Florida Site Visit Framework

Notes on how review area scores are determined:

1. Reviewers will analyze available evidence and will check all the criteria for inadequateness before considering higher judgment scores.
2. The team will use a preponderance of evidence within each review area to determine the score—except where/when constraining criteria described in number 4 come into play.
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 review area score can NOT be Good 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. Reviewers will triangulate evidence in order to ensure judgments capture typical aspects of the program. Triangulation allows reviewers 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 review area.
   a. For example: A reviewer will connect evidence from observing a program's early literacy course with evidence from observing candidates teaching reading with comments graduates, principals and faculty make about the quality of reading instruction. These two pieces of evidence could then inform judgments in areas 1 (Content Knowledge and Teaching Methods), 2 (Clinical Placement, Feedback, and Candidate Performance) and possibly even 3 (Program Performance Management).

REVIEW AREA 1: Quality of Content Knowledge and Teaching Methods

Context and Rationale: This review area focuses on how well the program ensures teacher candidates acquire content knowledge and key teaching methods and skills needed to be an effective educator. The site visit 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 to make this judgment; one of these sources is direct observation of teacher candidates so that reviewers understand how successfully coursework and related program content convey key content knowledge and teaching methods to all teacher candidates in the reviewed program.

> *Note on elementary reading and math criteria:* The specific criteria set forth in the framework are included as core, research-based components of developing children's literacy and mathematical skills. As such, reviewers will look for the specific aspects of reading and math as outlined.
>
> *Note on online learning:[1]* 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, Post-Bacc Certification-Only):* The site visit will assess how the program determines that its candidates have mastered relevant content knowledge before they complete the program, and how the program responds to any content knowledge improvement that may be needed for admitted candidates as a result of the program's assessment of their content knowledge.

Essential questions being answered:
- How does the program ensure individual teacher candidates have a secure knowledge of their content (especially Scientifically-Based Reading Instruction, Math, other subject areas in elementary programs and secondary content areas for secondary programs)?

---

[1]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 program ensure teacher candidates are well equipped with key teaching techniques and methods (particularly classroom management, assessment, differentiation, academic feedback, questioning skills) 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 so that candidates learn how to apply their coursework knowledge?

Likely sources of evidence for this review area:
- Observations of program courses (including multiple sections of the same course when these are offered)
- Course syllabi
- Conversations with teacher candidates, program faculty/staff, school staff (cooperating teachers, supervising teachers, principals), and recent program graduates
- Program handbooks
- Observations of teacher candidates teaching
- Surveys of program graduates and employers
- Degree Plans

Note on "constraining criteria": The quality of literacy training delivered by the program to all teacher candidates **must be good or better** in order for the final judgment on Quality of Content Knowledge and Teaching Methods to be good.

Indicator 1.1 Content Knowledge[2]				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
*Initial Teacher Preparation ELEMENTARY Program Literacy Training (To include content knowledge, strategies, and application defining learning goals for all learners at various stages of reading and writing development.)	Coursework and training provide **comprehensive, systematic, and sequential training** of scientific research/evidence-based reading instruction within the five essential components[3] of reading paired with elements of early literacy instruction, **consistently enabling** elementary teacher candidates to teach students how to read effectively, ensuring that the **progress of *all* students is good or better.** These elements include: 1. Oral language development 2. Explicit, systematic, and sequential instruction in the areas of: • Phonological processing and phonemic awareness • Phonics instruction • Spelling	Coursework and training **address, systematic, sequential training of** scientific research/evidence-based reading instruction within the five essential components of reading paired with elements of early literacy instruction, **enabling** elementary teacher candidates to teach students how to read effectively, *enhancing the progress and learning of the students they teach.* These elements include: 1. Oral language development 2. Explicit, systematic, and sequential instruction in the areas of: • Phonological processing and phonemic awareness • Phonics instruction • Spelling	Coursework and training address some components of scientific research/evidence-based reading instruction within the five essential components of reading paired with elements of early literacy instruction **and inconsistently enables** elementary teacher candidates to progress the learning of the students they teach. These elements include: 1. Oral language development 2. Explicit, systematic, and sequential instruction in the areas of: • Phonological processing and phonemic awareness • Phonics instruction • Spelling	Coursework and training **do not enable** elementary teacher candidates to teach literacy including scientifically based reading instruction.

---

[2] States may require use of Praxis or other state content knowledge tests (e.g. FTCE in Florida); while programs find this necessary in order to meet state requirements, it is not sufficient in assessing content mastery to ensure that all admitted candidates have a secure grasp of content knowledge.
*Constraining criteria

[3] There are five essential components of reading: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension. Where evidence of a program employing the three-cueing system model of reading or visual memory as a basis for teaching word reading, as referenced in sections 1004.04 and 1004.85, Florida Statutes, a program will receive an inadequate in this criterion.

Initial Teacher Preparation ELEMENTARY-Program Literacy Training (continued)	3. Fluency 4. Comprehension 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	3. Fluency 4. Comprehension 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.	3. Fluency 4. Comprehension 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.	
Initial Teacher Preparation ELEMENTARY-Program **Math Content:** ● Numbers and Operations ● Algebra and Functions ● Geometry and Measurement ● Data Analysis and Probability **Math Pedagogy:** ● Conceptual understanding ● Problem solving ● Fluency	Coursework and training address, comprehensively and in depth, **all major elementary math content areas and key aspects of math pedagogy** to foster conceptual and procedural mastery of math instruction, **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, in depth, **all major elementary math content areas and key aspects of math pedagogy** to foster conceptual and procedural mastery of math instruction 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** elementary 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** elementary teacher candidates to teach elementary math in order to enhance the progress and learning of their students.

Indicator 1.1 Content Knowledge (continued)				
Initial Teacher Preparation- ELEMENTARY- Program Other subject areas • Science • Social Studies • Professional Learning and/or Capstone Coursework[4]	Coursework and training **consistently** enable teacher candidates to master the **content knowledge and skills** necessary to *teach* **highly effective lessons** in elementary subject areas 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 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 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 in order to enhance the progress and learning of their students.
Initial Teacher Preparation SECONDARY Program Core Subject Area	The program **consistently assesses** relevant content knowledge 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 **learning and progress of all students is good or better**.	The program **assesses** relevant content knowledge 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 students they teach.	The program **inconsistently assesses** relevant content knowledge 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 and learning of the students they teach.	There is little evidence that the program assesses candidate content knowledge. Coursework and training **does not enable** secondary teacher candidates to teach their secondary subject and, as a result, **student learning is significantly inhibited.**

---

[4] Courses here could be teaching skills and strategies as well as content-specific in focus.

Initial Teacher Preparation SECONDARY Program Core Subject Area Literacy Training[5] (To include content knowledge, strategies, and application defining learning goals for all learners at various stages of reading and writing development.)	Coursework and training provide **comprehensive, systematic, and sequential training** of scientific research/evidence-based reading instruction within the five essential components[6] of reading paired with elements of early literacy instruction, **consistently enabling** teacher candidates to teach students how to read effectively, ensuring that the **progress of *all* students is good or better.** These elements 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 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	Coursework and training **address, systematic, sequential training of** scientific research/evidence-based reading instruction within the five essential components of reading paired with elements of early literacy instruction, **enabling teacher** candidates to teach students how to read effectively, **enhancing the progress and learning of the students they teach.** The elements 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 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	Coursework and training address some components of scientific research/evidence-based reading instruction within the five essential components of reading paired with elements of early literacy instruction and **inconsistently enables** teacher candidates to progress the learning of the students they teach. These elements 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 6. Grammar/Syntax 7. Written expression 8. Formal and informal assessments that inform literacy instruction. 9. ELL 10. Learning Differences to include dyslexia and students with learning disabilities as well as other learning needs	Coursework and training **do not enable** teacher candidates to teach literacy including scientifically based reading instruction.

[5] Candidates prepared in coverage areas identified in section 1012.585(3)(f), Florida Statutes, must successfully complete all reading endorsement competencies. All other coverage areas not included in section 1012.585(3)(f), Florida Statutes, must successfully complete reading endorsement competencies one (1) and two (2).

Educator Preparation Institutes Content Pedagogy[6]	Coursework and training address, comprehensively and in depth, **all content areas and key aspects of content pedagogy** to understanding and application of content area pedagogy that **consistently enables** teacher candidates to teach the identified content area(s) **highly effectively**, ensuring that the **progress and learning of all students is good or better**.	Coursework and training address secondary content area pedagogy so that candidates understand and can apply content area pedagogy and **enables** teacher candidates to **effectively** teach content specific area(s), such that they **can enhance the progress and learning of the students they teach.**	Coursework and training address **some** secondary content area pedagogy so that candidates understand and can apply content area pedagogy, **but inconsistently enable** teacher candidates to teach content specific area(s) that **enhance the progress and learning of the students they teach.**	Coursework and training **do not enable** teacher candidates to teach content area pedagogy in order to enhance the progress and learning of their students.

Educator Preparation Institute Literacy Training (To include content knowledge, strategies, and application defining learning goals for all learners at various stages of reading and writing development.)	Coursework and training provide **comprehensive, systematic, and sequential training** of scientific research/evidence-based reading instruction within the five essential components[6] of reading paired with elements of early literacy instruction, **consistently enabling** teacher candidates to teach students how to read effectively, ensuring that the **progress of *all* students is good or better.** These elements include:
	1. Oral language development
	2. Explicit, systematic, and sequential instruction in the areas of:
	  • Phonological processing and phonemic awareness
	  • Phonics instruction
	  • Spelling
		Coursework and training **address, systematic, sequential training of** scientific research/evidence-based reading instruction within the five essential components of reading paired with elements of early literacy instruction, **enabling teacher** candidates to teach students how to read effectively, **enhancing the progress and learning of the students they teach.** The elements 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
		6. Grammar/syntax
			Coursework and training address some components of scientific research/evidence-based reading instruction within the five essential components of reading paired with elements of early literacy instruction and **inconsistently enables** teacher candidates to progress the learning of the students they teach. The elements 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
				Coursework and training **do not enable** teacher candidates to teach literacy including scientifically based reading instruction.

---

[6] Candidates prepared in coverage areas identified in section 1012.585(3)(f), Florida Statutes, must successfully complete all reading endorsement competencies. All other coverage areas not included in section 1012.585(3)(f), Florida Statutes, must successfully complete reading endorsement competencies one (1) and two (2).

| Educator Preparation Institute Literacy Training (continued) | 3. Fluency
4. Comprehension
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. | 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. | |

Indicator 1.1 Content Knowledge (continued)				
Educator Preparation Institute- Content Mastery[7] • Assessment • Proactive efforts to address any deficiencies	The program ensures that **all** candidates **consistently demonstrate mastery** of relevant content knowledge, 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 program ensures that **most** candidates demonstrate relevant content knowledge, provides 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 program **inconsistently** ensures that candidates demonstrate relevant content knowledge, 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 program **does not ensure** candidates' ability to demonstrate adequate content knowledge, 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**.

---

[7] Content mastery of candidates is assessed and when deficiencies are evident the program takes measures to ensure those deficits are remediated so that relevant content is mastered.

Indicator 1.2 Teaching Methods[8]				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
Classroom management	Coursework and training in classroom management **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 ● differentiate the learning environment for students in need.	Coursework and training in classroom management **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 ● differentiate the learning environment for students in need.	Coursework and training in classroom management **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 ● differentiate the learning environment for students in need.	Coursework and training in classroom management **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 ● differentiate the learning environment for students in need.

[8] 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 can be used to advance student learning and how use of these skills may differ across content areas.

Indicator 1.2 Teaching Methods (continued)				
Assessment	Coursework and training in assessment equip teacher candidates with the knowledge, understanding, and skills to **accurately assess** K-12 student performance and progress and to adjust their instruction in response to this information. This includes enabling them to utilize formative assessment results in their instruction so that **all** students, including those with ESL, special education, and gifted needs, make at least good academic progress.	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 students and to adjust their instruction in response to this information. This includes enabling them to utilize formative assessment results so that **most** of their students, including those with ESL, special education, and gifted needs, make at least good academic progress.	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.
Differentiation	Coursework and training prepares teacher candidates to **highly effectively** adapt the curriculum and differentiate the content, process and/or product during instruction 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 the content, process or product during instruction 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 the content, process or product during instruction 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 and differentiate to the content, product or process during instruction to meet the needs of students with varying learning needs.

Indicator 1.2 Teaching Methods (continued)				
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 1.3 Connections to Practice[9]				
Criteria	**4 – Strong**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
Connections to Practice between coursework and the clinical application of coursework knowledge	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.) that provide **all candidates** with opportunities to learn how to apply their coursework knowledge to clinical practice.	Program coursework **frequently includes appropriate and good** connections to practice (such as scenarios, use of videos of classroom teaching, fieldwork assignments, simulations, modeling strong instructional practices, etc.) that provide **most candidates** with opportunities to learn how to apply their coursework knowledge to clinical practice.	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., in a way that help candidates learn how to apply coursework knowledge.	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.

---

[9] Through program coursework, all candidates are provided with explicit, real-world applications of the content knowledge and teaching methods presented in coursework, and observe strong modeling of teaching methods and skills, so that teacher candidates learn *how to apply* their coursework knowledge to clinical practice situations. These connections to practice do not assume that fieldwork is the only way to learn application of knowledge to classroom settings: faculty modeling, role-playing among candidates enrolled in the course, the use of videos to demonstrate how skills or knowledge are deployed in the classroom, simulations, and avatar-based practice opportunities are some of the concrete ways connections to practice can be embedded in course content.

REVIEW AREA 2: Quality of Clinical Placement, Feedback, and Candidate Performance

Context/Rationale: The final clinical experience (often referred to as student teaching or internship) offers candidates the opportunity to apply the knowledge acquired through program coursework, prior field 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 review area, reviewers are **not evaluating teacher candidates** through these observations: reviewers 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 reviewers**. 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 is central to the review area, reviewers will include evidence on earlier clinical experiences where appropriate.

> *Note on Educator Preparation Institutes:* For programs where clinical placement is determined by employment of program candidates as teachers of record who are enrolled in the program, the site visit 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.

Essential questions being answered:
- How does the program structure the final clinical experience and select the clinical placement site?
- How are cooperating teachers and/or program supervisors 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 cooperating teachers?
- Is the feedback constructive, actionable and likely to lead to improvement in teaching and learning practices?
- How do cooperating teachers, principals, and/or program supervisors view the overall quality of teacher candidate?
- What is the impact of candidate teaching on student learning during the observed lesson?
- What is the evidence from the site visit with regards to the quality of teacher candidates?

Likely sources of evidence for this review area:
- Observations of teacher candidates teaching
- Observation of feedback provided by program supervisors to candidates
- Blank and completed observations and evaluation instruments
- Conversations with teacher candidates, program faculty/staff, and school/district staff (cooperating teachers, principals, HR)
- Data on all supervisor 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 cooperating teachers and supervisors
- Surveys of program completers

Note on "constraining criteria": The quality of written and oral feedback (Indicator 2.2) 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 2.1 – Clinical Placement				
Criteria	**4 – Strong[10]**	**3 – Good**	**2 – Needs Improvement**	**1 – Inadequate**
Initial Teacher Preparation Program Clinical placement timing and length	Teacher candidates are consistently placed at the beginning of the K-12 school term (ideally at the beginning of a school year), and student teaching lasts for at least a **full school term**. *(The program **intentionally** provides Spring semester student teaching candidates with an opportunity to experience the beginning of school activities **(within the first two weeks)** during the fall semester before student teaching in the spring semester.)*	Teacher candidates are consistently placed within the first two weeks of the K-12 school term (ideally at the beginning of a school year), and student teaching lasts for at least **twelve consecutive weeks.** *(Spring semester candidates participate in **some** of the beginning of school activities the semester before their student teaching. Placements **may not always** occur during the first two weeks of school.)*	Teacher candidates are not consistently placed within the first two weeks of the K-12 school term (ideally at the beginning of a school year), and student teaching **only** lasts for twelve consecutive weeks. *(Spring semester candidates inconsistently participate in the beginning of school activities the semester before their student teaching. Placements are **not intentional** and do not regularly occur.)*	Teacher candidates are not placed within the first two weeks of the K-12 school term (ideally at the beginning of a school year). Student teaching is not twelve **consecutive** weeks. *(Spring semester candidates do not participate in the beginning of school activities the semester before their student teaching.)*

---

[10] Activities for teacher candidates who are consistently placed at the beginning of the K-12 school term include the following activities: preplanning, first day procedures, open house or parent communication(s), and classroom management plans.

Indicator 2.1 – Clinical Placement (continued)				
Educator Preparation Institute Clinical placement timing and length	Teacher candidates are consistently placed **at the beginning of the K-12 school** term (ideally at the beginning of a school year) and student teaching lasts for at least a **full school term**.	Teacher candidates are consistently placed **within the first two week**s of the K-12 school term and student teaching lasts for **at least ten weeks.**	Teacher candidates are **not consistently placed within first two weeks** of the K-12 school term and/or lasts for **less than ten weeks but more than six weeks.**	Student teaching lasts for **less than six weeks.**
Selection of clinical placement schools[11][12]	**High-quality placements ensure** that teacher candidates gain **substantial practical experience** to develop their teaching skills effectively in schools that are **high performing and/or improving over the past two years**, a **substantial portion of which** have a **growing student population**.	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 over the past two years, **some of which** have a **growing student population.**	Placements **inconsistently ensure** that teacher candidates gain **practical experience** to develop their teaching skills effectively in placements where **some schools** are high performing and/or improving over the past two years, **some of which** have a **growing student population.**	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 over the past two years and also serve a **growing student population**.
Selection of cooperating teachers (mentor teachers)[13]	Cooperating teachers are **consistently chosen** based on demonstrated effectiveness and capacity to serve as a mentor.	Cooperating teachers are **often chosen** for effectiveness and capacity to serve as a mentor.	Program **has selection criteria** that cooperating teachers be chosen for effectiveness and capacity to serve as a mentor but **cooperating teachers inconsistently have these.**	There is **no clear rationale** for choosing cooperating teachers for their effectiveness OR for their capacity to serve as mentors.

---

[11] For programs where clinical placement is determined by employment of program candidates as teachers of record who are enrolled in the program this criterion does not apply (e.g. Educator Preparation Institutes).

[12] Team will examine up to 10 schools where most candidates are placed plus any not on that list but where the team observed.

[13] 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.

Indicator 2.1 – Clinical Placement (continued)				
Educator Preparation Institute[14] **Clinical On--Site Supports**	Programs **consistently demonstrate** that **multiple supports** are in place for candidates who are teaching, 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.	Programs demonstrate that they **provide some** onsite support for candidates who are teaching. **examples may 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.	Programs **inconsistently demonstrate supports** are in place for candidates teaching through onsite visits to assess candidate performance and/or **few interventions** are available if/when placement weaknesses arise OR the interventions take place **inconsistently** and/or are **inconsistently effective**.	Programs are **not able to demonstrate supports** are in place for candidates teaching. There is **little or no evidence** of onsite support for candidates and/or **they do not make interventions** when weaknesses in candidate performance arise OR the interventions are **ineffective**.

---

[14] For programs where clinical placement is determined by employment of program candidates as teachers of record who are enrolled in the program, the site visit 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 2.2 – Observation and Feedback				
Criteria	4 – Strong	3 – Good	2 – Needs Improvement	1 – Inadequate
Observation form(s) used by program supervisors	Observation and/or evaluation instrument(s) includes **explicit focus on ALL**: ● 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 instruction ● differentiated instruction for ESL, special education, and gifted needs ● academic feedback and questioning ● Candidate content knowledge	Observation and/or evaluation instrument(s) **addresses most (5--6)**: ● 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 instruction ● differentiated instruction for ESL, special education, and gifted needs ● academic feedback and questioning ● Candidate content knowledge	Observation and/or evaluation instrument(s) **addresses only some (3--4)**: ● 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 instruction ● differentiated instruction for ESL, special education, and gifted needs ● academic feedback and questioning ● Candidate content knowledge	Observation and/or evaluation instrument(s) **addresses few (1--2)**: ● 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 instruction ● differentiated instruction for ESL, special education, and gifted needs ● academic feedback and questioning ● Candidate content knowledge

Indicator 2.2 – Observation and Feedback (continued)			
Program supervisor and cooperating teacher training on observation and evaluation	All program-based supervising teachers and classroom cooperating teachers receive **regular substantive** training to **measurable standards for reliability** on methods and practices of high-quality observation and feedback.	All program-based supervising teachers and classroom cooperating teachers receive **regular substantive training** on methods and practices of high-quality observation and feedback.	Program-based supervising teachers and classroom cooperating 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-based supervising teachers or classroom cooperating 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 the observed lesson, **strategically** builds on previous feedback, and identifies key action steps for improvement.	**Accurate written and oral feedback** after each required observation **usually** has a clear link to **evidence of student learning** during the observed lesson, builds on previous feedback, and identifies **most** key action steps for improvement.	**Written and oral feedback** after each required observation is **inconsistent** and/or **inconsistently builds** upon previous feedback, **does not link** to student learning, and/or **does not directly identify** action steps for improvement.	**Written and oral feedback** after each required observation is **inaccurate** and/or **does not link to** student learning and **does not identify** key action steps for improvement.

[*] Constraining Criteria

Indicator 2.2 – Observation and Feedback (continued)			
Consistency of expecta-tions	Supervising teachers, classroom cooperating teachers and all classroom observers have **consistently high expectations** for candidate performance and student learning, and they work collaboratively to deliver **strong feedback that is accurate and highly relevant** to the needs of teacher candidates.	Supervising teachers, classroom cooperating teachers and all classroom observers **usually** have **consistent expectations** about candidate performance and student learning, and they **mostly** work collaboratively to ensure that **feedback is accurate and relevant** to the needs of teacher candidates.	Supervising teachers, classroom cooperating teachers and all classroom observers **have inconsistent expectations** about candidate performance and student learning, and/or their feedback is **inconsistent or not always relevant** to the needs of teacher candidates.	Supervising teachers, classroom cooperating teachers and all classroom observers provide teacher candidates with **feedback that is not accurate or relevant** to the needs of teacher candidates and/or **expectations are not clear**.

Indicator 2.3 – Candidate Performance				
Criteria	4 – Strong	3 – Good	2 – Needs Improvement	1 – Inadequate
Student engagement and candidate impact on student learning during lesson[15]	**All students are engaged** in learning during the observed lesson and candidate teaching **consistently advances** student learning during the observed lesson.	**Most students are engaged** in learning during the observed lesson and candidate teaching **consistently advances** student learning for most students during the lesson.	**Students are inconsistently engaged** in learning during the observed lesson 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 knowledge	Students benefit from **accurate and high-quality** content because candidates **consistently teach exceptionally well**, demonstrating strong subject knowledge, particularly in reading, literature, history/social studies, math and science.	Students benefit from **accurate** content because candidates consistently teach **well**, demonstrating **good** subject knowledge, particularly in reading, literature, history/social studies, math and science.	Students inconsistently benefit from accurate content because candidates teach inconsistently, demonstrating some **errors** in subject knowledge, particularly in reading, literature, history/social studies, math and science.	Students have **few 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.**

[15] Student learning during an observed lesson can be determined by direct observation of student work in the classroom as well as evidence that students are active in debate and discussion during the lesson, discovering evidence or patterns, making contributions to the understanding of other students—or even the teacher—of a subject or topic, asking and/or answering probing questions, and providing responses to reviewer questions that demonstrate learning and understanding of lesson content.

Indicator 2.3 – Candidate Performance (continued)				
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: ● 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 supported by teacher candidate ability to **consistently and effectively** demonstrate the use of these teaching and learning strategies: ● 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: ● 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 questioning	Student learning and/or engagement is **impeded by** teacher candidate **inability** to use one or more of these teaching and learning: ● 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
Feedback from recent graduates and principals of recent graduates	Recent graduates, cooperating teachers and principals of recent graduates report that program graduates make a **strong positive** impact on student learning without the need for targeted interventional professional **learning** from the school or district.	Recent graduates and principals of recent graduates report that program graduates make a **positive** impact on student learning without the need for targeted interventional professional **learning** from the school or district.	Recent graduates and principals of recent graduates report that **targeted interventional professional learning** from the school or district **was sometimes needed** to enable the graduates to improve their impact on student learning.	Recent graduates and principals of recent graduates report that **significant professional learning 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.

REVIEW AREA 3: Quality of Program Performance Management

Rationale/Context: This review area examines whether and how program leadership—*at all levels*—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. The site visit 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 collected and used by the program and who uses it? How does the program monitor the quality of its data and seek to improve data quality where needed?
- Does the program have—and use—quality control "gates", transition points, or checkpoints at the end of each program stage to decide whether a candidate is ready to move to the next stage? What data are used to make these decisions?
- Does the program have intervention plans for weaker candidates? For those candidates unable to meet performance improvement goals, 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 program leadership monitor connections between coursework and clinical experiences and ensure that faculty know how well their students can implement course content?
- How does program leadership take action as a result of information? Frequency? What steps are taken to monitor the results of steps taken to make improvements?
- How does the program ensure it meets Florida Statutes (1004.04, 1004.85, 1012.56(8)) whereby prior to program completion, each candidate must demonstrate positive impact on student learning growth and pass all relevant portions of the Florida Teacher Certification Examination (FTCE)?

Likely sources of evidence for this review area:
- Data over time (to include: teaching observations, evaluations, surveys, employment outcomes, impact of candidates and graduates on student learning)
- 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 (cooperating teachers, principals)
- Program handbooks, MOUs, and/or other program documents
- Program or individual candidate improvement 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

Indicator 3.1: 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**.
Internal quality control gates (or checkpoints) and intervention plans	Program leadership monitors candidate performance through internal performance checkpoints and **utilizes data** including student learning growth and FTCE results to ensure that all candidates **exceed high standards** of performance before moving into the next phase of their teacher preparation (e.g., into student teaching, 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 monitors candidate performance through internal performance checkpoints and **utilizes data** including student learning growth and FTCE results to ensure that all candidates **meet high standards** of performance before moving into the next phase of their teacher preparation (e.g., into student teaching, 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 including student learning growth and FTCE results to ensure that candidates **meet standards** of performance before moving into the next phase of their teacher preparation (e.g., into student teaching, 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 standards.	The program **does not monitor candidate performance** through formal internal performance checkpoints and/or the **expected standards are unclear** and/or **they do not address Florida Statute and include student learning growth**. The program **does not use formal interventions** (including a counseling out process) for teacher candidates who do not meet program performance standards.

Indicator 3.1: Program Performance Management (continued)				
Quality monitoring (data sources could include: program improvement plans, candidate completion rates, feedback surveys, internal reviews, faculty study groups, faculty/peer observations)	The program has a **formal organized system** through which program leadership uses high-quality data to **regularly and systematically monitor** overall quality of coursework, field experiences, the observation and feedback system employed to support development of teacher candidates, candidate performance and key program outcomes. This includes **regular examination of** observation and feedback instruments and practices as well as **regular training** for supervising teachers	The program has **an informal set of processes** through which program leadership **usually makes use of good data to monitor** overall quality of coursework, field experiences, the observation and feedback system employed to support development of teacher candidates, candidate performance and key program outcomes. This includes **review of** observation and feedback instruments and practices as well as **regular training** for supervising teachers.	Program leadership **inconsistently monitors** overall quality of coursework, field 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 supervising teachers.	The program **does not take steps to monitor** the quality of coursework, candidate fieldwork experiences, and/or the program's observation and feedback practices. Supervising teachers **do not receive at least annual training** to ensure consistency of approach in giving feedback to teacher candidates.
Monitoring coursework quality and coursework-clinical connections	Program leaders **systematically monitor the quality of coursework and teaching and take steps** to ensure there are **strong connections** between program coursework and the clinical component of the program, including methods for sharing 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 have an **informal system** in place to **monitor the quality of coursework and teaching and** to ensure there are **good connections** between program coursework and the clinical component of the program, including methods for sharing 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** and do not ensure the presence of good coursework-clinical connections, and/or they 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.

Indicator 3.1: Program Performance Management (continued)			
Quality improvement planning[16]	The program has a **formal system for improvement planning** informed by **high-quality data**, involving **all relevant stakeholders** in continuous improvement activities, and resulting in **action plans** with **measurable goals.** There is a **sustained cycle** of monitoring, acting on results, and assessing the impact of improvement steps on program outcomes.	The program's quality improvement activities **usually make use of good quality data** and involve **many key stakeholders** to produce action plans with measurable goals. However, **there is no formal system** in place that supports a sustained cycle of monitoring, acting on results, and assessing the impact of improvement steps on program outcomes.	The program **inconsistently** makes use of improvement plans based on monitoring data to develop action steps that result in stronger outcomes for individual and groups of teacher candidates and completers.	Quality improvement plans are **not used to examine the effectiveness** of the program and secure further improvements in outcomes for individual and groups of teacher candidates and completers.

---

[16] Quality improvement planning involves all stakeholders, using results to take action for continuous improvement.

REVIEW AREA 4: Quality of Selection

Context and Rationale: This review area 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. ***This review area is for informational purposes only.***

Essential questions being answered:
- What principles, criteria, and recruitment/selection practices drive the 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 program completers more representative of the student population of the schools and/or district(s) served by the program?

Likely sources of evidence for this review area:
- 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

Indicator 4.1 – Selection				
Criteria	4 – Strong	3 – Good	2 – Needs Improvement	1 – Inadequate
GPA[17]	**All** of the most recently admitted cohort of students are selected with a **GPA of 3.0 or greater**.	**At least 75%** of the most recently admitted cohort of students are selected with **a GPA of 3.0 or greater**.	**Less than 75%** of the most recently admitted cohort of students are selected with **a GPA of 3.0 or greater**.	**GPA for more than 50%** of the most recently admitted cohort of students is **below 2.75**. –OR– The program is **unable to provide data** to reviewers on the individual pre-selection GPA of all admitted candidates.
Standardized Tests[18]	Teacher candidates selected for the program are **drawn from the top third** of the college going population, as measured by appropriate standardized tests.	Teacher candidates selected for the program are **drawn from the top half** of the 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 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 college going population. –OR– The program is **unable to provide data** to reviewers on the individual ACT/SAT scores of all admitted candidates.

[17] All programs should be able to provide review teams with the pre-admission grade point averages (GPA) of all admitted candidates.

[18] This applies to programs housed in institutions that use nationally normed standardized tests in their admissions processes; community and state colleges and post-baccalaureate programs generally do not require standardized test scores like ACT, SAT, or GRE, so this criterion does not apply in those situations. For programs that cannot provide standardized test data but are housed in an institution that can provide this information, reviewers will look at the institution average for the most recently admitted class.

Indicator 4.1 – Selection (continued)				
Demographic representation of enrolled candidates	The demographic profile of enrolled teacher candidates **makes a significant contribution** to a teacher workforce more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program**,** as shown by evidence that **progress has been made over at least three consecutive years AND the program has a written plan with clear objectives and timelines.**	The demographic profile of enrolled teacher candidates **contributes** to a local teacher workforce more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program, as shown by **evidence that progress has been made over the past two consecutive years AND** the program has a **written plan with clear objectives and deadlines**.	There is **little evidence that progress has been made** on selecting candidates whose **demographics** contributes to a local teacher workforce more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program.	The program **does not enroll a population** of teacher candidates that contributes to a local teacher workforce more representative of the K-12 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	The demographic profile of program completers **makes a significant contribution** to a teacher workforce more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program**,** as shown by **evidence that progress has been made over at least three consecutive years AND** the program **has a written plan with clear objectives and timelines.**	The demographic profile of program completers **contributes** to a local teacher workforce more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program, as shown by evidence that **progress has been made over the past two consecutive years AND** the program has a **written plan with clear objectives and deadlines**.	There is **little evidence that progress has been made** on producing new teachers whose **demographics** contributes to a local teacher workforce more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program.	The program **does not produce a population** of completers that contributes to a local teacher workforce more representative of the K-12 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.

Indicator 4.1 – Selection (continued)				
Admission Process (e.g. audition, interview, etc.)	The program uses **multiple measures[19]** in addition to standardized test scores and pre-selection GPA to determine fit and/or promise for teaching in its admission process, **systematically monitors** whether these measures result in effective teacher candidates, **and provides evidence supporting the impact** of these measures.	The program uses **measures** in addition to standardized test scores and pre-selection GPA to determine potential for teaching in its admission process and **informally monitors how these measures impac**t 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 effectiveness.	The program **does not examine any potential or fit for teaching measures** beyond standardized test scores and pre-selection GPA.

---

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