



# **Louisiana Teacher Preparation Provider On-Site Review Framework**

**May 2020**

*For use during the first accountability cycle of the Teacher Preparation Quality Rating System  
(2020-2021 and 2021-2022)*

## Domain 1: Quality of Recruitment and Selection

**Rationale:** This domain addresses the teacher preparation provider’s responsibility to recruit and select candidates who show potential for the teaching profession and the current regional educational context.

Indicator 1.1	Level 4 – Strong	Level 3 - Good	Level 2 – Needs Improvement	Level 1 - Inadequate
<p>To what extent do the selection and recruitment criteria and practices result in candidates who show potential for success in the teaching profession?</p> <p><b>Criteria</b></p> <p>a. Selection process includes multiple measures</p> <p>b. Consistency and rigor in candidate selection</p>	<p>The provider’s selection criteria include multiple measures with <b>clear descriptions</b> of how each measure is used to determine final selection.</p> <p>The provider’s selection criteria are <b>rigorous, well documented, and consistently applied</b> across all programs.</p> <p>The provider is able to demonstrate that at least <b>90 percent of candidates across all programs</b> meet the agreed upon selection criteria.</p> <p>The provider <b>regularly reviews and hones</b> its selection processes to increase the quality of their candidate pool.</p>	<p>The provider’s selection criteria include multiple measures with <b>clear descriptions</b> of how each measure is used to determine final selection.</p> <p>The provider’s selection criteria are <b>rigorous, well documented, and consistently applied</b> across all programs.</p> <p>The provider is able to demonstrate that at least <b>90 percent of candidates across all programs</b> meet the agreed upon selection criteria.</p>	<p>The provider’s selection criteria include multiple measures.</p> <p>The provider’s selection criteria are <b>not well documented</b> or are <b>inconsistently</b> applied across programs.</p> <p>The provider is <b>unable to demonstrate</b> the proportion of candidates who meet the agreed selection criteria.</p>	<p>The provider’s selection criteria rely on one measure.</p> <p>The provider’s selection criteria are <b>not documented and are inconsistent</b>.</p> <p>The provider is <b>unable to demonstrate</b> the proportion of candidates who meet the agreed selection criteria.</p>
Indicator 1.2	Level 4 – Strong	Level 3 - Good	Level 2 – Needs Improvement	Level 1 - Inadequate
<p>To what extent is there convincing evidence that recruitment and selection processes result in candidate cohorts that represent the students of the region?</p> <p><b>Criteria</b></p> <p>a. Diversity planning</p> <p>b. Impact of diversity plans</p>	<p>The provider has created <b>specific and measurable diversity goals</b> that will result in program completers who are more representative of the K-12 student body they will serve.</p> <p>The provider has developed a <b>concrete plan</b> for meetings those goals.</p> <p>The provider has <b>solid evidence</b> of how its work over a three year period is resulting in a demographic profile of program completers that is more representative of the student population of the schools or the school systems served by the program.</p> <p>Strategies to meet the diversity goals are <b>regularly reviewed and revised</b>.</p>	<p>The provider has created <b>specific and measurable diversity goals</b> that will result in program completers who are more representative of the K-12 student body they will serve.</p> <p>The provider has developed a <b>concrete plan</b> for meetings those goals.</p> <p>The provider has <b>some evidence</b> of how its work over a three year period is resulting in a demographic profile of program completers that is more representative of the PK-12 student body they will serve.</p>	<p>The provider has created diversity goals but <b>has not defined</b> how these goals will be measured.</p> <p>The provider has <b>not developed a clear plan</b> for meeting diversity goals.</p> <p>It is <b>difficult for the provider to show</b> how its work over a three year period is resulting in a demographic profile of program completers that is more representative of the PK-12 student body they will serve.</p>	<p>The provider <b>has not established</b> diversity goals or strategies to achieve these goals.</p> <p><b>The provider is unable to demonstrate</b> how its work over a three year period is resulting in a demographic profile of program completers that is more representative of the PK-12 student body they will serve.</p>

*\*Diversity includes gender, race, ethnicity and social/economic status.*

### Possible Sources of Evidence

- Handbooks, policies and protocols outlining the program’s admission criteria and process
- Interviews with program staff
- Written plans detailing strategic recruitment efforts
- Demographic data on school cohort, most recent completer cohort, local and state K-12 students and teacher workforce
- K-12 student outcome data

## Domain 2 - Quality of Content Knowledge and Teaching Methods

**Rationale:** This domain focuses on how effectively the program ensures teacher candidates acquire content knowledge and the key teaching methods and skills needed to grow students by one academic year or meet IEP goals.

Constraining criteria for PK-3, ELEMENTARY, and ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS Education Program Reviews: *Indicator 2.1 must be good or strong in order for the final score on Quality of Content Knowledge and Teaching Methods to be good.*

Indicator 2.1	Level 4 – Strong	Level 3 - Good	Level 2 – Needs Improvement	Level 1 - Inadequate
<p>To what extent does the provider prepare candidates to teach students to write and to read utilizing the five essential components of reading instruction?</p> <p><b>Criteria</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coverage of writing and of the five essential components of reading instruction*, as applicable to the certification grade band (e.g., early childhood, elementary, secondary)</li> <li>Modeling of effective literacy teaching strategies</li> <li>Responsiveness of courses to candidates’ needs</li> <li>Candidates’ abilities to teach students literacy skills</li> </ol>	<p>Literacy courses and training provide <b>comprehensive coverage</b> of writing and of the five essential components of reading instruction.</p> <p>Course instructors <b>consistently model</b> effective literacy teaching strategies.</p> <p>Course instructors <b>consistently adjust</b> course content or training to address gaps in candidates’ ability to teach students how to read.</p> <p>Candidates <b>consistently and effectively teach students literacy skills</b>, as observed in field observations.</p>	<p>Literacy courses and training provide <b>comprehensive coverage</b> of writing and of the five essential components of reading instruction.</p> <p>Course instructors model effective literacy teaching strategies, <b>most of the time</b>.</p> <p>Course instructors <b>adjust</b> course content or training to address gaps in candidates’ ability to teach students how to read, <b>most of the time</b>.</p> <p><b>Candidates effectively teach students literacy skills, most of the time</b>, as observed in field observations.</p>	<p>Literacy courses and training are <b>somewhat consistent</b> with current research.</p> <p>Course instructors <b>inconsistently model</b> effective literacy teaching strategies.</p> <p>Course instructors <b>inconsistently adjust</b> course content or training to address gaps in candidates’ ability to teach students how to read.</p> <p><b>Candidates inconsistently or ineffectively teach students literacy skills</b>, as observed in field observations.</p>	<p>Literacy courses and training are <b>inconsistent</b> with current research.</p> <p>Course instructors <b>rarely model</b> effective literacy teaching strategies.</p> <p>Course instructors <b>rarely adjust</b> course content or training to address gaps in candidates’ ability to teach students how to read.</p> <p>Candidates <b>display limited</b> ability to teach students literacy skills, as observed in field observations.</p>

\*The five essential components of reading instruction are phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, comprehension, and fluency.

Indicator 2.2	Level 4 – Strong	Level 3 - Good	Level 2 – Needs Improvement	Level 1 - Inadequate
<p>To what extent does the provider ensure that all candidates master the content knowledge and content pedagogy needed to effectively grow students by one academic year or meet IEP goals?</p> <p><b>Criteria</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Course instructors’ knowledge of current PK- 12 student standards and the content knowledge and content pedagogy needed to teach the standards</li> <li>Course instructors’ teaching of how to use PK-12 student standards</li> <li>Candidates’ mastery of content knowledge and content pedagogy</li> </ol>	<p>Course instructors <b>consistently demonstrate full knowledge</b> of current PK-12 student standards and the content knowledge and content pedagogy needed to teach the standards.</p> <p>Faculty <b>consistently model</b> effective practices for utilizing PK-12 student standards, including prioritizing and sequencing key skills and concepts, to facilitate student learning.</p> <p>Candidates <b>consistently</b> utilize content knowledge and content pedagogy effectively, as observed in field placements.</p>	<p>Course instructors <b>consistently demonstrate full knowledge</b> of current PK-12 student standards and the content knowledge and content pedagogy needed to teach the standards.</p> <p>Faculty model effective practices for utilizing PK-12 student standards to facilitate student learning, <b>most of the time</b>.</p> <p>Candidates utilize content knowledge and content pedagogy effectively, <b>most of the time</b>, as observed in field placements.</p>	<p>Course instructors display <b>limited knowledge</b> of current PK-12 student standards and the content knowledge and content pedagogy needed to teach the standards.</p> <p>Faculty <b>inconsistently model</b> effective practices for utilizing PK-12 student standards to facilitate student learning.</p> <p>Candidates <b>inconsistently</b> utilize content knowledge and content pedagogy effectively, as observed in field placements.</p>	<p>Course instructors <b>do not demonstrate knowledge</b> of current PK-12 student standards or the content knowledge and content pedagogy needed to teach the standards.</p> <p>Faculty <b>rarely model</b> effective practices for utilizing PK-12 student standards to facilitate student learning.</p> <p>Candidates display <b>limited ability</b> to effectively utilize content knowledge and content pedagogy, as observed in field placements.</p>

Indicator 2.3	Level 4 – Strong	Level 3 – Good	Level 2 – Needs Improvement	Level 1 - Inadequate
<p>To what extent does the provider ensure teacher candidates practice and implement effective <b>planning for instruction</b> utilizing high-quality curricular materials and practice and implement effective teaching skills* needed to grow students by one academic year or meet IEP goals?</p> <p><b>Criteria</b></p> <p>a. Course instructors’ use of high-quality curricular materials</p> <p>b. Course instructors’ modeling of effective teaching skills*</p> <p>c. Candidates’ mastery of effective teaching skills*</p>	<p>Course instructors <b>consistently</b> ground their teaching of planning for instruction in the use of high-quality curricular materials.</p> <p>Course instructors <b>consistently and effectively model</b> all of the teaching skills outlined below.</p> <p>Candidates <b>consistently and effectively implement</b> all of the teaching skills outlined below, as observed in field placements.</p>	<p>Course instructors <b>consistently</b> ground their teaching of planning for instruction in the use of high-quality curricular materials.</p> <p>Course instructors <b>consistently and effectively model</b> all of the teaching skills outlined below.</p> <p>Candidates implement most teaching skills outlined above <b>most of the time</b>, as observed in field placements.</p>	<p>Course instructors <b>inconsistently</b> ground their teaching of planning for instruction in the use of high-quality curricular materials.</p> <p>Course instructors <b>inconsistently model</b> teaching skills or model <b>limited</b> teaching skills.</p> <p>Candidates <b>inconsistently implement</b> effective teaching skills, as observed in field placements.</p>	<p>Course instructors <b>rarely</b> ground their teaching of planning for instruction in the use of high-quality curricular materials.</p> <p>Course instructors <b>rarely model</b> effective teaching skills.</p> <p>Candidates <b>rarely implement</b> effective teaching skills, as observed in field placements.</p>
<p><i>*Teaching skills include effectively building classroom culture, assessing student learning, differentiation (including for English language learners and special education students), academic feedback and questioning, and content specific teaching strategies.</i></p>				
<p><b>Possible Sources of Evidence</b></p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multiple sources of evidence are used within this domain; one of these sources is direct observation of Louisiana teacher candidates during the one-year residency so review team members understand how successfully coursework and related program content convey key content knowledge and teaching methods to all teacher candidates in the inspected program.</li> <li>• Course syllabi</li> <li>• Interviews with teacher candidates, program faculty/staff (including supervising teachers), school staff (mentor teachers, principals), and recent program completers, with list of interview question prompts included in the corresponding handbook</li> <li>• Program handbooks</li> <li>• Observations of teacher candidates teaching</li> <li>• Surveys of program completers and employers, other provider data (e.g., state agency provided data)</li> <li>• Degree Plans, course catalogs</li> </ul>				

## Domain 3 - Quality of Feedback and Candidate Performance

**Rationale:** This domain focuses on how effectively the program provides feedback to candidates within their residency placements. It also assesses how well program supervisors use observation and feedback data to inform individual goal tracking and interventions to candidates in the field.

Indicator 3.1	Level 4 – Strong	Level 3 - Good	Level 2 – Needs Improvement	Level 1 - Inadequate
<p>To what extent does the program utilize a process for written and oral feedback that is grounded in PK-12 student learning and includes measurable growth goals for candidates?</p> <p><b>Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Written and oral feedback grounded in PK-12 student learning</li> <li>b. Growth goals for candidates</li> </ul>	<p>All observers <b>consistently provide</b> written and oral feedback that is accurate and has a clear link to <b>evidence of student learning</b> during the observed lesson.</p> <p>Written and oral feedback after each observation <b>strategically</b> builds on previous feedback and identifies <b>key measurable growth goals</b>.</p> <p><b>All feedback</b> results in <b>teacher candidates knowing precisely what they must do next to improve their practice</b> and how these improvements will be measured.</p> <p>The provider <b>regularly reviews and hones</b> their written and oral feedback processes.</p>	<p>The majority of observers consistently provide written and oral feedback that is accurate and has a clear link to <b>evidence of student learning</b> during the observed lesson.</p> <p>Written and oral feedback after each observation builds on previous feedback and identifies <b>key measurable growth goals</b>.</p> <p><b>Most feedback</b> results in <b>teacher candidates knowing precisely what they must do next to improve their practice</b>.</p>	<p>There is an agreed process for written and oral feedback, but not all observers use the process consistently or accurately. This results in written and oral feedback that is <b>inaccurate or does not link</b> to student learning.</p> <p>Written and oral feedback after each observation <b>inconsistently</b> builds upon previous feedback or does not directly identify key measurable growth goals.</p> <p>Feedback <b>inconsistently</b> results in teacher candidates <b>knowing what they must do next</b> to improve their practice.</p>	<p>Written and oral feedback after each required observation is <b>inaccurate or does not link to student learning</b>.</p> <p>Written and oral feedback after each observation and <b>does not identify</b> key measurable growth goals.</p> <p>Teacher candidates are <b>often unclear</b> about what they must do next to improve their practice.</p>
Indicator 3.2	Level 4 – Strong	Level 3 - Good	Level 2 – Needs Improvement	Level 1 - Inadequate
<p>To what extent does the observation and feedback process result in improvement in the quality of student learning in the K-12 setting?</p> <p><b>Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Effectiveness of supports to meet growth goals</li> <li>b. Counseling out process</li> <li>c. Impact of observation and feedback process</li> </ul>	<p>Supervisors <b>consistently provide effective supports</b> to candidates to meet growth goals.</p> <p>The program has <b>formal interventions</b> (including a counseling out process) that are grounded in feedback <b>from both program supervisors and mentor teachers</b> for teacher candidates who do not meet program performance standards.</p> <p>Candidates <b>consistently improve</b> their teaching practice. Candidates also <b>consistently advance</b> student learning, as observed in field placements.</p>	<p>Supervisors provide effective supports to candidates to meet goals, <b>most of the time</b>.</p> <p>The program has <b>formal interventions</b> (including a counseling out process) that are grounded in feedback from both program supervisors and mentor teachers for teacher candidates who do not meet program performance standards.</p> <p>Candidates <b>consistently improve</b> their teaching practice. Candidates also <b>advance</b> student learning, <b>most of the time</b>, as observed in field placements.</p>	<p>Supervisors <b>inconsistently provide</b> supports to candidates to meet goals.</p> <p>The program has <b>formal interventions</b> (including a counseling out process) for teacher candidates who do not meet program performance standards. Formal interventions may not be grounded in feedback from <b>both program supervisors and mentor teachers</b>.</p> <p>Candidates demonstrate <b>uneven or inconsistent improvements</b> to their teaching practice. Candidates also <b>inconsistently</b> advance student learning, as observed in</p>	<p>Supervisors <b>rarely</b> provide supports to candidates to meet these goals.</p> <p>The program <b>does not use formal interventions</b> (including a counseling out process) for teacher candidates who do not meet program performance standards.</p> <p>Candidates demonstrate <b>limited improvements</b> to their teaching practice. Candidates <b>rarely contribute</b> to student learning, as observed in field placements.</p>

### **Possible Sources of Evidence**

- Observations of teacher candidates teaching
- Observation of feedback provided by program supervisors to candidates
- Blank and completed observations and evaluation instruments
- Interviews with teacher candidates, program faculty/staff, and school/district staff (mentor teachers, principals, HR)
- Data on all program supervisor and/or mentor teacher 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 mentor teachers and supervisors
- Surveys of program completers and host school site administrators, other provider data (e.g., state agency-provided data)



## Domain 4 - Quality of Continuous Improvement Process

**Rationale:** This domain examines how the program collects and utilizes data, and works with school system partners, to continually improve the quality of the teacher preparation program.

Indicator 4.1	Level 4 – Strong	Level 3 - Good	Level 2 – Needs Improvement	Level 1 - Inadequate
<p>To what extent do program leaders and faculty systematically collect and collate high-quality* data to facilitate continuous program improvement?</p> <p><b>Criteria</b></p> <p>a. Alignment of leaders and faculty on use of high-quality data</p> <p>b. Data collection processes</p> <p>c. Data accessibility</p>	<p>Program leaders and faculty can clearly articulate what high-quality* data are in their context and how data will be used to inform continuous improvement efforts.</p> <p>High-quality data are <b>regularly collected using standardized practices</b> across all programs.</p> <p>Data are efficiently collated and readily available for leaders to use.</p>	<p>Program leaders and faculty can clearly articulate what high-quality* data are in their context. Program leaders have <b>some understanding</b> of how high-quality data will be used to inform continuous improvement efforts.</p> <p>Data are <b>regularly collected using standardized practices</b> across <b>most programs</b>.</p> <p>Data are efficiently collated and readily available for <b>most</b> leaders to use.</p>	<p>Program leaders and faculty have <b>limited knowledge</b> of what high-quality* data are in their context and how high-quality data will be used to inform continuous improvement efforts.</p> <p>Data are collected regularly <b>but not through standardized practices</b>.</p> <p>Data are not easily accessible.</p>	<p>Program leaders and faculty <b>cannot articulate</b> what high-quality* data are in their context or how high-quality data will be used to inform continuous improvement efforts.</p> <p>Program data are collected <b>irregularly or infrequently</b>.</p> <p>Data are not accessible.</p>
<p><i>*High-quality data could include but is not limited to: candidates’ or program completers’ impact on K-12 student learning (including student achievement data on state-wide assessments), course surveys, observation data from mentor teachers and clinical faculty, focus groups with residents and program completers regarding their preparedness to teach; focus groups with mentor teachers and principals regarding candidates’ preparedness to teach.</i></p>				
Indicator 4.2	Level 4 – Strong	Level 3 - Good	Level 2 – Needs Improvement	Level 1 - Inadequate
<p>To what extent do program leadership, faculty, partner district and school leaders, and mentor teachers engage in continuous improvement planning?</p> <p><b>Criteria</b></p> <p>a. Use of data</p> <p>b. Impact of continuous improvement planning</p>	<p><b>Leadership at all levels</b>, including program faculty, partner district and school leaders, and mentor teachers— <b>regularly meets</b> to analyze high-quality data.</p> <p>Based upon these meetings, improvement plans with <b>specific, measurable, and rigorous goals</b> grounded in <b>improving K-12 student learning</b> are developed.</p> <p>Plans are <b>regularly reviewed and revised</b>.</p> <p>As a result, the provider can <b>concretely demonstrate</b> that the program is improving over time, as evidenced by at least <b>90 percent</b> of improvement goals being met.</p>	<p><b>Leadership at most levels</b>, including program faculty, partner district and school leaders, and mentor teachers— <b>regularly meets</b> to analyze high-quality data.</p> <p>Based upon these meetings, improvement plans with <b>specific, measurable, and rigorous goals</b> grounded in <b>improving K-12 student learning</b> are developed.</p> <p>Plans are <b>sometimes reviewed and revised</b>.</p> <p>As a result, the provider has <b>some evidence</b> that the program is improving over time.</p>	<p><b>Some</b> program leaders and faculty meet <b>infrequently</b> to analyze high-quality data.</p> <p>Based upon these meetings, improvement plans with <b>general goals</b> are developed.</p> <p>Improvement plans include <b>limited connections to improving K-12 student learning</b>.</p> <p>Plans are <b>rarely</b> revisited or revised to ensure goals are met.</p> <p>As a result, the provider has <b>limited evidence</b> that the program is improving over time.</p>	<p>Program leaders and faculty <b>rarely</b> meet to analyze high-quality data.</p> <p>Improvement plans, if developed, <b>rarely</b> address key areas of improvement that are grounded in high-quality data.</p> <p>As a result, the provider is <b>unable to demonstrate</b> that the program is improving over time</p>

### Possible Sources of Evidence

- Data over time (which could include teaching observations, evaluations, surveys, employment outcomes, impact of candidates and completers on student learning (to include value-added results)
- 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 (mentor teachers, principals)
- Program handbooks, MOUs, and/or other program documents
- Program or individual candidate improvement/intervention 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
- State agency-provided data