

Transcript for 6A-5.066 January 24, 2018, 3:00 pm EDT

**Slide 1:** Webex team, please start the recording.

Good day, ladies and gentlemen and welcome to the Rule Development workshop and webinar, with an opportunity for public input on draft rule text for Rule 6A-5.066 – Approval of Teacher Preparation Programs.

This is Kimberly Pippin, Program Director with the Office of Educator Preparation and Bureau Chief Eileen McDaniel, as well as other Department staff.

So that everyone is aware, we are conducting this workshop both as a webinar via conference call and face-to-face. I would like to go through a few instructions for all of the different groups of people joining us today. For everyone's information, today's webinar and conference call are being recorded and the recording, the presentation materials and the transcripts will be available upon request.

It will be extremely helpful if you have the draft rule text available so you can follow along as we go through the rule. The draft rule language was posted to the State Board of Education's website on January 10, 2018, and subsequently emailed through our listserv accounts on January 23, 2018. For anyone who has not received the documents, please email Eileen McDaniel at Eileen.McDaniel@fldoe.org. She will send the documents within 2 business days. For those of you in the room, a copy of the rule and supporting documents are located at the back of the room.

For today's discussion, we will be reviewing various sections of the draft rule. For ease of locating each section, please take some time to place page numbers on the draft rule.

**Slide 2:** We are going to conduct our workshop in three sections.

The first part will be a brief overview presentation of the authorizing statutes that are the underpinnings to this rule and form the basis for this draft rule language. Within this part, we will provide to you the basic rule text itself.

After we have reviewed the statutes, and more specifically the rule language being discussed today, there will be two interactive parts.

The interactive portions of today's workshop include Part Two where everyone who is participating, whether it is via the webinar or conference call OR in-person, can ask clarifying questions. This provides an opportunity for someone to make sure he or she understands properly what was said during the presentation, whether it was in the statute or in the draft rule text. These questions – and the comments that follow – will help the Department to improve the draft rule text.

After the question and answer session has ended, we will go to Part Three, which is the actual public comments' section for this rule development workshop.

During this time, audience participants, whether physically participating, or participating by conference call or webinar who wish to make a comment about the rule, will have an opportunity to do so. During this time there will be no responses, or questions, or debate.

**Slide 3:** A few more details about input and participation.

When you are asking a question or making a comment, please state your name and your affiliation, which can be just your institution, your school district, your association, or anything else you want us to know about where you are from.

Persons in the room who wish to ask questions or make comments, we ask that you fill out a speaker's card where you will write your name and your affiliation down so that we have the correct spelling for the record. Please give your Speaker's Card to one of the Department staff prior to the question and comment time.

If you are participating by conference call, please follow the instructions that the operator will provide during part two and three.

If you are participating via the webinar, you can type your question into the text box.

When we get to Part Three, which is the Comment Section, depending on how many people are in the queue to make comments and depending on how much meeting time we have left, we may limit those comments to a certain amount of time that allows everyone the opportunity to speak who wishes to do so.

If you prefer to submit your questions or comments in writing, you can do this at any time.

- You can mail them to us; you can leave them here if you are in the room.
- You can provide input to the State Board of Education's website as noted on this slide, or
- You can submit questions or comments via email.

**Slide 4:** One last thing about input and participation.

This rule is being advertised for public comment. It is draft rule text.

It is extremely important to us that we have your comments and suggestions for change.

This can be things like "Please keep this text."

"Please delete this section."

"Please add this language."

Or “I like where you are going on this except that I think that you need to change it to – or clarify it to say – such and such.”

In order to improve the rule text, we also ask that you be as specific as possible.

**Slide 5:** Before we share what’s in the law and an overview of what is in the draft rule text.

We wanted to share with you that we reached out to stakeholders from teacher preparation programs to take a look at potential draft rule language and gain their input and feedback on the draft language. We are eternally grateful to the following individuals from these esteemed institutions:

Dr. Gina Almerico, University of Tampa

Dr. Amy Guerette, Florida State University

Dr. Gloria Pelaez, St. Thomas University, FACTE President

Dr. Amy Ringue, Daytona State College

Mr. Darran Town, University of South Florida

The draft rule language being proposed for your consideration has been heavily contributed to and influenced by these individuals and others who have sent feedback to us since July.

Again, a huge thank you to all of you for taking the time to review draft rule language and provide considerable feedback and input.

**Slide 6:** We would also like to share with you a little about our journey as we have reviewed and revised this rule with you.

The road to rule revision and potential adoption has been extensive and lengthy – but, from July 2017 to now, time and effort spent on this rule has led to potential changes to the draft language that should benefit all of our teachers and students.

Throughout the last six months, the department has gathered feedback and input during rule development workshops, stakeholder committee feedback sessions, and during the FACTE meeting to inform significant changes to the draft rule language. The version of the draft rule that is being presented today is a result of extensive consideration, feedback and input.

Public input and feedback will remain open up until this rule goes to the State Board of Education for possible adoption. Throughout this time the public comment avenues are open to you and changes to the proposed language being presented to you today for your consideration will continue. In February, after reviewing any additional public input or comment we have received as a result of today’s workshop, we anticipate that we will publish a final version which

the Commissioner will present to the State Board of Education for consideration at its March 21<sup>st</sup> State Board meeting.

Now let's proceed into Part One, which is the part of the presentation regarding what's in the law and an overview of what is in the draft rule text.

**Slide 7:** Before discussing Rule 6A-5.066, Approval of Teacher Preparation Programs.

Let's first begin with a brief discussion of rule authority and what the law says is the content of this rule.

**Slide 8:** The laws that authorize the State Board of Education to adopt rules for the initial and continued approval of ALL state-approved teacher preparation programs permits the State Board to describe the program review process; the continued approval timelines; and the criteria for continued approval. As a reminder, it is the Commissioner of Education that determines the continued approval of all Florida state-approved teacher preparation programs.

The authority comes through statutes – specifically the following:

- For our Initial Teacher Preparation Programs – often termed as our “traditional teacher preparation programs” that usually terminate in a degree – the authorizing statute is Section 1004.04, Florida Statutes, entitled Public Accountability and State Approval for Teacher Preparation Programs. We refer to these programs as ITPs.
- Second, for our Educator Preparation Institutes or EPIs – these are post-baccalaureate programs that also prepare teachers and are offered by institutions and private providers – the authorizing statute is Section 1004.85, Florida Statutes, Postsecondary Educator Preparation Institutes.
- And third, we have Professional Development Certification Programs, formerly called District Alternative Certification Programs, in which school districts and now charter schools and charter management organizations, may offer these post-baccalaureate programs – the authorizing statute is Section 1012.56 paragraph 8.

**Slide 9:** So now, let's turn to the draft rule language itself for your review and consideration.

**Slide 10:** First – let's discuss the significant wins – where your workload should be reduced, some barriers may be lowered, and your limited resources eased a bit to permit you to do what you do – teach teachers how to teach our students.

These are the “high fives” -- the “big wins” -- as a result of proposed rule changes.

First – very importantly...

1.) No longer required are the annual Institutional Program Evaluation Plans (or IPEPs) for ITPs, and the Annual Program Evaluation Plans (APEPs) for EPIs and the District Program Evaluation Plans (DPEP) for PDCPs. Programs will no longer be required to submit an annual IPEP, APEP, or DPEP. Instead, during the last year of the program's approval period, programs will submit a report assuring the department that they remain in compliance with statutory requirements. We will share more about this new requirement later in this presentation.

2.) Programs seeking initial approval will no longer be required to submit matrices describing the assessment tasks for each FEAP indicator or for each Subject Area competency and skill. We streamlined the process to only require programs to submit a curriculum map that identifies which course each FEAP indicator or Subject Area competency/skill is addressed and assessed.

3.) The Initial Program Approval form is now in a side-by-side format. This means that the program approval requirements for each of the three program types are provided in one single form. Not only does the side-by-side format provide an at-a-glance view of each program approval requirement for each of the three types of state-approved teacher preparation programs, the side-by-side format also greatly reduces the number of forms that are incorporated in the rule.

**Slide 11:** So to dig deeper into the proposed rule revisions today – for your consideration – let's look at some specific sections and discuss them for understanding.

First, we wish to note that we have only made significant rule revisions to a few specific sections of the rule.

These sections include:

- The Standards for Approval of Teacher Preparation Programs - located on page 4
- The Initial Program Approval Standards Form referenced in section (3) which is also located on page 4
- The Continued Approval Site Visit Section which starts on page 7 and continues to page 8
- The Evidence of Programmatic Improvement Section found on page 8
- And, the Continued Approval Summative Score which is also located on page 8.

To ensure the rule was clear, comprehensive and logical, we made significant revisions to the organization of the rule by ensuring the processes and requirements for program approval flowed chronologically – for instance, starting with section (2) we specified the standards for program approval, followed by section (3), we specified the specific processes for initial approval, followed by the annual reporting requirements for state-approved teacher preparation programs, and then a description of the requirements and processes for continued approval of teacher preparation programs, and so forth.

This slide depicts the sections of the rule where significant rule revisions were applied.

**Let's review each of these sections together.**

**Slide 12:** So – let's begin a deeper dive into what we just reviewed – where we made significant changes to the draft rule language based on your feedback and input.

First, let's go back to the top of page #4.

Let's review draft language for the Standards for approval of teacher preparation programs section - (2).

This section suggests revisions to the rule to more specifically identify the standards that programs must meet in order to receive initial and continued approval of a teacher preparation program.

The current rule only incorporates the documents that specify the program approval standards; whereas, the proposed draft rule includes the specific standards for initial and continued program approval within the actual rule text. This revision assisted in bringing a greater coherence to the initial and continued approval processes described in section (3) and section (5), respectively.

You will also notice that there are now four standards for program approval, compared to three standards that are currently required by the current version of this rule.

**Slide 13:** Initial Program Approval Standards Form

The initial program approval standards form is incorporated by reference under the section that describes the initial program approval processes – section (3) - and now provides each initial program requirement for each program type in a side-by-side format. The side-by-side document reduces the number of forms incorporated by reference in the rule. Instead of three separate initial program approval standards forms – one for each program type – the draft rule only proposes to include one form.

Other major changes to the initial approval process include - what we shared earlier as a significant win – the streamlining of the initial program approval process. Programs are no longer required to submit a FEAPs or Subject Area Competency Matrix that identifies the assessment task for each indicator or skill. Instead, programs will submit a curriculum map that identify the course where each indicator or competency are addressed and assessed. The department will provide templates to support programs in meeting this new requirement.

**Slide 14:** Continued Approval Site Visit Section – (5)(b)

Let's review the Continued Approval Site Visit Section, specifically section (5)(b) found on page 7 – about 1/5<sup>th</sup> of the way down the page.

This section revises the site visit process in the following manner:

There are now two components of the **site visit** – a program evaluation plan requirement and an onsite visit process.

Let's discuss first the "program evaluation plan." The program evaluation plan is a report that is only submitted during the last year of the continued approval period, prior to the site visit. This report is reviewed by the department to assure that the program is in compliance with the statutory requirements and assures that the program continues to meet these requirements – such as, for initial teacher preparation programs, only admitting individuals who have met the 2.5 Grade Point Average admission requirement and have received a passing score on the General Knowledge examination. These statutory requirements are not reviewed during the onsite visit.

The specific details of these assurances are specified under this section of the rule and require providers to assure that:

- Only candidates that meet state-mandated admission requirements are admitted into the program.
- A certification ombudsman is provided
- All program candidates, prior to program completion, have demonstrated positive impact on student learning growth and passed all portions of the Florida Teacher Certification Examinations.
- Remediate completers who earned a developing or unsatisfactory on their performance evaluation and are referred by the employing school district during their first 2 years immediately following program completion.
- Postsecondary and school district personnel who supervise, instruct or direct candidates during field experience courses and internships meet state-mandated qualifications.
- And, programs have a formal system for continuous program improvement.

All requirements of the program evaluation plan must be met prior to continued approval. Providers not meeting these requirements must submit evidence that the deficiency has been corrected prior to continued approval being issued.

**Slide 15:** Continued Approval Site Visit Section – (5)(b)(continued)

On page 7, a little more than halfway down the page, the processes and timeline for the activities that will occur prior, during and after the onsite visit are described under section (5)(b)2 of the draft rule.

Subparagraph (a) states that the program with the largest enrollment will receive a site visit during the final year of the continued approval period. As a result of feedback, we are proposing to clarify this language to state that "During the final year of the continued approval period, the

Department shall conduct an onsite visit of the program with the largest enrollment for a provider, if an elementary education program or prekindergarten-primary education program is not offered.”

The remainder of this section identifies the specific timeline for the onsite activities, including which standards the onsite visit will review for evidence of the program’s implementation and when the preliminary and final report will be provided to the provider. As a result of feedback from you and others, the first standard – Quality of Selection – will be reviewed only upon the provider’s request. However, even if reviewed, this standard will NOT be calculated into the Continued Approval Site Visit Rating.

**Slide 16:** Continuous Improvement Plan Section - (5)(c)

Now let’s take a look at the Evidence of Programmatic Improvement section of the draft rule, specifically section (5)(c). This section is located on page 8 – about 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the way down.

This section includes an explanation of the process and requirements for the improvement plan that is being recommended for your consideration as part of the continued approval process, including when to submit a progress report with evidence illustrating progress towards the improvement goal. The draft language presented to you in prior workshops stated that an improvement plan was required if the site visit report included findings of *needs improvement* or *inadequate*; however, based on feedback from you and others, this version of the draft rule proposes that ALL programs are required to submit an improvement plan as a result of the site visit.

The improvement plan must specify the goals and strategies that the provider will use to enhance its teacher preparation programs as a result of the feedback received from the written report, as well as the institution identifying the qualitative or quantitative evidence that will be used to measure progress towards the goals. This section proposes that the qualitative and quantitative evidence is due to the department by June 1<sup>st</sup> for fall site visits, or December 1<sup>st</sup> for those with spring site visits.

**Slide 17:** Continued Approval Summative Score – (5)(d)

The proposed revisions to the continued approval summative score section, which is located under section (5)(d) of the draft rule on page 8- halfway down the page- identifies and describes the basis and determination of a program’s continued approval.

The continued approval summative score or CASS includes up to three components. These components are:

APPR Average Summative Rating;

Continued Approval Site Visit Rating; and



Evidence of Programmatic Improvement Rating.

The draft rule language proposes that the components would be weighted as:

50% for the APPR Average Summative Rating;

20% for the Continued Approval Site Visit Rating; and

30% for Evidence of Programmatic Improvement Rating.

The APPR Average Summative Rating and Continued Approval Site Visit Rating would both receive a score between 1.0 – 4.0, with the last component - Evidence of Programmatic Improvement - only receiving a score of 1 or 4. This is because an institution that provides qualitative or quantitative evidence will receive a score of 4. If no evidence is provided this area would receive a score of 1, according to the draft rule language for your consideration.

**Slide 18:** Let's put all of this information together. Now that we have discussed all components that will lead to a Continued Approval Decision, let's examine this more closely. This chart illustrates the three components that factor into the Continued Approval Summative Score, also referred to as CASS.

As illustrated, the first component - APPR Average Summative Rating -constitutes 50% of the Continued Approval Summative Score. The next component - Continued Approval Site Visit Rating - is 20% of the score; and the last component - evidence of programmatic improvement rating – contributes 30% to the Continued Approval Summative Score.

It is important to emphasize that the calculation of these three components form the basis of a program's continued approval decision and will yield a rating of Full Approval with Distinction, Full Approval or Denied, depending on the CASS score. The rating scale for the CASS is located on page 8 of the draft rule.

**Slide 19:** That concludes the overview of what the laws state and the draft rule language for 6A-5.066 offered to you today for your consideration and comment – which was Part One of today's workshop. Now we will move to Part Two, which is to provide you an opportunity to ask clarifying questions.

As a reminder, you may ask questions to clarify anything in the presentation or the draft text. If we are unable to provide an answer today, we will record your questions and get back with you for a response.

**Slide 20:** As a reminder, you may ask questions to clarify anything in the presentation or the draft text. Again, this is the clarifying question section. If you have comments regarding the rule, we will take them a little later.

Remember that input may be provided at any time online at the address noted on this slide.

When we get to the comment section, we will provide more information to assist you.

**Slide 21:** As you think about the input you might provide, please keep these guidelines in mind:

We are seeking input from you on how to improve the rule, such as:

- Suggestions for changes or agreement with specific text in the rule (for example., keep this..., delete this..., add this..., change this to read..., etc.).
- To the extent that you can provide why you believe the change is needed, please provide a reason. This will help us with context and help us track that same issue in other parts of the rule.
- Comments on whether the rule text actually accomplishes what the law and/or presentation indicates is intended.

**Slide 22:** So let's begin with those who are on the conference call line, then the chat feature on the webinar, and then we will go to those who are in the room. For those who are in the room, please indicate to a Department member that you have a clarifying question so that when it is your turn, we can be certain to recognize you.

Operator, will you please compile the queue for questions and answers at this time.

(Answer questions from those on the conference call line first; then the chat room. (Read the Chat Questions out loud for ALL to hear, then respond.)

Finally, ask if anyone in the audience has clarifying questions.

**Slide 23:** With the time remaining, let's turn to the public comments' section of our rule development workshop. We will begin with those on the conference call line, then the chat feature, and finally to those in the audience today. If time is limited, we will limit the amount of time for your comments to no more than 2 minutes each to ensure that all comments are heard and recorded.

Remember, you can also add comments to the website we indicated earlier. As a reminder, during this portion of the workshop, the Department will not respond to your comments, nor will there be a debate about your comments. We appreciate your participation in our rule development workshop today.

**Slide 24:** So, let's begin with those on the webinar and telephone line...

Operator, please compile the queue for comments.

Comments from the chat feature on the webinar?

Comments from the audience?

**Slide 25**: This concludes our Rule Development Workshop for today. Thank you for your participation throughout – and have a good day.