Standard V Preliminary Proposals
Overview and Summary

The Professional Educator Standards Board implementation timeline for Standard V calls for teacher preparation programs to submit a preliminary proposal for re-approval at the March 2009 meeting. Board members will review proposals and provide feedback at that meeting.

All 21 approved teacher preparation programs have submitted preliminary proposals based on a template prepared by OSPI's Professional Education and Certification office (See Attachment A for template). The proposals themselves will be placed on the OSPI and PESB websites for viewing by Board members, university teacher educators, and others. The purpose of this report is to provide a brief overview and summary of the major themes emerging from the 21 proposals.

Preparing candidates to generate, analyze, and respond to student-based evidence

The heart of standard V revolves around the idea that student learning is the ultimate measure of teacher success, and that teacher candidates should produce evidence not just of their own skills, but of the learning achieved by their students.

The re-approval template asked institutions to address this issue in two sections. First, programs were asked to identify major examples of evidence (teacher-based and student-based) for each of the four sections of Standard V. A summary of these examples is being prepared by PEC and will be placed on the OSPI website.

Second, programs were asked to describe how candidates will be prepared to generate, analyze, and respond to student-based evidence. Their responses to this question reflected the diversity of the institutions, but also revealed a number of themes.

Analysis of P-12 student work samples is becoming a major component of teacher preparation programs. This kind of analysis, which requires candidates to look closely at student progress toward learning targets and to review teaching strategies in light of the results, is carried out in assessment courses, methods courses, practicum experiences, and student teaching. Institutions are also developing a variety of specific tools—assignments, worksheets, and assessments—to support this new emphasis. Typical names

for these tools are "Positive Impact Project," "Evidence Collection Worksheet," "Student Evidence Rubric," and "Evidence-Based Portfolio System."

Student-based evidence is being addressed both in academic coursework and in field experiences. While institutions do not appear to be adding significant amounts of field experience, they are clearly sharpening the focus on what happens within those experiences. Programs are orienting candidates, supervisors, and cooperating teachers to the need to focus on student-based evidence; they are revising rubrics and evaluation forms to reflect a more student-based approach; and they are developing specific assignments to be carried out during field experience. At the same time, coursework is incorporating a stronger emphasis on student-based evidence. In some cases, courses are directly linked to required field work (for example, candidates are introduced to a concept in class and then asked to apply it during practicum). Where direct access to P-12 students is not available, courses are using simulations, case studies, and video clips to develop habits of focusing on student evidence.

Some programs are being very intentional about the sequencing and scaffolding required for candidates to develop an in-depth understanding of evidence-based teaching. Because of the paradigm shift required by a focus on student-based evidence, "covering" the idea in a single course is unlikely to be sufficient, so these programs are building a coordinated sequence that moves steadily from awareness to understanding to application.

Finally, although it wasn't mentioned enough in the proposals to be considered a theme, two programs noted they were making an effort to ensure that university faculty are modeling evidence-based practices within their own teaching.

Changes in course content

Programs were asked to summarize changes in course content they had made in order to meet the new standards. Only one program reported adding wholly new courses, but many described making modifications in existing courses. Several themes were apparent in the reported changes.

Assessment was a major focus of course changes, particularly assessment that focused on student-based evidence: "How do we know our students learned the material?" The new emphasis included classroom-based assessment projects, analysis of P-12 student work samples, and consideration of student voice.

Technology was mentioned in a number of proposals. In most cases, the added content did not appear to involve introduction of new concepts but instead revolved around effective integration of technology into instruction.

Instructional integration of content was often identified as a new focus. Standard V includes a number of concepts that do not clearly fall into discrete traditional content areas such as math, science, history, and English. For this material to be taught effectively, teacher candidates must have the capacity to weave a variety of content and perspectives into a single lesson. This theme usually showed up in connection with environmental sustainability, aesthetic reasoning, cultural competence, and community connections.

Beyond changes in academic courses, many programs reported revisions in student teaching and other field experiences. In a few cases, this resulted in added time in the field or in associated reflective seminars. One program also added a practicum in community-based organizations for elementary candidates. More commonly, programs have worked to bring a stronger focus on student-based evidence into field experiences by developing targeted assignments, revising rubrics, and training field supervisors to keep candidate attention focused on student learning.

Additionally, one institution indicated it had revisited its whole conceptual framework to incorporate many of the concepts from Standard V. Another noted that it planned to use a "spiral" approach for delivery of the new concepts, beginning with a focus on teacher evidence and then moving to student-based evidence as candidates gained more opportunities for application in classrooms.

Student teaching and other field experiences

Because Standard V has potential implications for field experiences, the proposal template also asked programs about their requirements for student teaching and other field experiences, as well as the reflective opportunities associated with work in the field.

Although much of the information requested was quantitative in nature, the results proved to be difficult to aggregate and summarize. The 21 proposals showed a wide variety of arrangements for field experience, both across programs and within programs. Much of this variation undoubtedly reflects the local agreements that programs have negotiated with their P-12 partners. In addition, the many varieties of field experience described by institutions do not necessarily share the same definition. For example, there has been a growing trend for student teaching to be spread over multiple academic

terms—perhaps a couple days a week for one quarter, followed by full-time student teaching in the same classroom the next quarter. However, while one institution may characterize both experiences as "student teaching," another might classify a very similar arrangement as "other field experience." Hence, caution should be used in making comparisons across institutions. Institutional responses are listed in tabular form on Attachment B.

Institutions reported that candidates are provided with considerable reflective opportunities during student teaching and field experiences. A majority of programs offer a concurrent seminar during student teaching that allows opportunity for candidates to share experiences, articulate issues, and collaboratively solve problems. Other reflective opportunities are built into observations by supervisors. Candidates are also frequently asked to provide written reflections on a regular basis, either as discrete papers or as journal entries. A number of programs have tied early field experiences to specific courses, offering opportunities to learn about a concept in class, apply it in the field, and discuss the outcomes in class.

PEAB involvement

Institutions were asked to briefly describe PEAB involvement in the redesign of the program. All proposals indicated that PEABs had been actively involved in Standard V activities. Most commonly, Standard V topics were a recurring topic at regularly scheduled PEAB meetings throughout the past year. PEAB involvement sometimes extended beyond discussion at regular meetings, as members also served on subcommittees and task forces. PEABs provided guidance on issues such as student-based evidence, assessment, common lesson plan formats, P-12 partnerships, and alignment between the residency portfolio and the positive impact requirement of the professional certificate.

Involvement with P-12 partners

A somewhat related question asked programs to indicate how P-12 partners had been involved in the implementation. This question was designed to focus on how universities have worked with the schools and districts in which their candidates are placed. However, because universities commonly think of PEABs as being their primary P-12 partners, responses to this question often reiterated responses to the preceding question about PEAB involvement.

However, at least 13 proposals specifically indicated that universities had involved local practitioners in some way. In most cases, the involvement

consisted of communicating the nature of Standard V and discussing the implications for field placements and other collaborative activities. In other cases, programs had taken additional steps such as experimenting with a co-teaching model, including P-12 partners in study groups and task forces, recruitment of National Board teachers as adjuncts and co-designers of courses, and updating internship agreements with local districts to reflect Standard V requirements). Four universities in eastern Washington are using an OSPI grant to inform local districts about the implications of Standard V.

Despite these efforts, institutions have concerns about the involvement of P-12 partners. On a later question addressing barriers to implementation, just under half of the universities specifically identified the need to help P-12 practitioners understand the implications of Standard V, particularly the need to provide field placements that facilitate the collection of student-based evidence. A number of programs asked for OSPI to take the lead in communicating with districts.

Issues and barriers

The final question on the re-approval template asked institutions to identify issues and barriers that are yet unresolved, and also asked what forms of assistance from OSPI and PESB would be helpful. A number of clear themes emerged from this section.

The lack of a revised pedagogy assessment makes it difficult for programs to complete their assessment system. The PPA, as the sole statewide assessment that captures key elements of Standard V, will set the target with which institutional curricula and assessments will be aligned. Not knowing what the revised instrument will look like, preparation programs feel as though they are operating in the dark.

The P-12 community is not fully aware of Standard V, and P-12 classrooms may not always support the goals of Standard V. While many P-12 schools have adopted evidence-based practices, many have not. Universities sometimes find themselves having to provide training to their P-12 partners as well as to their own faculty and supervisors, and sometimes have difficulty finding field placements that support candidates' efforts to focus on student evidence and student voice.

The move toward evidence-based preparation requires a paradigm shift that is not quickly or easily accomplished. Although by now university faculty, candidates, supervisors, and P-12 partners have been introduced to the concepts underlying Standard V, understanding the full implications and

changing long-established behaviors require consistent, intensive effort. One university reported, "We are struggling to understand what `student voice' means in the wide variety of situations of student teaching our candidates use."

Crucial resources—time, money, and staff—are in short supply. These are perennial concerns, but they are have special relevance at a time when some universities may be facing budget cuts of up to 20%.

Many of the university recommendations for OSPI and PESB support flow from the concerns expressed above. In particular, institutions would welcome these steps:

- Completion of the revised PPA as soon as possible
- OSPI and PESB efforts to communicate with the P-12 community about Standard V and its implications
- State-level guidance and technical assistance in developing a clearer definition and deeper understanding of core concepts such as student-based evidence and student voice

Attachment A

Standard V Program Re-approval Template

Submit completed form to your liaison by January 31, 2009.

Institution

Date

Dean/Director Signature _____

PEAB Chair Signature _____

What would be the major examples of evidence in your program for Standard 5.1: Knowledge of Subject Matter and Curriculum Goals?

Criteria—*Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	Teacher-Based Evidence *Teacher demonstrates capacity to provide effective learning experiences.*	Student-Based Evidence *Students demonstrate engagement in effective learning opportunities.*
A. Content driven. All students develop understanding and problem-solving expertise in the content area(s) using reading, written and oral communication, and technology. **B. Aligned with curriculum standards and outcomes.** All students know the learning targets and their progress towards meeting them. **C. Integrated across content areas.** All students learn subject matter content that integrates mathematical, scientific, and aesthetic reasoning.		

What would be the major examples of evidence in your program for Standard 5.2: Knowledge of Teaching?

Criteria—*Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	Teacher-Based Evidence *Teacher demonstrates capacity to provide effective learning experiences.*	Student-Based Evidence *Students demonstrate engagement in effective learning opportunities.*
A. Informed by standards-based assessment. All students benefit from learning that is systematically analyzed using multiple formative, summative, and self-assessment strategies. **B. Intentionally planned.** All students benefit from standards-based planning that is personalized. **C. Influenced by multiple instructional strategies.** All students benefit from personalized instruction that addresses their ability levels and cultural and linguistic backgrounds. **D. Informed by technology.** All students benefit from instruction that utilizes effective technologies and is designed to create technologically proficient learners.		

What would be the major examples of evidence in your program for Standard 5.3: Knowledge of Learners and their Development in Social Contexts?

Criteria—*Evidence of teacher candidate practice reflect planning, instruction, and communication that is:*	Teacher-Based Evidence *Teacher demonstrates capacity to provide effective learning experiences.*	Student-Based Evidence *Students demonstrate engagement in effective learning opportunities.*
A. Learner centered. All students engage in a variety of culturally responsive, developmentally, and age appropriate strategies. **B. Classroom/school centered.** Student learning is connected to communities within the classroom and the school, including knowledge and skills for working with others. **C. Family/Neighborhood centered.** Student learning is informed by collaboration with families and neighborhoods. **D. Contextual community centered.** All students are prepared to be responsible citizens for an environmentally sustainable, globally interconnected, and diverse society.		

What would be the major examples of evidence in your program for Standard 5.4: Understanding of Teaching as a Profession?

Criteria—*Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	Teacher-Based Evidence *Teacher demonstrates capacity to provide effective learning experiences.*
A. Informed by professional responsibilities and policies. All students benefit from a collegial and professional school setting. **B. Enhanced by a reflective, collaborative, professional growth-centered practice.** All students benefit from the professional growth of their teachers. **C. Informed by legal and ethical responsibilities.** All students benefit from a safe and respectful learning environment.	

1. Briefly summarize the changes in course content to meet the new standard criterion.

2. Describe how the candidates will be prepared to generate, analyze and respond to student-based evidence.

3. Indicate characteristics of field experiences

   A. Student teaching

   --If student teaching occurs within one academic term: Number of weeks full-time student teaching

   --If student teaching occurs over multiple academic terms:

Number of weeks of full-time student teaching

Number of FTE weeks of part-time student teaching*

*E.g., 2 days of student teaching for 10 weeks would be 20 days/5 = 4 FTE weeks
B. Other field experiences

--Number of fieldwork hours required for admission to program

--Number of other required fieldwork hours prior to student teaching

C. Describe the ways in which candidates are given opportunities to discuss/reflect on:

--Student teaching

--Other fieldwork

4. Briefly describe PEAB involvement in redesign of the program.

5. Describe how P-12 partners have been involved in the implementation.

At this point, what appear to be the major issues and/or barriers that remain to be resolved before completion of implementation? What forms of assistance/support from OSPI

Attachment B

Field experience summary

Institution	Weeks Full-time Student teaching	FTE weeks of part-time student teaching	Other required field experience	Required fieldwork before admission
Antioch	10	NA	Three (3) one week-periods and one (1) two-week observation period in the classroom where they are to student teach. The two-week period is immediately prior to student teaching	40
CWU	10	NA	3 credit hours in Professional Education (Core) Program; Content areas range from 3 to 20 credit hours, depending on endorsement area. Total post admission credit hours = 6 to 23. (Several content areas are working to increase fieldwork.)	4 credit hours
City U. BA	10-12	NA	200-300 hr	80 hr
City U. MIT	10-12	NA	235 hr	Evidence of successful work w/school-age children
City U. Alt routes	Yearlong	NA	NA	--
EWU	11	NA	Field experience for EWU candidates are three (3) consecutive quarters prior to student teaching with designated required professional education courses: quarter 1, a minimum of three (3) hours per week, teach four (4) lessons; quarter 2, a minimum of nine (9) hours per week, teach eight (8) lessons; quarter 3, a minimum of three (3) hours a week, teach four (4) lessons (165 hours)	--
Gonzaga undergraduate	16	NA	60	30
Gonzaga MIT	16	NA	90	--
Gonzaga Special education	Undergraduate: 12 for candidates seeking special education certification only. Note: For those candidates seeking elementary and special education certification, candidates complete 16 weeks of regular education student teaching and 9 weeks of special	NA	Undergraduate: 60 + 30 included as part of the beginning of student teaching experience Graduate: 90 + 30 included as part of the beginning	Undergraduate: 30 Graduate: 0

Institution	Weeks Full-time Student teaching	FTE weeks of part-time student teaching	Other required field experience	Required fieldwork before admission
	education student teaching. This is completed across 2 semesters Graduate: 12		of student teaching experience	
Heritage	14 . We are analyzing this requirement with the intent of increasing the amount of actual instructional time ("solo time") and decreasing the amount of other required activities. Any changes will require an examination of student teacher cooperating teacher roles. This is in direct response to requests from the field. There are no part time student teaching assignments.	NA	118	10 hr
Lesley	14	NA	75 hr	--
Northwest	7-9	3-10	120-360 hr	20 hr
PLU	BAE with Certification Program: 11 weeks; MAE with Certification Program: 12 weeks; Alternative Routes: 18 weeks of full time internship equal to one K-12 academic semester.	NA	Undergraduate program: Term I, 45 hours; Term II, 60 hours; Term III, 60 hours; MA with Certification Program: Summer Reading Academies and one university semester (September to mid-December) prior to student teaching in the spring; Alternative Routes: Summer field work, 30 hours, plus a gradual phase in to student depending on past experience	--
SMU	16	NA	40-720, depending on program	30
SPU	We have three different iterations of student teaching. In each iteration, we are beginning to use a co-teaching model of student teaching where the responsibility for running the class slowly transfers from the cooperating teacher to the candidate. a. Undergrad/Post Bacc Program: The student teaching is most typically 20 weeks in length. b. MAT Program: The student teaching is 14 weeks in length. c. ARC Program: The student teaching is an entire school year and based on the district schedule not the university	NA	MAT Program: The early field experience is 50 hours Undergraduate/Post Bacc Program: The early field experience is 48	At this time, there is no requirement for fieldwork for admission. Students who have extensive experience receive a preference in an enrollment decision.

Institution	Weeks Full-time Student teaching	FTE weeks of part-time student teaching	Other required field experience	Required fieldwork before admission
	schedule.			
Seattle U.	12-14	2-4	5-6 weeks depends on entry point (hours vary depending on purpose of the field assignment) Almost 50% of the program is in the field.	For the MIT Program, we consider a range based on a number of factors, candidate experience since our age range of candidates is from 22-60 years of age. This determination is made through review of the faculty at admission time.
TESC	20	NA	140-160	40 strongly recommended
UPS	15	10 weeks, 5 each at 2 grade levels in 2 different schools	--	--
UW-Bothell	10	6	--400 (elementary; 440 (secondary) --5 days of "September Experience"	60
UW-Seattle elementary program	6 Candidates in the Elementary program participate in student teaching field work in a partner school beginning in August, continuing part time (two days per week) through January, full time through WASL, and then part time (three days per week) through the end of the school year. All candidates are placed in clusters at one of our network of racially and culturally diverse schools in high needs communities in the Seattle area. Field experiences are included in every quarter of the program.	25	--	60
UW-Seattle Secondary program	8 Candidates in the Secondary Program participate in a two week full time field experience in the first quarter of the program (Spring), in a half time teaching practicum in a diverse high needs school during the second (summer) quarter, in a full time 6 week practicum, followed by a morning only practicum for the remainder of the quarter at their	25	--	60

Institution	Weeks Full-time Student teaching	FTE weeks of part-time student teaching	Other required field experience	Required fieldwork before admission
	student teaching site in 3rd (fall) quarter, followed by full time student teaching through March (4th quarter). All candidates are placed in clusters at one of our network of racially and culturally diverse schools in high needs communities in the Seattle area. Field experiences are included in every quarter of the program.			
UW-Tacoma	8	10	--	40
Walla Walla	10	NA	40+ secondary; 60+ elementary	35-40 secondary; 75-80 elementary
WSU	15 weeks for undergraduate programs and 10-12 weeks for MIT programs	NA	Variable: Elementary education undergraduate preservice teachers complete approximately 238 practicum hours before student teaching; Secondary education undergraduate preservice teachers complete approximately 210 hours of practicum before student teaching; and, MIT students in the elementary education program and secondary education program complete a range of approximately192-256and240-360 hours respectively of pre-internship fieldwork before their internship/student teaching.	80
WWU elem	Elementary Education: 18.6 weeks Quarter 1, 2 or 3 -1 FTE week (40 hrs over a 3-week period preparatory to September school start -ELED 491) Quarter 1 -2.2 FTE weeks (2 mornings weekly -ELED 470, 425) Quarter 2 -4.4 FTE weeks (2 days weekly -ELED 471, 492) Quarter 3 -11 weeks full time (ELED 494) Early Childhood Education: 16.5 weeks Quarter I -5.5 FTE weeks (2.5 days weekly -ECE 495) Quarter 2 -11 weeks fulltime (ECE 496)		Elementary Education: 94 contact-hours (ELED 370, 480, 481 and SCED 490; MATH 382). Four practicum and one course with embedded field work that emphasize effective teaching methods and strategies, teaching science and math, basic reading instruction, and literacy methods and assessment Early Childhood Education: 148 contact hours (ECE 390, 391 and SCED 490; ECE 380, 430, 434, 438, 439 and MATH 482). Three practica and six courses with embedded field work that emphasize effecting teaching methods and strategies in infant/toddler and preschool settings, and in teaching science and math.	Not required, but weighed heavily in very competitive admissions decisions.
WWU Secondary	18 weeks		• The field experiences prior to the internship have become longer, and more focused on candidate reflection and student learning. We are piloting having field experiences with candidates clustered in one setting to allow for greater reflection on	Not required, but considered in admissions decisions.

Institution	Weeks Full-time Student teaching	FTE weeks of part-time student teaching	Other required field experience	Required fieldwork before admission
			professional practice. • Field experiences allow candidates to engage in service learning opportunities, working with students in middle school classrooms in their endorsable area, working with students in high school classrooms in their endorsable area, and serving on special activities as a result of university-school partnerships (e.g., mentoring students working on senior projects and adjudicating final presentations). • Candidates engage in producing reflective essays about their field experience, and these are discussed during seminar sessions. Written observations/ reflections are assigned in class, and discussion of assignments is a scheduled activity in each course and field experience. • Candidates collaborate with advisors and P·12 teachers to discuss ideas for enhancing student learning. • Candidates focus reflection on learning through graphic organizers and other protocols to structure reflection	
WWU Special Education	Special Education (P-K or P-12l: 11 weeks (SPED 496, 498, or 499) Special Education {P-12 and Elementary} Dual Endorsement: 11 weeks each (SPED 498 and ELED 494)	NA	Special Education CP-12): 252 contact hours (SPED 390, 440, 480. 481. 482). Five practicum that emphasize effective teaching methods and strategies and the development, implementation and monitoring of instructional intervention programs in literacy, math, and behavior. Early Childhood Special Education (P-3): 300 contact hours (SPED 440, 480, 481, 482; ECE 390,391; ECE 380, 430, 434, 439) . Six practicum and four courses with embedded field work that emphasize effective teaching methods and strategies and the development, implementation and monitoring of instructional intervention programs in literacy, math, and behavior with a specific emphasis on infant/ toddler and preschool settings. Special Education (P-12 and Elementary) Dual Endorsement: 292 contact hours (SPED 390,	Not required. but considered in admissions decisions.

Institution	Weeks Full-time Student teaching	FTE weeks of part-time student teaching	Other required field experience	Required fieldwork before admission
			440, 480, 481, 482; SCED 490; MATH 382). Six practicum and one course with embedded field work that emphasize effective teaching methods and strategies and the development, implementation and monitoring of instructional intervention programs in literacy, math and behavior, and in science	
Whitworth	**Elementary candidates** complete an Extended Placement Program in which they are placed in their student teaching placement in their junior year. Their actual student teaching is over a 14 week semester, but they are in the classroom for three semesters. **Secondary candidates** complete their student teaching over a 14 week semester.	NA	Elementary: 250 hours Secondary: 210 hours	30 – 40 hours
Whitworth MIT	NA	Number of weeks of full-time student teaching: 15 Number of FTE weeks of part-time student teaching 5 The MIT teacher candidates are in the same room(s) with the same teacher(s) for the entire year. During the fall term, they are in schools 2 days per week for 13 weeks. During the spring term, they are student teaching full time from late January to the last week in May.	NA	Candidates are granted full admittance to the MIT program after successfully completing the fall term practicum which consists of two days per week for 13 weeks
Whitworth Evening Teacher Certification program	12 weeks followed by 2 more weeks in a setting that is very different from previous practica experiences and serves a culturally diverse population.	NA	Two practica consisting of at least 30 hours each	30 hours