**GUIDELINES FOR THE BOARD OF REGENTS TEACHER PREPARATON APPROVAL AND EVALUATION SYSTEM** ***(Updated: 9.19.17)***

## A. STRUCTURE OF THE GUIDELINES

The *Guidelines for the Board of Regents Teacher Preparation Approval and Evaluation System* have been designed to address the following seven questions that the National Academy of Education recommended in a report entitled *Evaluation of Teacher Preparation Programs: Purposes, Methods, and Policy Options* that was released in 2013 and identified a decision framework for constructing or revising a teacher preparation evaluation system.

*Question 1: What is the purpose of the teacher preparation evaluation system?*
*Question 2: What aspects of teacher preparation are considered to be important?*
*Question 3: What sources of evidence will provide the most accurate and useful information about the aspects of teacher preparation that are of primary interest?*
*Question 4: How will the measures be analyzed and combined to make a judgment about program quality?*
*Question 5: What are the intended and potentially unintended consequences of the evaluation system for TPPs and education more broadly?*
*Question 6: How will transparency be achieved? What steps will be taken to help users understand how to interpret the results and use them appropriately?*
*Question 7: How will the system be monitored?*

## B. PURPOSE OF THE BOR TEACHER PREPARATION APPROVAL AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

The primary purpose of the Board of Regents (BoR) Teacher Preparation Approval and Evaluation System is:

*To demonstrate that teacher preparation programs at public universities in Louisiana are addressing workforce needs as they prepare and support teacher candidates and new teachers who demonstrate knowledge and skills to successfully teach PK-12 students to be college- and career-ready.*

## C. ASPECTS OF TEACHER PREPARATION THAT MATTER THE MOST

The five aspects of teacher preparation that matter the most and will be addressed in the *BoR Teacher Preparation Approval and Evaluation System* will be the following:

- Program Innovation
- Candidate Selection
- Knowledge and Skills for Teaching
- Performance as Classroom Teachers
- Program Productivity and Alignment to State Needs

Four of the five areas are aligned with the major components for the *2020 Key Effectiveness Indicators* identified by Michael Allen, Edward Crowe, and Charles Coble (Teacher Preparation Analytics) in 2014. Teacher Preparation Analytics provided permission for the State to use the structure to create Louisiana's *Teacher Preparation Data Dashboards* and the Board of Regents evaluation system. The area of "Program Innovation" was identified by the college/school of education deans/directors.

## D. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE ABOUT ASPECTS OF TEACHER PREPARATION THAT ARE IDENTIFIED AS IMPORTANT

All teacher preparation programs MUST provide evidence for ALL of the following nine areas to be approved to operate teacher preparation programs at public universities in Louisiana. Failure to meet expectations in one area can result in loss of BoR approval to offer degrees and programs.

**BOR REQUIREMENTS FOR APPROVAL OF TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS**

- ☑ Regional institution accreditation (i.e., SACSCOC).
- ☑ University System and Board of Regents (BoR) approval to offer degrees and programs.
- ☑ Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) initial and onging approval for program completers to receive a license to teach in Louisiana.
- ☑ National program accreditation (i.e., CAEP/NCATE/TEAC).
- ☑ Documentation of teacher preparation program alignment to BESE policy.
- ☑ Documentation of integration of current state and national student and teacher standards into the teacher preparation curriculum.
- ☑ Attainment of BoR completer requirements.
- ☑ Compliance with Title II Higher Education Act.
- ☑ Attainment of effectiveness measures.

The following identifies types of evidence that must be provided for each of the nine requirements for approval and evaluation of teacher preparation programs by the BoR.

*Evidence #1:* *Regional Institution Accreditation* - A public university must provide documentation when responding to multiple requirements in the following areas to obtain initial institution accreditation and later reaffirmation institution accreditation from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC).

a. Integrity of institution operation in all matters

b. Core requirements for an institution to operate (e.g., governance, leadership, planning and evaluation, student enrollment, degrees, student/faculty support, financial base, physical resources, etc.)
c. Comprehensive standards which reflect good practice and accomplishments in higher education (e.g., mission, selection/evaluation of leadership, organizational structure, delegation of authority, expectations, instruction, competency of faculty, community/public service, etc.)
d. Adherence to federal requirements

*Evidence #2:* *University System and Board of Regents Program Approval* - A public university must submit a Letter of Intent and Proposal to their university system and the BoR for each individual teacher preparation degree/program, have the proposals undergo review by State and national experts, and successfully address all of the following areas to be approved to offer a degree and program.

*Information Required for All University Degrees and Programs:*
a. Description of Program and Curriculum
b. Identification of Need for the Program
c. Recruitment, Selection, and Enrollment of Students
d. Provision of Qualified Faculty
e. Availability of Library and Other Resources to Support Learning
f. Availability of Facilities and Equipment
g. Administrative Structure and Support
h. Accreditation of Program
i. Subject Matter Fields at the University That Support the Program
j. Costs

*Additional Information Required for Teacher Preparation Programs:*
a. Alignment of Courses to BESE Certification Requirements
b. Alignment of Courses to BESE Teacher Standards/Competencies
c. Alignment of Courses to BESE PK-12 Student Content Standards
d. Sequence of Courses
e. Progression of Clinical Experiences
f. Description of Recruitment and Selection of Teacher Candidates
g. Descriptions of Teacher Preparation Courses (i.e., Course Syllabi)
h. Description of Clinical Experiences (e.g., Clinical Educators, Placements)
i. Description of Assessment System and Program Evaluation

*Evidence #3:* *Board of Elementary and Secondary Education Initial and Ongoing Approval* – The Louisiana Department of Education (LDOE) reviews all Proposal documentation provided by the BoR for a new degree/program to verify that the degree/program meets all BESE policy requirements. In addition, BESE/LDOE conducts on-site reviews to determine if all BESE policies for teacher certification, teacher preparation program approval, and teacher preparation evaluation are being addressed.

*Evidence #4:* *National Program Accreditation.* A public university must provide evidence to demonstrate that they have successfully collected data and addressed national and state standards (i.e., National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), or Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)). *(Note: CAEP is now the only agency for national program accreditation.)*

*National CAEP Expectations:*

a. Candidate development and use of in-depth content knowledge and practices to advance student learning
b. Existence of effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice.
c. Quality of candidates as a continuous process during recruitment, selection, and progression
d. Impact of completers upon P-12 student achievement/development, instruction, and school plus satisfaction of completers regarding preparation
e. Collection and use of valid data to examine the effectiveness of completers and to improve the program.

As part of the national program accreditation process, all undergraduate degree and advanced degree pathways are required to undergo Program Review with National Recognition to align specialty licensure area data with national standards developed by specialized professional associations (SPAs). All alternate pathways, post-baccalaureate certificates, graduate certificates, post-master certificates, and formal programs of study are to undergo Program Review with Feedback instead of Program Review with National Recognition.

The BoR will waive programs required to undergo CAEP Program Review with National Recognition if the programs: (1) do not have required state licensure tests; (2) are new programs that have not been in existence long enough to produce an annual cohort of completers; and (3) if the licensure program areas have under 10 candidates over three cycles of data reported.

*Evidence #5*: *Program Alignment to BESE Policies* - A public university must provide documentation when requested by the BoR to demonstrate that changes in courses to teacher preparation programs continue to be aligned with BESE policies.

*Evidence #6*: *Integration of Current State/National Standards for Students/Teachers into the Preparation Curriculum* - A public university must integrate changing State and national standards for students and teachers into the teacher preparation program to ensure that new teachers are prepared to address changing needs in schools.

*Evidence #7:* *BoR Completer Review* - A public university must provide evidence that they have met Board of Regents expectations for a minimum number of graduates over three years.

a. Number of graduates of undergraduate degrees

b. Number of graduates of Master of Arts in Teaching degrees
c. Numbers of students being awarded Post-Baccalaureate Certificates and Masters Certificates for completers of Practitioner Teacher Programs and Certification-Only alternate programs.

*Evidence #8:* *Title II Higher Education Act* - A public university must provide evidence that they have submitted data elements to the United States Department of Education (USDE) to comply with requirements for the Higher Education Act. Examples of data elements submitted each year are: Listing of all programs; number of enrolled students; number of completers; candidates' races; candidates' gender; candidates' requirements to enter and exit teacher preparation programs, candidates' median GPA when entering and exiting the programs; candidates' majors; candidates' subject areas; candidates' average scaled scores and passage rates for each licensure assessment taken; identification and attainment of yearly program goals for mathematics, science, special education, and Limited English Proficient Students; identification of programs identified as at-risk and/or low performing; program use of technology, etc.

*Evidence #9:* *Effectiveness Measures* - A public university must provide evidence that they have successfully met State expectations to demonstrate teacher preparation effectiveness. One indicator pertaining to passage rates of licensure assessments is currently being used as an effectiveness measure for the BoR Teacher Preparation Accountability System to identify At-Risk and Low-Performing programs for reporting to the USDE for the Title II Higher Education Act. Other measures will be identified in the future.

## E. COMBINATION AND ANALYSIS OF MEASURES TO MAKE A JUDGEMENT ABOUT PROGRAM QUALITY

Programs must meet *all* of the following criteria for programs at public universities to be approved by the BoR:

*Evidence #1 Criteria: Regional Institution Accreditation*

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) must report that the university meets initial institution accreditation expectations and later meets reaffirmation institution accreditation requirements. *Types of Data:* Input and Output. *Review Time Period:* Five Year Interim Review; Ten Year Reaffirmation Accreditation.

*Evidence #2 Criteria: University System and Board of Regents Program Approval*

The Board of Regents must adopt a motion to approve the implementation of a new degree/program that has been recommended for approval by the university system, BoR staff, and national experts (when appropriate). *Types of Data:* Input and Output. *Review Time Period:* One Time

*Evidence #3 Criteria: Board of Elementary and Secondary Education Initial and Ongoing Approval*

The Board of Elementary and Secondary Education must adopt a motion to approve a university-based program whose completers will receive licenses to teach in Louisiana. *Types of Data:* Input and Output. *Review Time Period:* Timeline to be determined by the Louisiana Department of Education and Board of Elementary and Secondary Education.

*Criteria for Evidence #4: National Program Accreditation*

National/state accreditation boards must specify in a report that a university has met NCATE/TEAC/CAEP national accreditation standards. *Types of Data:* Input and Output. *Review Time Period:* Yearly Reports for Ongoing CAEP Reviews*;* Every Seven Years for Site Visit and Comprehensive Review

*Criteria for Evidence #5***:** *Program Alignment to BESE Policies*

BoR staff and LDOE staff must sign documents to indicate that changes in courses within teacher preparation programs are aligned with BESE policy. *Type of Data*: Input. *Review Time Period*: Ongoing.

*Criteria for Evidence #6: Integration of Current State/National Standards for Students/Teachers into the Preparation Curriculum*

BoR must have written confirmation that public universities have integrated changes to state/national standards for students/teachers into the teacher preparation curriculum. In addition, national accreditation teams composed of national representatives must possess evidence of integration of current state/national standards into the preparation curriculum. *Types of Data*: Input and Output; *Review Time Period*: One time for initial documentation; Every Seven Years for Site Visit and Comprehensive Review for national accreditation.

*Criteria for Evidence #7: BoR Completer Review*

BoR must report that a public university meets expectations during low completer reviews for individual degrees and certificates. *Type of Data*: Output. *Review Time Period:* Every Two Years.

*Criteria for Evidence #8: Title II Higher Education Act*

Westat (i.e., USDE) must report that a public university has entered by April 30$^{th}$ of each year all required data on a web site provided by the USDE. *Types of Data:* Input and Output. *Review Time Period:* Yearly.

*Criteria for Evidence #9: Effectiveness Measures*

BoR must possess evidence that a public university met expectations for indicators identified for a teacher quality system. *Types of Data: Input and Output. Review Time Period:* Yearly.

## F. INTENDED AND POTENTIALLY UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES OF THE TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM APPROVAL AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

The most important intended consequence is for public universities to be preparing effective new teachers whose students are better prepared as they enter colleges and careers. Another intended consequence is for higher education, state leaders, schools, districts, and the public to have consistent and meaningful information regarding the quality of teacher preparation programs at public universities. This can help to overcome perceptions that may be based upon incomplete information.

A potential unintended consequence is for public universities with small programs to have a sufficient number of completers (e.g., more than ten completers) to publicly report data for specific types of evidence. If unable to report certain types of evidence, the results may not fully reflect the full quality of the programs.

Another unintended consequence is that the public may conclude that the 14 public universities are the only providers of teacher preparation programs when there are many other private universities, private providers, and districts offering programs that prepare new teachers.

## G. TRANSPARENCY AND APPROPRIATE INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

Transparency will exist by creating yearly reports pertaining to the performance of teacher preparation programs. The yearly reports will assist the public in interpreting the results and will be made available to higher education leaders and faculty, legislators, state agencies, teacher/principal/superintendent/school board organizations, business/community leaders, and other stakeholders.

## H. MONITORING OF THE SYSTEM

The BoR will use an advisory council composed of State leaders, K-12 district/school leaders/teachers, university leaders/faculty/candidates, and parent/community/business leaders who will monitor the implementation of the BoR Teacher Preparation Approval and Evaluation System. The council will identify elements within the system that should be removed, added, or revised. These recommendations will go to the campuses and university systems for recommendations to the BoR for changes to the system.