Division of Teaching and Learning

Educator Quality and Effectiveness Team

State EPP and/or Program Approval

Site Review Team Final Report

STATE EPP and/or PROGRAM APPROVAL VISIT TO:

(Institution/Organization)

(Location)

(Date)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.   Introduction

It is recommended, but not required, that the <ins>sample language templates</ins> below be used or incorporated into an official Site Review Team findings report after a state approval site visit has been conducted on a non-traditional educator preparation provider seeking to obtain state EPP approval.

A.   The institution/organization

The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) _____ (organization/program name) based in Washington, DC, is committed to providing a pipeline of qualified educators to serve in the PreK-12 public, private and charter schools. Founded in _____ (year) by _____ (founders, social entrepreneurs or parent organization), the organization was initially granted state approval to offer educator preparation programs which lead to an educator credential in the District of Columbia in _____ (month) of _____ (year). The (organization/program name) mission is "_____." (Mission statement).

The EPP employs a non-traditional program delivery model, whereby program or teacher candidates serve as resident teachers of record under the guidance and mentorship of other, experienced teachers, while undergoing their preparation. The delivery model for the program emphasizes the importance of the immediate integration of theory-based instruction with clinical practice, supported by ongoing and regular mentorship.

B.   The unit and its program(s)

The EPP _____ (program name) is located at_____ (address) in Washington, DC. During the onsite review process, _____ (lead person name) served as the Executive Director and was named as the Unit Head. _____ (person name) serves as the Program Manager and was named as the organization's Accreditation Coordinator on its application.   The organization's application included a request for the approval of a single subject area program _____ (subject area).

C.   The Review

On December 30, 2011, the OSSE Educator Quality and Effectiveness team received an application from _____ (organization/program name) declaring its intent to seek renewal of its state approval program status, which authorizes the EPP to prepare and recommend educator candidates for DC educator credentials. On _____ (date), in accordance with established procedures, _____ (organization/program name) submitted an organizational report demonstrating its compliance with the DC Organizational Standards for Educator Preparation, as well as a subject area program proposal for the above-referenced program in _____ (subject area).

A state-appointed and trained site review team (SRT) was assembled in the weeks immediately following submission of the organizational report and subject area program proposal. This SRT conducted a fact-finding review of _____ (organization/program name) application and supporting materials that included the applicable subject area standards, as well as the admission and program structure requirements. The review was conducted in accordance with guidelines for review and evaluation delineated on the OSSE educator accreditation and state approval website and set forth in the District of Columbia Organizational Standards for educator preparation that gives guidance for EPPs seeking State EPP approval.

To demonstrate evidence of meeting standards, _____ (organization/program name) provided the SRT with the required exhibits electronically, in advance of the scheduled on-site evaluation visit. The decision to provide electronic exhibits facilitated a _____ (length of visit) on-site evaluation visit. The overall analysis of the review team regarding the on-site accreditation review was that the organization was _____ (prepared/not prepared) for the review and that it _____ (clearly/did not clearly) outlined its approach to preparing educators in a way that meets the DC standards.

In particular, the review team cited the organization's _____ (list programs, special projects and partnerships) as a _____ (effective/ineffective) means for identifying and preparing

qualified future candidates for educator roles in the DC schools. The review team also noted the

_____ (rigor/lack of rigor) of the organization's selection process and in particular its _____

(ability/inability) to root out candidates whose dispositions toward teaching and student learning

are inappropriate for roles in school settings.

Final Scoring and Rating of Site Review

The site review team members must rate the EPP on each standard and element of the educator

preparation program. The rating rubric for is listed below. Educator preparation programs

seeking new or continued State EPP approval must score a rating of 2 or higher.

     3 = Target
     2 = Acceptable
     1 = Unacceptable
     0 = Information insufficient for making an initial judgment

II. State EPP and/or Program Approval Sample Recommendation

A. State EPP Approval Recommendation

The following recommendations are presented for consideration by the District of Columbia State Superintendent of Education. Following these recommendations is a detailed report of findings made by the site review team, which serves as the basis for the recommendations.

Recommendation:

Grant/Not Grant State EPP and/or Program Approval through June 30, or December 31, 201X

Organizational Standards Ratings:

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge Skills and Dispositions
The Standard is met/ met with areas for improvement/not met

Standard 2: Assessment System and Organizational Evaluation
The Standard is met/ met with areas for improvement/not met

Standard 3: Field Experiences
The Standard is met/ met with areas for improvement/not met

Standard 4: Diversity
The Standard is met/ met with areas for improvement/not met

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development
The Standard is met/ met with areas for improvement/not met

Standard 6: Organizational Governance and Resources
The Standard is met/ met with areas for improvement/not met

B. Program Approval Recommendation

As a part of the overall state EPP and program approval review, the SRT conducted an extensive assessment of the EPP's individual subject area program(s). The analysis consisted of an in-depth look at the curriculum for each program to determine its alignment with state program standards, and an examination of the quality and validity of the key and minor assessments selected to measure candidates' ability to demonstrate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions.

The analysis also included an in-depth review of the candidate performance assessment data which resulted as a product of the organization's overall assessment system. As a result of the review team's analysis, the following program approval status recommendations are presented for consideration by the State Superintendent of Education.

Recommendation:

Grant/Not Grant State EPP Approval   through June 30, or December 31, 201X
For the following program subject area(s):

Subject Area(s) Listed Below

-
-

Rating for Each Element of the Standards: In the column for "rating," please rate how adequately each element of the standard is being addressed based on the information available prior to (during pre-visit) the on-site visit.

0 = Information insufficient for making an initial judgment **1 = Unacceptable** **2 = Acceptable** **3 = Target**

III. Site Review Team Findings

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional and state standards.
0 = Information insufficient for making an initial judgment 1 = Unacceptable 2 = Acceptable 3 = Target

Indicators	Rating	Comments
1a. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates		
1b. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates		
1c. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates		
1d. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals		
1e. Student Learning for Other School Professionals		
1f. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates		

Overall Assessment of Standard 1

Recommendation: The standard is <mark>met/not met/met with areas for improvement</mark>.

Rationale:
-
Areas for Improvement:
-

Standard 2: Assessment System and Organization Evaluation

The organization has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and completer performance, and organization operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the organization, and its programs.

0 = Information insufficient for making an initial judgment 1 = Unacceptable 2 = Acceptable 3 = Target

Indicators	Rating	Comments
2a. Assessment System		
2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation		
2c. Use of Data in Organizational Improvement		

Overall Assessment of Standard 2

Recommendation: The standard is <mark>met/not met/met with areas for improvement</mark>.

Rationale:
-

Areas for Improvement:
-

Standard 3: *Field Experiences*

The organization and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

0 = Information insufficient for making an initial judgment 1 = Unacceptable 2 = Acceptable 3 = Target

Indicators	Rating	Comments
3a. Collaboration between Organization and LEA/School Partners		
3b. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice		
3c. Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions To Help All Students Learn		

Overall Assessment of Standard 3

Recommendation: The standard is <mark>met/not met/met with areas for improvement</mark>.

Rationale:
-

Areas for Improvement:
-

Standard 4: *Diversity*
The organization designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including P-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

0 = Information insufficient for making an initial judgment 1 = Unacceptable 2 = Acceptable 3 = Target

Indicators	Rating	Comments
4a. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences		
4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty		
4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates		
4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P–12 Schools		

Overall Assessment of Standard 4

Recommendation: The standard is <mark>met/not met/met with areas for improvement</mark>.

Rationale:
-

Areas for Improvement:
-

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development		
Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues. The program systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.		
0 = Information insufficient for making an initial judgment 1 = Unacceptable 2 = Acceptable 3 = Target		
Indicators	**Rating**	**Comments**
5a. Qualified Faculty		
5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching		
5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service		
5d. Organization Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance		
5e. Organization Facilitation of Professional Development		

Overall Assessment of Standard 5

Recommendation: The standard is <mark>met/not met/met with areas for improvement</mark>.

Rationale:
-

Areas for Improvement:
-

Standard 6: Organization Governance and Resources		
The organization has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional and state standards.		
0 = Information insufficient for making an initial judgment 1 = Unacceptable 2 = Acceptable 3 = Target		
Indicators	**Rating**	**Comments**
6a. Organization Leadership and Authority		
6b. Organization Budget		
6c. Personnel		
6d. Organization's Facilities		
6e. Organization's Resources including Technology		

Overall Assessment of Standard 6

Recommendation: The standard is <mark>met/not met/met with areas for improvement</mark>.

Rationale:
-

Areas for Improvement:
-