

CONTINUED PROGRAM APPROVAL TRAINING TRANSCRIPT

Slide 1 – Introduction

Welcome to the Bureau of Educator Recruitment, Development and Retention's Continued Approval Standards Training. Thank you for making time in your schedule to attend this technical assistance session. My name is Kay Caster, Educational Policy Consultant with the Office of Educator Preparation.

I will talk about the Florida Department of Education Continued Program Approval Standards during this presentation. Therefore, you may wish to have available the rule language and the continued approval standards documents, which can be found at:

<https://www.flrules.org/gateway/RuleNo.asp?title=EDUCATOR%20STANDARDS,%20PREPARATION%20AND%20PERFORMANCE&ID=6A-5.066> and
<https://www.flrules.org/gateway/reference.asp?No=Ref-04964>

During this technical assistance, I will provide an overview of the continued approval process and introduce you to the new continued approval standards. At the end of this presentation, you will have an opportunity to ask questions on any part of the training or the recent changes that were adopted for continued state approval of educator preparation programs.

Slide 2 - Section 1004.04, Florida Statutes, Public accountability and state approval for teacher preparation programs and Section 1004.85, Florida Statutes, Postsecondary educator preparation institutes.

The requirements for continued state-approval of an Initial Teacher Preparation program and an Educator Preparation Institute program at your institution are set forth in Florida Statutes 1004.04 and Section 1004.85 Florida Statutes, in State Board of Education Rule 6A-5.066.

Both sections of the Florida Statutes provide language on continued approval, with a distinct focus on evidence that the program is implementing the requirements of the standards and indicators and performance of program completers.

Therefore, changes to standards by statute and rule now include approval criteria based on performance from measurable outcomes. These outcomes are to demonstrate the program's performance in preparing program completers that are effective in the classroom and have a positive impact on P-12 student achievement.

Slide 3 - Rule 6A-5.066, FAC Approval of Teacher Preparation Programs

Rule 6A-5.066 of the Florida Administrative Code provides for a system of approving teacher preparation programs. The Rule outlines the process for initial state approval and continued approval. Recently, Rule 6A-5.066 was revised and now provides a definition of key terms, such as "continued approval." The Rule also provides processes, policies, and criteria for determining

continued approval, including the procedures and requirements for data reporting, performance expectations and field experiences.

Slide 4 - Continued Program Approval Standards Are...

The Continued Approval Standards, as codified in Rule 6A-5.066, are specified for each program type. These standards are to ensure a fair, consistent, and balanced review for all programs on criteria that are to be met in order to receive a rating of Acceptable. Additionally, the Continued Program Approval Standards indicate what must be included in the report of the program's evaluation plan which is submitted annually, the program summary report, and the program implementation as evidenced through the site visit to receive an "Acceptable" rating.

Slide 5 - Graphic

The continued program approval process now covers a five-year cycle. This process is displayed in the graphic on Slide 5. The process includes the annually submitted program evaluation plans based on the continued approval standards; summative ratings of annual program performance reports (APPRs) which reflect the program's results on each outcome-based performance metric; and the results from the site visit review conducted during the final year of the program approval period. The results of Steps 1-3 are summarized and presented to the Commissioner who makes the final decision for continued program approval, as shown in Step 4. I will now explain the role of each of these continued approval requirements and how they impact continued program approval.

Slide 6 - Step 1: Annual Program Evaluation Plan

Each year, all state-approved programs submit candidate and completer data to the state via the eIPEP system. The reports vary depending on the program type: Initial Teacher Preparation Programs and Educational Leadership programs submit Institutional Program Evaluation Plans (IPEPs) and Educator Preparation Institutes submit Annual Program Evaluation Plans (APEPs). These annual plans are to describe clearly, with supporting data and evidence, how the program has met the criteria for continued approval as described in the "Continued Program Approval Standards" document. As you see in the document, Continued Program Approval Standards Document, which would be either Form ITP CAS-2015 or Form EPI CAS-2015), there are three standards with associated indicators that are the foundation for meeting continued approval requirements. Standard 1, "Program Candidate and Completer Quality" focuses on how the program provides high-quality preparation and how candidates and completers positively impact students' academic achievement. Standard 2, "Field and Clinical Practices," emphasizes the program's ability to provide meaningful field and clinical experiences with supervision by qualified personnel that provide constructive feedback and support to guide positive progression and development for each program candidate. And, Standard 3 which is pivotal in the continued approval process due to its focus on using sustained, evidence-based data to continuously improve the program's impact and the effectiveness of its candidates and completers.

The program evaluation plans that you submit for your program by November 15th of each year must fully describe any programmatic changes, address departmental feedback and review findings, and describe how the program has made continuous improvement based on measurable results by evaluating and analyzing candidate and completer data, as well as other program performance data as evidence.

Slide 7 - Step 2: Annual Program Performance Report (APPR)

Step 2 involves the Annual Program Performance Report, known as the APPR, reports on completers' performance who were employed as instructional personnel in a Florida public school district. Performance metrics that are not applicable to a program are not rated.

Slide 8 - Step 2: Annual Program Performance Report (APPR) continued

Each program with an APPR receives a summative score from 1 to 4. These scores are based on the six performance metrics identified in state law. Briefly, I will explain these six performance metrics.

Placement Rate is determined by those completers who were employed in either of the two subsequent years following completion in an instructional position in a Florida public school district. Programs may also provide data for candidates teaching in private schools or out-of-state schools if data are available and verifiable.

Retention Rate is determined by the average number of years instructional personnel (who were initially employed in either of the 2 subsequent years following completion) remained employed in a five year follow-up period from initial employment. Again, programs may also provide data for candidates teaching in private schools or out-of-state schools if data are available and verifiable.

Student learning growth is based on the performance of pre-kindergarten to grade 12 students on statewide assessments for in-field completers from the previous three year period who received a student learning growth score from the most recent year.

Student performance by subgroups is based on the performance of students in prekindergarten through grade 12, who are assigned to in-field program completers aggregated by student subgroup, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This measurement is to show how well the teacher preparation program prepares teachers to work with a diverse population of students in a variety of settings in Florida public schools. Scores are based on completers from the previous 3-year period who received a student learning growth score from the most recent year.

Results of program completers' annual evaluations are based on completers from the previous three year period who received an evaluation rating from the most recent year.

Production of program completers in statewide critical teacher shortage areas that are identified annually by the State Board of Education is a Bonus Only metric. Scores are based on the number of completers from the most recent year compared to the number of completers from the previous year.

Slide 9 - Step 3: The Site Visit Review

Step 3: During the final year of the five-year approval period, a site visit review is conducted by a team of reviewers. The reviewers are institutional faculty and administrators who have been trained to ensure an objective and fair review of continued approval standards, and have expertise in continued state approval, assessment, curriculum design, and clinical training. The site visit, in conjunction with evidence and descriptive reports provided by the institution for each program, informs the Commissioner for determination of continued approval. This slide displays the two parts of the site visit review process: the off-site review and the on-site review. Both parts are critical to determining whether a program receives continued approval for the next program cycle. I will explain each part of the site visit review in the next two slides.

Slide 10 - The Off-Site Visit Review

During the Off-Site review, the review team first reviews the annual Program Evaluation Plans, such as the IPEPs and APEPs and the Annual Program Performance Reports, or APPRs, for each program and for each year during the 5-year period. The Off-Site team review also includes the institution's Summary Report for each program. This summary report provides narrative information and data detailing how the program has met requirements, with a strong focus on how the program has undergone continuous improvement throughout the five-year cycle. The summary report should show year-to-year progression, summarize and offer reflections on program outcomes, identify trends and patterns, and explain key programmatic changes. There should be data that are clear and detailed on candidate and completer performance over the program approval cycle. The off-site review concludes with a report of findings outlining acceptable compliance, weaknesses and/or omissions determined through evidence, documentation and/or descriptions. The off-site review report also identifies specific areas or items that need further clarification. This report offers guidance to both the institution and to the review team prior to the start of the on-site review.

Slide 11 - The On-Site Visit Review

Following the off-site review, the review team visits the institution for the on-site review. The purpose of the on-site visit review is to substantiate the continuous improvement process by obtaining and reviewing additional evidence, resolving questions, identifying exemplars and possibly any weaknesses that may exist. The on-site visit may include orientations with the assessment system and individuals involved with the field experiences, sessions where candidates exhibit their knowledge of the FEAPs and demonstrate impact on student learning, interviews with key personnel, classroom observations, and any other means that may provide critical evidence for making recommendations for continued approval.

Once the on-site review has been completed, the review team produces a comprehensive report called the Final Report of Findings with Recommendations. The report is a comprehensive evaluation of all evidence presented to the team and a thoughtful and thorough description of recommendations and justification for the scoring of continued approval. The final report is presented into three sections. The first section is a summary reporting the scores

for each standard. Scoring is based on the Continuous Approval Standards Rubric which is used by the site visit review team to determine whether the program met each of the standards and indicators at an Acceptable level. The resulting overall score or summative rating for each program on the site visit will range from 1 to 4. The second section of the on-site visit team's report will detail findings, accolades and recommendations based on the continued approval standards. The third section provides for the results of calculated averages of all Annual Program Performance Reports for each program over the continued approval period, which is then added to the summative rating score for the continued approval site visit. This Final Report of Findings and Recommendations is submitted by the chair of the review team to the Office of Educator Preparation for approval by the Commissioner.

Slide 12 - Continued Approval Summative Score

Rule 6A-5.066 specifies that "approval" or "denial" of continued approval will be based on the scoring from the site visit team and the average of the APPR summative rating scores that the program received over the course of the five-year period. Rule provides a calculation, which is called a Continued Approval Summative Score. I will explain the calculation in the next slide.

Slide 13 - Step 4: Commissioner's Decision on Continued Approval Status

The Commissioner determines and authorizes continued approval based on the Continued Approval Summative Score, or CASS. The CASS is calculated in this way:

- Take the average of all of the APPR summative rating scores for the program for the five-year cycle.
- Add the average of the APPR summative rating to the site visit summative score for the program.
- Divide the resulting sum by 2. This is the calculation for the Continued Approval Summative Score, or CASS, which will range from 1.0 to 4.0.

The Commissioner will authorize continued approval based on the CASS for each program:

- Full Approval with Distinction: CASS is above 3.5
- Full Approval: CASS is between 2.4 to 3.5
- Denial of Approval: CASS is below 2.4

If a program is denied continued approval, the institution may choose to reapply for initial approval through the initial approval process.

Slide 14 - The Continued Program Approval Standards

Initial and continued approval of all programs are based on three standards. The three approval standards are interconnected, meaning one leads to the other. Data collected, analyzed and evaluated on Standard One, Program Candidate and Completer Quality and Standard Two, Field/Clinical Practices should establish clear and specific evidence that support Standard Three, Program Effectiveness.

Standard Three, Program Effectiveness is focused on how data were reviewed and analyzed on a regular and ongoing basis for continuous program improvement. Program Effectiveness essentially is continuous improvement that is sustained, founded upon data driven evidence, and results from regular evaluation of the effectiveness of the program's candidates and completers. Although continued approval is based on the quality of all three standards, Standard three is crucial to continued approval of programs so Standard Three and its indicators will be closely reviewed during the continued approval process. I will provide further detail on Standard 3 in the next couple of slides.

Slide 15 – Standard Three, Indicator 3.1

Continuous Improvement is based on what data were collected and analyzed on the program's candidates and completers. It is critical to evaluate data outcomes from Standards One and Two in determining program effectiveness and key program or policy changes. Questions to consider and respond to are:

- What aggregated data were collected and how were they used?
- What analysis of aggregated program candidate and program completer outcome data occurred?
- What areas of need or weaknesses were identified?
- What remedies were implemented for any APPR performance target receiving a Level One or Level Two score?
- What outcomes were evaluated from changes implemented?

Slide 16 - Standard Three, Indicator 3.2

Standard 3, Indicator 3.2 focuses on the program elements and capacity for impacting P-12 student learning. Programs should have processes for examining candidates' mastery of the Uniform Core Curricula and completers' performance in educating students on the Florida Standards. Evidence should be supported by:

- Specific program elements identified by aggregated data analyses that were determined as areas of strength or areas of weakness for continuous program improvement.
- Stakeholders' roles, responsibilities, and involvement in the decision-making process for program enhancements and changes.
- Specific programmatic enhancements and changes that were made (or will be made) resulting from the decision-making process.

Slide 17 - Opportunity for Questions

Now I will provide an opportunity for you to ask questions regarding this overview of continued program approval.

Slide 18 - Contact Information

Thank you for your participation in the Continued Program Approval Training today. This slide shows contact information for the Office of Educator Preparation staff. We are glad to offer assistance for you in this process.