



*BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION  
FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE  
RECOMMENDATIONS  
YEAR SEVEN REPORT*

*Submitted to the  
Governor,  
Board of Regents, and  
Board of Elementary & Secondary Education*

*May 18, 2006*

# BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE YEAR SEVEN REPORT

## **A. STRUCTURE OF THE BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION**

The Blue Ribbon Commission was originally created by the Board of Regents (BoR) and the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) during April 1999. It is supported by the Governor and is housed within the Governor's Office of Education. During 2005-06, the Commission was composed of 34 members who represented each of the following areas.

### **Nine Designated Members**

- Two members of the Board of Regents
- Two members of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education
- Chairperson of the Senate Education Committee or designee
- Chairperson of the House Education Committee or designee
- Commissioner of Higher Education or designee
- Governor's Designee
- State Superintendent of Education or designee

### **Ten Members Selected by the Board of Regents**

- One University/College President/Chancellor
- One University Provost
- One Dean of a College of Education (public institution)
- One Dean of a College of Education (private institution)
- One Dean of College of Arts and Science
- One College of Education Faculty Member
- One College of Arts/Science Faculty Member
- One Community and Technical College Representative
- One PK-16+ Coordinator
- One Teacher Preparation Candidate

### **Ten Members Selected by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education**

- One District Superintendent (Urban)
- One District Superintendent (Rural)
- One District Director of Personnel
- One Elementary Principal
- One Middle School Principal
- One High School Principal
- One Elementary School Teacher
- One Middle School Teacher
- One High School Teacher
- One School Board Member

**Five Members Jointly Selected by the Board of Regents and Board of Elementary and Secondary Education:**

- Two Community Representatives
- One Parent
- One Grant Generator
- One NAACP Member

The Blue Ribbon Commission for Educational Excellence was co-chaired during 2005-06 by Frances Henry (Board of Regents) and Glenny Lee Buquet (Board of Elementary and Secondary Education) and served in an advisory capacity to the Board of Regents, Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, and Governor.

**B. CHARGE AND OBJECTIVES FOR THE BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION (2005-06)**

Due to Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita, the Blue Ribbon Commission for Educational Excellence did not meet during fall 2005 and only met on four occasions during spring 2006 (February 9, 2006; March 9, 2006; April 6, 2006; and May 11, 2006).

During 2005-06, the Blue Ribbon Commission was given the following charge:

To examine the Teacher Preparation Accountability System and expand the system to address critical needs.

It addressed the following objectives:

- Identify changes to indicators for the Teacher Preparation Accountability System.
- Identify changes to baselines, timelines, and formula.
- Identify changes to corrective actions, rewards, and transitions due to the hurricanes.

On May 11, 2006, the Blue Ribbon Commission recommended that the following areas be addressed within the 2005-06 Blue Ribbon Commission recommendations.

- Changes to the Teacher Preparation Accountability System.
- Changes to be Addressed by the Commission During 2006-07 once Additional Data are Available
- Additional Information to be Gathered for the 2006-07 Blue Ribbon Commission for Educational Excellence

The specific actions for each area are listed in this report. Appendix A identifies where the recommended changes will occur within the existing Teacher Preparation Accountability System.

**C. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE (2005-06)**

The following are recommendations that were made by the Blue Ribbon Commission for Educational Excellence during 2005-06 to strengthen the Teacher Preparation Accountability System.

**1. CHANGES TO THE TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM**

*Recommendation #1: Make changes identified by the Blue Ribbon Commission to the existing Teacher Preparation Accountability System.*

**a. Indicators for the Teacher Preparation Accountability System**

*Indicators*

- 1) List “*Critical Certification Shortage*”, “*Critical Rural District Shortage*”, “*Number of Racial Minority Graduates*”, “*Teaching Minority*”, and “*Grades 4-8 Education*” as five separate indicators.
- 2) Add “*Value-Added Teacher Preparation Assessment Model*” as an indicator for the Authentic University-School Partnerships for 2008-2009.

**b. Critical Certification Shortage Areas**

- 1) Add the following indicators to the existing list of “*critical certification shortage areas*”:
  - a) Foreign languages
  - b) Reading specialists
- 2) Identify the specific areas of science and special education for the “*critical certification shortage areas*”:
  - a) Science (Biology, General Science, Chemistry, Physics, Environmental Science, and Earth Science)
  - b) Special Education (Mild/Moderate, Visually Impaired, Hearing Impaired, Early Intervention, Significant Disabilities, and Speech Pathologist)

**C. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE (2005-06) (CONT'D.)**

**1. CHANGES TO THE TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONT'D.)**

**b. Critical Certification Shortage Areas (Cont'd.)**

c) Remove Grades 4-8 from the “*Critical Certification Shortage Areas*”.

3) Count the number of certified teachers who “Add-on” additional areas of certification in the Critical Certification Shortage Areas.

**c. Critical Rural District Shortage Area**

1) List East Carroll Parish, St. Helena Parish and Madison Parish as the three parishes with critical rural shortages.

**d. Grades 4-8 Education**

1) Define Grades 4-8 Educators as a separate indicator.  
2) Count the number of certified teachers who “Add-on” certification in Grades 4-8.

**e. Rewards**

1) Change the wording to indicate that universities who receive rewards will be recognized at a public celebration.  
2) Change the wording to indicate that universities will receive a larger reward if they earn a label of “Exemplary” as compared to a label of “High Performing”.

**f. Level 2 Corrective Actions**

1) Change the wording to indicate that candidates must receive written notification from the university that indicates that it has been provided an “At-Risk” label and must reach a “Satisfactory” level in two years. Candidates should be informed of university actions to reach a “Satisfactory” level.

**C. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE (2005-06) (CONT'D.)**

**1. CHANGES TO THE TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONT'D.)**

**g. Level 3 Corrective Action**

- 1) Change the wording to indicate that candidates must receive written notification from the university that indicates that it has been provided a “Low-Performing” label and must reach a “Satisfactory” level in two years. Candidates should be informed of university actions to reach a “Satisfactory” level.

**h. Non-approval**

- 1) Change the following wording “may complete their program at the university and be employed in the state” to read as “may complete their program and be eligible for certification.”

**i. High Performing Status not Reaching in Four Years**

- 1) Change the following wording “If a Satisfactory university does not reach a High Performing status by April 1 (2006) . . .” to read as “If a Satisfactory university does not reach a High Performing status in four years . . . .”

**2. CHANGES TO BE ADDRESSED BY THE COMMISSION DURING 2006-07 ONCE ADDITIONAL DATA ARE AVAILABLE**

*Recommendation #2: Have the Blue Ribbon Commission review new data during 2006-07 before making changes to the baselines, weights, and formula for the Teacher Preparation Accountability System.*

- a. **Baseline for Quantity Index**
- b. **Expected Percentage of Increase for Quantity Index**
- c. **Certification Index**
- d. **New Teacher Survey Index**
- e. **Assessor Survey Index**
- f. **Weights for Quantity Indicators**
- g. **Weights for Certification Index, New Teacher Index, and Assessor Index to Calculate Institutional Performance Index**

**C. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE (2005-06) (CONT'D.)**

**2. CHANGES TO BE ADDRESSED BY THE COMMISSION DURING 2006-07 ONCE ADDITIONAL DATA ARE AVAILABLE (CONT'D.)**

- h. Weights for Quantity Index and Institutional Performance Index to Calculate Teacher Preparation Performance Score**
- i. Scaled Scores for Labels**

**3. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO BE GATHERED FOR THE 2006-07 BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE**

*Recommendation #3: Have staff collect additional information during summer 2006 and present the information to the Blue Ribbon Commission during 2006-07.*

**a. Rewards**

- 1) Form a committee to determine how reward funds should be distributed for universities that receive “Exemplary” and “High Performing” labels.

**b. Teacher and Mentor Survey**

- 1) Form a committee to redesign the New Teacher Survey and Mentor Survey in order for them to be administered at the conclusion of student teaching and the conclusion of the Louisiana Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program.

**c. Retention of Teachers**

- 1) Calculate the retention rate of new teachers who remain within the field of education over a five year time period.
- 2) Form a committee to examine the results and identify incentives to retain teachers who leave the profession.

**d. Baselines for Teacher Quantity Index**

- 1) Determine projections for 2006-07 enrollment in teacher preparation programs to make recommendations for baselines for the Teacher Quantity Index.

**C. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE (2005-06) (CONT'D.)**

**3. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO BE GATHERED FOR THE 2006-07 BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE (CONT'D.)**

**e. Process to Calculate Add-on Certifications**

- 1) Form a committee to identify the process that will be used to calculate the number of certified teachers who have added on certifications in the Critical Shortage Areas and Grades 4-8.

**f. Simulations for Accountability Formula**

- 1) Develop simulations to examine the impact of weights upon the formula for the Teacher Preparation Accountability System.

**g. Increases in Certified Teachers in District With High Shortages of Teachers**

- 1) Gather data to determine why some parishes with high percentages of uncertified teachers have demonstrated significant increases in certified teachers during the last four years.

**h. Education Majors who are not Admitted to Programs**

- 1) Identify a process to collect data pertaining to number of teacher candidates who declare Education as a major but are not admitted to the Teacher Preparation Programs and reasons for not being admitted.



# APPENDIX A



Draft

## TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

This document is being developed by the  
Blue Ribbon Commission for  
Educational Excellence

May 18, 2006

# TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

## DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><b>Indicators</b></p> <p>1. What indicators should be used to determine if teacher preparation programs have demonstrated growth?</p>	<p>The following indicators should be used to determine if teacher preparation programs have demonstrated growth.</p> <p><b>Teacher Quantity:</b></p> <p>Q1 Number of traditional and alternate certification program completers relative to a predetermined <i>program completer target</i>.</p> <p>Q2 Number of traditional and alternate certification program completers in <i>critical certification shortage areas</i> (i.e., mathematics, science, <b>special education, foreign languages, and reading specialists</b>).</p> <p>Q3 Number of traditional and alternate certification program completers in <i>critical rural district shortage areas</i> (i.e., three rural districts identified by the state with the largest percentage of uncertified teachers).</p> <p>Q4 Number of <i>racial minority</i> traditional and alternate certification program completers.</p> <p>Q5 Number of <i>teaching minority</i> traditional and alternate certification program completers.</p> <p><b>Q6 Number of Grades 4-8 traditional and alternate certification program completers.</b></p> <p><b>Institutional Performance:</b></p> <p>P1 Percentage of program completers who took PRAXIS subtests and passed the subtests.</p> <p>P2 Ratings by new teachers of the quality of their teacher preparation programs to prepare them for teaching.</p> <p>P3 Ratings by building level assessors of first year teachers regarding the quality of teacher preparation programs to prepare new teachers.</p> <p><b>Authentic University-School Partnerships:</b></p> <p><b>A1 Value-Added Teacher Preparation Assessment Model (Values to be recommended by Dr. George Noell once it has been determined that the model is valid and reliable.)</b></p>

## TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONT'D.)

### DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><i>Phase-in Schedule of Indicators</i></p> <p>2. When will the indicators be integrated into the formula to calculate Teacher Preparation Performance Scores?</p>	<p>Not all indicators will be available for the system at the same time. A phase-in schedule has been provided below:</p> <p>2006-08      The following indicators will be used to calculate the Teacher Preparation Performance Scores:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Number of traditional and alternate certification program completers. (2005-06 regular and alternate program completers)</li> <li>(b) Number of traditional and alternate certification program completers in <i>grades 4-8 education</i>.</li> <li>(c) Number of traditional and alternate certification program completers in <i>critical certification shortage areas</i>. (2005-06 regular and alternate program completers)</li> <li>(d) Number of traditional and alternate certification program completers in <i>critical rural district shortage areas</i>. (2005-06 regular and alternate program completers)</li> <li>(e) Number of <i>racial minority</i> traditional and alternate certification program completers. (2005-06 regular and alternate program completers)</li> <li>(f) Number of <i>teaching minority</i> traditional and alternate certification program completers. (2005-06 regular and alternate program completers)</li> <li>(g) Ratings by new teachers of the quality of their teacher preparation programs to prepare them for teaching. (Regular and alternate program completers when exiting Student Teaching and the Louisiana Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program)</li> <li>(h) Ratings by building level assessors of <i>new</i> teachers regarding the quality of teacher preparation programs and induction programs to prepare new teachers. (Mentors of regular and alternate program completers when new teachers exit the Louisiana Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program)</li> </ul> <p>2008-2009      In addition to the above indicators, phase-in the following indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Recommended values from Value-Added Teacher Preparation Assessment Model.</li> </ul>

## TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONT'D.)

### DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS						
<p><b>Definitions of Indicators</b></p> <p>3. How will specific indicators be defined?</p> <p><i>Note: The sum will be a "duplicated" count, meaning, for example, that someone coded both as "African-American" and "male taking the Early Childhood Education test" would count as two, not one.</i></p>	<p><b>a. Critical Certification Shortage</b></p> <p>A <i>critical certification shortage</i> will be the number of traditional and alternate certification program completers reported to the BOR who meet all program and state requirements to be certified to teach in the following areas: <b>Science</b> (Biology, General Science, Chemistry, Physics, <b>Environmental Science</b>, and <b>Earth Science</b>), <b>Special Education (Mild/Moderate, Visually Impaired, Hearing Impaired, Early Intervention, Significant Disabilities, and Speech Pathologist)</b>, <b>Mathematics</b>, <b>Foreign Languages</b>, and <b>Reading Specialists</b>. In addition, this will include the number of certified teachers who add-on new certifications in these areas.</p> <p><b>b. Critical Rural District Shortage</b></p> <p>The <i>critical rural district shortage</i> will be the number of traditional and alternate certification program completers who select to teach in the following rural school districts who have the greatest percentage of uncertified teachers: St. Helena Parish, Madison Parish, and <b>East Carroll Parish</b>.</p> <p><b>c. Number of Racial Minority Graduates</b></p> <p>A <i>racial minority</i> will be the sum of the number of traditional and alternate certification program completers who take the PRAXIS exams, as reported by ETS, coded as any of the following:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">(1) African-American.</td> <td style="width: 33%;">(3) Hispanic</td> <td style="width: 33%;">(5) Pacific Islander</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(2) Asian-American.</td> <td>(4) Native American</td> <td>(6) Other (Specify: _____)</td> </tr> </table> <p><b>d. Teaching Minority</b></p> <p>A <i>teaching minority</i> will be the sum of the number of traditional and alternate certification program completers who take the PRAXIS exams, as reported by ETS, coded as any of the following:</p> <p>(1) Male and taking the "Early Childhood Education" test OR (2) Male and taking the "Elementary Education" test.</p> <p><b>e. Grades 4-8 Education</b></p> <p><b>Grades 4-8 Educators</b> will be all regular and alternate certification teachers who attain certification as grades 4-8 teachers as they complete their teacher preparation programs.</p>	(1) African-American.	(3) Hispanic	(5) Pacific Islander	(2) Asian-American.	(4) Native American	(6) Other (Specify: _____)
(1) African-American.	(3) Hispanic	(5) Pacific Islander					
(2) Asian-American.	(4) Native American	(6) Other (Specify: _____)					

## TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONT'D.)

### DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS															
<p><i>Teacher Quantity Index</i></p> <p>4. How will a Teacher Quantity Index be calculated?</p> <p style="color: red;">(This section will be revised in 2006-2007 by the Blue Ribbon Commission for Educational Excellence once more current data are available.)</p>	<p>The Board of Regents approved a goal of a 15% increase in program completers beyond a Baseline Score as a target for universities to achieve an “A+” status for quantity. The 15% goal was jointly determined by members of the Board of Regents and Board of Elementary and Secondary Education based upon percentage of uncertified teachers in the State and the anticipated capacity of universities to increase quantity. It was determined that the increase could be exhibited by increasing the overall number of program completers each year or increasing the diversity of the completers (e.g., certification shortage, rural shortage, racial minorities, and teaching minorities).</p> <p>System heads may require all institutions to increase by the same percentage, or they may adjust the degree of increase at individual institutions and require one institution to demonstrate a greater level of increase (e.g., 18%) and another institution to demonstrate a lower level of increase (12%) based upon the institution’s capacity to increase. An overall 15% increase will be required for the total system. Individual public universities will have the right to present information to their system boards if they feel that the program completer target set for their institution is not appropriate. A 15% increase in the percentage of program completers has been established for all private universities who wish to participate in the Teacher Preparation Accountability System.</p> <p>A Baseline Score will be calculated for each institution by determining the total number of regular and alternate certification students who completed the teacher preparation programs during the time period of July 1, 2000 to June 30, 2001. This cohort was selected due to their completion immediately after the approval of the Teacher Preparation Accountability System by the Board of Regents and due to their scores being used to assign grades to institutions during April 2002 for passage of the PRAXIS examinations. The baseline will remain constant until the Teacher Preparation Accountability System is reexamined for 2005-2006.</p> <p>A Quantity Score will be calculated for each institution by assigning one point to every regular and alternate certification program completer during a year. One-half a point will also be assigned for every program completer during that year that fits the definitions for: critical certification shortages, critical rural district shortages, racial minorities, and teaching minorities. The total number of program completers will be added to the bonus points to determine the Quantity Score.</p> <p>Quantity Score = Program Completers + <b>Grades 4-8 Education</b> + (.5 * [Certification Shortage + Rural Shortage + Racial Minority + Teaching Minority])</p> <p>The Quantity Score will be compared to the Baseline Score to determine the percentage of increase or decrease and the assigned grade.</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%;">A+</td> <td style="width: 70%;">+15% and greater difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score</td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: right;">(Scaled Scores: 125+)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>+5% to +14% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(Scaled Scores: 100-124.9)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>-3% to +4% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(Scaled Scores: 80-99.9)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>-4% to -15% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(Scaled Scores: 50-79.9)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Below C</td> <td>-16% and greater difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(Scaled Scores: 0-49.9)</td> </tr> </table> <p>Standard scores will be assigned to all percentages to create a Teacher Quantity Index for each institution.</p>	A+	+15% and greater difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	(Scaled Scores: 125+)	A	+5% to +14% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	(Scaled Scores: 100-124.9)	B	-3% to +4% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	(Scaled Scores: 80-99.9)	C	-4% to -15% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	(Scaled Scores: 50-79.9)	Below C	-16% and greater difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	(Scaled Scores: 0-49.9)
A+	+15% and greater difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	(Scaled Scores: 125+)														
A	+5% to +14% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	(Scaled Scores: 100-124.9)														
B	-3% to +4% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	(Scaled Scores: 80-99.9)														
C	-4% to -15% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	(Scaled Scores: 50-79.9)														
Below C	-16% and greater difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	(Scaled Scores: 0-49.9)														

## TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONT'D.)

### DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS																																				
<p><i>Institutional Performance Index</i></p> <p>5. How will the Institutional Performance Index be calculated?</p> <p style="color: red;">(This section will be revised in 2006-2007 by the Blue Ribbon Commission for Educational Excellence once more current data are available.)</p>	<p>Regression analysis will be used to convert individual values to individual scaled scores for each index.</p> <p><i>Certification Index</i></p> <p>Grades and specific scaled scores will be assigned to institutions based upon the overall percentage of program completers who passed the PRAXIS examinations. The grades and corresponding percentage ranges and scaled scores ranges are the following:</p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border: none;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>Grades</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>Percentages</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>Scaled Scores</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A+</td> <td>98%-100%</td> <td>125+</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>92%-97%</td> <td>100-124</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>87%-91%</td> <td>80-99</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>80%-86%</td> <td>50-79</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Below C</td> <td>0%-79%</td> <td>0-49</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Graduate Satisfaction Index</i></p> <p>Grades and specific scaled scores will be assigned to specific mean scores from surveys administered during the fall of each year to first year teachers who completed their programs the previous year. Teachers will use a 1 to 4 point scale to respond to questions pertaining to their preparation to teach within schools. The grades and corresponding ranges for mean scores and scaled score are the following:</p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border: none;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>Grades</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>Means</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>Scaled Scores</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A+</td> <td>128 and above</td> <td>125+</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>117.0-127.9</td> <td>100-124</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>107.0- 116.9</td> <td>80-99</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>93.0 – 106.9</td> <td>50-79</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Below C</td> <td>0-92.9</td> <td>0-49</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="color: red;"><i>Assessor Survey Index</i></p> <p>Grades and scaled scores will be determined in the future.</p> <p><i>Institutional Performance Index</i></p> <p>The formula that will be used to calculate the Institutional Performance Index will be the following:</p> $\text{Institutional Performance Index} = (\text{Certification Index} + \text{Graduate Satisfaction Index} + \text{Assessor Survey Index} / 3)$	<i>Grades</i>	<i>Percentages</i>	<i>Scaled Scores</i>	A+	98%-100%	125+	A	92%-97%	100-124	B	87%-91%	80-99	C	80%-86%	50-79	Below C	0%-79%	0-49	<i>Grades</i>	<i>Means</i>	<i>Scaled Scores</i>	A+	128 and above	125+	A	117.0-127.9	100-124	B	107.0- 116.9	80-99	C	93.0 – 106.9	50-79	Below C	0-92.9	0-49
<i>Grades</i>	<i>Percentages</i>	<i>Scaled Scores</i>																																			
A+	98%-100%	125+																																			
A	92%-97%	100-124																																			
B	87%-91%	80-99																																			
C	80%-86%	50-79																																			
Below C	0%-79%	0-49																																			
<i>Grades</i>	<i>Means</i>	<i>Scaled Scores</i>																																			
A+	128 and above	125+																																			
A	117.0-127.9	100-124																																			
B	107.0- 116.9	80-99																																			
C	93.0 – 106.9	50-79																																			
Below C	0-92.9	0-49																																			

**TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONT'D.)**  
**DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS**

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS															
<p><i>Less Than 10 Program Completers</i></p> <p>6. Will data be used if there are less than 10 program completers?</p>	<p>If data is available for less than 10 program completers at an institution during a given year, two consecutive years of data will be used to determine an average score. If two consecutive years of data are not available, the specific variable will not be integrated into the accountability formula until the data are available.</p>															
<p><i>Labels for Teacher Preparation Programs</i></p> <p>7. How will labels be assigned to Teacher Preparation Programs?</p> <p><i>(This section will be revised in 2006-2007 by the Blue Ribbon Commission for Educational Excellence once more current data are available.)</i></p>	<p>The labels listed below will only be assigned to the overall Teacher Preparation Performance Score. However, individual grades will be assigned to the Quantity Index and Institutional Performance Index.</p> <p>The Teacher Preparation Performance Scores will range from 0 to beyond 100, with a score of 100-124.9 indicating that a university possesses a High Performing program. All universities will be expected to achieve a Teacher Preparation Performance Score of 100 and achieve a “High Performing” status by April 2006.</p> <p><b>April 2003 &amp; Beyond</b></p> <p>During April 2003 and beyond, universities will be assigned specific labels each year based upon the level of their Teacher Preparation Performance Scores. For the first four years (April 2003-April 2006), the following scores must be achieved to receive the following labels:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60%;">Exemplary Teacher Preparation Program</td> <td style="width: 5%;">=</td> <td>Performance Score of 125.0 and above</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High Performing Teacher Preparation Program</td> <td>=</td> <td>Performance Score of 100.0 -124.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Satisfactory Teacher Preparation Program</td> <td>=</td> <td>Performance Score of 80.0 - 99.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>At-Risk Teacher Preparation Program</td> <td>=</td> <td>Performance Score of 50.0 - 79.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Low Performing Teacher Preparation Program</td> <td>=</td> <td>Performance Score of 0 - 49.9</td> </tr> </table> <p>After 2003-2006, it is intended that the scores required to receive each label will increase over time. Beginning with 2006-2007, there will be a revised schedule of scores associated with the labels. Universities will be expected to demonstrate additional growth to meet the new criteria and maintain the labels.</p>	Exemplary Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of 125.0 and above	High Performing Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of 100.0 -124.9	Satisfactory Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of 80.0 - 99.9	At-Risk Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of 50.0 - 79.9	Low Performing Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of 0 - 49.9
Exemplary Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of 125.0 and above														
High Performing Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of 100.0 -124.9														
Satisfactory Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of 80.0 - 99.9														
At-Risk Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of 50.0 - 79.9														
Low Performing Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of 0 - 49.9														

**TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONT'D.)**  
**DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS**

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><i>Rewards</i></p> <p>8. Should universities be rewarded for high performance and/or growth?</p>	<p>Universities should receive rewards if they attain Teacher Preparation Performance Scores that result in labels of "Exemplary" or "High Performing". They should also receive a reward if they have a "Satisfactory" label and demonstrate a predetermined amount of growth. Types of rewards should be:</p> <p><i>Exemplary Teacher Preparation Programs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Universities receive a positive label.</li> <li>b. Universities be recognized at a public celebration.</li> <li>c. Universities receive public recognition in institutional report cards and state reports.</li> <li>d. Universities receive a monetary reward that is at a higher level than the reward for High Performing Teacher Preparation Programs. The reward funds may be used for professional development of faculty or to fund a special initiative that enhances the knowledge of faculty.</li> </ul> <p><i>High Performing Teacher Preparation Programs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Universities receive a positive label.</li> <li>b. Universities be recognized at a public celebration.</li> <li>c. Universities receive public recognition in institutional report cards and state reports.</li> <li>d. Universities receive a monetary reward that is at a lower level than the reward for Exemplary Teacher Preparation Programs. The reward funds may be used for professional development of faculty or to fund a special initiative that enhances the knowledge of faculty.</li> </ul>



**TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONT'D.)**  
**DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS**

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><i>Corrective Actions</i></p> <p>9. What will happen when a university obtains an "At-risk Teacher Preparation Program" label or a "Low Performing Teacher Preparation Program" label.</p>	<p>Universities should receive corrective actions if they attain Teacher Preparation Performance Scores that result in labels of "At-risk" or "Low Performing." Types of corrective actions are the following.</p> <p><i>For At-risk Teacher Preparation Programs Only</i></p> <p><i>Level 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Universities receive an "At-risk" label for the U.S. Department of Education.</li> <li>b. Universities obtain an external expert to work with the PK-16+ Councils to conduct a rigorous program review and identify actions to improve the teacher preparation program.</li> <li>c. Universities report recommended actions to improve the teacher preparation program to the public.</li> <li>d. Universities report progress in improving the teacher preparation program to the public on an annual basis.</li> <li>e. Universities have two years to reach "Satisfactory" level.</li> </ul> <p><i>Level 2:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Universities receive an "At-risk" label for the U.S. Department of Education.</li> <li>b. Board of Regents refuses to approve new university programs in colleges that offer general education and major courses to teacher education majors.</li> <li>c. Board of Elementary and Secondary Education assign private universities a "probationary status" as part of the state approval process.</li> <li>d. Universities provide teacher preparation candidates with written notification (e.g., e-mail, letter, etc.) that communicates that the program has been assigned an "At-Risk" label and must reach a "Satisfactory" level in two years or be labeled as "Low Performing." The written communication should identify actions that are being implemented to reach a "Satisfactory" level.</li> <li>e. Universities have one year to move to "Satisfactory" level. Universities that fail to demonstrate growth will move to Level 3 corrective actions.</li> </ul>

**TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONT'D.)**  
**DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS**

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><i>Corrective Actions (Cont'd.)</i></p> <p>9. What will happen when a university obtains an "At-risk Teacher Preparation Program" label or a "Low Performing Teacher Preparation Program" label (Cont'd.)</p>	<p><i>For Low Performing Teacher Preparation Programs or At-Risk Teacher Preparation Programs that Fail to Demonstrate Growth During Level 2 Corrective Actions</i></p> <p><b>Level 3:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Universities receive a "Low Performing" label for the U.S. Department of Education.</li> <li>b. Universities are assigned an external team (funded by universities) to assist the program.</li> <li>c. Universities provide teacher preparation candidates with written notification (e.g., e-mail, letter, etc.) that communicates that the program has been assigned a "Low Performing" label and must reach a "Satisfactory" level in two years or be reconstituted the next year. The written communication should identify actions that are being implemented to reach a "Satisfactory" level.</li> <li>d. Universities have two years to move to a "Satisfactory" level. (Note: Universities that have had an "At-risk" label for three years will have only one year to move to a "Satisfactory" level before moving to Level 4.)</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 4:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Universities lose state approval of teacher preparation programs.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Non-approval</i></p> <p>10. What will happen once a university moves into Level 4 corrective action?</p>	<p>Once a university reaches Level 4 of the corrective actions, the program will no longer be approved by the state. If the university wishes to reconstitute the program, it may not submit a plan for a new program until a minimum of one year is spent planning the reconstituted program.</p> <p>Once a university loses its program approval, it may accept no new students into the teacher preparation program. Students already enrolled in the non-approved teacher preparation program may complete their program at the university and be eligible for certification. A non-approved institution is expected to work with approved institutions and help students transfer credits to approved universities providing the students meet admission requirements at the approved universities.</p> <p>The performance of students from non-approved institutions who enter approved institutions during their final 30 hours will not be calculated into the Teacher Preparation Performance Score of the approved institutions.</p>

**TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONT'D.)**  
**DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS**

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><b><i>High Performing Status Not Reached in Four Years</i></b></p> <p>11. What happens if a “Satisfactory” university does not reach a “High Performing” status in four years?</p>	<p>If a “Satisfactory” university does not reach a “High Performing” status <b>in four years</b>, the following will occur:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. University obtains an external expert to work with the PK-16+ Council to conduct a rigorous program review and identify actions to improve the teacher preparation program.</li> <li>b. University reports recommended actions to improve the teacher preparation program to the public.</li> <li>c. University reports progress in improving the teacher preparation program to the public on an annual basis.</li> </ol>
<p><b><i>Corrective Action - New Accountability Cycle</i></b></p> <p>12. Can institutions be given a second label of “At-Risk” or “Low Performing” based upon new indicators if they are already in Corrective Action?</p>	<p>Institutions that enter into Corrective Action will have two years to address the accountability indicators and reach a Satisfactory level. These institutions will not be assigned an additional label and will not be required to address new accountability indicators until they have exited Corrective Action at the end of the two year time period.</p>
<p><b><i>Corrective Action - Exit in One Year</i></b></p> <p>13. What happens if institutions enter into Corrective Action and reach a “Satisfactory” or higher level in less than two years?</p>	<p>If a campus enters into Corrective Action and exits within a one year time period, the campus will have the “At-Risk” or “Low-Performing” label removed and exit Corrective Action. The campus will be given a one year grace period and assigned a label of “Transitional Teacher Preparation Program” for one year. Data for new indicators will be reported; however, the institution will not be held accountable for new indicators until the end of the second year.</p>