



**27 Month Program Review
WSU Tri-Cities
Alternative Route Educator Certification
Program**

**WSU Tri-Cities
Fall 2019**

2019-2020

Executive Summary

Background and Context

This report details the findings of the 27-Month Program Review for WSU-Tricities College alternative route teacher preparation program. Like all new educator preparation programs, WSU-Tricities College is currently approved on limited approval. From this review and report, the Professional Educator Standards Board will consider and vote to grant full approval, retain the program on limited approval, or rescind program approval.

WSU-Tricities College was designed with research based practices and constructivist theory for both young learners and adults. The guiding framework is best summed up in the figure below developed by Cochran, DeRuiter, & King (1993). The program has been supported through the Alternative Route Block Grant program and emerged from a pre-existing educator preparation program. The program is housed on WSU's Tri-Cities Campus and operates in cooperation with traditional WSU educator preparation programs. The review team focused on the recent years' implementation of the program and conducted the present 27-month review evaluation.

In order to determine how, in what ways, and to what degree newly approved preparation programs are performing, the 27-month program review focuses on the following key evaluation questions:

1. How is the program being implemented relative to the design under which it was initially approved?
2. To what degree does the program's processes and outcomes align with PESB educator preparation program standards?
3. How is the program demonstrating outputs, processes, and outcomes?
4. How is the program assessing performance to design, develop, and implement improvement initiatives?

Program Description

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION					
Organization type	Washington State University Tri-Cities Alternative Route to Certification				
Degree					
Certificate offered	Alternative Route Program for Paraeducators				
Alternative Routes	1	2	3	4	None
	X				
Candidates	Prospective	Current	Completers		
	28-30	13-15			
Endorsements	Approved to offer	Date approved	Currently offering		
	Elementary Education & K-8		X		
	Special Education		X		
	ELL/Bilingual Education		X		

Preface

27-Month Evaluation Requirement

The Washington State Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) ensures that the state's educator preparation programs prepare diverse and learner-ready educators for Washington's schools. Toward this end, the PESB oversees preparation program approval and ongoing program review. PESB approves programs that demonstrate potential to uphold all preparation program standards and requirements, serve local and state educator workforce shortages, and offer needed access to candidates. Such programs are initially approved in specific locations for an initial approval period of 27 months following the beginning of instruction. Prior to the expiration of initial approval staff of the board conduct site visits to determine if the program is in full compliance and performance aligned with state approval requirements. This includes a full review of all applicable key performance indicators and program standards. The review is a dimensional evaluation in which the quality and value of the program is determined by looking at its performance on multiple dimensions of merit, including design fidelity, standards alignment, key performance indicators, and the ability to demonstrate continuous improvement.

Outcomes of the 27-Month Review

The review will produce information for program improvement and accountability. The review will provide:

- Better understanding of program design, implementation, and outcomes
- Opportunities for strategic input into preparation programs
- An approval decision by the Professional Educator Standards Board

Key Audiences

The Professional Educator Standards Board

The primary audience of the 27-month review report is the Washington State Professional Educator Standards Board whose members will use the report to make an approval decision. Based on the content of the review report and the recommendations of the review team, PESB members will determine whether the program will be approved to transition from limited approval to full approval, remain on limited approval, or have approval rescinded. Members of the PESB will also use 27-month program review reports to gather information about the overall health of the educator preparation system in the state and to make ongoing decisions related to preparation program standards, approval, and review.

The Preparation Program Being Reviewed

The 27-month review will provide valuable insights to the preparation program being reviewed by focusing on critical areas of practice, highlighting promising practices, and by providing commendations and recommendations. The review will address all areas of educator preparation program practice, but will focus on areas of practice identified through analysis of key performance indicators, program leaders' goals, and evidence provided by the program of meeting each of the Board's [program standards](#). Each review will seek information about innovative and effective practices for the purpose of examining and sharing these practices. And, each review will provide both commendations and recommendations for program improvement.

The Wider Field of Educator Preparation

Another key audience for the 27-month review is the wider field of educator preparation. Findings, commendations, and recommendations of the review team will serve to inform the wider field of educator preparation and prompt further discussion and dissemination of promising practices.

Program Review Team

Program review teams including individuals familiar with the program and expert in the areas of practice identified for focused review. Review teams consist of 5, 6, or 7 individuals, dependent on the programs' focus and the expertise of the review team. One PESB staff member will serve as chair on the review team during the review process but will not serve in an evaluative role. Additional members of the review team shall include one member of the programs' professional educator advisory board (PEAB), one P-12 practitioner with expertise related to the program scheduled for review, and two representatives of peer programs. Any two of these review team members, or two additional members, must be identified individuals with expertise related to the standards identified as focal areas.

WSU-Tricities College Review Team

Name	Role in Review	Contact
Nicholas Gillon	PESB Staff Chair	Nicholas.gillon@k12.wa.us
Amy Salinas	P-12 Practitioner familiar with program	amy.salinas@rsd.edu
Becca Anderson	PEAB representative	becca.anderson@ksd.edu
Mary Jo Larsen	Peer program representative	larsenmj@plu.edu
Patrick Sexton	Peer program representative	pgsexton@uw.edu
Mary Jo Larsen	Timely, successful completion of EdTPA	larsenmj@plu.edu
Patrick Sexton	Para educators balancing work and program	pgsexton@uw.edu

Evaluation Criteria

Program Standards and Requirements

The primary evaluation criteria are the PESB program standards and the degree to which the program upholds each. In order to evaluate the degree to which WSU-Tricities College educator preparation program upholds PESB program standards and requirements the authors of this report reviewed data submitted by WSU-Tricities College educator preparation program personnel; conducted a day-long, structured focus group; collected additional evidence as requested.

Prior to the program review, PESB staff provided a list of guiding questions and possible data sources for each of the 7 Domain Standards ([PESB Standards, Evidence, and Guiding Questions](#)). WSU educator preparation program personnel provided evidence of upholding each domain standard and component area. Review team members then examined the guiding questions and data sources, discussed them, and develop a list of follow up questions. PESB staff provided these follow up questions to WSU educator preparation program personnel in advance, then asked program personnel to respond during the site visit. The review team then shared additional questions and requests for data and conducted limited follow-up interviews.

This section is organized around three essential functions of newly approved preparation programs and includes the review team's assessment regarding how each standard was met, unmet, or being exceeded. Each of these essential functions goes beyond any particular program standard. However, each program standard can be best characterized under one of these essential functions. These three essential functions served as organizing structure for the site review and this section of the report (agenda):

1. Developing and improving sustainable programming (Domains 7 & 5)
2. Serving communities with educator preparation programming and educators (Domains 1, 3 & 4)
3. Preparing culturally responsive, skilled, and knowledgeable educators (Domains 2 & 6)

Developing and Improving Effective and Sustainable Programing

Effective and sustainable programming is the foundation of preparing educators for Washington State districts and schools. This essential function involves administrative, governance, resources, and data infrastructure and encompasses standards 7 and 5.

Domain 7: Program Resources and Governance

7A. Administrative Unit | Providers ensure that programs utilize a separate administrative unit responsible for the composition and organization of the preparation program.

Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found this standard to be met. The [Context and Overview Statement](#) provided by the WSU TriCities program leaders included a description of the program's offerings, self assessed strengths, support structures, challenges and lessons learned, and notions of program stability and longevity. The [program's logic model](#) includes program features, outcomes, impacts, and theory of change. The detailed [Description of Standard 7A](#) outlines how the program is structured and how program decisions

are made. The program [Organizational Chart](#) and Roles and [Responsibilities Chart](#) lay out the work of key program members. The [Policies, Responsibilities, and Authorities](#) document identifies roles and responsibilities of the designated administrators.

[7B. Personnel](#) | *Providers ensure the program has adequate personnel to promote teaching and learning.*
Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found this standard to be met. The WSU TriCities alternative route program is run separately from other WSU programs, however program leaders on each campus are in regular and ongoing communication about all aspects of the program. The [Descriptions of Process](#) document for Standard 7B detailed ratios of personnel to candidates and how personnel decisions have been made. The program [Organizational Chart](#) and [Faculty CV Portfolio](#) documents detailed roles and backgrounds of instructors. Typically teaching faculty do not supervise candidates' clinical practices experiences. Rather, supervisors for the program are experienced local educators, many of whom are semi-retired and have been with the program since it was formed, and with the TriCities traditional route program before that. Supervisors support between four and ten candidates at a time depending on location and capacity and are matched with candidates based on geography and temperament. Initially the program enrolled 28 candidates, which program leaders found effective, but not ideal. After reducing the number of candidates in the cohort from 28 to 14, the program did not reduce the number of faculty or support positions. This change added significantly to the amount of support available for each candidate. Going forward, the program leaders anticipate enrollments between 13 and 15 ideally.

[7C. Facilities](#) | *Providers ensure the program has adequate facilities and resources to promote teaching and learning.*
Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found this standard to be met. The WSU TriCities Alternative Route program uses classroom space as needed on the TriCities campus. The [Descriptions of Process](#) document for Standard 7C details the facilities, resources, and governance details associated with this standard. Space allocation policies are documented in [Executive Policy 35](#). [ARBG Plans of Study](#), [Example Schedule](#), and [Campus Support](#) documents illustrated the use of campus spaces. The program shares some spaces and services with the traditional route program and shares some administrative capacity and student services with the whole WSU multi-campus system. Campus resources such as student food pantry, writing center, and library support are open and accessible to candidates until 11:00 pm. Web and virtual resources such as help desk, tech support, and research databases are accessible offsite to candidates and shared among candidates across WSU campuses. The program also shares central services such as legal, facilities planning, and fund raising across campuses. Review team members found that the space and provisions were adequate and commended program leaders on their ability to coordinate services in efficient fashion across campuses.

Domain 5: Data and Assessment Systems

Educator preparation providers maintain data and systems that are sufficient to evaluate program performance, direct program decision-making, and fulfill reporting requirements of the professional educator standards board.

5A. Effective Data Systems | Providers develop and maintain effective data systems that are sufficient for program growth, evaluation, and mandated reporting.

Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found this standard to be met with program specific data practices and practices set within the institutional context. The multi-campus WSU educator preparation programs share centralized data capacity for storing, tracking, and reporting data to fulfill state reporting requirements. The [Descriptions of Process](#) document for Standard 5A describes details of the program's data system(s) used for candidate record keeping, state reporting, and program use. [Program review data feedback](#) reports describe program performance on indicators. The review report considers all WSU educator preparation programs, not the TriCities program alone. Program specific data systems and practices include the [ARBG data collection tool](#) report and the [ARBG Evaluation Report](#), which involve data specifically related to the alternative route program. Program specific data are used to understand recruitment, retention, and candidates success. These data are also used with the PEAB for decision-making, and to support candidates in assessing prior learning at admissions, and throughout the program to identify and target needs for support during field experiences.

In these program specific data applications, there are a combination of formal and informal processes and practices. Formal processes include the Alternative Route Block grant report and the collection and submission of application, assessment, and candidate demographics to the main WSU campus. Candidates satisfaction surveys are conducted through the main WSU campus and also in the TriCities Alternative Route program. These data are used among PEAB and program leaders to make program development decisions. More informal, but regular, practices include formative feedback about candidates from districts and field supervisors. These processes have been largely paper based up to now. Review team members encouraged program leaders' efforts to formalize and digitize some processes.

5B. Secure Data Practices | Providers utilize secure data practices for storing, monitoring, reporting, and using data for program improvement.

Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found this standard to be met. The [Descriptions of Process](#) document for Standard 5B described details of the programs data security practices and protocols. Access to program data is limited based on users' need for accessing candidate information. Access is restricted using active directory, tiered access, and password protection. WSU data are held in a manner aligned with Washington State OCIO and FERPA data security and storage requirements. The systems also use internet content filtering compliant with the Children's Internet Protection Act. Documents include a [Description of the Assessment Coordinator](#) position who focuses on this work the [Washington State University Data Policies](#) to which the program adheres. The program has participated in annual data collection and received [Annual Program Indicator Feedback Reporting](#), however that reporting aggregates the TriCities campus with the Pullman campus.

5C. Program Reporting | *Providers produce and utilize data reports in accordance with data manual and reporting guidance published by the board.*

Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found this standard met. The [Descriptions of Process](#) document for Standard 5C described details of the annual reporting process for this program; [Advisory Board minutes](#) as well as [PEAB Agendas](#) and minutes were reviewed with reference to this program standard. Up to now, data from the TriCities program have been collected and transmitted by alternative route program leaders to colleagues on the main WSU campus, who aggregate the data and submit them to the PESB. Data from the 2018-19 academic year were collected and reported accurately and on time during the fall 2019 data submission. In future years, data specifically from the alternative route program will be evaluated collectively with the main campus but will be also disaggregated to benefit program leaders and decision-makers. Review team members encourage program leaders to actively use those data sources as they become available.

Serving Communities with Educator Preparation and Learner-Ready Novice Educators

The second essential function of newly approved preparation programs serving to organize this section was *serving communities with educator preparation and learner-ready teachers*. This critical function of all preparation programs is addressed in program standards 1, 3, and 4.

Domain 1: Candidates and Cohorts

Educator preparation programs recruit, select, support, and prepare diverse cohorts of candidates with potential to be outstanding educators.

1A. Strategic and Ongoing Outreach | *Providers conduct strategic and ongoing outreach to identify, recruit, admit, support, and transition promising educator candidates*

Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found this standard met. TriCities Alternative Route preparation program leaders use multiple outreach strategies and methods; primarily, outreach is done through partnerships with seven local school districts. The [program's logic model](#) includes the clear goal to recruit paraeducators from local districts to address educator shortage needs. [The Descriptions of Process Document](#) for Standard 1A and the [Outreach Plan](#), and [Partnership Template](#) describe details of partnership and outreach strategies used in the program. Key strategies for contacting and recruiting candidates include social media, website, flyers, and district information sessions. The program has guided its efforts through data collected by districts. [Program Outreach and Recruitment](#) materials are available. [Educator Shortage data from 2018](#) include ELL/Bilingual and Special Education, [Teacher Shortage by District](#) includes endorsements offered by the program, and the [Shortage Area Table](#) shows program outcomes to-date.

1B. Recruiting and Supporting Underrepresented Groups of Candidates | *Providers of educator preparation programs use strategies to recruit, admit, and prepare a greater number of candidates from underrepresented groups including, but not limited to, candidates of color in effort to prepare an educator workforce that mirrors the characteristics of the student population in Washington state public schools*

Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found this standard met. [The Descriptions of Process Document](#) for Standard 1B describes details of partnership and outreach strategies used in the program. The program is situated within a highly diverse context (approximately 47% people of color), and the program draws heavily from partner districts' paraeducator workforces, which happen to be predominately people of color. The preparation program demographics mirror the demographic profile of the local community and educators prepared in the program so far show a high rate of retention in their schools and districts. The [Outreach Plan](#) and [Partnership Template](#) described details of partnership and outreach strategies used in the program. Review team members found these strategies responsive to the local community and developed in close, informed partnerships with district leaders. The [program's logic model](#) includes the clear goal to recruit paraeducators from local districts to address educator shortage needs. The program also employs a number of strategies to support and retain diverse candidates such as the diversity and inclusion book club to better inform faculty and supervisors, TRIO services, alternative route conditional loan scholarships, test preparation, academic resources, and a discrete, accessible food pantry to support candidates experiencing food insecurity. [Details of the Diversity and Inclusion Book Club](#) are included in the materials provided to the review team.

1C. Admission Standards | *Providers set, publish, and uphold program admission standards to ensure that all educator candidates and cohorts are academically capable and technically prepared to succeed in educator preparation programs.*

Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found this standard to be met. [The Descriptions of Process Document](#) for Standard 1C describes details of partnership and outreach strategies used in the program. [Program Outreach and Recruitment](#) materials are delivered to program partners. All program requirements are effectively communicated in the program's flyers, websites, and handbooks in varied amounts of detail. [Basic Skills Tests Passing Scores](#) and [Application](#) to the program and are provided. Candidate supports are designed and connected with enrollment and outreach processes to retain candidates as they transition into and complete the program.

Domain 3: Novice Practitioners

Educator preparation programs prepare candidates who are role ready.

3A. Role Readiness | *Providers prepare candidates who are ready to engage effectively in their role and context upon completion of educator preparation programs.*

Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found this standard to be met. [The Descriptions of Process Document](#) for Standard 3A described details related to the standard. The [ARBG Plans of Study](#), [Example Schedule](#), and [Campus Support](#) documents, [Course Map and edTPA Rubrics](#), [Submission Guidance](#), [Summary Actions and Tips](#), and [Student Teaching Course Materials](#) show multiple approaches to preparing candidates for their role and context. Community relationships with a local refugee center, family learning center, as well as home visits to students, and field trips to support organizations are included in coursework to provide candidates further opportunities to understand the social and political contexts of schooling in the partner districts. Follow-up completer surveys have been used to assess candidates' perceptions of their preparation; data reveal that TriCities campus completers tend to be at the top of all WS campuses in terms of candidate satisfaction. Based on these surveys, as well as other candidate and district feedback opportunities, program leaders partner with faculty and local advisory board members to improve the

program. Program leaders also encourage candidates in practicum or student teaching to take advantage of professional development in the district. All candidates are invited to participate in BEST supports; participation among candidates in these additional supports is approximately 50%.

3B. Reflective Practice / *Providers prepare candidates to develop reflective, collaborative, and professional growth-centered practices through regular evaluation of the effects of their practice through feedback and reflection.*

Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found this standard met. The [Descriptions of Process Document](#) for Standard 3B described details related to the standard. The review team members examined candidate Professional Growth Plans ([PGPs](#)) and prior learning assessment ([PLA](#)) materials and found multiple examples of reflective, job-embedded, course connected learning opportunities. Faculty also model and deepen their own reflective practice through organized book study groups. The program's coursework, field work, and district partnerships create opportunities for candidates' reflective practice and job-embedded PGPs. Feedback from field supervisors is catalogued using field-based supervision forms that are aggregated and shared with program leaders. Program leaders review the trends in supervisors' feedback in connection with candidates coursework to identify when and how to intervene to provide additional support as necessary. Ongoing program seminars are used to frame discussions and support around emergent themes and challenges.

3C. Working with Paraeducators / *Providers prepare candidates for their role in directing, supervising, and evaluating paraeducators.*

Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found this standard to be met. The [Descriptions of Process Document](#) for Standard 3C describes details related to the standard. A majority of the candidates in the program are paraeducators, many of whom can earn credit for their prior learning through the program's credit-for-prior-learning process. Course work includes strategies for collaborating with paraeducator and opportunities for current paraeducators to explore, discuss, and prepare for the challenging transition from paraeducator to teacher, within the same school context. Although review team members found the standard met, they recommend the program embed a more deliberate curriculum focus to the Washington State Paraeducator standards of practice.

3D. Educator Evaluation / *Providers require candidates to demonstrate knowledge of teacher evaluation research and Washington's evaluation requirements.*

Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found this standard met. The [Descriptions of Process Document](#) for Standard 3D described details related to this standard. Details regarding program processes for supporting candidates' understanding of the TPEP evaluation are included in the [Student Teaching Handbook and Resource Guide](#), [Student Teaching Materials](#), and Student Teaching Seminar syllabus. [Alignment of InTasc and TPEP criteria](#) are used in conjunction with course and field work to support candidates' integrated understanding of their course work, field work, and eventual TPEP evaluations. The program also includes integrated [PGP](#) assignments to support candidates ongoing orientation toward professional development and evaluation.

Domain 4: State and Local Workforce Needs

Educator preparation programs contribute positively to state and local educator workforce needs.

4A. Partnerships to Address Workforce Needs | *Providers partner with local schools, districts, and communities to assess and respond to educator workforce, student learning, and educator professional learning needs.*

Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found this standard to be met. The [Descriptions of Process Document](#) for Standard 4A described details related to the standard. [Educator Shortage data from 2018](#) included ELL/Bilingual and Special Education, [Teacher Shortage by District](#) document included endorsements offered by the program, and the [Shortage Area Table](#) showed program outcomes to-date. The [program's logic model](#) included the clear goal to recruit paraeducators from local districts to address educator shortage needs. [PEAB](#) members and their contact information for the 2019-2020 are provided; excerpts from [PEAB meetings](#) are included. These documents demonstrate ongoing partnerships with local districts, PEAB members, and local advisory board members that have led to a tight focus on the needs of partnering districts. One area of distinct and future focus is preparing bilingual teachers. Program leaders intend to continue working to improve their ability to support local schools with bilingual teachers to serve their communities.

4B. Data to Address Workforce Needs | *Providers use preparation program and workforce data in cooperation with professional educator advisory boards to assess and respond to local and state workforce needs.*

Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found this standard to be met. The [Descriptions of Process Document](#) for Standard 4B describes details related to the standard. The program has developed its offerings based on the needs of its partner districts, the WSU PEAB, as well as the programs' local advisory board. Partner districts enjoy strong relationships with program leaders and have communicated in ongoing ways about their needs for educators, and the potential candidates working in their districts. Review team members noted room for improvement in terms of formalizing some of these processes, work that was underway by program leaders. [Summary Briefs](#) show descriptions from partner districts. [Educator Shortage data from 2018](#) include ELL/Bilingual and Special Education, [Teacher Shortage by District](#) includes endorsements offered by the program, and the [Shortage Area Table](#) shows the candidates prepared in those endorsement areas. The WSU PEAB also provided input into the needs that the program serves. [PEAB](#) members and their contact information for the 2019-2020 are provided; excerpts from [PEAB meetings](#) and PEAB Annual Data Collections, [P1](#) and [P2](#), were reviewed. Because the WSU PEAB includes all campuses, program leaders have developed a local advisory board to inform the Tri-Cities program particularly. The local advisory board provides information on induction needs, professional development, candidates' education / career connection, and professional development support.

4C. Endorsements in Shortage Areas | Providers of teacher educator preparation programs prepare and recommend increasing numbers of candidates in endorsement and areas identified by the board as workforce priorities.

Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found this standard to be met. The Descriptions of Process Document for Standard 4C described details related to the standard. [Educator Shortage data from 2018](#) include ELL/Bilingual and Special Education, [Teacher Shortage by District](#) includes endorsements offered by the program, and the [Shortage Area Table](#) shows the candidates prepared in those endorsement areas. [PEAB meetings](#) and [data collections](#) are available. These documents show a concerted effort on behalf of program leaders to support local partners workforce development needs. Review team members interviewed multiple stakeholders from local districts who each emphasized the positive relationship between the district and the program and how that relationship has benefited particular candidates.

Preparing Culturally Responsive, Skilled, and Knowledgeable Educators

The third essential function of newly approved preparation programs serving to organize this section was *preparing culturally responsive, skilled, and knowledgeable educators*. This critical function of all preparation programs is addressed in standards 2 and 6.

Domain 2: Candidates' Knowledge, Skills and Cultural Responsiveness

Educator preparation program providers prepare candidates who demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and cultural responsiveness required for the particular certificate and areas of endorsement, which reflect the state's approved standards.

2A. Methods of Instruction | Providers demonstrate effective, culturally responsive pedagogy using multiple instructional methods, formats, and assessments.

Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found this standard to be met. Providing culturally responsive teaching and learning opportunities has been a key focus of program leaders and faculty. Faculty members' research areas focus on these practices and the program's hiring practices highly favor teacher educators who have experience and expertise in this area of practice ([Faculty CV Portfolio](#)). The [Description of Process Document](#) for standard 2A indicated how the program approaches this standard. The [Alternative Route Block Grant Plans of Study](#) and the more detailed [Alternative Route teacher certification syllabi](#) are all available and demonstrate multiple examples of qualified faculty using a variety of instructional methods, formats, and assessments. Program leaders have also organized and provided book study groups to explore issues of culturally responsive education that are aligned with the needs of local communities. The [Book Study Invite](#), [Letter to Faculty](#), [Presentation](#), [Book Study Wrap-up](#), and interviews with faculty members provided review team members more details about these book studies. Another key strategy has been the [AVID Continuing education professional development opportunities](#) focused on culturally responsive teaching. Specifically, the learning opportunity for faculty and field supervisors includes "critical conversations involving gender, class, religion, ability, ethnicity, and sexual orientation, and will experience the positive and negative effects that teacher expectations, privilege, and stereotyping can have on student achievement". These ideas and discussions are connected to faculty members' practice in teaching candidates as well as candidates' experiences in schools.

2B. Subject Matter Knowledge | Providers ensure that completers demonstrate the necessary subject matter knowledge for success as educators in schools.

Review Team Findings: *Met*

Review team members found this standard to be met. [Descriptions of Process Domain 2.B](#) outlined the program's overall work on this standard. Program leaders mapped curriculum and field work to current standards, support mentors' and field supervisors' understanding of culturally responsive practices, and Since Time Immemorial curriculum. Curriculum mapping takes place every half year, and edTPA to course connections are assessed annually. The preparation program was initially developed according to PESB's former five standards and Washington State specific role standards, but program leaders have redeveloped courses and syllabi to align with InTASC standards ([Alternative Route Block Grant Plans of Study](#); [InTASC Standards, Essential Knowledge, and Courses](#); [Key Course Assessments and Performance Tasks](#)). Mentors' and field supervisors' training was initially focused on only rules, regulations, and program processes (Student-teaching Required Paperwork, Student Teaching Timelines, Student-teaching Weekly Conference Form). However, over the years the program has been underway, program leaders have shifted this learning to include culturally responsive pedagogy. Leaders acknowledge this step has been important and effective but there is still reason to increase emphasis on this area ([Mentor-Teacher Webinar](#), [Book Study and Letter to Field Supervisors](#), [AVID Professional Development](#)). The program has also increased its focus on implementing learning experiences focused on enhancing and expanding their use of the Since Time Immemorial curriculum resources ([Faculty Responses to STI Implementation](#)). Faculty provided several examples of how STI is used, for example case studies involving families from native communities related to SPED referral practices, a math/science unit on salmon, a puzzle map involving geography and local tribes, as well as three STI implementation workshops held in the Spring of 2019.

2C. Pedagogic Skill | Providers ensure that candidates demonstrate pedagogical knowledge and skill relative to the national professional standards adopted by the board for the role for which candidates are being prepared.

Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found this standard to be met. [Descriptions of Process Domain 2.C](#) described how throughout the program, candidates participate in both coursework and fieldwork. In field work experiences, they are expected to apply what they have learned in the courses. Candidates are observed weekly by mentors during the first semester, four times by field supervisors during the second semester, followed by weekly mentor visits in the third semester. During the official student teaching experience, candidates are observed 12 times by their field supervisor and weekly by their mentor. Mentors and field supervisors used varied tools as well as documentation and communication strategies. Program leaders review all candidates' field supervision reports to identify any issues of understanding, disposition, or signs of struggle and conference with candidates. Program leaders address and support candidates as needed, in partnership with field supervisors, mentors, and school leaders as appropriate. Review team members examined [Alternative Route Certification Syllabi](#) and discussed field experience practices with faculty, district personnel, and field supervisors. Student teaching materials and practice focused courses ([TL 401](#), [TL 402](#), [TL 405](#), [TL 411](#), and [TLL 415](#)) as well as the [Instructional Practicum Handbook](#) clarify the programs processes and emphasis on ensuring candidates demonstrate pedagogical knowledge and skill relative to the national professional standards.

2D. Cultural Responsiveness | Providers ensure that candidates are well prepared to exhibit the knowledge and skills of culturally responsive educators.

Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found this standard to be met. The [Descriptions of Process Domain 2.D.](#) document provides an overview of the program's approach to ensuring candidates have the knowledge and skills of culturally responsive educators. Faculty members' research backgrounds, vitas, and course syllabi all denote a clear focus on culturally responsive pedagogy ([Faculty CV Portfolio](#)). Several faculty members who teach courses that heavily involve culturally responsive pedagogy included responses to their work and experience ([Firestone](#), [Petersen](#), [Johnson](#), [Newcomer](#)). All faculty members and field supervisors in the program have had ongoing training and experience deepening their understanding of culturally responsive pedagogy. From these experiences faculty showed evidence of culturally responsive pedagogy in course revisions and instructional practices practices ([Book Study Invite](#), [Letter to Faculty Presentation](#), and [Book Study Wrap-up](#); [AVID Continuing education professional development opportunities](#)).

Domain 6: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

Educator preparation providers offer field-based learning experiences and formalized clinical practice experiences for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills needed for their role.

6A. Field Placement Partnerships | Providers establish and maintain field placement practices, relationships, and agreements with all school districts in which candidates are placed for field experiences leading to certification or endorsement per WAC 181-78A-125 and 181-78A-300.

Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found this standard met. The [Descriptions of Process Document](#) for Standard 6A describes details related to the standard. [PEAB meetings](#) agendas, [Special Education Practicum Handbook](#), and [Student Teaching Handbook](#) all indicate districts involved in program partnerships. MOUs between the program and the districts include all required information (WAC 181-78A-300). Initially the program included 5 distinct partners; since being in operation, the program has included two additional partner districts. Program details and logistics are provided to district leaders to clarify the programs goals and processes. Review team members reviewed documents and interviewed stakeholders from multiple districts. Each conveyed that the partnership had been overall very positive, had improved over time, and had benefited the candidates served.

6B. Integrating Coursework and Field Work | Providers ensure that candidates integrate knowledge and skills developed through field and industry experiences with the content of programs' course work.

Review Team Findings: *Met*

The [Descriptions of Process Document](#) for Standard 6B described details related to the standard. Prior [Learning Assessment](#) materials, [ARBG Plans of Study](#), [Mentor-teacher Webinar](#), and [Campus Support](#) documents include clear connections between coursework and fieldwork. Materials also include [Special Education Practicum Handbook](#), [Student Teaching Handbook](#), [Field Supervisor Evaluation](#) form, [Weekly Conference Form](#), and [Teaching Reflection on an Arts Lesson](#). Review team members interviewed several field supervisors and faculty members who described the ways in which course work is designed around implementation experiences and those implementation experiences are matched with field based assessment strategies.

6C. Testing Requirements | Providers offer field experiences and related assessment requirements in accordance with WAC 181-78A-300 and the board approved candidate assessment requirements.

Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found this standard to be met. The [Descriptions of Process Document](#) for Standard 6C described details related to the standard. Review team members examined [syllabi](#) as well as the [Student Teaching Handbook](#), [SPED Practicum Handbook](#), [Student Teaching Materials](#), [Timelines](#) and [EdTPA Rubrics](#). [Guidance for submitting the EdTPA](#) and the [Student Teaching Seminar](#) syllabus also provided outlines of the strategies program personnel use to inform and guide candidates as they complete admission, endorsement, and edTPA assessments. Specific edTPA supports included coursework aligned with edTPA rubrics, practice opportunities for feedback in the area of writing and video taping. The program also supports candidate work groups for peer-peer learning opportunities and a practice edTPA in their advanced practicum.

6D. Diversity in Field Experiences | Providers ensure that candidates participate in field experiences in school settings with students and teachers who differ from themselves in race, ethnicity, home language, socio-economic status or local population density.

Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found this standard to be met. The [Descriptions of Process Document](#) for Standard 6D described details related to the standard. Review team members examined [Candidate PGP Exemplars](#), [Clinical Practice placement records](#) and [program syllabi](#) in addition to [faculty members' reflections](#) on culturally responsive practices in educator preparation. In order to meet this standard, the program leaders require candidates to complete a [Diversity in Field Experiences form](#) regarding their schooling experiences in order to help them select a diverse setting for their field experience. Based on this survey faculty work with district partners, mentors, and field supervisors to provide candidates opportunities to have field experiences in school settings with students and teachers who differ from themselves. For the WSU Tri-Cities program, as well as other programs serving educators already working in schools, this standard can be particularly hard to meet. Districts have demonstrated some willingness to move candidates for short-term experiences when their current placement does not easily allow them to experience school settings that differ from their own background. Review team members found this standard met and encouraged program leaders to continue to consider how to involve community and district partnerships to enable candidates to have broader field experiences outside of their school day.

Process Evaluation

Program Design and Delivery

Several key features of the WSU-Tricities College program design and delivery are their strong district partnerships, their orientation within a larger university, and design of the program itself. District partnerships were obvious and intentional. During the review process, review team members discussed the program with multiple stakeholders from partnering districts. Each individual described responsive, beneficial, and productive relationships with program leaders, candidates, and field supervisors. These district partnerships have served as connections between candidates' work and study. District partnerships also play a key role in program outreach. Since inception, the program has added two new district partners to serve candidates in their area. Review team members did receive feedback that communication about how candidates can join the program was always available, but that communication has not always been consistent in quantity or method across districts. Program leaders emphasize the importance of these partnerships in program outreach, however with seven district partners in the area with many educators who may be eligible and interested, and only 13-15 available slots, program leaders described a hesitancy to over-saturate the area with advertisement. Although these communication practices in districts showed some signs of challenge, broadly, district partnerships in the program are very strong.

The WSU program is nested in a large institution and emerged from a pre-existing program. The multi-campus WSU system is very large, the educator preparation programs alone expand across multiple districts and cities. This large system creates potential for smaller programs to receive less support or somehow be swallowed up by larger programs, however review team members found no indication that this was the case. Based on interviews, evidence, and documentation examined by the review team, the WSU Tri-Cities Alternative Route program leadership and personnel have developed strong support networks in the community and communication patterns with the main campus that have enabled a small, nimble program to operate effectively and responsively on behalf of the community it serves. In coming years, review team members encourage the program leaders to enhance and formalize some of their community connection strategies and data use processes to better understand the impacts of the program in the local area, disaggregated from that of other WSU educator preparation programs.

The way the program has been designed, it has opened the door to candidates who may not have access to any other program. With its tuition scholarships, credit for prior learning process, and support resources, the program positions itself to be immensely impactful, even if only for a small number of candidates. The program is accessible financially by virtue of the Alternative Route Block Grant. Without grant funding, the program costs cannot be covered without tuition and expenses to candidates. The credit for prior learning process, which involves assessing candidates previous experience and know-how in reference to course objectives shows signs of ensuring that candidates demonstrate all competencies, in some cases without taking all courses. The program leaders have shown responsibility and diligence in organizing a system that not only recognizes when candidates have the necessary competencies, but also when they do not and which particular competencies need to be assessed strictly within courses and not through prior learning assessments.

Reporting and Follow-Up

Reporting process and outcomes

Following the review, the review team has provided this report identifying any areas of practice in which program performance is out of alignment with standards and requirements.

Presentation to the Washington State Professional Educator Standards Board

This report was presented to the Washington State Professional Educator Standards Board during the course of its regular meeting on May 21st, 2020.

Program Providers Response

Providers of the program reviewed may submit a reply to the review to report within three weeks following receipt of the report. Program leaders are also invited to make a ten minute oral presentation at the Board meeting on May 21st, 2020.
