or the conduct of individual review team members; and
- alert the provider's representative to any serious concerns that may lead to the program being judged inadequate in any of the four key domains.

53. The notes of any key points of discussions with the provider will be recorded on an evidence form.

Daily team meetings during the on-site review

54. The on-site review team will:

- meet briefly at the end of each day[5] to discuss emerging findings in a 45-60 minute team meeting; at least one provider representative will observe; and
- record the outcomes of all team meetings on daily summary evidence forms.

Reaching final judgments

55. Towards the end of the on-site review visit, the team will hold a final team meeting to consider all the evidence available and make its final judgments. The lead team member is responsible for ensuring that the review team collectively agrees on the judgments about the program, include reference to the score descriptors in the evaluation framework (part 3 of this handbook), and that judgments are supported convincingly by evidence. Team members identify the strengths and areas for improvement of the program and what it must do to improve. Final scores will be recorded and key points for feedback will be identified as the meeting progresses.

Providing feedback to the provider

56. Before leaving, the lead review team member must ensure that the leader responsible for the provider is clear about:

- the scores awarded for each domain
- the main findings of the on-site review
- the recommendations for improvement

[5] Where this is not possible, team members will discuss their findings by telephone with the lead team member, who will discuss these with the review team and in the presence of the provider's representative.

- the post-review survey

57. In the final meeting with provider leadership, the lead team member should explain to those present that the purpose of the oral feedback is to provide the main findings from the on-site review and to set out how the provider can improve further. The lead review team member will provide an opportunity for provider leadership to seek clarification about the judgments, but discussion will be brief. The review team will complete an evidence form summarizing the key points raised at the feedback meeting.

After the on-site review

The on-site review report

58. Following the on-site review, the lead review team member will write a report about the main findings of the review. The findings will be consistent with those given verbally to the provider at the end of the on-site review.

59. The lead review team member will forward a draft of this report to the provider for a factual accuracy check within approximately 21 working days of the end of the visit. The provider will have five working days to respond. The lead team member will respond to the provider's comments about factual accuracy.[6]

    The provider will receive an electronic version of the final report within approximately 30 working days of the end of the on-site review.

The code of conduct for review team members

60. So that on-site review is productive, it is important that review team members and the provider establish and maintain an appropriate working relationship based on courtesy and professional behavior. Review team members are expected to uphold the code of conduct below.

61. Review team members are required to uphold the highest professional standards in their work and to treat everyone they encounter during on-site review fairly and with respect. These standards are assured through a code of conduct, which is set out below.

[6] In the unlikely circumstances where there is a score change or the text of a report has been subject to significant amendments made after the provider has completed its factual accuracy check, the lead team member will talk this through with the provider's representative.

Review team members should:

- evaluate objectively, be impartial and inspect without fear or favor;
- evaluate programming in line with the evaluation framework and not allow personal opinions to cloud judgments;
- base all evaluations on clear and robust evidence;
- report honestly and clearly, ensuring that judgments are fair and reliable;
- carry out their work with integrity, treating all those they meet with courtesy, respect and sensitivity;
- endeavor to minimize the stress on those involved in the on-site review;
- act in the best interests and well-being of teacher candidates and students connected with the provider;
- maintain purposeful and productive dialogue with those being reviewed, and communicate judgments clearly and frankly;
- respect the confidentiality of information, particularly about individuals and their work;
- not discuss outcomes of the on-site review with anyone outside of the team;
- respond appropriately to reasonable requests;
- respond to concerns or complaints raised by the provider as soon as is reasonably possible;
- ensure that all meetings are recorded on evidence forms, including the pre-visit meeting with the provider; and
- take prompt and appropriate action on any child welfare or health and safety issues.

Part 3. The evaluation framework, criteria and score descriptors

Introduction

62. The framework sets out criteria and score descriptors to guide review team members when judging the quality of the programming being reviewed. The framework indicates the main types of evidence review team members are expected to collect and analyze as well as essential questions being answered. This guidance is not exhaustive and must be considered in the wider context of provider quality.

63. The on-site review evaluation framework is designed to apply to the specific context of each pathway and its applicable programs being reviewed. Review team members will use the evaluation framework in conjunction with the instructions and guidance in part 2 of this handbook.

Judging the quality of a provider

64. The on-site review evaluation framework will evaluate four key domains:

    1. Quality of Selection
    2. Quality of Content Knowledge and Teaching Methods
    3. Quality of Clinical Placement, Feedback and Candidate Performance
    4. Quality of Program Performance Management

65. In making these judgments, review team members will analyze the evidence available and decide which score descriptor provides the best fit. Review team members will check all the criteria for inadequate before considering scores at a higher level. When evidence indicates that any of the criteria for inadequate applies, then that aspect of the provider's work is likely to be scored inadequate.

66. For each of the four key domains, review team members will use the following scale:

    - score 4: strong
    - score 3: good
    - score 2: needs improvement
    - score 1: inadequate

In making all their judgments, review team members must draw on all the available evidence, triangulate evidence to determine typicality, and follow the guidance in this handbook, particularly the score descriptors in the framework.

Louisiana On-Site Review Framework

© 2018. Teacher Prep Inspection-US, Inc. All rights reserved.

In furtherance of its charitable purposes, Teacher Prep Inspection-US, Inc. (TPI-US) asserts full intellectual property rights to this Teacher Preparation On-Site Review Framework and to any work conducted by TPI-US through use of this Framework. This includes the TPI-US process of teacher preparation program on-site reviews and related records, reports, documents, products and other material sent in conjunction with this process.

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or using any information storage and retrieval system without permission in writing by Teacher Prep Inspection-US, Inc.

Notes on how domain scores are determined:

1. On-site review team members will analyze available evidence and will check all the criteria for inadequate before considering higher domain scores.
2. The team will use a preponderance of evidence within each domain to determine the score.
3. The guidance provided by this framework is not exhaustive and must be considered in the wider context of program quality.
4. Constraining criteria are indicated where relevant (i.e. the overall domain score can NOT be good or better if criteria X is not at least Good).
5. Likely sources of evidence are meant to serve as initial guidance and are not considered exhaustive.
6. On-site review teams will triangulate evidence in order to ensure scores capture typical aspects of the pathways and associated programs offered by the provider. Triangulation allows review team members to trace connections that might exist between a course and other sources of evidence as well as how similar pieces of evidence come to bear on more than one domain.
    a. For example: An onsite review team member will connect evidence from observing a program's early literacy course with evidence from observing candidates teaching reading with comments program completers, principals and faculty make about the quality of reading instruction. These three pieces of evidence could then inform scores in Domains 2 (Content Knowledge and Teaching Methods), 3 (Clinical Placement, Feedback, and Candidate Performance) and possibly even 4 (Program Performance Management).

DOMAIN 1: Quality of Selection

Context and Rationale: This domain addresses the program'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.

Essential questions being answered:

- What principles, criteria, and recruitment/selection practices drive selection of program applicants?
- What is the quality, as determined by pre-selection GPA and/or standardized test scores, of recent cohorts?
- What efforts are underway to make the program candidates and completers more representative of the student population of the schools and/or district(s) served by the program?

Likely sources of evidence for this domain:

- Data on pre-selection GPA of all candidates in most recent cohort
- Standardized test score data (ACT, SAT, GRE) for most recent cohort
- Demographic data on current cohort, most recent completer cohort, local or state K-12 students and teacher workforce
- Handbooks or policies outlining the program's admission criteria and process
- Conversations with program staff about selection criteria and recruitment initiatives
- State agency-provided data

Indicator 1.1 – Selection				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
GPA[7]	**All students** are selected with a **GPA of 3.0 or greater**.	**At least 75%** of admitted students are selected with **a GPA of 3.0 or greater**.	**Less than 75%** of admitted students are selected with **a GPA of 3.0 or greater**.	**GPA for more than 50%** of the selected students is **below 2.5**. –OR– The program is **unable to provide data** to review team on the individual pre- selection GPA of all admitted candidates.
Standardized Tests	Teacher candidates selected for the program are **drawn from the top third** of the national college going population, as measured by appropriate standardized tests.	Teacher candidates selected for the program are **drawn from the top half** of the national college going population, as measured by appropriate standardized tests.	Teacher candidates selected for the program are **drawn from below the top half but above the bottom third** of the national college going population, as measured by appropriate standardized tests (i.e., above the 33rd and below the 50th percentiles of the standardized test national distribution of test takers)	Teacher candidates selected for the program **are drawn from the bottom third** of the national college going population. –OR– The program is **unable to provide data** to inspectors on the individual ACT/SAT scores of all admitted candidates.

[7] All programs should be able to provide inspection teams with the pre-admission grade point averages (GPA) of all admitted candidates. During the 2016-2017 pilots, the team will report on the mean and median GPA though it will not impact the numeric score for the judgment area.

Indicator 1.1 – Selection				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
Demographic Representation of enrolled candidates (may be ethnicity and/ or SES) [8]	The demographic profile of enrolled teacher candidates **makes a significant contribution, as shown by evidence that progress has been made over at least three consecutive years,** to a teacher workforce more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program.	The program has a **written plan with clear objectives and timelines** for ensuring that selection contributes to a local teacher workforce more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program. – AND- There is **evidence that progress has been made** over the past two consecutive years.	The program **does not have a written plan but seeks in other ways** to select candidates that contribute to a local teacher workforce more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program. – OR-There is **little evidence that progress has been made** on the written plan.	The program **does not produce a population** of teacher candidates that contributes to a local teacher workforce more representative of the K12 students and **has no concrete plans for becoming more representative** of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program.
Demographic Representation of program completers (may be ethnicity and/ or SES)	The demographic profile of program completers **makes a significant contribution, as shown by evidence that progress has been made over at least three consecutive years,** to a teacher workforce more representative of the student population of the schools and/ or the districts served by the	There is **evidence that progress has been made** over the past two consecutive years in producing a cohort of program completers more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program. – AND- The program or institution has a **written plan with clear**	The program **does not have a written plan but seeks in other ways** to ensure that program completers contribute to a local teacher workforce more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program. – OR-There is **little evidence that progress has been made** on the written plan.	The program **does not produce a population** of completers that contributes to a local teacher workforce more representative of the K12 students and **has no concrete plans for becoming more representative** of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program.

[8] If available: compare to districts where graduates are hired or districts where candidates are placed for clinical placement (top 10 if more than 10).

Indicator 1.1 – Selection				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
	program.	**objectives and timelines** for ensuring that a diverse cohort of selected candidates complete the program in order to contribute to a more representative local teacher workforce.		
Admission Process (e.g. audition, interview, etc.)	The program uses **multiple measures**[9] in addition to standardized test scores and pre- selection GPA to determine fit and/ or promise for teaching in its admission process and has **evidence that these measures result in effective teacher candidates.**	The program uses **some measures** in addition to standardized test scores and pre-selection GPA to determine potential for teaching in its admission process and **monitors how these measures impact candidate effectiveness.**	The program uses some **measures** in addition to standardized test scores and pre-selection GPA to determine potential for teaching in its admission process, but **does not monitor the impact** of the measures on candidate effectiveness.	The program **does not examine any potential or fit for teaching measures** beyond standardized test scores and pre-selection GPA.

[9] This may include measures beyond application and background checks such as recommendations, interviews, auditions, videos, micro-teaching, etc.

DOMAIN 2: Quality of Content Knowledge and Teaching Methods

Context and Rationale: This domain focuses on how well the program ensures teacher candidates acquire content knowledge and key teaching methods and skills needed to be an effective educator. On-site review focuses on coursework and related experiences offered by the program 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 within this domain; one of these sources is direct observation of Louisiana teacher candidates during the one-year residency so that review team members understand how successfully coursework and related program content convey key content knowledge and teaching methods to all teacher candidates in the inspected program.

Note on English Language Arts and Mathematics criteria: The specific criteria set forth in the framework are included as core, research-based components of developing P-12 students' literacy and mathematical skills. As such, reviewers will look for the specific aspects of literacy and math as outlined.

Note on online learning[10]: The online program teaching faculty knows the primary concepts and structures of effective online instruction and is able to create learning experiences to enable teacher candidate success. This includes providing clear expectations, timely accurate feedback on assignments and assessments, active learning opportunities and use of assessments, projects, and assignments that meet learning goals and assess learning progress by measuring candidate achievement of the learning goals.

Note on alternate certification programs (MAT, PTP, Certification-Only): On-site review will assess how the provider determines that its candidates have mastered relevant content knowledge before they complete a program, and how the provider responds to any content knowledge improvement that may be needed for admitted candidates as a result of the programs' assessment of their content knowledge.

Essential questions being answered:

- How does the provider ensure individual teacher candidates have a secure knowledge of their content (especially Scientifically-Based Literacy Instruction, math, other subject areas in elementary programs and secondary content areas for secondary programs)?

[10] For more information please see the National Standards for Quality Online Teaching https://gsw.edu/Assets/Academic%20Affairs/files/IEP/NACOL_Standards_Quality_Online_Teaching.pdf

- How does the provider ensure teacher candidates are well equipped with key teaching techniques and methods (particularly classroom management, assessment, differentiation, academic feedback, questioning) to bring about advancements in student learning and achievement?
- What connections (e.g. scenarios, simulations, peer teaching, assignments) are made in courses between course knowledge and its application to teaching practice?

Likely sources of evidence for this domain:

- Observations of program courses (including multiple sections of the same course when these are offered)
- Course syllabi
- Interviews with teacher candidates, program faculty/staff (including supervising teachers), school staff (mentor teachers, principals), and recent program completers, with list of interview question prompts included in the corresponding handbook
- Program handbooks
- Observations of teacher candidates teaching
- Surveys of program completers and employers, other provider data (e.g., state agency provided data)
- Degree Plans, course catalogs

Note on "constraining criteria" for ELEMENTARY and ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS Education Program Reviews: The quality of scientifically-based reading/literacy instruction delivered by the program to all teacher candidates **must be good or better** in order for the final score on Quality of Content Knowledge and Teaching Methods to be good.

Indicator 2.1 Content Knowledge[11]				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
English Language Arts Teacher Content Knowledge and Pedagogy (To include content knowledge, strategies, and application	Coursework and training provide **comprehensive coverage** of scientific research/evidence based reading instruction within the 5 essential	Coursework and training **address** scientific research/evidence based reading instruction within the 5 essential components of reading	Coursework and training address some components of scientific research/evidence based reading instruction within the five essential	Coursework and training **do not enable** ELA teacher candidates to teach literacy including scientifically based reading instruction.

[11] Louisiana policy requires the use of Praxis content knowledge tests; while programs find this necessary in order to meet state requirements, it may not be sufficient in assessing content mastery to ensure that all admitted candidates have a secure grasp of content knowledge.

Indicator 2.1 Content Knowledge[11]				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
defining learning goals for all learners at various stages of reading and writing development.)	components[12] of reading paired with elements of early literacy instruction, consistently enabling ELA teacher candidates to teach students how to read effectively, ensuring that the **progress of *all* students is good or better.** These elements, as applicable to the certification grade band (e.g., early childhood, elementary, secondary), include: 1. Oral language development 2. Explicit, systematic, and sequential instruction in the areas of: ● Phonological processing and phonemic awareness ● Phonics instruction ● Spelling 3. Fluency 4. Comprehension 5. Vocabulary instruction	paired with elements of early literacy instruction, enabling ELA teacher candidates to teach students how to read effectively, ***enhancing the progress and learning of the students they teach.*** These elements, as applicable to the certification grade band (e.g., early childhood, elementary, secondary), include: 1. Oral language development 2. Explicit, systematic, and sequential instruction in the areas of: ● Phonological processing and phonemic awareness ● Phonics instruction ● Spelling 3. Fluency 4. Comprehension 5. Vocabulary instruction to include morphology	components of reading paired with elements of early literacy instruction **and inconsistently enables** ELA teacher candidates to progress the learning of the students they teach. These elements, as applicable to the certification grade band (e.g., early childhood, elementary, secondary), include: 1. Oral language development 2. Explicit, systematic, and sequential instruction in the areas of: ● Phonological processing and phonemic awareness ● Phonics instruction ● Spelling 3. Fluency 4. Comprehension	

[12] Five essential components of reading: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

Indicator 2.1 Content Knowledge[11]				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
(Continued: English Language Arts Teacher Content Knowledge and Pedagogy)	to include morphology 6. Grammar/syntax 7. Written expression 8. Formal/informal assessment practices that inform literacy instruction 9. ELL 10. Learning Differences to include dyslexia and students with learning disabilities as well as other learning needs.	6. Grammar/syntax 7. Written expression 8. Formal/informal assessment practices that inform literacy instruction 9. ELL 10. Learning Differences to include dyslexia and students with learning disabilities as well as other learning needs.	5. Vocabulary instruction to include morphology 6. Grammar/syntax 7. Written expression 8. Formal/informal assessment practices that inform literacy instruction 9. ELL 10. Learning Differences to include dyslexia and students with learning disabilities as well as other learning needs.	
Math Teacher Content Knowledge **Math Teacher Content Pedagogy**	Coursework and training address **all major math content areas[13] and key aspects of math pedagogy and consistently** enable teacher candidates to teach math **highly effectively**, ensuring that the **progress and learning of all students is good or better**.	Coursework and training address **all major math content areas and key aspects of math pedagogy and** enable teacher candidates to teach math **effectively** such that they **can enhance the progress and learning of the students they teach**.	Coursework and training address **some** math domains and key aspects of math pedagogy AND/OR **inconsistently** enable teacher candidates to teach math such that candidates can enhance the progress and learning of their students.	Coursework and training **do not enable** teacher candidates to teach math in order to enhance the progress and learning of their students.

[13] As identified in in Louisiana student standards

Indicator 2.1 Content Knowledge[11]				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
(ELEMENTARY)[14] Other subject areas	Coursework and training **consistently** enable teacher candidates to master the content knowledge and skills necessary to ***teach*** **highly effective lessons** in elementary subject areas (including literature, history/social studies, and science) so that the **progress and learning of all students is good or better.**	Coursework and training enable teacher candidates to master the content knowledge and skills necessary to ***teach*** **effective lessons** in elementary subject areas (including literature, history/social studies, and science) so that the **progress and learning of all students is good or better.**	Coursework and training **inconsistently** enable teacher candidates to master the content knowledge and skills necessary to ***teach*** elementary subject areas (including literature, history/social studies, and science) such that candidates can enhance the progress and learning of their students.	Coursework and training **do not enable** teacher candidates to master the content knowledge and skills necessary to ***teach*** effective lessons, particularly in elementary subjects (including literature, history/social studies, and science) in order to enhance the progress and learning of their students.
(SECONDARY)[15] Other subject areas	The provider **consistently assesses** mastery of relevant content knowledge and disciplinary literacy of candidates and provides support where needed to ensure **comprehensive** knowledge of content so that coursework and training enable teacher candidates to teach secondary subjects **highly effectively** and the	The provider **assesses** mastery of relevant content knowledge and disciplinary literacy of candidates and **usually** provides support where needed so that coursework and training enable teacher candidates to teach secondary subjects **effectively**, ensuring that they can **enhance the learning and progress** of the	The provider **inconsistently assesses** mastery of relevant content knowledge and disciplinary literacy of teacher candidates, providing **little support** when necessary and/or coursework and training **inconsistently** enable teacher candidates to teach secondary subjects so that they are able to enhance the progress	There is little evidence that the provider assesses candidate mastery of content knowledge and disciplinary literacy. Coursework and training **does not enable** secondary teacher candidates to teach their secondary subject and as a result, **student learning is significantly inhibited.**

[14] Elementary includes early childhood PK-3, 1-5, and Integrated to Merged 1-5 programs
[15] Secondary includes Middle Grades 4-8 and Secondary Grades 6-12 core subjects (ELA, mathematics, sciences, social studies) and Integrated to Merged programs

Indicator 2.1 Content Knowledge[11]				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
	learning and progress of all students is good or better.	students they teach.	and learning of the students they teach.	
(ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION PROGRAMS) Content Mastery	The provider ensures that **all** candidates **consistently demonstrate mastery** of relevant content knowledge and disciplinary literacy, and the program has **clear evidence** that it takes steps to assess candidates' content knowledge, and where necessary provides **highly effective** support so that **candidates'** content mastery results in the **learning and progress of all students being good or better**.	The provider ensures that **most** candidates demonstrate mastery of relevant content knowledge and disciplinary literacy, shows evidence that it has taken steps to assess content knowledge, and has **some evidence** of providing support, where necessary, so that the **majority** of candidates' content mastery **enhances the learning and progress** of the students they teach.	The provider **inconsistently** ensures that candidates demonstrate mastery of relevant content knowledge and disciplinary literacy, and/or there is **little evidence** that the program assesses their content knowledge and/or, where necessary, **provides little support** to enable candidates to have, or gain, content mastery as a result **student learning is inconsistent**.	The provider **does not ensure** candidates' ability to demonstrate adequate content knowledge and disciplinary literacy, and the program **does not have steps** in place to support candidates, where necessary, in gaining mastery of relevant content as a result **student learning is significantly inhibited**.

Indicator 2.2 Teaching Methods[16]				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
Classroom management	Coursework and training in classroom management	Coursework and training in classroom management	Coursework and training in classroom management	Coursework and training in classroom management

[16] Key teaching skills such as academic feedback and questioning, managing student behavior, assessment, and differentiation should be embedded and integrated into different content areas such that candidates fully understand how these key skills relate to or may differ across content areas.

Indicator 2.2 Teaching Methods[16]				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
	equip teacher candidates with the knowledge, understanding and skills to manage behavior and discipline **highly effectively** and create a **positive and highly engaging climate for academic learning**. This includes **all** of the following: • make effective use of time and materials • keep classroom on track and minimize student distraction • use contingent praise for good behavior • handle disruptive student misbehavior.	**equip** teacher candidates with the knowledge, understanding and skills to manage behavior and discipline **effectively** and create a **positive climate for academic learning**. This includes **all** of the following: • make effective use of time and materials • keep classroom on track and minimize student distraction • use contingent praise for good behavior • handle disruptive student misbehavior.	**inconsistently** equip teacher candidates with the knowledge, understanding and skills to manage behavior and discipline effectively and create a positive climate for academic learning. Some of the following may not be present: • make effective use of time and materials • keep classroom on track and minimize student distraction • use contingent praise for good behavior • handle disruptive student misbehavior.	**does not equip** teacher candidates with the knowledge, understanding and skills to manage behavior and discipline effectively and create a positive climate for academic learning. Several of the following may not be present: • make effective use of time and materials • keep classroom on track and minimize student distraction • use contingent praise handle disruptive student misbehavior. • handle disruptive student misbehavior.
Assessment	Coursework and training in assessment equip teacher candidates with the knowledge, understanding and skills to **accurately assess** K-12 student performance and progress. This includes enabling them to utilize formative assessment results in their instruction so that **all** students, including those with	Coursework and training in assessment equip teacher candidates with the knowledge, understanding and skills to **accurately assess** student performance and progress for **most** of their K-12 students, enabling them to utilize formative assessment results so that **most** of their students, including those with ESL,	Coursework and training in assessment **inconsistently** equip candidates to assess student performance and progress, including inconsistent use of formative assessment results in their instruction; not all students make at least good academic progress.	Coursework and training in assessment **does not enable** candidates to assess student learning and to use formative data to inform their instruction of students.

Indicator 2.2 Teaching Methods[16]				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
	ESL, special education, and gifted needs, make at least good academic progress.	special education, and gifted needs, make at least good academic progress.		
Differentiation	Coursework and training prepares teacher candidates to **highly effectively** adapt the curriculum and differentiate for **all students** including those with ESL, special education, and gifted needs, ensuring that **all students make good or better progress** in the lesson and over time.	Coursework and training prepares teacher candidates to **effectively** adapt the curriculum and differentiate for **most** students including those with ESL, special education, and gifted needs, ensuring **most students make progress** in the lesson and over time	Coursework and training **inconsistently** prepares teacher candidates to adapt the curriculum and differentiate to meet the needs of all students including those with ESL, special education, and gifted needs.	Coursework and training **does not prepare** candidates to adapt the curriculum differentiate to meet the needs of students with varying learning needs.
Academic feedback and questioning	Coursework and training consistently equip teacher candidates with the knowledge, skills and understanding to **effectively** engage **all** students in **rigorous** learning through **highly effective** academic feedback that is timely, accurate and specific and **high-level** questioning where students and/or teachers **build off responses.**	Coursework and training consistently equip teacher candidates with the knowledge, skills and understanding to engage students in learning through **effective** academic feedback that is timely, accurate and specific and questioning that includes **higher-level, open-ended questions**.	Coursework and training **inconsistently prepare** teacher candidates to engage students in learning through academic feedback and questioning. Coursework and training **may not address key components** of feedback (timeliness, accuracy, and specificity) OR **does not address level and variety** of questioning.	Coursework and training **do not equip candidates** to engage students in learning through academic feedback and questioning.

Indicator 2.3 Connections to Practice[17]				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
Connections to Practice	Program coursework has **frequent and strong** connections to **immediate practice** such as: scenarios, use of videos of classroom teaching, fieldwork assignments, simulations, modeling strong instructional practices, etc.	Program coursework **frequently includes appropriate and good** connections to practice and allow candidates to **regularly apply** learning. Examples include: scenarios, use of videos of classroom teaching, fieldwork assignments, simulations, modeling strong instructional practices, etc.	Program coursework has **inconsistent** relevant connections to practice with **missed opportunities** to include: scenarios, use of videos of classroom teaching, fieldwork assignments, simulations, modeling strong instructional practices, etc.	Program coursework has **few OR ineffective** connections to practice such as: scenarios, use of videos of classroom teaching, fieldwork assignments, simulations, modeling strong instructional practices, etc.

[17] Candidates receive frequent opportunities to practice teaching methods, observe strong modeling of teaching methods and skills, and are provided with explicit, real world applications of the content knowledge and teaching methods presented in coursework.

DOMAIN 3: Quality of 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 pre-residency clinical 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, review team members are **not evaluating teacher candidates** through these observations: they 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 review team members**. 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 (one- year residency) is central to the domain, reviewers will include evidence on earlier pre-residency clinical experiences where appropriate.

> *Note on Alternate Certification Programs* (MAT, PTP, Certification-only)*:* For programs where clinical placement is determined by employment of program candidates as teachers of record who are enrolled in the program, the on-site review focus is on how well the provider ensures that all enrolled candidates are receiving the support and guidance needed to develop their teaching knowledge and skills and what interventions and supports are in place to address weaknesses in placements if/when they arise.

Essential questions being answered:

- How does the program structure the final clinical experience (one-year residency) and select the clinical placement site (for undergraduate programs)?
- How are classroom mentor teachers and/or supervisors at the program and school level chosen, trained, and supported by the program?
- What aspects of teaching and learning does the observation tool provide feedback on?
- What is the quality of the feedback candidates receive? Is it an accurate reflection of the quality of teaching and learning during the observed lesson?
- How consistent is the feedback provided by the program supervisors and classroom mentor teachers?
- Is the feedback constructive, actionable and likely to lead to improvement in teaching and learning practices?
- How do mentor teachers, principals, and/or program supervisors view the overall quality of teacher candidates?
- What is the impact of candidate teaching on student learning during the observed lesson?
- What is the evidence from onsite review with regards to the quality of teacher candidates?

Likely sources of evidence for this domain:

- Observations of teacher candidates teaching
- Observation of feedback provided by program supervisors to candidates
- Blank and completed observations and evaluation instruments
- Interviews with teacher candidates, program faculty/staff, and school/district staff (mentor teachers, principals, HR)
- Data on all program supervisor and/or mentor teacher observation scores and written comments for cohorts of teacher candidates in the reviewed program
- Program handbooks, MOUs, and/or other program documents with information on the selection, training and support of mentor teachers and supervisors
- Surveys of program completers and host school site administrators, other provider data (e.g., state agency-provided data)

Note on "constraining criteria": The quality of observation and feedback (Indicator 3.2) delivered by program supervisors to all candidates **must be good or better** in order for the key judgment on Quality of Clinical Placement, Feedback, and Candidate Performance to be good.

Indicator 3.1 – Clinical Placement				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
Clinical placement timing and length	Teacher candidates are consistently placed **at the beginning of the K12 school** semester (ideally at the beginning of a school year) and student teaching lasts for at least a **full K12 school semester**.	Teacher candidates are consistently placed **within the first two week**s of the K12 or preK12 school semester and student teaching lasts for **at least ten weeks.**	Teacher candidates are **not consistently placed within first two weeks** of the K12 school semester and/or lasts for **less than ten weeks but more than six weeks.**	Student teaching lasts for **less than six weeks.**

Indicator 3.1 – Clinical Placement				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
Selection of clinical placement schools[18],[19] • Ethnic diversity • SES • Academic performance • Distance from program location • HQ curriculum • State-trained Mentors	High-quality placements ensure that teacher candidates gain **substantial practical experience** to develop their teaching skills effectively **in high performing and/or improving schools**, a **substantial portion of which** have a diverse student body (to include SES and/or ethnicity).	Placements ensure that teacher candidates gain **practical experience** to develop their teaching skills effectively in placements where **most schools** are high performing and/or improving schools, **some of which** have a diverse student body (to include SES and/or ethnicity).	Placements inconsistently ensure that teacher candidates gain **practical experience** to develop their teaching skills effectively in placements where **most schools** are high performing and/or improving schools, **some of which** have a diverse student body (to include SES and/or ethnicity).	Placements **do not ensure** that teacher candidates are able to develop their teaching skills in schools that have at least some evidence of improving academic performance and also serve a diverse student body (to include SES and/or ethnicity).
****During the LEARNING PHASE (2018-2019 and 2019-2020), this criterion will be for informational purposes only and the team will collect information on the placement school aspects bulleted above (ethnic diversity, SES, academic performance, distance from program location, HQ curriculum, state-trained mentors).**				
Selection of mentor teachers[20]	Mentor teachers are **consistently chosen** based on demonstrated effectiveness and capacity to serve as a mentor.	Mentor teachers are **often chosen** for effectiveness and capacity to serve as a mentor.	Program **has selection criteria** that mentor teachers be chosen for effectiveness and capacity to serve as a mentor but **mentors inconsistently have these.**	There is **no clear rationale** for choosing mentor teachers for their effectiveness OR for their capacity to serve as mentors.
Clinical On-Site Supports (Alternative	Programs **consistently demonstrate** that **multiple supports** are in place for candidates who are teaching,	Programs demonstrate that they **provide some** onsite support for candidates who are teaching--**examples may**	Programs **inconsistently demonstrate supports** are in place for candidates teaching through onsite	Programs are **not able to demonstrate supports** are in place for candidates teaching. There is **little or**

[18] If available: compare to districts where graduates are hired or districts where candidates are placed for clinical placement (top 10 if more than 10).

[19] For programs where clinical placement is determined by employment of program candidates as the teacher of record who are enrolled in the program, this criterion does not apply. While not coming to bear on the score, review teams will note evidence of how the district fulfills this responsibility where relevant.

[20] For programs where clinical placement is determined by employment of program candidates as the teacher of record who are enrolled in the program, this criterion does not apply. While not coming to bear on the score, reviewer teams will note evidence of how the district fulfills this responsibility where relevant.

Indicator 3.1 – Clinical Placement				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
Certification Programs)[21] CONTINUED	including frequent visits to provide timely oral and written feedback that focuses on how well students are learning, as well as evidence that **strategic interventions** routinely take place to address weaknesses in candidate performance if/when they arise.	**include** frequent visits to provide timely oral and written feedback that focuses on how well students are learning, as well as **some evidence** that interventions take place to address weaknesses in candidate performance if/when they arise.	visits to assess candidate performance and/or there are **ineffective or few interventions** available if/when placement weaknesses arise.	**no evidence** of onsite support for candidates and/or **they do not make interventions** when weaknesses in candidate performance arise.

Indicator 3.2 – Observation and Feedback				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
Observation form(s) used by program supervisors and mentor teachers	Observation instrument includes **explicit focus on ALL**: • setting instructional outcomes • student engagement in learning and participation in the lesson • impact of candidate instruction on learning during the observed lesson • specific, research-based classroom	Observation and/or evaluation instrument **addresses all**: • setting instructional outcomes • student engagement in learning and participation in the lesson • impact of candidate instruction on learning during the observed lesson • specific, research-based classroom management strategies, • use of formative assessment to inform	Observation and/or evaluation instrument **addresses only some (3-4)**: • setting instructional outcomes • student engagement in learning and participation in the lesson • impact of candidate instruction on learning during the observed lesson • specific, research-based	Observation and/or evaluation **addresses few (1-2)**: • setting instructional outcomes • student engagement in learning and participation in the lesson • impact of candidate instruction on learning during the observed lesson • specific, research-based classroom management

[21]For programs where clinical placement is determined by employment of program candidates as teachers of record who are enrolled in the program, the review focus is on how well the program ensures that all enrolled candidates are receiving the support and guidance needed to develop their teaching knowledge and skills and what interventions and supports are in place to address weaknesses in placements if/when they arise.

Indicator 3.2 – Observation and Feedback				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
	management strategies • use of formative assessment to inform instruction • differentiated instruction for ESL, special education, and gifted needs • academic feedback and questioning • candidate content knowledge	instruction • differentiated instruction for ESL, special education, and gifted needs • academic feedback and questioning • candidate content knowledge	classroom management strategies • use of formative assessment to inform instruction • differentiated instruction for ESL, special education, and gifted needs • academic feedback and questioning • candidate content knowledge	strategies • use of formative assessment to inform instruction • differentiated instruction for ESL, special education, and gifted needs • academic feedback and questioning • candidate content knowledge
Program supervisor and mentor teacher training on observation and evaluation[22]	All program supervisors and mentor teachers receive **regular substantive** training to **measurable standards for reliability** on methods and practices of high quality observation and feedback.	All program supervisors and mentor teachers receive **regular substantive training** on methods and practices of high quality observation and feedback.	Program supervisors and mentor teachers receive **minimal training, at least annually,** on the observation and/or evaluation instrument.	The program **does not provide training** on methods and practices of effective observation and feedback to program supervisors and mentor teachers who observe/host teacher candidates.
Quality of written and oral feedback	**Accurate written** and oral feedback after each required observation has a clear link to **evidence of student learning** during	**Accurate written** and oral feedback after each required observation **usually** has a clear link to **evidence of student learning** during the	Written and oral feedback after each required observation is inconsistent and/or **inconsistently** builds upon previous	Written and oral feedback after each required observation is **inaccurate and/or does not link to student learning** and does

[22] On-site review focuses on training and maintaining inter-rater reliability of all program and district/school observers.

Indicator 3.2 – Observation and Feedback				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
	the observed lesson, **strategically** builds on previous feedback, and identifies key actionable improvement steps.	observed lesson, builds on previous feedback and identifies **most** key actionable improvement steps.	feedback, **does not link** to student learning and/or does not directly identify key actionable improvement areas.	not identify key actionable areas for improvement.
Consistency of expectations for program supervisors and mentor teachers	Program supervisors and mentor teachers have **consistently high expectations** and work collaboratively to ensure **strong feedback that is accurate and highly relevant** to the needs of teacher candidates.	Program supervisors and mentor teachers **usually** have **consistent expectation**s and **mostly** work collaboratively to ensure that **feedback is accurate and relevant** to the needs of teacher candidates.	Program supervisors and mentor teachers **have inconsistent expectations** and/or feedback is **inconsistent or not always relevant** to the needs of teacher candidates.	Program supervisors and mentor teachers provide teacher candidates with **feedback that is not accurate or relevant** to needs of teacher candidates and expectations are not clear.

Indicator 3.3 – Candidate Performance				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
Student engagement and candidate impact on student learning during lesson[23]	**All students are engaged** in learning and candidate teaching **consistently advances** student learning during the observed lesson.	**Most students are engaged** in learning and candidate teaching **consistently advances** student learning for most students during the lesson.	**Students are inconsistently engaged** in learning and candidate teaching **inconsistently advances** student learning.	**Few students are engaged** in learning during the observed lesson and candidate teaching **does not contribute to** student learning.
Subject	Students benefit from	Students benefit from	Students **inconsistently**	Students have **few**

[23] In some cases, student learning can be ascertained by district or state value added measures but it may also be determined by direct observation of student work in the classroom, employer surveys, or other appropriate means. Reviewers will focus on engagement and student learning during the observed lesson.

Indicator 3.3 – Candidate Performance				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
knowledge	**accurate and high quality** content because candidates **consistently** teach **exceptionally well**, demonstrating **strong** subject knowledge, particularly in reading, writing, literature, history/social studies, math and science.	**accurate** content because candidates **consistently** teach **well**, demonstrating **good** subject knowledge, particularly in reading, writing, literature, history/social studies, math and science.	benefit from accurate content because candidates teach **inconsistently**, demonstrating **some errors** in subject knowledge, particularly in reading, writing, literature, history/social studies, math and science.	**opportunities** to benefit from accurate content because candidates are **unable to consistently demonstrate** subject knowledge to ensure that lessons are taught accurately **and/or inaccuracies in content adversely impact student learning**.
Teaching Skills and Strategies	Student learning and engagement are supported by teacher candidate ability to **consistently and highly effectively** demonstrate the use of these teaching and learning strategies: • setting instructional outcomes • classroom management strategies • formative assessment and its use to inform instruction • differentiated instruction for gifted students, ELLs and students with special learning needs	Student learning and engagement are supported by teacher candidate ability to **consistently and effectively** demonstrate the use of these teaching and learning strategies: • setting instructional outcomes • classroom management strategies • formative assessment and its use to inform instruction • differentiated instruction for gifted students, ELLs and students with special learning needs • academic feedback and questioning	Student learning and engagement **are not always supported** due to **inconsistent ability** of teacher candidate to demonstrate the use of these teaching and learning strategies: • setting instructional outcomes • classroom management strategies • formative assessment and its use to inform instruction • differentiated instruction for gifted students, ELLs and students with special learning • academic feedback and	Student learning and/or engagement is **impeded by** teacher candidate **inability** to use one or more of these teaching and learning: • setting instructional outcomes • classroom management strategies • formative assessment and its use to inform instruction • differentiated instruction for gifted students, ELLs and students with special learning needs • academic feedback and questioning

Indicator 3.3 – Candidate Performance				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
	• academic feedback and questioning		questioning	
Feedback from recent graduates and principals of recent completers	Recent completers and principals of recent completers report that program completers make a **strong positive** impact on student learning without the need for targeted interventional professional development from the school or district.	Recent completers and principals of recent completers report that program completers make a **positive** impact on student learning without the need for targeted interventional professional development from the school or district.	Recent completers and principals of recent completers report that **targeted interventional professional development** from the school or district **was sometimes needed** to enable the completers to improve their impact on student learning.	Recent completers and principals of recent completers report that **significant professional development was required** in the first year of teaching to ensure that teaching reaches an acceptable level of effectiveness and/or to ensure that pupils make expected levels of progress.

DOMAIN 4: Quality of Program Performance Management

Rationale/Context: This domain examines whether and how program leadership—*at all levels, including program faculty, partner district and school leaders, and mentor teachers*—utilize data to continually improve the quality of teacher preparation and outcomes for all teacher candidates. Program performance management gives careful attention to quantitative and qualitative data, review of data quality (e.g., reliable and valid measures of clinical performance and student learning), well-established processes for performance review and action steps based on that review, and broad involvement of faculty and administrators at all levels of the program in these monitoring and improvement processes. Program performance management also includes systematic and regular attention to the quality of program coursework and faculty teaching, taking into account their impact on relevant program outcomes and to the ability of all candidates to teach well as a result of the quality of course content and faculty teaching.

Quality assurance through effective program performance management takes place by building and sustaining a culture of continuous improvement that directly engages all members of the organization. Multiple sources of information are used to monitor the performance of individual candidates, cohorts of candidates, and cohorts of recent completers. This information leads directly to action steps to improve the program as well as follow up monitoring to gauge the impact of these improvement actions. Onsite review also focuses on the quality and accuracy of data used by the program 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.

Core concepts of program performance management are: full engagement of all members of the organization in continuous improvement activities; regular use of multiple sources of quantitative and qualitative information by all members of the organization working together; prompt action steps taken as the result of careful performance monitoring; the use of data to assess the effectiveness of steps taken in response to identified needs for improvement; and a sustained cycle of monitoring, acting on results, and assessing the impact of improvement activities embedded into the culture of the program.

Essential questions being answered:

- How do program leadership and faculty use a wide variety of information to understand candidate and cohort performance and make improvements to the program? How often?
- What is the quality of data about the program and who uses it? How does the program monitor the quality the data?
- Does the program have—and use—quality control gateways or checkpoints at the end of each program phase to decide whether a candidate is ready to move to the next phase? What data are used to make these decisions?

- Does the program have intervention plans for weaker students? For degree-seeking students who do not perform adequately, is there a non-certification degree track for them?
- How does the program monitor and take steps to improve the quality of coursework and teaching?
- How does the program leadership monitor connections between coursework and clinical experiences and ensure faculty know how well their students can implement course content?
- How does program leadership take action as a result of information? Frequency? Specificity/explicitness? What steps are taken to monitor the results of steps taken to make improvements?

Likely sources of evidence for this domain:

- Data over time (to include: teaching observations, evaluations, surveys, employment outcomes, impact of candidates and completers on student learning (where available), etc.)
- Observations of teacher candidates teaching and of program courses
- Courses taught through multiple sections or at multiple sites
- Observation of feedback provided to candidates
- Completed observation and evaluation instruments across multiple observations for whole cohorts of candidates
- Conversations with program faculty/staff, teacher candidates, and school staff (mentor teachers, principals)
- Program handbooks, MOUs, and/or other program documents
- Program or individual candidate improvement/intervention plans, action plans and results of the interventions
- Program outcomes such as employment, persistence, performance, feedback from graduates and employers, impact on student learning outcomes
- State agency-provided data

Indicator 4.1: Program Performance Management				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
Quality of Data	Program collects and uses multiple sources of **high-quality internally and externally validated data** to monitor ongoing performance.	Program collects and uses **multiple sources of information**, most of which are high quality data, to monitor ongoing performance.	Program collects and uses **few sources of high quality information**, relying on data of **inconsistent quality** to monitor ongoing performance.	Sources of information collected and used for program monitoring are **not high quality data**.

Quality monitoring **(data sources could include: program improvement plans, candidate completion rates, feedback surveys, internal reviews, faculty study groups, faculty/peer observations)**	Program leadership **regularly and systematically monitors** overall quality of coursework, clinical experiences, and the observation and feedback system employed to support development of teacher candidates. This includes **regular examination of** observation and feedback instruments and practices as well as **regular training** for mentor teachers	Program leadership **usually monitors** overall quality of coursework, clinical experiences, and the observation and feedback system employed to support development of teacher candidates. This includes **review of** observation and feedback instruments and practices as well as **regular training** for mentor teachers.	Program leadership **inconsistently monitors** overall quality of coursework, clinical experiences, and the observation and feedback system employed to support development of teacher candidates. Examination of observation and feedback instruments and practices is not regular nor is training for mentor teachers.	The program **does not take steps to monitor** the quality of coursework, candidate fieldwork clinical experiences, and/or the program's observation and feedback practices. Mentor teacher **do not receive at least annual training** to ensure consistency of approach in giving feedback to teacher candidates.
Internal quality control gates (or checkpoints) and intervention plans	Program leadership monitors candidate performance through internal performance checkpoints/gateways and utilizes data to ensure that all candidates **exceed high standards** of performance before moving into the next phase of their teacher preparation (e.g., into one-year residency, being recommended for licensure). The program has **formal interventions** (including a counseling out process) for teacher candidates who do not meet program performance	Program leadership monitors candidate performance through internal performance checkpoints/gateways and utilizes data to ensure that all candidates **meet high standards** of performance before moving into the next phase of their teacher preparation (e.g., into one-year residency, being recommended for licensure). The program has **formal interventions** (including a counseling out process) for teacher candidates who do not meet program performance standards.	Program leadership **inconsistently monitors candidate performance** and inconsistently utilizes data to ensure that candidates **meet standards** of performance before moving into the next phase of their teacher preparation (e.g., into one-year residency, being recommended for licensure), and/or the program **inconsistently uses formal interventions** (including a counseling out process) for teacher candidates who do not meet program performance	The program **does not monitor candidate performance through formal internal performance checkpoints/gateways** and/or the **expected standards are unclear**. The program **does not use formal interventions** (including a counseling out process) for teacher candidates who do not meet program performance standards.

	standards.		standards.	
Quality assurance and improvement planning	The program has and **regularly uses rigorous and well-embedded** quality assurance systems informed by high quality data about cohorts or groups of candidates and completers to **sustain high-quality outcomes**, and these processes are the basis for improvement planning and action steps.	The program has and usually makes use of **good** quality assurance systems informed by high quality data about cohorts or groups of candidates and completers to **sustain high-quality outcomes**, and these are the basis for improvement planning and action steps.	The program **inconsistently** makes use of quality assurance systems, and these quality assurance insurance **systems need improvement** to be used effectively in improvement planning and action steps.	Quality assurance systems are **not used to examine the effectiveness** of the program and secure further improvements in outcomes for individuals and groups of teacher candidates and completers.
Coursework-clinical connections	Program leaders **systematically monitor the quality of coursework and teaching** to ensure there are **strong connections** between program coursework and the clinical components of the program including shared information between the faculty who teach courses and those who supervise candidate clinical performance so that course instructors understand how well candidates are able to implement what they learn.	Program leaders **monitor the quality of coursework and teaching** to ensure there are **good connections** between program coursework and the clinical components of the program including shared information between the faculty who teach courses and those who supervise candidate clinical performance so that course instructors understand how well candidates are able to implement what they learn.	Program leaders **inconsistently monitor the quality of coursework and teaching** to ensure good coursework-clinical connections and/or **inconsistently monitor** how well information is shared between the faculty who teach courses and those who supervise candidate clinical performance.	Program leaders **do not monitor** the quality of coursework and teaching to ensure good coursework-clinical connections.

Glossary of Terms

The following descriptions are provided to clarify how TPI-US approaches and thinks about key aspects of teacher preparation and key teaching skills. These descriptions are not meant to be exhaustive but illustrative.

Academic Feedback: Feedback provided to students or between students, and used to assess students' progress, monitor and adjust instruction, prompt student thinking, facilitate discussion and provide timely feedback to students on the accuracy of their work/ thinking that leads to improvement. Academic feedback can be oral, written, or virtual and removes students' conjecture on their own progress. Academic feedback contributes to a deep, productive learning environment.

Look fors:

- Academic feedback that is timely, accurate, and specific; how it is used to support and/or further student learning.
- Feedback aligns to specific learning goals (more than "good job").
- Guides student learning on how to achieve learning outcomes, providing a "how to" get to the desired outcome.
- Provided by the teacher/teacher candidate and student to student.
- Teacher candidate circulates to monitor student learning and provide feedback.
- Coursework and training that explicitly models and provides instruction on how to provide academic feedback.

Assessment: Students are assessed through performance and/or what they are able to produce as a result of their learning. Formative and summative results are used to inform instructional decisions and to guide student learning. Formative assessment is an integral part of instruction that helps students identify progress, or lack of it, in their own learning. Teachers are able to use formative assessment, including checks for understanding, to address misconceptions and/or struggling students' needs immediately.

Look fors:

- Evidence a teacher candidate has about student learning during the lesson.
- Use of formative assessment, including checks for understanding, throughout a lesson.
- Assessment that allows a teacher candidate to accurately gain knowledge of all students' learning and, if needed, adjust instruction accordingly (even mid-class).
- Active monitoring of student *learning* and *understanding*.
- Student learning is monitored through academic feedback and questioning.
- Use of "teachable moments" to monitor and adjust instruction.
- Formulating specific questions for evidence of student understanding.
- Students are actively involved in collecting information from formative assessments and provide input.

- Assessments provide opportunities for student choice and opportunities for students participate in designing assessments for their own work.
- Teacher candidate-designed assessments are authentic, with real-world application as appropriate.
- Coursework and training that demonstrates and explicitly teaches assessment strategies and skills.

Classroom Management: Clear rules and expectations for learning and behavior that are explicitly established and positively reinforced through social approval, contingent activities, and consequences to maintain appropriate behavior and high expectations. Expectations for learning and behavior include management of groups, transitions, and activities and material. When disruptions do occur they are handled in a timely and effective manner and do not detract from student learning.

Look fors:

- Evidence the teacher candidate has established routines and procedures for activities in the classroom including centers, discussions, transitions, distribution of materials and supplies, and direct instruction.
- How misbehavior is handled when it arises-- does the handling of misbehavior further disrupt class?
- How are low level disruptions handled by the teacher candidate? Classroom environment establishes a culture for learning.
- Actively monitoring student behavior.
- Minimal loss of instructional time.
- Students engaged in routines and procedures.
- Productive, positive classroom with high levels of engagement.
- Respectful culture where student and teacher candidate interactions demonstrate caring and respect for one another.
- Coursework and training that models and explicitly teaches classroom management strategies.

Differentiation: Tailoring instruction to meet the needs of **all** students including but not limited to English Language Learners, Special Education, and Gifted. This could include teacher candidates differentiating content, process, products, or the learning environment that is ongoing.

Look fors:

- **Content** – what the student needs to learn. Examples: using materials at varying levels; use of auditory and visual methods; working with small groups to remediate a skill or idea or extend thinking for advanced or gifted learners;
- **Process** – activities in which the student engages in order to master the content. Examples: using tiered activities through which all learners work with the same important understandings and skills, but proceed with different levels of support, challenge, or complexity; use of centers that encourage students to explore subsets of the class topic of particular interest to them; providing students with a learning partner; use of manipulatives or other tactile supports, varying the length of activity or time a student may take to complete a task in order to provide additional support

for a struggling learner or to encourage an advanced learner to pursue a topic in greater depth.

- **Products** – culminating projects that ask the student to rehearse, apply, and extend what he or she has learned in a unit. Examples: providing students options of how to demonstrate required learning; use of rubrics that match and extend students' varied skills levels; allowing students to work alone or in small groups on their products; and encouraging students to create their own product assignments as long as the assignments meet learning expectations and contain required elements.
- **Learning environment** – Classroom environment supports a culture for learning and is a place where students and the teacher value academic work. Examples: places in the room to work for students to work without distraction, as well as places that invite student collaboration; materials that reflect a variety of cultures, community and home settings; clear guidelines for independent work that parallel individual needs; routines that allow students to get help when teachers are unable to provide immediate assistance.
- Coursework and training that models and explicitly teaches how to differentiate instruction.

Engagement in Student Learning: Students are *actively* contributing to the learning environment through discussion, answering questions, and generating work that supports the lesson objectives; they are provided appropriate and meaningful opportunities for student to student interaction and choices in learning activities. Engagement in student learning demonstrates students' ability to develop a deeper understanding through what they do.
Evidence for student engagement can be identified in the quality of what students are saying and doing as a result of what the teacher candidate has facilitated or planned. **Note:** engagement is more than simply "compliant" attentiveness or "busy" student behavior.

Look fors:

- Students responding to the teacher candidate or one another in discussion, asking questions, explaining thinking to the instructor and to each other, reading critically, (not limited to these actions).
- What students are being asked to do during the lesson (e.g., busywork or cognitive engagement in learning).
- Students engaged in hands-on activities that foster learning and development of knowledge and skills.
- Students engaged in challenging content and learning that require complex thinking.
- Scaffolds and challenges provided by the teacher candidate for inquiry and exploration of content.
- Lesson structure and pacing provide appropriate time to foster reflection and integrate understanding.
- Students are doing the cognitive work, not the teacher candidate.
- Appropriate grouping tied to lesson and learning objectives (individual, pairs, small groups, purposeful, random).
- At the preparation program level, coursework and training that explicitly attends to helping teacher candidates learn and practice strategies for effective student engagement in learning.

Highly Effective Instruction: Teaching delivered with a clear purpose, high expectations, and engaging learning opportunities. Formative assessment is frequent and routine and maximizes the impact on learning. Highly effective teaching is a challenging and rigorous learning experience. Highly effective instruction promotes student learning outcomes through content knowledge, quality questions, academic feedback, differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all learners and provides students with a respectful culture for learning.

Look fors:

- Teacher candidate is facilitating instruction at an appropriate pace, actively monitoring students' academic progress through questions and feedback that promote responses and thinking by the students.
- Teacher candidate continuously monitors student achievement through learning activities.
- Student enthusiasm, interest, thinking, problem solving, discussion, and grouping help obtain learning goals.
- Learning tasks that require high-level student thinking and invite students to explain their thinking.
- Students highly motivated to work on all tasks and persistent even when the tasks are challenging.
- Flexibility from the teacher candidate in making minor or major adjustments during a lesson as a response to student learning.
- Students actively working on cognitively challenging tasks rather than watching while their teacher candidate "works".
- Appropriate lesson structure and pacing; with time for closure and student reflection.
- Coursework and related experiences offered by the program develop the content knowledge and teaching skills of teacher candidates resulting in improved student learning.

Questioning: Purposeful, differentiated, aligned to objectives, varied in level (basic to complex), and frequently used in instruction to elicit student thinking and facilitate student learning. High- quality questions support students to make connections to content and come to a new understanding of complex material.

Look fors:

- Teacher candidates use divergent and convergent questions.
- Teacher candidates frequently uses questions to make connections and/or challenge students' thinking.
- Questions push beyond procedural to conceptual.
- Questions elicit multiple response types such as choral, individual, written, shared, and group.
- Participation from all students is facilitated by the teacher candidate in multiple ways to encourage and promote all students in discussions that are a result of quality questioning techniques; as a result, most (if not all) students are engaged in the discussion.

- Teacher candidate builds on responses of students.
- Coursework and training that models and explicitly teaches how to incorporate questioning.

Student Work: Work connected to learning experiences and relevant to students' lives. It is used to organize, interpret, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information learned rather than reproduce it and is often supported through writings, discussions, and projects.

Look fors:

- Student activities, materials and assignments promote student thinking and allows for students to explain their responses and demonstrate understanding of content.
- What type of student work candidates require of students; how candidates use the student work to understand, assess, and extend student learning.
- Connects learning to real life experiences.
- Draws conclusions about student learning and achievement.
- Examines and analyzes information in multiple forms.
- Provides information on student thinking, progress and contribution to the learning process.
- Coursework and training that models and explicitly teaches candidates how to use student work to promote student thinking and to understand, assess, and extend student learning.

Glossary sources:

Adams, G., Danielson, C., Moilanen, G., & Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (2009). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria, Va.

Assessing and Evaluating Teacher Preparation Programs. (2013). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Ferguson, Ronald and Danielson, Charlotte. (2015) *How Framework for Teaching and Tripod 7Cs Evidence Distinguish Key Components of Effective Teaching*, in Designing Teacher Evaluation Systems (eds T. J. Kane, K. A. Kerr and R. C. Pianta), John Wiley & Sons, Inc., San Francisco. doi: 10.1002/9781119210856.ch4.

Kane, Thomas and Douglas Staiger, *Learning about Teaching: Initial Findings from the Measures of Effective Teaching Project.* (2010). Seattle, WA: Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

Kane, Thomas and Douglas Staiger. (2012). *Gathering Feedback on Teaching: Combining High-Quality Observations with Student Surveys and Achievement Gains.* Seattle, WA: Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

Milken, L. & National Institute For Teaching In Excellence.(1999). *Teacher and Student Advancement Evaluation Rubric.* Washington, DC.

National Reading Panel. (DATE). *Teaching Children To Read: An Evidence-Based Assessment of the Scientific Research Literature on Reading and Its Implications for Reading Instruction*. Retrieved from https://www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/pubs/nrp/documents/report.pdf.

Pashler, Harold, Mark McDaniel, Doug Rohrer, and Robert Bjork. (2008). *"Learning Styles: Concepts and Evidence."* Psychological Science in the Public Interest December 2008 vol. 9 no. 3105-119. Retrieved from http://psi.sagepub.com/content/9/3/105.abstract.

Schmidt, William, Nathan Burroughs, Leland Cogan, and Richard Houang. (2016). "The role of subject-matter content in teacher preparation: an international perspective for mathematics", Journal of Curriculum Studies, DOI: 10.1080/00220272.2016.1153153

Tomlinson, C. A. (2000). What Is Differentiated Instruction? Retrieved from http://www.readingrockets.org/article/what-differentiated-instruction

Tomlinson, C. (1995). How to Differentiate Instruction in Mixed-ability Classrooms. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. ED 386 301.

Tomlinson, C. (1999). *The Differentiated Classroom: Responding to the Needs of all Learners*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. ED 429 944.

Top 20 Principles from Psychology for PreK-12 Teaching and Learning. (2015). American Psychological Association, Coalition for Psychology in Schools and in Education. Retrieved from https://www.apa.org/ed/schools/cpse/top- twenty-principles.pdf.

University of Texas, (2016) *The UTeach Observation Guide and Training Protocol*. Austin, TX.

Louisiana On-Site Review Glossary of Terms

The following definitions are provided to clarify terms used within Louisiana teacher preparation on-site review materials and tools.

Terms

Alternate Teacher Preparation Program—a pathway designed for candidates with a minimum of a baccalaureate degree earned at a regionally accredited institution. An alternate program includes a minimum number of credit or contact hours of coursework or training as defined in *Bulletin* 996 and required practice experiences, including a one-year supervised internship in a school setting. There are three types of alternate teacher preparation programs: Practitioner Teacher Program, Master's Degree Program, and Certification-Only Program. For admission to an alternate program, applicants must demonstrate content mastery. Also referred to as *Alternate Teacher Certification Program*.

Host School—a P-12 setting in which candidates complete pre-residency clinical experience and residency. Also referred to as *Clinical Placement Site* and *Field Experience Site*.

Intervention Plan—the means by which a provider develops an individualized prescription of activities, support, and outcomes to assist a candidate in mastery or pathway and/or program requirements to reach completion. Also referred to as *Accentuated Growth Plan*, *Prescription Plan*, *Individual Growth Plan*, and *Improvement Plan*.

Mentor Teacher—all P-12 district-based individuals, including classroom teachers, instructional facilitators, etc., who assess, support, and develop a candidate's knowledge, skills, or professional dispositions at some stage in the clinical experiences. Also referred to as *Supervising Teacher* and *Cooperating Teacher*.

Non-University Preparation Provider—in BESE policy and associated LDOE programming, a non-profit or for-profit organization approved to offer Practitioner Teacher Programs or Certification- Only Programs. Also referred to as *Private Provider* or *Non-IHE*.

Pathway—a traditional (undergraduate) or alternate (practitioner, master's degree, or certification-only) preparation programming structure which may include one or more certification areas.

Program—a plan of study offered by an educator preparation provider for a certification area specific to content area(s) and grade range. For degree-bearing pathways (undergraduate, master's) offered by a university provider, pathway and/or program structure may vary as determined by the College in which each program is housed.

Program Supervisor—all educator preparation provider faculty contracted or employed by the provider to assess, support, and develop a candidate's knowledge, skills, or professional dispositions at some stage in the clinical experiences. Also referred to as *Clinical Evaluator*, *Field Supervisor*, and *Practitioner Advisor*.

Residency—a supervised one-year practice experience in a public or approved non-public school in a classroom in the grade level and content area for which the candidate is pursuing certification.

The residency must directly align with and sequentially develop the competencies identified in *Bulletin 746*, including a combination of instructional goal-setting and planning; classroom teaching; analysis of student assessment results; parent-teacher communication; and collaborations with other teachers. Candidate teaching competency during the residency is jointly assessed by the provider and residency school site administrator, including observations and measures of candidates' impact on all students' learning. Also referred to as *Clinical Experience*, *Clinical Placement*, *Student Teaching*, and *Field Experience*.

Site Supervisor—a contracted or employed district or provider representative who oversees, evaluates, and informs clinical experience stakeholders for an assigned school or group of schools including, but not limited to, candidates, mentor teachers, program supervisors, and P-12 school administrators.

Traditional Teacher Preparation Program—a baccalaureate degree program that includes a minimum of 120 credit hours of coursework and required practice experiences. A traditional program includes a combination of general education, content area, and teaching coursework, assessments, and related practice experiences, including a one-year supervised residency. Also referred to as *Undergraduate Preparation Program*.

Louisiana Stakeholder Interview Question Guide

The questions below are meant to serve as an initial list of potential questions to ask stakeholders. It is by no means exhaustive and on-site review teams MUST ensure that they ask questions that are appropriate and tailored to the specific context of each on-site review visit. This will often mean asking follow-up questions that are not listed.

Candidates:

- Tell me about your clinical/field experience placements (e.g., student teaching and experiences prior to student teaching or becoming a teacher of record).
- How typical was this lesson?
- Tell me about the feedback you get from those assigned to observe and coach you (e.g., your school-based mentor teacher, your program supervisor). Does the feedback help you improve your teaching? Could you provide an example? How consistent is the feedback?
- What do you believe are the strengths of your teacher preparation program? Areas for improvement?
- How well prepared do you feel in [classroom management, differentiation, content area, etc.]?
- If you were the leader of the teacher preparation program, what would you change to help ensure new teacher candidates are best prepared to be effective educators?

Classroom Mentor (Cooperating) Teacher:

- How many candidates from [provider name] have you mentored? What training have you had to be a mentor? How were you selected?
- How typical was this lesson?
- Please tell me a little about the feedback the candidate gets from his/her program supervisor. How often do you agree with that feedback? What happens if there is a disagreement?
- What do you believe are the strengths of this program/provider in preparing new teacher candidates to be effective educators? Areas for improvement? How have you observed this play out in the new teacher candidates you've mentored?

Course Faculty:

- Was today's class session typical? Is there always…… do you …….?
- Describe how today's session fits in with the rest of the course.
- How do you make connections between the theory of the course and its practical implementation for new teacher candidates in the classroom? What opportunities are there for candidates to apply their learning?
- How well are candidates able to implement what they have learned in [this course content] in their clinical teaching placement? Have you visited schools in which new teacher candidates complete their placements?

Human Resource Staff:

- How many completers from [provider name] are employed in the district?
- Do you specifically recruit from [provider name]? Why or why not?

- When thinking specifically about candidates from [provider name], what have you observed or heard to be their strengths and or areas for improvement?
- What do you know about the connection between the schools in which teacher candidates serve internships/residencies (as student teachers and/or as teachers of record) and the schools in which they are ultimately hired?
- What information/data do you have to indicate the effectiveness of program completers in the classroom once they have been hired?

Principals:

- How many candidates from [the provider] are currently at your school? In past years?
- Have you hired any candidates or completers from the provider? Why or why not?
- Describe how the classroom mentor (cooperating) teachers are chosen.
- When thinking specifically about candidates from [provider name], what have you observed or heard to be their strengths and/or areas for improvement?
- How well prepared are new teacher candidates in [classroom management, differentiation, content area, etc.]?
- Have you observed new teacher candidates teach? What have you observed?
- How effective are the channels of communication between your school and the teacher preparation provider/program?

Program Leadership:

- Tell me more about [the selection process, how mentor (cooperating) teachers are selected, any processes in place to monitor candidate quality, etc.].
- Does the provider have intervention plans for struggling candidates? If so, please describe.
- How is information from observations of new teacher candidates collected? Is it analyzed? What does this information show?
- What data are collected and utilized to demonstrate how effective the program is in preparing new teacher candidates to be effective educators? What do the data show?
- What data are available to demonstrate that program candidates and completers are effective practitioners once hired?

Program Supervisor:

- How typical was this lesson? How typical was the feedback?
- Describe the process for observing teacher candidates, how many times etc, and for providing feedback.
- Tell me about the observation tool you use.
- How do you know that your observation evaluations would correlate and align with another supervisors'? Tell about the inter-reliability training you've received from [the provider].
- Did the provider provide any training and/or preparation for your role? If so, please describe.
- What happens to the data and information generated from teacher candidate observations? Who analyzes the data for the provider?
- What do you believe are the strengths of this program? Areas for improvement?

Recent Graduates:

- When you completed your teacher preparation program, what areas did you feel most prepared in? Least?
- What do you believe are the strengths of this provider/program? Areas for improvement?

- How helpful were the courses you took in preparing you for [classroom management, differentiation, content area, etc.]?
- Tell me about the schools in which you completed clinical/field experiences, including student teaching or residency as teacher of record and any experiences prior to that.
- Please tell me a little about the feedback you received from your program supervisor during the final clinical experience (student teaching or residency as teacher of record)? How helpful was it?
- Tell me what would happen if you were finding any difficulties with your teaching or coursework.