



**ORIGINAL  
BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION ON TEACHER  
QUALITY TEACHER PREPARATION  
ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM**

**April 24, 2003**

## TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

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><i>Note: Each of the three areas (e.g., Teacher Quantity, Institutional Performance, and Authentic University-School Partnerships) will receive a weight of 1/3 in the rating system.</i></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, mild/moderate special education, and middle school certification) and <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>Q3 Number of <i>racial minority</i> traditional and alternate certification program completers and number of <i>teaching minority</i> traditional and alternate certification program completers.</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 their first year of 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>P4 Retention rates of traditional and alternate certification program completers.</p> <p><b>Authentic University-School Partnerships:</b></p> <p>A1 Improvement in growth targets in Professional Development Schools for K-12 School Accountability System.</p> <p>A2 Other indicators (to be determined).</p>

## TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONT=D)

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. As a result, the system will start with a limited number of variables, add some the second and third years, and reach its final state in 2004-2005. Because all indicators will be appropriately indexed, a programs score in one year will be comparable to that of previous years even though the previous years= scores contained only a subset of the indicators. A phase-in schedule has been provided below:</p> <p>2001-2002 (a) Percentage of program completers who took PRAXIS subtests and passed the subtests. (2000-2001 traditional and alternative program completers)</p> <p>2002-2003 In addition to the above indicator for 2001-2002 program completers, phase-in the following indicators:</p> <p>(a) Number of traditional and alternate certification program completers (2001-2002 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort).</p> <p>(b) Number of traditional and alternate certification program completers in <i>critical certification shortage areas</i> and number of traditional and alternate certification program completers in <i>critical rural district shortage areas</i> (2001-2002 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort).</p> <p>(c) Number of <i>racial minority</i> and <i>teaching minority</i> traditional and alternate certification program completers (2001-2002 program completer cohort).</p> <p>(d) Ratings by new teachers of the quality of their traditional teacher preparation programs to prepare them for their first year of teaching (2001-2002 traditional certification program completer cohort)</p> <p>2003-2004 In addition to the above indicators for 2002-2003 program completers, phase-in the following indicators:</p> <p>(a) Ratings by building level assessors of first year teachers regarding the quality of teacher preparation programs to prepare new teachers (2002-2003 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort).</p> <p>(b) Ratings by new teachers of the quality of their alternate certification programs to prepare them for their first year of teaching (2002-2003 alternate certification program completer cohort).</p> <p>2004-2005 In addition to the above indicators for 2003-2004 program completers, phase-in the following indicators:</p> <p>(a) Retention of program completers at the end of their third year of teaching (2000-2001 traditional and alternate certification program completer cohort).</p> <p>(b) Achievement of growth targets of Professional Development Schools.</p> <p>Future Cycle Phase in K-12 student achievement data.</p>

## TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONT=D)

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><i>Definitions of Indicators</i></p> <p>3. How will specific indicators be defined?</p>	<p><b>a. Critical Shortages</b></p> <p><i>Critical Certification Shortage:</i> 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: Biology, General Science, Chemistry, Physics, Mild/Moderate Special Education, Mathematics, and grades 4-8 certification.</p> <p><i>Critical Rural District Shortage:</i> 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: Red River; East Feliciana; St. Helena; Madison; and Assumption.</p> <p>The sum will be a "duplicated" count, meaning, for example, that someone coded both as "Mathematics" and teaching in "Red River School District" would count as two, not one.</p> <p><b>b. Number of Minority Graduates</b></p> <p><i>Racial Minority:</i> 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) African-American.</li> <li>(2) Asian-American.</li> <li>(3) Hispanic.</li> <li>(4) Native American.</li> <li>(5) Pacific Islander.</li> </ul> <p><i>Teaching Minority:</i> 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Male and taking the "Early Childhood Education" test OR (2) Male and taking the "Elementary Education" test.</li> </ul> <p>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.</p> <p><b>c. Rating by new teachers of the quality of their teacher preparation programs</b></p> <p>A survey was developed and field-tested during spring of 2001 with 1999-2000 program completers and fall 2001 with 2000-2001 program completers. The survey examines teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of their programs in preparing them for their first year of teaching in a school setting. This survey will be administered to all teachers who complete a program the previous year and teach in a public school in Louisiana during the next year. Standards have been established for scores on the survey and raw scores are converted to a Teacher Survey Index.</p>

## TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONT=D)

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><i>Definitions of Indicators</i></p> <p>3. How will specific indicators be defined? (Cont-d)</p>	<p><i>d. Rating by building level mentors of the quality of the preparation of first year teachers</i></p> <p>The survey will be completed by building level mentors that will be observing and assisting first year teachers in public schools throughout the state. This survey will contain questions that examine mentors' perceptions of the effectiveness of teachers programs in preparing teachers for their first year of teaching. Once standards have been established for scores on the survey, raw scores will be converted to an Assessor Survey Index.</p> <p><i>e. Retention of teachers</i></p> <p>The retention rate of teachers will be calculated by examining the number of program completers who are teaching in a Louisiana school three years after graduation, divided by the number of completers who started teaching in a Louisiana school the fall after graduation less the number who have moved out of state.</p>
<p><i>Formula to Calculate Full Teacher Preparation Performance Scores</i></p> <p>4. How will the overall Teacher Preparation Performance Score be calculated?</p>	<p>A key component of the Teacher Preparation Accountability System is <i>single composite scores</i> for individual universities, called <i>Teacher Preparation Performance Scores</i>. The calculation of these scores will be based upon a formula that examines how well universities perform on each of the indicators.</p> <p>2002-2003 &amp; 2003-2004</p> <p>The overall score will be obtained by summing the average index for Teacher Quantity and the average index for Institutional Performance divided by two.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Teacher Preparation Performance Score = <math>\frac{\text{Teacher Quantity Index} + \text{Institutional Performance Index}}{2}</math></p> <p>2004 -2005</p> <p>The overall score will be obtained by summing the average index for Teacher Quantity, the average index for Institutional Performance, and the average index for Authentic University-District Partnerships divided by three.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Teacher Preparation Performance Score = <math>\frac{\text{Teacher Quantity Index} + \text{Institutional Performance Index} + \text{University-District Partnership Index}}{3}</math></p>

## TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONT=D)

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS															
<p><i>Teacher Quantity Index</i></p> <p>5. How will a Teacher Quantity Index be calculated?</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.</p> <p>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 + (.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: 60%;">+15% and greater difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score</td> <td style="width: 30%; text-align: right;"><i>(Scaled Scores: 125+)</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>+5% to +14% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score</td> <td style="text-align: right;"><i>(Scaled Scores: 100-124.9)</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>-3% to +4% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score</td> <td style="text-align: right;"><i>(Scaled Scores: 80-99.9)</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>-4% to -15% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score</td> <td style="text-align: right;"><i>(Scaled Scores: 50-79.9)</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Below C</td> <td>-16% and greater difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score</td> <td style="text-align: right;"><i>(Scaled Scores: 0-49.9)</i></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	<i>(Scaled Scores: 125+)</i>	A	+5% to +14% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	<i>(Scaled Scores: 100-124.9)</i>	B	-3% to +4% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	<i>(Scaled Scores: 80-99.9)</i>	C	-4% to -15% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	<i>(Scaled Scores: 50-79.9)</i>	Below C	-16% and greater difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	<i>(Scaled Scores: 0-49.9)</i>
A+	+15% and greater difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	<i>(Scaled Scores: 125+)</i>														
A	+5% to +14% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	<i>(Scaled Scores: 100-124.9)</i>														
B	-3% to +4% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	<i>(Scaled Scores: 80-99.9)</i>														
C	-4% to -15% difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	<i>(Scaled Scores: 50-79.9)</i>														
Below C	-16% and greater difference between Quantity Score and Baseline Score	<i>(Scaled Scores: 0-49.9)</i>														

## TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONT=D)

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS																																				
<p><i>Institutional Performance Index</i></p> <p>6. 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>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><i>Assessor Survey Index and Retention 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> $\text{Institutional Performance Index Retention} = \frac{(\text{Certification Index} + \text{Graduate Satisfaction Index} + \text{Assessor Survey Index} + \text{Index})}{4}$	<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)

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS															
<p><i>Less Than 10 Program Completers</i></p> <p>7. 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>8. 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 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="padding-right: 20px;">Exemplary Teacher Preparation Program</td> <td style="padding-right: 20px;">=</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)

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><b>Rewards</b></p> <p>9. 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><b><i>Exemplary Teacher Preparation Programs</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Universities receive a positive label.</li> <li>b. Public ceremonies be held to recognize accomplishments.</li> <li>c. Universities receive public recognition in institutional report cards and state reports.</li> <li>d. Universities receive professional development grants for faculties.</li> <li>e. Universities receive fellowship funds for students in graduate programs.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>High Performing Teacher Preparation Programs</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Universities receive a positive label.</li> <li>b. Public ceremonies be held to recognize universities.</li> <li>c. Universities receive public recognition in institutional report cards and state reports.</li> <li>d. Universities receive professional development grants for faculty.</li> </ul>

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><b><i>Corrective Actions</i></b></p> <p>10. What will happen when a university obtains an "At-risk Teacher Preparation Program" label or a "Low Performing Teacher Preparation Program" label?</p> <p>(NOTE: Movement to a lower level will be based upon cumulative years. Thus, if a university labeled as "At-risk" spends one year in Level 1, moves to "Satisfactory" the next year, moves back to "At-risk" the next, and does not reach "Satisfactory" the next year, the university will move to Level 2 corrective action due to the fact that it had an "At-risk" label for a total of two years.)</p> <p>* Board of Regents will compile a list of experts to work with the universities. The universities may select from the list or hire another expert with similar expertise.</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><b><i>For At-risk Teacher Preparation Programs Only</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Level 1:</i></b></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><b><i>Level 2:</i></b></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 refuse 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 have one year to move to "Satisfactory" level. Universities that fail to demonstrate growth will move to Level 3 corrective actions.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>For Low Performing Teacher Preparation Programs or At-Risk Teacher Preparation Programs that Fail to Demonstrate Growth During Level 2 Corrective Actions</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Level 3:</i></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 contact students to inform them of the status and plans to improve the teacher preparation program.</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><i>Level 4:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Universities lose state approval of teacher preparation programs.</li> </ul>

## TEACHER PREPARATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM (CONT=D)

QUESTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><i>Non-approval</i></p> <p>11. What will happen once a university moves into Level 4 correction 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 employed in the state. 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>
<p><i>High Performing Status Not Reached in Four Years</i></p> <p>12. 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 by April 1 (2006), 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><i>Corrective Action - New Accountability Cycle</i></p> <p>13. 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>14. What happens if institutions enter into Correction 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>