

FOLIO REVIEWER TRAINING 2015
TRANSCRIPT

Slide 1: Folio Reviewer Training

Good morning/afternoon, I am Tonya Jones and I would like to thank each of you for attending our Folio Reviewer Training for Initial Approval of teacher preparation programs. The goal of this training is to prepare you as a folio reviewer and to ensure that we all share the same knowledge and understanding of the standards and review process so that we are able to appropriately, effectively, and consistently review modified and initial program folios that are submitted for approval. In this training we will review the standards for state-approved programs and each corresponding indicator. Further, we will discuss the criteria each program will need to meet in order to receive an acceptable rating on their folio submission.

To assist you in following along with this training, I recommend that you have in front of you a copy of the following documents: Section 1004.04, Florida Statutes, State Board of Education Rule 6A-5.066, the Request to Submit Form (RTS-2015) and the Initial Program Approval Standards (ITP IAS-2015). These documents can be located on the Educator Preparation website. Please mute your lines and hold all questions and comments until the end of the presentation.

Slide 2: Legal Authority: Educator Preparation Statute and Rule

The requirements for obtaining state approval of a teacher preparation program are set forth in Section 1004.04, Florida Statutes, and State Board of Education Rule 6A-5.066. Under this statute and rule, the program approval system guides teacher educators in conceptualizing, developing, implementing, and evaluating programs that meet state-adopted program approval standards. The requirements in this statute and rule allow institutions the academic freedom to innovate while holding each institution accountable for producing quality teachers that have a positive impact on P-12 student learning.

Slide 3: Program Approval Dynamics

Florida has two separate processes of program approval: the initial approval process and the continued approval process. The initial approval process requires programs to submit a program port"folio" or what we call the folio. A program's folio is the blueprint for program implementation. The program's blueprint should provide the plans and processes for operation, including delivery, curriculum, assessments, field experiences, data collection, and continuous improvement. The folio should provide evidence of how the program will meet the requirements for continued state approval. The components of the folio will address each of the initial approval standards and its corresponding indicators in detail, including a description with supporting evidence.

The indicators for each standard have multiple criteria that outline the specific information required for a program folio to receive an "Acceptable" rating. The standards, indicators and criteria are all outlined in the Initial Program Approval Standards document that you should have in front of you for this training.

Please note that the specific requirements for continued approval, including site visits, will be discussed in the Continued Program Approval Training.

Slide 4: 2 Types of Initial Program Folios

We have two types of initial program folios: initial approval folios and modified initial approval folios. The initial approval folio is specifically for institutions that are seeking for the very first time the approval of a teacher preparation program. These institutions do not currently have a Florida state-approved teacher preparation program. The “modified” initial program approval process is for those “veteran” institutions that currently have at least one state-approved teacher preparation program. The modified process provides abbreviated procedures as many of the standards, indicators and criteria will be the same across all of the institution’s state-approved programs. This modified process allows these institutions to submit a folio for a new program without re-addressing these standards, indicators and criteria that are duplicative. Additionally, stand-alone endorsement programs, such as the Gifted Endorsement, and infused endorsement programs, such as the ESOL Endorsement or Reading Endorsement, are also considered modified folios.

Slide 5: Timelines and Folio Review Overview

Per State Board Rule, the Department will conduct a review for each folio within 90 days of submission. The entire review process from beginning to end must be conducted and completed with feedback provided back to the institution within 90 days of receipt of the completed folio by the Department. During this first year of accepting program folios, we will allow institutions to submit folios on an ongoing basis. The Request to Submit form will still need to be submitted one month prior to the submission of the program folio. After this first year, we will move to a quarterly submission process. The quarterly folio submission due dates will be: January 15, April 15, July 15 and October 15 of each year.

Upon receipt of a Request to Submit form, Department staff will review the document to ensure that it contains all the necessary elements and is complete. If a Request to Submit form has missing or deficient elements, institutions will have a period of 60 business days after being notified in writing by the Department to submit supplemental information or documentation to address the deficits.

Once we receive a complete Request to Submit Form, the Department will contact qualified reviewers and assemble the team. The folio review process will occur after the completed folio is received and a final report will be submitted to the Department. The staff of the Office of Educator Preparation will review and finalize the report, which will be submitted to the Commissioner of Education with an approval recommendation. The Commissioner, by law, has the final authority to approve or deny a submitted folio.

Slide 6: Folio Review Process

The folio review process will be the same for both full initial and modified initial folio submissions. Each folio review team will consist of three (3) to four (4) reviewers, of which one

team member will be selected by Department staff to be the team chair. The team chair will assign sections of the folio to each reviewer on the team. The folio review process will occur over a two (2) to three (3) week period which will allow the team to individually and collectively review the folio. Each reviewer will submit their assigned review to the team chair. During the review period, there will be a conference call meeting that will be led by the team chair and facilitated by Department staff. This conference call will be conducted to address and answer any unresolved issues, questions or concerns about the folio and to finalize the review. The team conference call is mandatory unless arrangements have been made between the team member, team chair and the Department. The team chair and Department may schedule other conference call meetings during the review period for the team to discuss and collaborate on the findings as necessary. The team chair will submit a final summative report to the Department.

Slide 7: Folio Reviewer Responsibilities

The folio reviewer has very important responsibilities. It is essential that each review is fair, consistent, and timely. A folio reviewer will be required to read the entire program folio. The reviewer will assess the program folio based only on the standards, indicators and criteria. Neither the Department nor the review team has the authority to require anything other than or beyond the scope of the legislatively mandated standards. After reading the folio, each reviewer will document and summarize the findings of his or her designated or assigned elements of the standards, including recommendations, commendations and weaknesses. Recommendations, commendations and weaknesses will be discussed in more detail later in this training. Each reviewer will participate in scheduled review team conference call meetings or team email correspondence to discuss the program folio and to report and discuss findings. The review team will collaborate to reach a consensus on the findings and on the final approval recommendation of the program folio. Lastly, each team member will submit his or her individual report to the team chair.

Slide 8: Folio Reviewer Qualifications

There are five (5) required qualifications for a folio reviewer. A reviewer should:

1. Be a current faculty or staff member of a state-approved teacher preparation program;
2. Receive a recommendation from the program's Dean or Director;
3. Complete the Department's Folio Reviewer Training;
4. Complete the Department's Initial Approval Training.
5. Sign a verification of training and commitment form. This final step will be completed at the time a reviewer is selected to serve on a first review team.

Slide 9: Folio Review "Team Chair" Responsibilities

The role of team chair is very important. In addition to fulfilling the responsibilities of a folio reviewer, the chair serves as the leader and facilitator of the review team. The chair will collaborate with the Department staff throughout the review process to discuss any changes or conflicts regarding, timelines, conference calls, final report due dates and to address any other issues that may arise. At the beginning of the two (2) to three (3) week review period, the team chair will lead the review process by assigning standards/indicators to each team member for

review. The team chair will schedule and lead the discussions on all conference calls regarding the review. The chair will receive the individual reports from each reviewer and compile them into one summative report ensuring that all findings are appropriately written, documented and included within the final report. The team chair will submit the final summative report to the Office of Educator Preparation. The team chair will be available to answer any questions from the Commissioner of Education as the report is reviewed for the final approval decision.

Any review team member may be asked to serve as the chair. The qualifications for the team chair are the same as for the review team member; however, the team chair will preferably have served on a previous folio review team.

Slide 10: RATINGS

During the review process, ratings will be assigned for each standard's indicators as either "acceptable or unacceptable." The Scoring Guide that will be used to determine these ratings and its descriptors is located on page 6 of the Initial Program Approval Standards document.

The overall approval rating of the program standards is a summation of its indicators. There are two possible overall approval ratings a program may receive after the folio review process: Fully Approved or Denied. Notification of approval or denial of approval for each program folio submitted will be sent to the institution or private provider in the form of a report.

If a program folio receives a rating of denial of approval, the report will identify the reasons for the denial and any deficiencies and/or weaknesses found. If a folio yields an overall rating of denial of approval, the program unit may resubmit the folio at a later date. The entire folio including ALL standards and indicators - even those standards and indicators deemed "acceptable" in the previous review - must be resubmitted.

Once a program folio receives an overall rating of "fully approved," a 5-year approval cycle is established for that program. The effective date of a program's approval cycle is July 1 of the year in which the folio is approved. A program's ending or expiration date is June 30 of the final year in the 5-year cycle. At the end of the 5-year cycle, programs will go through the continued approval process. Note – for institutions that already have at least one state-approved program, the new fully approved program will have the same continued approval period as all other programs within the institution. Fully Approved programs are required to submit an annual Program Evaluation Plan (IPEP or APEP) documenting candidate performance, continuous improvement efforts and any other programmatic changes.

Slide 11: Scoring Guide

Each of the Indicators will be rated as either acceptable or unacceptable. The summation of the Indicators will dictate the overall rating of the program folio. In order for a program to receive an overall approval rating of Fully Approved, all Indicators must receive a rating of acceptable. If any Indicator receives a rating of unacceptable, that program folio will receive an overall rating of Denied.

Slide 12: Standard 1

I will now walk you through each of the Initial Approval Standards, including the indicators and criteria to ensure that we all have the same understanding and interpretation. Please have your copy of the Initial Approval Standards handy to reference and follow along. I will start with Standard 1 which is located on page 2 of the Initial Approval Standards document.

Standard 1 for Initial Program Approval requires each program to provide information regarding how it will instruct, monitor and ensure the quality of all program candidates and completers. You will notice on pages 2 and 3 of the Initial Approval Standards document that Standard 1 has three (3) indicators. I will now discuss each of these indicators and the criteria shown in the boxes that follow on the document.

Slide 13: Standard 1 Indicators and Criteria

Indicator 1.1 is located on page 2 of the Initial Program Approval Standards document.

This indicator states, “Each program consistently applies state-mandated admission requirements.” As you can see on the Initial Program Approval Standards document, there are three criteria listed for indicator 1.1.

Criterion # 1- The first criterion for indicator 1.1, as seen on page 2, states that the program will describe the “admission requirements, processes and procedures used to determine students have met the state-mandated admission requirements outlined in section 1004.04(3)(b), F.S.” Here you will review for a description of the program’s procedures for tracking and monitoring admission requirements. The description should include not only the admission standards required by state law, but also any additional admission requirements imposed by the program.

Criterion # 2 – The second criterion for indicator 1.1, found on page 2, states the program will describe the “methods for tracking progress and status and providing assistance to any student who was admitted under the 10% waiver provision.” For this criterion, you will review for a description of how the program will utilize the 10% waiver permitted by law, and if so, how it will be determined which candidates are admitted under the 10% waiver, as well as how the candidates will be monitored and tracked to ensure they are making progress to meet the state’s admission requirements. Please note that the 10% waiver is relevant for Initial Teacher Preparation (ITP) programs only.

Criterion # 3 – The third criterion for indicator 1.1, as shown on page 2 of the Initial Approval Standards document, states that the program will describe the “plan for annually collecting, monitoring and reporting data on candidates who were admitted, enrolled and completed the program.” The focus of this plan should be the overall “annual” process for collecting, monitoring and reporting data on the candidates. Additionally, the plan should include a step-by-step description of the process that includes any data, faculty or personnel, resources and/or supporting documents used in this reporting process. Please review to ensure that a description is provided that addresses the entire requirement of this criterion.

Slide 14: Standard 1 Indicators and Criteria continued

Indicator 1.2 is located on pages 2 and 3 of the Initial Approval Standards document. This indicator states, “The program must demonstrate that each completer possesses the required knowledge, skills and professional behaviors relevant for professional practices and work characteristics in his or her field.” Please notice that for Indicator 1.2 there are eight (8) criteria listed. It is the responsibility of the reviewer to look for a descriptive narrative that includes all of the requirements of all criteria.

Criterion # 1 - The first criterion for indicator 1.2, as you can see on page 2, requires programs to describe the process to assess, monitor and document each program candidate’s progress and mastery of the Uniform Core Curricula. It is very important that the process includes a description of how candidates will demonstrate mastery of the Uniform Core Curricula in both coursework AND in clinical field experiences. The Uniform Core Curricula is defined in statute and Rule 6A-5.066 and includes the following:

- Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs)
- The Competencies and Skills for Teacher Certification prescribed in Rule 6A-4.002, F.A.C.
NOTE: You must assess the overall subject area competency and address each of the subject area competency’s correlating indicators
- State-adopted content standards or the Florida Standards
- Scientifically-researched reading instruction
- Content literacy and mathematical practices
- Strategies appropriate for instruction of English language learners
- Strategies appropriate for instruction of students with disabilities, and
- School safety

Please note that if the program includes a Reading Endorsement, the scientifically-researched reading instruction may be addressed in the Reading Endorsement Competency matrix. Likewise, if the program will include an English for Speakers of Other Languages or ESOL Endorsement, the strategies appropriate for instruction of English Language Learners may be addressed in the ESOL matrix. I will further explain these matrices next under criterion 2.

Criterion # 2 – Criterion 2 for indicator 1.2 is shown on page 3 of the Initial Approval Standards document. For this criterion, the folio should include matrices that describe the critical tasks, assignments and assessments during coursework and the culminating field experience for the competencies and skills associated with each component of the Uniform Core Curricula. Review the applicable folio elements and evidences to ensure the matrices describe the critical tasks/assignments and assessments during coursework and field experiences/internship for the competencies and skills associated with each component of the Uniform Core Curricula (UCC). A separate matrix will be required for the FEAPs, Reading Competencies, ESOL Standards/Indicators (if the ESOL Endorsement is a part of the program) and the Subject Area Competencies and Skills. Review for sufficient details of the critical tasks, assignments and assessments to show clear alignment with the competencies and skills. The matrices must include:

- Prefix/number/title for each course in which the Uniform Core Curricula is taught and assessed
- Performance measure or indicator that is being assessed
- Title and description of the critical task or assessment
- Assessment instrument or method used to determine proficiency, including the specific criteria program candidates must meet

The Department has some sample templates for these matrices that I will discuss later in this presentation.

Slide 15: Standard 1 Indicators and Criteria continued

Criterion # 3 – Still on page 3 of the Initial Approval Standards, criterion 3 of indicator 1.2 requires a description of the program plan for remediating, mentoring and coaching any candidate who is not progressing proficiently through the program. This plan should include the roles of key faculty members who will assist or participate in the remediation process. It is your task to review the folio to ensure it includes a description of the program's plan for remediating, mentoring and coaching any candidate who is not progressing proficiently through the program and the role(s) of key faculty members who will assist or participate in the remediation process.

Criterion # 4 – For criterion 4 of indicator 1.2, the folio submission should include a copy (or a web link) of the state-approved performance evaluation system, including the instruments that will be used for the final summative evaluation of program candidates in their culminating student teaching experience. Please note that the performance evaluation system should be the same one that is used by the partner school district. To effectively perform the requirement of this indicator, it is imperative that you review for the establishment of a partnership with a school district and verification that the program unit has a plan to become proficient in using its instructional personnel evaluation system. This criterion may require multiple summative evaluation documents if the folio indicates there are multiple partnering school districts that have different evaluation models in place. If so, review to ensure that multiple corresponding partnering school district models are included.

Criterion #5– Criterion 5 of indicator 1.2 – still on page 3 – requires a described plan for analyzing candidate performance data at the individual and program level to ensure candidate's mastery of the Uniform Core Curriculum previously discussed under Criterion #1. The description of this analysis process should address candidate performance data at both the individual AND program levels. Addressing only one of these areas is not meeting the entire requirement of this criterion. Review to ensure that all components of this criterion have been completely described.

Criterion #6 – Criterion 6 of indicator 1.2, requires a step-by-step plan for collecting and monitoring the Florida Teacher Certification Examination results to ensure each candidate possesses the competencies and skills relevant for professional practices and work

characteristics in his or her certification area. You are to review to ensure that all components of this criterion have been completely described.

Criterion #7 – For criterion 7 of indicator 1.2, the folio should include a description of the plan for providing remediation and feedback to candidates who are unsuccessful in passing all subtests of the Florida Teacher Certification Examination. This plan may also include a step-by-step description regarding the development and use of an individual remediation plan, any faculty or personnel responsible, resources and/or supporting documents used in this remediation process. Review the described plan to ensure that all components of this criterion have been completely described.

Criterion #8 – Criterion 8, the last one for indicator 1.2 and also on page 3 of the Initial Approval Standards document, requires a description of the plan to monitor and remediate program completers who may be referred by the employing school district during the first two (2) years immediately following program completion. This is referred to as the 2-year guarantee. The plan should include criteria for developing an individualized plan with specific learning objectives and documenting the outcomes of the assistance provided. This remediation plan should also include a process for collaborating with the employing school district. It is the responsibility of the reviewer to ensure the remediation plan is completely described and that the plan also includes a process for collaborating with the employing school district.

Slide 16: MATRICES

To assist you in the review of the matrices requirement for indicator 1.2, sample matrices and templates for the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs), Competencies and Skills for Teacher Certification (usually referred to as the Subject Area Competencies and Skills), the Reading Endorsement Competencies (REC) and the English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Competencies are available on the Department's website.

For the Subject Area Competencies and Skills matrix, we encourage each program to utilize the Curriculum Mapping Tool offered by the Bureau of Postsecondary Assessment.

Review to ensure that the most current edition of the Subject Area Competencies and Skills has been used. If the Subject Area Competencies and Skills matrix is used, review to ensure that it includes how the indicator under each competency will be addressed as well as how the overall subject area competency will be assessed.

An ESOL matrix is required for programs with an ESOL endorsement component. Programs that are required to have the ESOL Endorsement include:

1. Elementary Education (grades K-6)
2. Exceptional Student Education (grades K-12)
3. Prekindergarten-Primary Education (age 3-grade 3)
4. English (grades 6-12)
5. Middle Grades English (grades 5-9)

Some programs are only required to include an ESOL Survey course. These programs include K-12 certification subject areas and secondary and middle grade programs not previously mentioned. For these courses, a separate ESOL matrix is not required, but please review to ensure that within the folio an ESOL Survey course is listed. This course must be a college or university level 3-semester hour credit overview or survey course which addresses at an awareness level the five areas of ESOL specified in Rule 6A-4.02451, F.A.C.

And finally, each program will need to provide a matrix that details how the additional components of the Uniform Core Curriculum will be addressed and assessed. These components include: school safety, strategies appropriate for instruction of students with disabilities and content literacy and mathematical practices. If any of these additional components are addressed within other matrices that have been submitted, this should be indicated or described in the folio submission.

Slide 17: Standard 1 Indicators and Criteria continued

Indicator 1.3 is located on page 3 of the Initial Approval Standards document. This indicator states, "Program candidates and completers must demonstrate positive impact on P-12 student learning growth in the candidate's and completer's area(s) of certification as measured by student performance data." As you can see on page 3, Indicator 1.3 has two (2) criteria.

Criterion # 1 – Criterion 1 of indicator 1.3 should describe both, the evaluation methods that will be utilized by a program candidate to demonstrate positive impact on P-12 student learning growth, as well as how the data results will be collected, evaluated and analyzed on program candidate impact on P-12 learning growth during field experiences.

Criterion # 2 – Criterion 2 of indicator 1.3 should provide an explanation of how P-12 student learning growth data will be gathered for each program completer within the first year of teaching after program completion and how the data results will be collected, evaluated and analyzed on program completer impact on P-12 student learning.

Be mindful that indicator 1.3 criterion 1 is about the program candidate during field experiences and indicator 1.3 criterion 2 is about the program completer within the first year of teaching after program completion. However, for both criteria within indicator 1.3, a plan should be provided that describes how the program will collect, evaluate, analyze and use the impact data results for continuous improvement.

Please note that some programs may receive impact data from the Florida Department of Education on their completers. For subject areas and grade levels that assess students using statewide standardized assessments such as the Florida Standards Assessment, the Department will provide them with impact data. However, programs with completers in grade levels and/or subject areas for which a statewide standardized assessment exists but a student learning growth formula has not been established, such as the end-of-course exam for biology or the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test for grade 5 science, will not receive this data from the Department. There are also grade levels and subject areas for which no statewide standardized

assessments exist, just local assessments permitted by law. For example kindergarten through grade 2 teachers, music teachers, or art teachers will not have a statewide assessment. In these cases, the school district is measuring student learning performance through local assessments which the program should seek to utilize. It is important for the program to know and provide a description for how they will provide student learning results for each of their completers – regardless of their teaching assignment. These student learning results are required by law.

Slide 18: Standard 2

I will now move on to Standard 2 of the Initial Approval Standards. Standard 2 is located on page 4 of the standards document. Standard 2 states that “the program ensures high-quality field and clinical experiences with high-quality feedback and support for each program candidate.” Standard 2 has 2 indicators – both also shown on page 4.

Slide 19: Standard 2 Indicators and Criteria

Indicator 2.1 indicates, postsecondary and school district personnel must meet the state-mandated requirements for supervision of candidates during field experiences. I will share these requirements specifically on the next slide. Indicator 2.1 has two criteria as you can see on page 4 of the standards document.

Criterion # 1– The first criterion asks programs to describe the step-by-step process for ensuring, collecting, and monitoring the qualifications of both the postsecondary program faculty and the school district personnel who instruct, direct and/or supervise field experience courses or internships in which a student candidate demonstrates his or her impact on P-12 student learning growth.

Criterion # 2– For criterion 2 of indicator 2.1, the folio should provide documentation of a written agreement between the program or institution and each school district where candidates will be placed for field and clinical experiences stating that all candidates will be placed with instructional personnel who meet these state-mandated requirements. An example of the documentation or written agreement between the program or institution and the school district could be a Memorandum of Understanding that clearly indicates or states all candidates will be placed with district personnel or teachers who meet the state-mandated requirements and qualifications.

Review the described plans for criterion 1 and 2 to ensure that all components of these criteria have been completely described and required evidences provided.

Slide 20: Postsecondary and School District Personnel Qualifications

The requirements for postsecondary program faculty are as follows:

1. specialized training in clinical supervision;
2. at least 3 years of successful, relevant prekindergarten through grade 12 teaching, student services, or school administration experience; and

3. an annual demonstration of experience in a relevant prekindergarten through grade 12 school setting as defined by State Board of Education rule. Per State Board Rule, annual demonstrations of relevant experience are p-12 school-based experiences occurring yearly that are related to and in a subject matter and grade level setting that are covered by the certification necessary for the field experience course(s) or internships that the program faculty is assigned to teach or supervise. Examples include, but are not limited to, co-teaching with a p-12 educator or providing p-12 instruction directly to p-12 students.

The requirements for school district personnel are as follows:

1. must have evidence of “clinical educator” training,
2. a valid professional certificate issued pursuant to s. [1012.56](#),
3. at least 3 years of teaching experience in prekindergarten through grade 12 and
4. must have earned an effective or highly effective rating on the prior year’s performance evaluation under s. [1012.34](#) or be a peer evaluator under the district’s evaluation system approved under s. [1012.34](#).

Slide 21: Standard 2 Indicators and Criteria continued

Standard 2 indicator 2.2, on page 4 of the standards document, states that “field and clinical practices are completed in settings relevant to program objectives for the development of candidate skills.” Indicator 1.2 has three (3) correlating criteria.

Criterion # 1 – Indicator 2.2 criterion 1 requires a description of how settings for candidate field experiences will be selected and monitored to ensure that they are relevant to the program’s objectives for the development and practice of candidate skills that represent the full spectrum of school communities in multiple contexts. Examples of multiple contexts may include school districts that serve or include populations such as urban, rural, populations with low income students, English Language Learners, students with disabilities, etc.

Criterion # 2 – Criterion 2 of indicator 2.2 requires a step-by-step description of how program candidates will receive feedback on their progress through field experiences/internships, including strategies for improvement. It is important that the folio documents how on-going feedback, to inform candidates of their progress towards meeting the competencies and skills will be provided.

Criterion # 3– And the last criterion for indicator 2.2 on page 4, #3 requires a description of how remediation will be determined, administered and monitored on program candidates who are not proficiently progressing in field and clinical practices and/or internships. Review to ensure the description includes a step-by-step process of the remediation plan including the development and use of an individual remediation plan, any faculty or personnel involved, and resources and/or supporting documents used in this remediation process.

Slide 22: Standard 3

Standard 3 for Initial Program Approval is on page 5 of the standards document. Standard 3 requires programs to have a plan for continuous program improvement based on analyses of the data and evidence collected on its candidates and completers. Standard 3 has two (2) indicators.

Slide 23: Standard 3 Indicators and Criteria

Standard 3/Indicator 3.1 requires the program to systematically examine candidate and completer performance and impact. As you can see on page 5 of the Initial Approval Standards, indicator 3.1 has 2 criteria. This indicator focuses on the data gathered in Standard 1.

Criterion # 1 –The first criterion under indicator 3.1 asks that the program describe its process for the annual review and analysis of aggregated data that will be collected on program candidates and program completers. Again, notice that this criterion provides a listing of the minimum data that should be included, and refers back to an indicator in standard 1 where the program described the plan for collecting the specified data. The review of data should include at least:

- Impact of P-12 student learning for all program completers employed in Florida public schools which relates to standard 1.3
- Program completers' performance as evidenced by the Annual Program Performance Report Card relating to standard 1.3
- Assistance provided to any program completer(s) as a result of the 2-year guarantee which relates to standard 1.2
- Impact of P-12 student learning for all program candidates during field experiences also from standard 1.3
- Program candidates' culminating field experience performance evaluations in demonstration of mastery of the Uniform Core Curricula relating to standard 1.2
- Program candidates' Florida Teacher Certification Exam subtest results at the competency level also related to standard 1.2
- Program candidate data admitted under the 10% waiver from standard 1.1, and
- Other data results under consideration by the program

Please notice on page 5 of the Initial Program Approval Standards document under indicator 3.1 criterion 1 that the first three bullets address “completers,” while the last five bullets address “candidates.” Please note, as indicated by the final bullet, that the program is not limited to only these specified data elements. Other data of interest to their program may be collected and analyzed for continuous improvement.

Let me reiterate, in Standard One the data collection process for each of the bulleted items under indicator 3.1 criterion 1 was described. Now, the focus is on “how” aggregated candidate and completer data will be reviewed and analyzed by the program on an annual basis for continuous program improvement. Once again, note that the corresponding indicators from Standard One in which each of the bulleted requirements were previously addressed are noted in parentheses after the requirements in Standard Three for reference. The difference between

Standard One and Standard Three is that in Standard One, the program describes the process or plan for assessing, reporting, collecting, and monitoring individual candidate and completer data, and in Standard Three the program should describe the process for the annual review and analysis of aggregated data and how this data will be used for continuous improvement.

Criterion # 2: Criterion 2 of Standard 3 indicator 3.1 is also located on page 5 of the Initial Program Approval Standards. This criterion asks for a detailed description of how the program will analyze the aggregated candidate and completer data to determine which area or areas of the program have needs or weaknesses that will require changes or improvements. Some leading “W” questions used in this process: Who are the participants? What are the steps in the process? When does this process take place? Where does this process take place? How are the areas of need determined for consideration for program improvement?

Review to determine if the answers to these leading questions are described or provided within the folio.

Slide 24: Standard 3 Indicators and Criteria continued

Indicator 3.2 of standard 3, located on page 5 of the standards document, states, “The program uses results of data collection to enhance program elements and capacity.” This indicator has 2 criteria.

Criterion # 1 – Criterion 1 of indicator 3.2 requires a description, based on aggregated data gathered on program candidate and completer performance and impact, as well as the areas of need or weakness determined for the program. Additionally, describe how the program will use that aggregated data to drive programmatic improvements to expand, enhance or change the program’s capacity or ability to meet and achieve the state’s educational goal to produce effective teachers.

Criterion # 2 – Criterion 2 of indicator 3.2 requires a description of the program stakeholders’ roles and responsibilities and how stakeholders’ input will be utilized in programmatic decision-making. Keep in mind that stakeholders can be both internal and external groups, as well as individuals such as program graduates, school district personnel, classroom teachers, principals, community agencies and business representatives.

Review the described plans for the two (2) criteria to ensure that all components of these criteria have been completely described and any applicable evidences provided.

Slide 25: Review Findings

A Florida institution seeking initial approval of its teacher preparation program must submit a folio that contains a description and supporting evidence of the design, delivery, curriculum content and evaluation of the specified program. The folio should be aligned to the standards and indicators set forth in the Initial Program Approval Standards Form (IAS-2015). The documentation for each criteria should be reviewed to ensure that the evidence presented in

the folio is clearly described and in alignment with the indicator. The narrative should be well-articulated, realistic, and contain all required elements.

Reviewers may consider and note findings as they read the report. Findings may include commendations, weaknesses, or recommendations. All findings should be included in the individual reviewer's report and discussed with the review team to determine inclusion in the final report. The review team will consider all findings in making the approval recommendation to the Department.

Writing the report is very key and essential in making an approval recommendation to the Department and for relaying the findings to the institution. If a folio has weaknesses, the report should clearly describe them so that the program may address them.

Slide 26: FINDINGS

Findings are statements that indicate the data or evidence that was reviewed and indicates the strengths or weaknesses in relation to the criteria of the standards and indicators. Findings may demonstrate a rationale for the rating. Findings should include the facts, evidence, and observations that were made based on the content of the folio. Findings should be clearly described and stated succinctly.

Slide 27: Example of Writing an Acceptable Finding

This slide displays a possible finding that would provide evidence toward an acceptable rating. Notice that the finding is very specific in addressing the FEAPs and the corresponding matrix details the elements of the criteria that were found in the folio submission. The findings should always note the standard and indicator for which it is addressing.

Slide 28: Example of Writing a Finding for an Unacceptable Rating

This slide displays a possible finding that would provide evidence of an unacceptable rating. Please take a few seconds to read the contents of slide 29. Notice that this finding details the missing elements and weakness that were found in the folio. The comments in red print within the slide highlight the weakness that addresses the FEAPs and its matrix.

Slide 29: Commendations

Commendations are statements or kudos that provide the program with feedback on elements of the standards where the program descriptions are exemplary and provide a possible model plan or process for other teacher preparation programs.

Slide 30: Weaknesses

Weaknesses found within an initial or modified folio submission must be addressed and corrected when or if the program folio is resubmitted. Weaknesses are factual and concise statements of a compliance problem found within the folio. Take a minute to read through the example statements of weaknesses on slide 31. Weaknesses should be based on missing information or the lack of element requirements that are set forth in statute and rule for each standard, indicator and criteria. Weaknesses should be clearly stated so that all parties involved

understand what needs to be addressed and corrected. Weaknesses should not contain the reviewer's personal biases or judgments.

Slide 31: Recommendations

Recommendations are considerations that provide advice or suggestions to programs regarding the implementation of their folio. As reviewers to our state-approved teacher preparation programs, you frequently have some helpful feedback or recommendations for submitting institutions. Recommendations should not be a weakness nor jeopardize the integrity of the folio.

Slide 32:

Thank you for your time, efforts and dedication to our process to prepare effective teachers for the state of Florida. We all benefit from this very worthwhile and important process because we have such a vested interest in what we do, but the ultimate benefactors are Florida's P-12 students!

At this time, we would like to address your questions, comments, or concerns.

Slide 33: Contact Information for Educator Preparation

We appreciate your participation in the Folio Reviewer Training for Initial Program Approval. As always, if you have any questions or concerns, please contact the Office of Educator Preparation. We look forward to working with you.