



2006-07
BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION
FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE
RECOMMENDATIONS
YEAR EIGHT REPORT

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

May 17, 2007

2006-07
BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE
YEAR EIGHT 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 2006-07, the Commission was composed of 36 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
- One University Content Expert in Special Education

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
- One District Content Expert in Special Education

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 2006-07 by Frances Henry (Board of Regents) and Glenn Lee Buquet (Board of Elementary and Secondary Education). See Appendix A for a listing of Blue Ribbon Commission members.

B. CHARGE AND FOCUS FOR THE BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION

The Blue Ribbon Commission for Educational Excellence met on six occasions during fall 2006 and spring 2007 (November 16, 2006, December 14, 2006, February 8, 2007; March 15, 2007; April 12, 2007; and May 3, 2007).

The Blue Ribbon Commission was given the following charge for 2006-08:

To recommend strategies to address the challenges faced by Louisiana schools to provide:

- *Quality special education;*
- *Reading teachers and services for students.*

The focus for 2006-07 was upon the following special education areas:

- *Special Education Data;*
- *Preparation of New Special Education Teachers.*

In addition, the Blue Ribbon Commission reviewed additional areas identified in the *2005-06 Blue Ribbon Commission for Educational Excellence Report* to revise the Teacher Preparation Accountability System.

The proposed focus areas for the Blue Ribbon Commission during 2007-08 include the following: Recruitment/Retention/Ongoing Support of Special Education Teachers; Identification/Placement of Special Education Students; and Reading Target Areas. The Blue Ribbon Commission Advisory Committee will meet in June 2007 and make determinations as to final focus areas and meeting dates for the coming year.

On May 3, 2007, the Blue Ribbon Commission approved recommendations for the *2006-07 Blue Ribbon Commission for Educational Excellence Report*. The specific actions for each area are listed on the following pages. Appendix B identifies where recommended changes will occur within the revised Teacher Preparation Accountability System.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE (2006-07)

The following are recommendations that were made by the Blue Ribbon Commission for Educational Excellence during 2006-07 to address special education needs and strengthen the Teacher Preparation Accountability System.

1. VALUE-ADDED TEACHER PREPARATION ASSESSMENT MODEL

- 1.1 Develop a value-added teacher preparation assessment model to examine the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs in preparing new special education teachers.
- 1.2 Explore the use of the value added teacher preparation assessment model to determine if average growth of student learning is attributed to varying levels of teaching experience, teacher attrition, professional development, higher degrees, etc.
- 1.3 Explore methods for determining if there is a relationship between the types and amounts of all funding (e.g., grants) allocated to teacher preparation units and their effectiveness values.
- 1.4 Identify indicators (e.g., knowledge, skills, dispositions) in pre-service teachers that will predict their effectiveness as teachers.
- 1.5 Identify factors/program components (e.g., student teaching, mentoring, etc.) in pre-service special education teacher preparation programs that predict teacher effectiveness.
- 1.6 Develop a process to disseminate information about the Value-Added Teacher Preparation Assessment Model results to local districts and the public.

2. RETENTION RATE

- 2.1 Develop a process to define and calculate the retention rate of certified special education teachers versus certified regular education teachers during the first five years of teaching.
- 2.2 Develop a process to define and calculate the retention rate of traditionally prepared certified special education teachers versus certified special education teachers prepared through an alternate certification pathway during the first five years of teaching.

3. NUMBER OF TEACHERS

- 3.1 Calculate the number of special education teachers by areas of special education certification prepared by universities in alternate and traditional teacher preparation programs.

4. COMPREHENSIVE DATA SYSTEM

- 4.1 Create a comprehensive post-secondary student data system in Louisiana that links Board of Regents, Louisiana Department of Education, and Department of Labor data to support federal IDEA mandates regarding Post-secondary School Transitions.
- 4.2 Create a comprehensive data system that follows teachers in their public schools through their entire career from when they chose education as a career to when they leave the system and determine why they leave.

5. LOW INCIDENCE SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

- 5.1 Support the creation of university consortia/agreements to provide courses/programs via distance learning for low incidence disabilities within performance-based programs.

6. SPECIAL EDUCATION MILD/MOCERATE TEACHER PREPARATION AND LICENSURE

- 6.1 Have university and district personnel work collaboratively during a series of Mild/Moderate Special Education Excellence Institutes to create recommendations that will be presented to the Blue Ribbon Commission before being made to the Louisiana Department of Education pertaining to regular and mild/moderate special education licensure and teacher preparation. Ensure that the recommendations address the following needs: Certification Structure (Integrated, Merged, Discrete, etc); Field-Based Experiences; Best Practices; Practical and Specialized Strategies.
- 6.2 (If appropriate) Identify and implement policy changes to Special Education Mild/Moderate Add-On Endorsement policy and Special Education Mild/Moderate Alternate Certification policy that align with recommended policy for the revised Special Education Mild/Moderate certification structure.
- 6.3 (If appropriate) Have universities make changes in teacher preparation programs to reflect the policy changes identified relative to special education certification.

6. SPECIAL EDUCATION MILD/MOCERATE TEACHER PREPARATION AND LICENSURE (CONT'D.)

- 6.4 Explore and identify ways to utilize online learning and other distance learning opportunities for individuals seeking certification in Special Education Mild/Moderate.

7. TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

- 7.1 Change wording from “Authentic University School Partnership Index” to “Growth of Student Learning Index.”
- 7.2 Include the word “add-on” in the description of the indicators for Q2 and Q6.
- 7.3 Assign equal weight (1/3) to each of the following indices when calculating the Teacher Preparation Performance Score unless additional information is provided in the future to indicate that the weight should be changed: Teacher Quantity Index, Institutional Performance Index, and Growth of Student Learning Index.
- 7.4 Change “Number of Racial Minorities Graduates” to “Racial Minorities.”
- 7.5 Phase in the Teacher Preparation Accountability System using the timelines identified.
- 7.6 Assign a value of 1 bonus point for all teachers with middle school certification.
- 7.7 Reword the use of reward funds to the following: *The reward funds may be used for professional development of faculty or to fund a special initiative that enhances the knowledge of teacher preparation faculty.*
- 7.8 Calculate Baselines for universities less impacted by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita by determining the total number of program completers during 2000-2005 and calculating the mean. *(Note: Nine Blue Ribbon Commission members voted to use the mean during the five year time period to calculate the Baseline Score, and eight Blue Ribbon Commission members voted to take all program completers from 2000-2005, eliminate the year with the highest number of program completers, eliminate the year with the lowest number of program completers, and average the number of program completers during the three remaining years.)*
- 7.9 The school districts who have the greatest percentage of uncertified teachers for the critical rural district shortages are St. Helena School District, Madison School District, and East Carroll School District

7. TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONT.D)

- 7.10 Allow institutions to use the following process when counting alternate certification candidates as program completers if they have successfully completed three years of teaching in place of student teaching or an internship.

The university can implement the flexibility provided in policy and waive the student teaching or internship course requirement, based on documentation of successful teaching experience. The university can identify what type of documentation is required of the candidate for this purpose.

The university will then recommend the candidate for certification purposes (as they do with other program completers) and that individual will be counted as a program completer for purposes of state accountability, legislative reporting, and NCATE.

If the university chooses not to utilize the option available in policy, then the individuals who complete the coursework, but are not recommended for certification, will not be counted as program completers for any purpose.

(Note: Written document was provided by NCATE to indicate that it was acceptable to use this process.)

- 7.11 Use the following process to calculate points for add-on certification.

Once candidates have graduated and received initial certification, universities/colleges will actively recruit teachers to pursue additional areas of certification in teacher shortage areas and meet with the teachers to develop prescriptive plans of six (6) or more credit hours to attain certification in the teacher shortage areas. The universities/colleges will identify the sequence of courses that must be taken for add-on certification in the shortage areas. Once candidates have completed all courses in the prescriptive plan and passed the appropriate Praxis examinations (if appropriate), the universities will recommend the candidates for add-on certification.

When submitting the annual Excel reports for program completers to the Board of Regents, the universities will complete a separate report for add-on course completers that identifies the names of candidates who completed the required courses in the prescriptive plans and passed the Praxis examinations (if appropriate) to become certified to teach in the shortage areas.

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

7.11 (Cont'd.)

Universities will not be given points for candidates who graduated from the universities and added areas of certification after graduation by just passing Praxis examinations. Universities will not be given points for candidates who complete courses for certification at different universities. These teachers will submit their transcripts directly to the Department of Education to become certified in the additional areas. One exception is teachers who take courses from different universities who are part of a prearranged consortium recognized by the BoR or BESE.

7.12 Have the 2007-08 Blue Ribbon Commission for Educational Excellence continue to collect data to revise the following areas of the Teacher Preparation Accountability System.

- a. Calculate the Baseline Scores for universities impacted by Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita.
- b. Determine when and/or if satisfaction surveys will be administered to regular pre-service teacher candidates, alternate certification teacher candidates, new teachers, mentors of regular pre-service teacher candidates, and mentors of new teachers as part of the Teacher Preparation Accountability System.
- c. If surveys are administered, determine the weights for the individual surveys and the weight for the Praxis Passage Rate Score for the Institutional Performance Index.
- d. Calculate the percentages of bonus points (+/-15%, +/- 20%, etc.) that candidates will be required to attain to reach the range of scaled scores from highest to lowest for the Quantity Index.
- e. Calculate all scaled scores and grade equivalents.
- f. Identify a date for the Teacher Preparation Performance Score Formula to be reexamined.
- g. Identify the year when universities will be required to attain a “High Performing” or “Exemplary” label.

APPENDIX A
BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE
MEMBERS
2006/2007

CHAIRPERSONS

Co-Chairperson	Glenny Lee Buquet Board of Elementary and Secondary Education	1309 Bayou Black Drive; Houma, LA 70360; (TEL) 985-876-5216; (FAX) 985-868-7919; E-mail: Glennyb@mobiletel.com
Co-Chairperson	Frances T. Henry Board of Regents	945 East Hart's Mill Lane; Baton Rouge, LA 70808; (H) 225-766-2589;(O) 225-342-4253 (FAX) 225-763-6346; E-mail: ftHenry@bellsouth.net

DESIGNATED MEMBERS

Board of Regents	Mary Ellen Roy Board of Regents	365 Canal Place #2000, New Orleans, LA 70130; (TEL) 504-566-1311; (FAX) 504-568-9130; E-mail: roym@phelps.com
Board of Elementary and Secondary Education	Polly Broussard Board of Elementary and Secondary Education	40117 Champion Tif, Gonzales, LA 70737; (TEL) 225-933-2349; (FAX) 225-766-5053; E-mail: educator@apeleducators.org
Governor's Designee	Andrew Muhl Policy Analyst	Office of the Governor; P. O. Box 94004; Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9004; (TEL) 225-342-8375; (FAX) 225-342-7099; E-Mail: andrew.muhl@la.gov
President of the Senate Designee	Senator J. Chris Ullo State Senator	2150 Westbank Expressway, Suite 705, Harvey, LA 70058; (TEL) 504-361-6690; (FAX) 504-361-6691; Local: TEL (225-342-2040) E-Mail: cullo@legis.state.la.us ; websen@legis.state.la.us
Chairperson, House Education Committee	Representative Carl Crane State Representative	836 Bancroft Way, Baton Rouge, LA 70808; (TEL) 225-765-2428; (FAX) 225-765-2388; (TEL @ Capitol) 225-342-6945; (FAX @ Capitol) 225-342-8336
Commissioner of Higher Education	E. Joseph Savoie Board of Regents	P. O. Box 3677, Baton Rouge, LA 70821-3677; (TEL) 225-342-4253; (FAX) 225-342-9318; E-mail: commish@regents.state.la.us
State Superintendent of Education	Paul Pastorek Louisiana Department of Education	P. O. Box 96064, Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064; (TEL) 225-342-3607; (FAX) 225-342-7316; E-mail: paul.pastorek@la.gov vicky.thomas@la.gov
Louisiana Community & Technical College System	Jerry Pinsel Interim Senior Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs	265 South Foster Drive, Baton Rouge, LA 70806; (TEL) 225-922-0844; (FAX) 225-922-1485; E-mail: jpinsel@lctcs.state.la.us

BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE
MEMBERS (CONT'D.)
2006/2007

MEMBERS SELECTED BY BOARD OF REGENTS		
University President	Sally Clausen President University of Louisiana System	1201 North Third Street, Suite 7-300 Baton Rouge, LA 70802; (TEL) 225-342-6950; (FAX) 225-342-6473; E-mail: sclausen@uls.state.la.us
University Provost	John Crain University Provost Southeastern Louisiana University	SLU Box 10798, Hammond, LA 70402; (TEL) 985-549-2316; E-mail: jcrain@selu.edu
University Deans	Jayne Fleener College of Education Dean Louisiana State University and A & M College Carmen Riedlinger Chair, Graduate Education Programs Our Lady of Holy Cross College Connie Walton Dean, College of Arts and Sciences Grambling State University	221 Peabody Hall Baton Rouge, LA 70803 (TEL) 225-578-1258; (FAX) 225-578-2267; E-mail: Fleener@lsu.edu 4123 Woodland Drive, New Orleans, LA 70131 (TEL) 504-398-2122 E-mail: CRiedlinger@olhcc.edu GSU Box 4260 Grambling, LA 71245 (TEL) 318-274-6202; (C) 504-398-2122 (W); (FAX) 318-274-6041; E-mail: waltoncr@gram.edu
University Faculty Members	Vic Schneider College of Arts/Sciences University of Louisiana at Lafayette James E. Barr College of Education Nicholls State University	Department of Mathematics; P. O. Box 41010; Lafayette, LA 70504; (TEL) 337-482-5295; (FAX) 337-482-5346; E-mail: vps3252@louisiana.edu 402 West Second Street, P. O. Box 2035, Thibodaux, LA 70310; (TEL) 985-447-8839; E-mail: jim.barr@nicholls.edu
PK-16+ Coordinator	Phyllis Sanders Assistant Professor of Curriculum & Instruction Department of Curriculum & Instruction University of Louisiana at Monroe	700 University Avenue, Strauss Hall, Monroe, LA 71209; (TEL) 318-342-1276; (FAX) 318-342-1240 E-mail: psanders@ulm.edu
Pre-service Teacher	Leigh Jefferson Southern University and A & M College	110 Plaquemine, Plaquemine, LA 70765; (TEL) 225-776-4446; E-mail: leighrenee13@yahoo.com
Topic Specialist – Higher Education	William Sharpton Associate Dean University of New Orleans	College of Education & Human Development ED 304; New Orleans, LA 70148 (TEL) 504-280-1397; (FAX) 504-280-1400 E-mail: wsharpto@uno.edu

BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE
MEMBERS (CONT'D.)
2006/2007

MEMBERS SELECTED BY BOARD OF ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY EDUCATION		
District Superintendent – Urban	Charlotte Placide East Baton Rouge Parish School System	1050 S. Foster Drive, Baton Rouge, LA 70806; (TEL) 225-922-5618; (FAX) 225-922-5499; Email: cplacide@ebrschools.org
District Superintendent – Rural	Walter Lee DeSoto Parish Board of Elementary and Secondary Education	201 Crosby St. Mansfield, LA 71052; (TEL) 318-872-3993; (FAX) 318-872-1324; E-mail: wlee@desotopsb.com
Elementary Principal of the Year	Mary Donatto St. Landry Parish	330 Camellia Avenue, Eunice, LA 70535; East Elementary School, 550 Brother J. Road, Eunice, LA 70535; (TEL) 337-457-2215; (FAX) 337-457-2257; Email: med1122@slp.k12.la.us
Middle School Principal of the Year	Sherry Brock East Baton Rouge Parish	7180 Annabelle Avenue, Baton Rouge, LA 70806; Westdale Middle School, 5650 Claycut Road, Baton Rouge, LA 70806; (TEL) 225-924-1308; (FAX) 225-926-9929 Email: sbrock@ebrschools.org
High School Principal of the Year	Brian Lejeune Jefferson Davis Parish	P. O. Box 50, Lacassine, LA 70650; (TEL) 337-588-4206; (FAX) 337-588-4283; Email: brian.lejeune@jdpsbk12.org
Elementary School Teacher of the Year	Oi Yee Monica Ratcliff Monroe City Schools	113 Hendon Circle, Monroe, LA 71203; (TEL) 318-342-8003; Email: oyratcliff@yahoo.com
Middle School Teacher of the Year	Brenda Lofton Lincoln Parish	5785 Highway 33, Choudrant, LA 71227; (TEL) 318-255-5467 or 318-777-3479; (FAX) 318-777-8409; Email: blofton@lincolnschools.org
High School Teacher of the Year	Bobbie Keller Ascension Parish	3425 North Angelle St., Pauline, LA 70763; (TEL) 225-869-4790; 225-715-2178 (C) Dutchtown High School, 13165 Highway 73, Geismar, LA 70734; (TEL) 225-621-8250 Email: bobbie@apsb.org
Personnel Director	Linda Busfield Assistant in Human Resources St. Charles Parish	46 Rosedown Drive, Destrehan, LA 70047; (TEL) 985-785-7232; (FAX) 504-785-2578; E-mail: lbusfield@stcharles.k12.la.us
School Board Member	Atley Walker West Baton Rouge Parish School Board Member	3751 Lukeville Lane; Bursly, LA 70719; (TEL) 225-771-4678; (FAX) 225-771-3338; adwalker@subr.edu
Topic Specialist – K-12 Education	Julia Carnes Director of Special Education Livingston Parish	P. O. Box 1130, Livingston, LA 70754; (TEL) (225) 686-4245 - Ext 245; E-mail: julia.carnes@lpsb.org

**BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE
MEMBERS
2006/2007**

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES SELECTED BY THE BOARD OF REGENTS & BOARD OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION		
Community Representatives	Dan Juneau Louisiana Association of Business and Industry (LABI)	P. O. Box 80258, Baton Rouge, LA 70898-0258; (TEL) 225-928-5388; (FAX) 225-929-6054; E-mail: danj@LABI.org
	Jim Brandt President Public Affairs Research Council of Louisiana, Inc.	P. O. Box 14776; Baton Rouge, LA 70898-4776; (TEL) 225-926-8414; (FAX) 225-926-8417; E-mail: jimbrandt@la-par.org
	Cheryl Joslyn LA PTA President (2005-2007)	8026 Elizabeth Lane, Mandeville, LA 70448; (TEL) 958-624-8623; (FAX) 985-674-2878; E-mail: jjoslyn@aol.com
	Kerry Davidson Grant Generator LaSIP/LA GEAR UP	1201 North Third Street, Suite 6-200; Baton Rouge, LA 70802; (TEL) 225-342-4253; (FAX) 225-342-3371; E-mail: Davidson@laregents.org
	Beverly Trahan National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) Louisiana State Conference Education Committee	Community Outreach Coordinator; Entergy Louisiana; 446 North Boulevard; Baton Rouge, LA 70805; (TEL) 225-381-5764; E-mail: BTRAHA1@entergy.com

**BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE
STAFF
2006/2007**

AGENCIES	NAMES	ADDRESSES & TELEPHONE NUMBERS
Board of Regents	Jeanne M. Burns Associate Commissioner for Teacher Education Initiatives	Board of Regents/Governor's Office of Education, P. O. Box 94004; Baton Rouge, LA 70804; (TEL) 225-342-0162; (FAX) 225-342-5326; E-mail: jeanne.burns@la.gov
Louisiana Department of Education	Sheila Talamo Assistant Superintendent, Office of Quality Educators	Louisiana Department of Education, P. O. Box 94064, Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064; (TEL) 225-342-3750; (FAX) 225-342-1055; E-mail: sheila.talamo@la.gov
Louisiana Department of Education	Carole Wallin Deputy Superintendent of Education	Louisiana Department of Education, P. O. Box 94064, Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064; (TEL) 225-342-3625; (FAX) 225-342-3283; E-mail: carole.wallin@la.gov
Board of Elementary and Secondary Education	Weegie Peabody Executive Director of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education	P. O. Box 94064, Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064; (TEL) 225-342-5840; (FAX) 225-342-5843; E-mail: weegie.peabody@la.gov
Louisiana Department of Education	Susan Aysenne Director, Division of School Standards, Accountability & Assistance	1201 North Third Street; P. O. Box 94064, Baton Rouge, LA 70802; (TEL) 225-342-7370; (FAX) 225-219-7370; E-mail: susan.aysenne@la.gov
Louisiana Department of Education	Anne Cloutre Education Program Consultant	1201 North Third Street; P. O. Box 94064, Baton Rouge, LA 70802; (TEL) 225-342-3515; (FAX) E-mail: anne.cloutre@la.gov
Office of the Governor	Linda Marino Administrative Assistant	Governor's Office of Education; P. O. Box 94004, Baton Rouge, LA 70804; (TEL) 225-342-0162; (FAX) 225-342-5326; E-mail: linda.marino@la.gov

APPENDIX B



DRAFT

TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

**THIS DOCUMENT IS BEING DEVELOPED BY THE
BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION FOR
EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE**

MAY 17, 2006

DRAFT DOCUMENT

TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

In compliance with the Higher Education Act of 1998, Louisiana created a Teacher Preparation Accountability System to assess the performance of teacher preparation programs within the state. During the first phase (2001-2002) of the accountability system, the performance of the regular and alternate certification students on the state teachers' examination (PRAXIS) was assessed. During subsequent phases (2002-2003, 2003-04, and 2004-05), a Quantity Index (e.g., quantity of program completers at each institution; quantity of program completers in teacher shortage areas) and an Institutional Index (e.g., performance of regular and alternate certification students on the state teachers' Praxis examinations; satisfaction ratings by regular program completers during their first year of teaching) were used to calculate a Teacher Preparation Performance Score for each institution. Universities were labeled as Exemplary, High Performing, Satisfactory, At-Risk, or Low Performing based upon their Teacher Preparation Performance Scores. The purpose of this accountability system was to clearly demonstrate to the public that all universities and colleges in Louisiana were working diligently to produce quality teachers who worked effectively with PK-12 students.

During 2005-06, it was not possible to implement the Teacher Preparation Accountability System due to the closure of universities and schools in Louisiana and the inability to collect data from displaced teachers and mentors due to Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita. A decision was made for the Blue Ribbon Commission for Educational Excellence to use the time to revise the Teacher Preparation Accountability System during spring 2006. On May 18, 2006, the Blue Ribbon Commission for Educational Excellence submitted a set of recommendations to revise the Teacher Preparation Accountability System to the Board of Regents and Board of Elementary and Secondary Education at a joint meeting. In addition, the Commission recommended that additional data be collected and further examined by the Blue Ribbon Commission during 2006-07 before implementing the revised accountability system.

During 2006-07, the Teacher Preparation Accountability System was not implemented due to the need to finalize the revision of the system. In particular, a need existed to establish new baselines for the Quantity Index for the Teacher Preparation Accountability System as a result of decreases in populations and student enrollments in the areas impacted by Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita. During spring 2007, the Blue Ribbon Commission reviewed additional data and made additional revisions to the Teacher Preparation Accountability System. The Commission determined that additional data was still needed about projected future enrollments at universities impacted by the hurricanes to predict baselines for the Quantity Index. In addition, additional input was needed pertaining to the collection of survey data from regular and alternate certification teachers and mentors. Therefore, it was recommended that the Blue Ribbon Commission examine the additional data and make final revisions to the Teacher Preparation Accountability System during 2007-08.

This draft document identifies revisions being discussed by the Blue Ribbon Commission Excellence. **The information that has been printed with a blue font identifies changes in the Teacher Preparation Accountability System recommended by the Blue Ribbon Commission on May 18, 2006 and May 17, 2007. The information that has been printed with a red font identifies changes that have not yet been finalized by the Blue Ribbon Commission. These items are currently being discussed and final decision will be made by the Blue Ribbon Commission during 2007-08.**

TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><i>Indicators</i></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>TEACHER QUANTITY INDEX:</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, alternate certification, and add-on program completers in <i>critical certification shortage areas</i> (i.e., mathematics, science, special education, foreign languages, and reading specialists).</p> <p>Q3 Number of traditional and alternate certification program completers in <i>critical rural district shortage areas</i> (i.e., five 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>gender minority</i> traditional and alternate certification program completers.</p> <p>Q6 Number of <i>Grades 4-8</i> traditional, alternate certification, and add-on program completers.</p> <p>INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE INDEX:</p> <p>P1 Percentage of program completers who took PRAXIS subtests and passed the subtests.</p> <p><i>(Note: Final decisions will be made by the Blue Ribbon Commission during 2007-08 regarding the following indicators for the Institutional Performance Index.)</i></p> <p><i>Regular Program Completers:</i></p> <p>P2 Ratings by <i>regular pre-service teacher candidates</i> regarding the quality of the teacher preparation programs to prepare student teachers to address the state standards for teachers (i.e., Components of Effective Teaching).</p> <p>P3. Ratings of <i>supervising teachers of regular pre-service teacher candidates</i> regarding the quality of teacher preparation programs to prepare student teachers to address the state standards for teachers.</p> <p>P4. Ratings by <i>new regular program completers</i> regarding the quality of their teacher preparation programs to prepare them to address the state standards for teachers.</p> <p>P5. Ratings by <i>mentors of new regular program completers</i> regarding the quality of the teacher preparation programs to prepare the teachers to address the state standards for teachers.</p>

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

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><i>Indicators (Cont'd.</i></p> <p>1. What indicators should be used to determine if teacher preparation programs have demonstrated growth? (Cont'd.)</p>	<p>INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE INDEX (CONT'D.):</p> <p><i>(Note: Final decisions will be made by the Blue Ribbon Commission during 2007-08 regarding the following indicators for the Institutional Performance Index.)</i></p> <p>Alternate Program Completers:</p> <p>P6. Ratings by <i>alternate certification teacher candidates</i> regarding the quality of their teacher preparation programs to prepare candidates to address the state standards for teachers.</p> <p>P7. Ratings by <i>supervising teachers of alternate certification teacher candidates</i> regarding the quality of their teacher preparation programs to prepare candidates to address the state standards for teachers.</p> <p>STUDENT GROWTH IN LEARNING INDEX</p> <p>G1 Value-Added Teacher Preparation Assessment Model (Values to be recommended by Dr. George Noel once it has been determined that the model is valid and reliable.)</p>
<p><i>Definitions of Indicators</i></p> <p>2. How will specific indicators be defined?</p>	<p>a. <i>Critical Certification Shortages</i></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: Science (Biology, General Science, Chemistry, Physics, Environmental Science, and Earth Science), Special Education (Mild/Moderate, Visually Impaired, Hearing Impaired, Early Intervention, Significant Disabilities), Mathematics, Foreign Languages, and Reading Specialists. In addition, this will include the number of certified teachers who add-on new certifications in these areas.</p> <p>b. <i>Critical Rural District Shortages</i></p> <p>The <i>critical rural district shortage</i> will be the number of traditional and alternate certification program completers who are selected to teach in the following rural school districts who have the greatest percentage of uncertified teachers: St. Helena School District, Madison School District, and East Carroll School District.</p>

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

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS						
<p><i>Definitions of Indicators</i></p> <p>2. How will specific indicators be defined? (Cont'd.)</p>	<p><i>c. Racial Minorities:</i></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><i>d. Gender Minorities</i></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><i>e. Grades 4-8 Educators</i></p> <p>Grades 4-8 Educators will be all regular/alternate certification program completers and add-on prescriptive plan completers who meet requirements to attain certification as grades 4-8 teachers once they complete their programs/plans.</p> <p><i>f. Add-on Certification:</i></p> <p><i>Once candidates have graduated and received initial certification, universities/colleges will actively recruit teachers to pursue additional areas of certification in teacher shortage areas and meet with the teachers to develop prescriptive plans of six (6) or more credit hours to attain certification in the teacher shortage areas. The universities/colleges will identify the sequence of courses that must be taken for add-on certification in the shortage areas. Once candidates have completed all courses in the prescriptive plan and passed the appropriate Praxis examinations (if appropriate), the universities will recommend the candidates for add-on certification.</i></p> <p><i>When submitting the annual Excel reports for program completers to the Board of Regents, the universities will complete a separate report for add-on course completers that identifies the names of candidates who completed the required courses in the prescriptive plans and passed the Praxis examinations (if appropriate) to become certified to teach in the shortage areas. Universities will not be given points for candidates who graduated from the universities and added areas of certification after graduation by just passing Praxis examinations. Universities will not be given points for candidates who complete courses for certification at different universities. These teachers will submit their transcripts directly to the Department of Education to become certified in the additional areas. One exception is teachers who take courses from different universities who are part of a prearranged consortium recognized by the BoR or BESE.</i></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 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS (CONT'D.)

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><i>Formula to Calculate the Teacher Preparation Performance Score and Phase-in Schedule for Indicators</i></p> <p>3. How is the overall Teacher Preparation Performance Score calculated and when will the indicators be integrated into the formula to calculate the Teacher Preparation Performance Scores?</p>	<p>The formula for the Teacher Preparation Performance Score will be the following:</p> $\text{Teacher Preparation Performance Score} = \frac{(\text{Teacher Quantity} + \text{Institutional Performance Index} + \text{Student Growth in Learning Index})}{3}$ <p>PILOT STUDY:</p> <p>April 8, 2007 Issue 2006-07 Teacher Preparation Institutional Report – Report all available data – No Labels. Summer 2007 Pilot the collection of data for the value-added model. Pilot the system to collect the 2006-07 quantity data. Pilot the collection of survey data from a sample of 2006-07 regular pre-service student teachers and supervising teachers of 2006-07 regular pre-service student teachers. Pilot the collection of survey data from a sample of 2006-07 alternate certification teacher candidates and supervising teachers of 2006-07 alternate certification teacher candidates. Pilot the collection of survey data from a sample of new regular teachers and mentors of new regular teachers.</p> <p>July 1, 2007 – Collect the quantity data for 2006-07 regular, alternate certification, and add-on certification completers. April 7 2008 Collect Praxis Passage rates for 2006-07 regular and alternate program completers. Analyze all data.</p> <p>April 8, 2008 Issue 2007-08 Teacher Preparation Institutional Report — Report all available data – No Labels</p> <p>FIRST TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT:</p> <p>July 1, 2007 - Collect data for the value-added model. June 30, 2008 Determine the remaining weights and scaled scores for the Teacher Preparation Accountability System. Collect survey data from 2007-08 regular pre-service student teachers and supervising teachers of 2007-08 regular pre-service student teachers. Collect survey data from 2007-08 alternate certification teacher candidates and supervising teachers of 2007-08 alternate certification teacher candidates. Collect survey data from new regular teachers and mentors of new regular teachers</p> <p>July 1, 2008 – Collect the quantity data for 2007-08 regular, alternate certification, and add-on certification completers. April 7 2009 Collect Praxis Passage rates for 2007-08 regular and alternate program completers. Analyze all data. Pilot the new formula to determine Teacher Preparation Performance Scores.</p> <p>April 8, 2009 Issue 2008-09 Teacher Preparation Institutional Report – Report all data No Labels.</p>

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

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><i>Formula to Calculate the Teacher Preparation Performance Score and Phase-in Schedule for Indicators (Cont'd.)</i></p> <p>3. How is the overall Teacher Preparation Performance Score calculated and when will the indicators be integrated into the formula to calculate the Teacher Preparation Performance Scores? (Cont'd.)</p>	<p>SECOND TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT:</p> <p>July 1, 2008 - June 30, 2009 Collect data for the value-added model. Determine the remaining weights and scaled scores for the Teacher Preparation Accountability System. Collect survey data from 2008-09 regular pre-service student teachers and supervising teachers of 2008-09 regular pre-service student teachers. Collect survey data from 2008-09 alternate certification teacher candidates and supervising teachers of 2008-09 alternate certification teacher candidates. Collect survey data from new regular teachers and mentors of new regular teachers</p> <p>July 1, 2009 – April 7 2010 Collect the quantity data for 2008-09 regular, alternate certification, and add-on certification completers. Collect Praxis Passage rates for 2008-09 regular and alternate program completers. Analyze all data. Determine Teacher Preparation Performance Scores.</p> <p>April 8, 2010 Issue 2009-010 Teacher Preparation Institutional Report – Implement the new formula and report all data – Assign Labels</p>

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

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS																		
<p><i>Teacher Quantity Index</i></p> <p>4. How will a Teacher Quantity Index be calculated?</p>	<p>A Baseline Score will be calculated for universities identified by the BoR as less impacted by Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita by determining the mean of all program completers between the dates of July 1, 2000 to June 30, 2005. The Baseline Score will remain constant until the Teacher Preparation Accountability System is reexamined during _____. <i>(Note: Dates to be determined by the Blue Ribbon Commission during 2007-08.)</i></p> <p>A Baseline Score for universities identified by the BoR as impacted by Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita will be calculated by: _____. <i>(Note: Process to be determined by the Blue Ribbon Commission during 2007-08.)</i></p> <p>A Teacher Quantity Score will be calculated for each institution by assigning one point to every regular and alternate certification program completer.</p> <p>One additional point will be assigned for all Grades 4-8 Educators who completed the regular/alternate programs and add-on prescriptive plans for Grades 4-8 certifications.</p> <p>One-half an additional point will be assigned for every program completer during that year that fits the definitions for: Critical Certification Shortage Areas, Critical Rural District Shortages, Racial Minorities, and Gender Minorities. The total number of bonus points will be added to the total number of program completers to determine the Teacher Quantity Score.</p> <p>Teacher Quantity Score = Program Completers + (1.0 * Grades 4-8 Educators) + (.5 * [Critical Certification Shortage Areas + Critical Rural District Shortage + Racial Minorities + Gender Minorities])</p> <p>The Teacher Quantity Score will be compared to the Baseline Score to determine the percentage of increase or decrease in quantity. Campuses will be required to have Teacher Quantity Scores that are at the following percentage levels to attain the corresponding scaled scores and grades. <i>(Note: Percentage to be determined by the Blue Ribbon Commission during 2007-08.)</i></p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Grades</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Percentages</th> <th style="text-align: right;">Scaled Scores</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A+</td> <td>+__% and greater difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score</td> <td style="text-align: right;">To be Determined</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>+__% to +__% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score</td> <td style="text-align: right;">To be Determined</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>-__% to +__% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score</td> <td style="text-align: right;">To be Determined</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>-__% to -__% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score</td> <td style="text-align: right;">To be Determined</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Below C</td> <td>-__% and greater difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score</td> <td style="text-align: right;">To be Determined</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Standard scores will be assigned to all percentages to create a Teacher Quantity Index for each institution.</p>	Grades	Percentages	Scaled Scores	A+	+__% and greater difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	To be Determined	A	+__% to +__% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	To be Determined	B	-__% to +__% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	To be Determined	C	-__% to -__% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	To be Determined	Below C	-__% and greater difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	To be Determined
Grades	Percentages	Scaled Scores																	
A+	+__% and greater difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	To be Determined																	
A	+__% to +__% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	To be Determined																	
B	-__% to +__% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	To be Determined																	
C	-__% to -__% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	To be Determined																	
Below C	-__% and greater difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	To be Determined																	

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

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS																																				
<p><i>Institutional Performance Index</i></p> <p>5. How will the Institutional Performance Index be calculated?</p>	<p>Regression analysis will be used to convert individual values to individual scaled scores for each index.</p> <p><i>Praxis Passage Rate Score</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 score ranges are the following:</p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <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>Teacher Satisfaction Survey Score (Regular Pre-service Teacher Candidates, Alternate Certification Teacher Candidates, and New Regular Teachers)</i></p> <p>Grades and specific scaled scores will be assigned to specific mean scores from surveys administered to regular pre-service teacher candidates, alternate certification teacher candidates, and new regular teachers. Teachers will use a 1 to 4 point scale to respond to questions pertaining to their preparation to address the state standards for teachers. The grades and corresponding ranges for mean scores and scaled score are the following: <i>(Note: Grades and Scaled Scores will be determined by the Blue Ribbon Commission during 2007-08.)</i></p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <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>To be Determined</td> <td>To be Determined</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>To be Determined</td> <td>To be Determined</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>To be Determined</td> <td>To be Determined</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>To be Determined</td> <td>To be Determined</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Below C</td> <td>To be Determined</td> <td>To be Determined</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Mentor Satisfaction Survey Score (Regular Pre-service Teacher Mentors, Alternate Certification Teacher Mentors, and New Regular Teacher Mentors)</i></p> <p>Grades and specific scaled scores will be assigned to specific mean scores from surveys administered to supervising teachers of student teachers and mentors of new teachers. <i>(Note: Grades and scaled scores will be determined by the Blue Ribbon Commission during 2007-08.)</i></p>	<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+	To be Determined	To be Determined	A	To be Determined	To be Determined	B	To be Determined	To be Determined	C	To be Determined	To be Determined	Below C	To be Determined	To be Determined
<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+	To be Determined	To be Determined																																			
A	To be Determined	To be Determined																																			
B	To be Determined	To be Determined																																			
C	To be Determined	To be Determined																																			
Below C	To be Determined	To be Determined																																			

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

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><i>Institutional Performance Index (Cont'd.)</i></p> <p>5. How will the Institutional Performance Index be calculated? (Cont'd.)</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> <p>Institutional Performance Index =</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Praxis Passage Rate Score (___%) +</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">[(Regular Pre-service Teacher Candidate Survey Score * ___%) & (Alternate Certification Teacher Candidate Survey Score * ___%) and (New Teacher Survey Score * ___%)] +</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">[(Regular Pre-service Teacher Candidate Mentor Survey Score * ___%) & (Alternate Certification Teacher Candidate Mentor Survey Score * ___%) & (New Teacher Mentor Survey Score * ___%)]</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>(Note: Percentages to be determined by the Blue Ribbon Commission during 2007-08.)</i></p>
<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>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, Institutional Performance Index, and Growth of Student Learning Index.</p> <p>The Teacher Preparation Performance Scores will range from 0 to beyond 100, with a score of ___ - ___ <i>(Note: To be Determined by the Blue Ribbon Commission during 2007-08.)</i> indicating that a university possesses a High Performing program. All universities will be expected to achieve a Teacher Preparation Performance Score of ____ <i>(Note: Score to be Determined by the Blue Ribbon Commission during 2007-08.)</i> and achieve a “High Performing” score by April ____ <i>(Note: Date to be determined by the Blue Ribbon Commission during 2007-08.)</i></p>

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

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS															
<p><i>Labels for Teacher Preparation Programs (Cont'd.)</i></p> <p>7. How will labels be assigned to Teacher Preparation Programs? (Cont'd.)</p>	<p>2009-10 & Beyond</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 2009-2010 to ____ (<i>Note: Date to be determined by the Blue Ribbon Commission in 2007-08.</i>), 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: 10%; text-align: center;">=</td> <td style="width: 30%;">Performance Score of ____.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High Performing Teacher Preparation Program</td> <td style="text-align: center;">=</td> <td>Performance Score of ____.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Satisfactory Teacher Preparation Program</td> <td style="text-align: center;">=</td> <td>Performance Score of ____.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>At-Risk Teacher Preparation Program</td> <td style="text-align: center;">=</td> <td>Performance Score of ____.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Low Performing Teacher Preparation Program</td> <td style="text-align: center;">=</td> <td>Performance Score of ____.</td> </tr> </table> <p>The formula for the Teacher Preparation Accountability System and the assignment of labels will be reexamined during ____ (<i>Note: Date to be determined by the Blue Ribbon Commission in 2007-08.</i>)</p>	Exemplary Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of ____.	High Performing Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of ____.	Satisfactory Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of ____.	At-Risk Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of ____.	Low Performing Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of ____.
Exemplary Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of ____.														
High Performing Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of ____.														
Satisfactory Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of ____.														
At-Risk Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of ____.														
Low Performing Teacher Preparation Program	=	Performance Score of ____.														
<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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Universities receive a positive label. b. Universities be recognized at a public celebration. c. Universities receive public recognition in institutional report cards and state reports. 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. <p><i>High Performing Teacher Preparation Programs</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Universities receive a positive label. b. Universities be recognized at a public celebration. c. Universities receive public recognition in institutional report cards and state reports. 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. 															

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

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"> a. Universities receive an "At-risk" label for the U.S. Department of Education. 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. c. Universities report recommended actions to improve the teacher preparation program to the public. d. Universities report progress in improving the teacher preparation program to the public on an annual basis. e. Universities have two years to reach "Satisfactory" level. <p><i>Level 2:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Universities receive an "At-risk" label for the U.S. Department of Education. b. Board of Regents refuse to approve new university programs in colleges that offer general education and major courses to teacher education majors. c. Board of Elementary and Secondary Education assign private universities a "probationary status" as part of the state approval process. 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. e. Universities have one year to move to "Satisfactory" level. Universities that fail to demonstrate growth will move to Level 3 corrective actions.

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

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>Level 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Universities receive a "Low Performing" label for the U.S. Department of Education. b. Universities are assigned an external team (funded by universities) to assist the program. 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. 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.) <p>Level 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Universities lose state approval of teacher preparation programs.
<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/colleges providing the students meet admission requirements at the approved universities/colleges.</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 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS (CONT'D.)

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><i>High Performing Status Not Reached in Four Years</i></p> <p>11. What happens if a "Satisfactory" university does not reach a "High Performing" status in the designated time period?</p>	<p>If a "Satisfactory" university does not reach a "High Performing" status in __ years (Note: Years to be determined by the Blue Ribbon Commission during 2007-08.), the following will occur:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. b. University reports recommended actions to improve the teacher preparation program to the public. c. University reports progress in improving the teacher preparation program to the public on an annual basis.
<p><i>Corrective Action - New Accountability Cycle</i></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><i>Corrective Action – Exit in One Year</i></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>

Individuals who have questions about this document may contact Dr. Jeanne M. Burns (Associate Commissioner for Teacher Education Initiatives – Board of Regents/Governor’s Office) at jeanne.burns@la.gov or 225-342-0162.