

# **OVERVIEW OF INPUTS FOR TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS & EVALUATION PROCESS CREATED FOR REDESIGN OF TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS**

## **National Experts**

During 2001-02, five national experts were hired by the State to do the following:

- Identify inputs to examine the quality of teacher preparation programs;
- Identify a process to evaluate redesigned teacher preparation programs; and
- Evaluate alternate and undergraduate teacher preparation programs.

The national expert hired as a consultant to oversee the work was the following:

- George Noel, Ph.D., Louisiana State University and A&M College

The four national experts hired as consultants to serve on a panel to identify inputs, develop the evaluation process, and evaluate the programs during the first cycle were:

- Dr. Craig Frisby, Ph.D., University of Missouri
- Martin A. Kozloff, Ph.D., University of North Carolina – Wilmington
- Kathleen Madigan, Ph.D., National Council on Teacher Quality
- Douglas McLeod, Ph.D., San Diego State University

Staff from the Louisiana Department of Education and Board of Regents met with the national experts as inputs and procedures were developed. The inputs and evaluation process they identified were used by the Louisiana Department of Education, Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, and Louisiana Board of Regents to develop redesign guidelines and evaluate redesigned teacher preparation programs from 2001 to 2010. Inputs were further refined by other national experts (e.g., Dr. Melissa Dodson, UTEACH, University of Texas at Austin, Mathematics Content; Dr. Linda Blanton, Florida International University, Mild/Moderate Special Education, etc.) who were hired as consultants during 2002-2010 to evaluate teacher preparation programs in specific content areas.

Information about the development and use of the process can be found in the redesign guidelines and evaluation reports on the Board of Regents website at the following URL:

<http://regents.louisiana.gov/index.cfm?md=pagebuilder&tmp=home&pid=290>

Names of all national experts hired as consultants to evaluate the programs can be found at the above URL in the introduction section of the individual evaluation reports.

## **Teacher Preparation Inputs**

The inputs that were identified by the national experts to evaluate the quality of teacher preparation programs were the following:

- Evidence of collaboration among college of education, college of arts/sciences/ humanities, and district teachers/administrators to develop the program.
- Evidence of an effective process to recruit and select teacher candidates.
- Alignment of teacher preparation curriculum to Louisiana Department of Education certification policies.
- Alignment of teacher preparation curriculum to Louisiana Department of Education PK-12 content standards.
- Alignment of teacher preparation curriculum to national PK-12 content standards.
- Alignment of teacher preparation curriculum to Louisiana teacher standards (e.g., Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching)
- Alignment of teacher preparation curriculum to national teacher standards (e.g., INTASC standards) and NCATE standards.
- Alignment of teacher preparation curriculum to No Child Left Behind expectations.
- Alignments of teacher preparation curriculum to Praxis basic skills, content, and professional knowledge exams.
- Alignment of objectives, site based activities, and assessments in courses to state/national standards.
- Existence of empirical base for courses that includes current and relevant research.
- Appropriateness and current dates of textbooks and resources for the specific content areas and grade spans for certification.
- Differentiation of materials and activities for specific content areas and grade spans within courses that contain candidates from multiple grade spans.
- Meaningful site-based activities that start early in the program and allow candidates to develop knowledge and skills in a progressive manner while working with children.
- Objectives, site-based experiences, and assessments that are aligned and appropriate for initial certification for new teachers
- Criteria to select sites for field-based experiences.
- Screening process and criteria to select mentors/supervisors for field-based experiences.
- Process to train mentors/supervisors to evaluate candidates.
- Evidence of handbooks or materials for student teaching/internships.
- Sufficient faculty with the necessary expertise to deliver the program.
- Evidence of an effective process to support completers of the program.
- Evidence of an effective process to evaluate the quality of the program and use evaluation data to improve the program.

### **Teacher Preparation Evaluation Process**

The process that was identified and used to evaluate teacher preparation programs from 2001 to 2010 was the following:

- Have the state develop guidelines that require teacher preparation programs to submit written documentation for the following:
  - Identification of Programs
    - Identification of Programs
    - Degree/Program Plans (Official Plan Forms)

- Degree Course Sequence
  - Progression of Site-Based Experiences
  - Alignment of Courses to Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching
- Program Description
  - Structure of Program
  - Teacher Preparation Programs and District Collaboration
  - Recruitment, Screening, and Selection
  - Support and Retention of Program Completers
- Narrative Description of Courses
  - Catalog Description
  - Course Form
  - Measurable Objectives
  - Assessments
  - Empirical Base
  - Resource and Materials
  - Qualified Faculty
- Description of Field Sites and Performance Activities
  - Criteria Used to Select Sites for Field-Based Experiences
  - Screening Process Used to Select Mentors/Supervisors
  - Preparation Process Used to Train Mentors/Supervisors to Support and Evaluate Candidates
- Assessment System and Program Evaluation
- Institutional Level Evaluation of Program
- Have teacher preparation programs form redesign teams composed of college of education faculty, college of arts/sciences/humanities faculty, and K-12 school/district partners to develop written redesign proposals based upon the guidelines and submit the proposals to the state for evaluation by national experts.
- Have nationally recognized experts use national expectations to determine if the redesign proposals address the inputs integrated into the guidelines.
- Have state experts determine if the programs address state certification requirements, state content standards, and state teacher standards.
- Have the national and state experts interview a team of university and district partners from each institution that developed the proposal to attain additional information about potential weaknesses.

- Have the national and state experts identify the following for each program:
  - **Strengths (Mandatory):** A list of strengths observed in each teacher preparation program by the evaluators.
  - **Stipulations (Mandatory):** A list of stipulations teacher preparation programs are required to address for the program(s) to be approved.
  - **Recommendations for Future Improvements (Optional):** A list of recommendations for teacher preparation programs to consider when further developing the program. Teacher preparation programs are not required to address the recommendations in order for their programs to be approved.
  
- Have the national and state experts make an overall recommendation about each of the redesigned program using one of the following:
  - **Recommended for Approval:** Programs that exhibited many strengths and had no stipulations
  - **Recommended for Approval with Stipulations:** Programs that had areas in need of further development
  - **Not Recommended for Approval:** Programs that were in need of major program redesign
  
- Have the State prepare a report that contains all of the experts’ recommendations, strengths, stipulations, and recommendations for future improvement for each individual institution and make the report available to the public.
  
- Have the programs “Recommended for Approval” be approved by the Board of Regents and Board of Elementary and Secondary Education for implementation.
  
- Have programs “Recommended for Approval with Stipulations” prepare a rejoinder that addresses the stipulations identified in the evaluators’ reports and submit them to the Board of Regents and Louisiana Department of Education for review. If all stipulations are addressed, the programs should be recommended for approval to the two boards.
  
- Have programs “Not Recommended for Approval” reconvene their redesign committees to further redesign their programs before resubmitting proposals during a future cycle.
  
- Terminate all pre-redesign programs that do not attain Board of Regents and Board of Elementary and Secondary Education approval by a date established in policy.
  
- Use national accreditation (e.g., NCATE) and the Teacher Preparation Accountability System (that includes value-added results) as outcome measures to determine if the teacher preparation programs successfully implemented what was proposed within the redesign proposals.

## **Impact (2001-2010):**

- As a result of this process during 2001-2010, the following occurred:
  - Some universities voluntarily chose not to submit redesign programs in specific content areas even though they had previously offered preredesign programs in those areas. The universities knew that they did not have faculty with the level of expertise that the national experts expected for the programs to be approved. Therefore, they chose to not submit and no longer offer programs in those content areas.
  - National experts maintained high expectations and there were programs that were not approved. These programs reestablished their redesign committees and identified more K-12 partners to further redesign their programs. The programs had to go through a full evaluation again by national experts during a later evaluation cycle. In some cases, the national experts did not approve the programs during the second evaluation cycle.
  - Due to the high expectations of the national experts, very few institutions had programs recommended for full approval.
  - Most teacher preparation programs had numerous stipulations and had to submit rejoinders to identify how they would be addressing the stipulations. The rejoinders were reviewed by a state committee and programs were not recommended for approval to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education and Board of Regents until all stipulations had been addressed.
  - Some programs did not address their stipulations and their pre-redesign programs were terminated. Candidates could no longer enter the programs after the termination date.
  - All teacher preparation programs are now NCATE/TEAC accredited.
  - As a result of the Teacher Preparation Accountability System, one institution's redesigned programs were labeled as "At-Risk" and entered into corrective action. The institution voluntarily decided to reconstitute their teacher preparation program and terminated all of their grades 4-8 and 6-12 programs which had few completers and only continued to operate their PK-3 and Grades 1-5 programs that were producing new teachers with 100% passage rate on the Praxis examinations.

*Prepared by:  
Jeanne Burns  
Louisiana Board of Regents*