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Background Information

• Plan 2020’s call for well-prepared and effective educators in an environment with greater flexibility and greater accountability

• Renewal of NCATE/CAEP Partnership Agreement and the need for more robust and streamlined data

• Collaboration with Alabama’s Colleges and Universities
  • CAEP Partnership Agreement Advisory Group
  • Alabama Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (ALACTE)
  • Alabama Alliance for Clinical Experiences
  • Field Director’s Forum
Purposes

• To ensure approved programs produce well-prepared and effective educators ready to improve P-12 student learning consistent with Plan 2020
• To move from a regulatory/input model toward a more robust continuous improvement/output model
• To focus on a limited number of key assessments providing high-quality information on candidate performance:
  1. Praxis II tests required for licensure
  2. Additional assessment of content knowledge
  3. Assessment of candidate’s ability to plan instruction or for non-teaching areas to fulfill identified professional responsibilities
  4. Evaluation of internship
  5. Assessment of impact on student learning or for non-teaching areas the ability to create supportive learning environments
• To emphasize the importance of well-planned, sequential, and meaningful field experiences
• To provide a framework for annual reports for institutions which feed into the data reports needed for comprehensive reviews and site visits
• To ensure comparable data streams are available across all Alabama institutions
Scope & Focus

1. **Curriculum plan:** Does the proposed curriculum adequately address and assess all relevant professional studies and program-specific standards?

2. **Field experiences:** Are field experiences well-planned, sequential, and meaningful?

3. **Key assessments:**
   1. Are the key assessments designed to produce adequate data to indicate candidates are attaining the proficiencies needed to be well-prepared and effective educators?
   2. Will the key assessments provide adequate data to inform program improvement?
Approval Options

• **Initial Approval** (new programs only, for up to seven years)
• **Continuing Approval** (for up to seven years)
• **Conditional Approval** (approval for three years)
• **Probationary Approval** (approval for one year)
• **Denial of Approval**

Programs with initial or continuing approval must submit a mid-cycle report in the fourth year.
Follow Up Options for Conditional Approval or Probationary Approval

• Annual written progress reports
• Oral presentation to ALSDE staff on progress
• Hosting a visit to review implementation of curriculum, field experiences, available data, and data analysis
Program Report Submission Form (2014 Pilot Form)

I. **Background Information:** Provide background knowledge of the structure of the program (checklist; transition points; delivery methods; numbers of admissions, completers, and recommendations for certification).

II. **Key Assessments:** Provide an overview of the assessment plan for the program in a summary chart. Key assessments are typically summative assessments of candidates’ proficiencies. Evaluation of key assessments is based on key assessment instruments and data, not the chart. Assessments and scoring guides must be submitted.

III. **Alignment of Standards to Curriculum and Key Assessments:** Provide an overview of how the program ensures each indicator is adequately addressed in curriculum and key assessment(s) so reviewers know where to look to determine if the evidence sufficiently demonstrates each indicator is met and whether the broader standard is met.

IV. **Summary of Field Experiences Prior to Internship:** Provide an overview of how the program requires candidates to demonstrate developing proficiencies in field experiences. Evaluation of field experiences is based on the chart and assessment instruments. Assessments for field experiences are typically formative assessments. The evidence should demonstrate field experiences are well-planned, sequential, and meaningful.

V. **Presentation of Data and Analysis:** For each key assessment, provide a summary of what the data shows and what it means.

VI. **Discussion of How Data and Analysis Informs Continuous Improvement:** Provide an overview of what the program has learned from analyzing all of the data in Section V and provide evidence of program changes that have been made as a result.
Section IV: Discussion of How Data and Analysis Inform Continuous Improvement

What might the discussion look like?

• **Content knowledge**: Data for our elementary education candidates indicate 100% pass all content areas (reading & English language arts, mathematics, social studies, science) assessed by Praxis II. However, our faculty noted sub-score data revealed the weakest area is in physical science. Program faculty met with partner P-12 faculty to review our University's requirements for core curriculum courses in science and elementary school science standards and curriculum. As a result, we now require at least one physical science course be taken. We also require that candidates teach at least two physical science lessons during student teaching. The mean science sub-score has increased by five points since the physical science course has been required.

• **Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and disposition**: Data from our internship assessment over the last three years indicated a relative weakness in demonstrating a belief that all students can become physically educated individuals. We followed up on this data by conducting interviews with selected cooperating teachers to gather more examples of when they observed this weakness. This led to a revision of PE 325 Adapted Physical Education course. Also, a field experience requiring application of knowledge and skills in working with P-12 students with physical impairments is now mandatory.

Continued on next slide
Effect on student learning: RDG 101 Teaching Reading requires candidates to work one-on-one with a struggling reader at our elementary partner school at least one hour a week for a full semester. The candidate uses assessment tools to identify areas to address and develops lessons approved by the classroom teacher before implementation. The students’ progress is recorded and continuously analyzed. Summary data from the last year shows the tutoring has made an impact.