

OMB No.1890 - 0004 Exp.10/31/2007



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report Cover Sheet (ED 524B)**

Check only one box per Program Office instructions.

Annual Performance Report **Final Performance Report**

General Information

1. PR/Award #: **P336B040046**

(Block 5 of the Grant Award Notification.)

2. NCES ID #: 217484

(See Instructions.)

3. Project Title: Rhode Island Teacher Education Renewal (RITER)

(Enter the same title as on the approved application.)

4. Grantee Name*(Block 1 of the Grant Award Notification.)*: University of Rhode Island

5. Grantee Address *(See Instructions.)*: c/o URI Research Office

70 Lower College Road

City: Kingston State: RI Zip:02881 Zip+4:

6. Project Director:

First Name

Last Name

Title

Peter

Adamy

Associate Professor

Ph. #:

4018747036

Fax #:

4018745471

Email Address:

ADAMY@URI.EDU

Reporting Period Information *(See instructions.)*

7. Reporting Period: From: 10/1/2005 To: 4/15/2006 (mm/dd/yyyy)

Budget Expenditures *(To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions. Also see Section B.)*

8. Budget Expenditures

	Federal Grant Funds	Non-Federal Funds (Match/Cost Share)
a. Previous Budget Period	1,067,059.00	296,474.00
b. Current Reporting Period	133,018.00	92,793.00
c. Entire Project Period <i>(For Final Performance Reports only)</i>	0.00	0.00

Indirect Cost Information *(To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions.)*

9. Indirect Costs

a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant?

Yes

No

b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement

approved Yes
by the Federal government? No

c. If yes, provide the following information:

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement: From: 7/1/2003 To: 5/30/2006
(mm/dd/yyyy)

Approving Federal agency: ED Other (Please Specify) HHS

Type of Rate (For Final Performance Reports Only): Provisional Final Other
(Please Specify)

d. For Restricted Rate Programs (check one) -- Are you using a restricted indirect cost rate that :

Is included in your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement?

Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2)?

Human Subjects (See instructions.)

10. Annual Certification of Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approval? Yes No
 N/A

Performance Measures Status and Certification (See instructions.)

11. Performance Measures Status

a. Are complete data on performance measures for the current budget period included in the Project

Status Chart? Yes No

b. If no, when will the data be available and submitted to the Department? 5/31/2007
(mm/dd/yyyy)

12. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this performance report are true and correct

and the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data.

Name of Authorized Representative: Franca Cirelli	Title: AD of Sponsored Projects
Signature:	Date:

Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Executive Summary Attachment:

Title : Executive Summary 2005-06

File : /Data/Projects/TQE Project/Reports/2006/Executive Summary.doc

OMB No.1890 - 0004 Exp.10/31/2007



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award #: **P336B040046**

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

1 . **Project Objective** Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Objective #1: Increase collaboration and dialogue among arts and sciences professors, teacher education professors and K-12 teachers and administrators through the development and implementation of a plan to ensure articulation between national content standards, the content knowledge of teacher education candidates and their ability of apply this knowledge

a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Teacher preparation programs on campuses with arts and science programs establish partnerships with arts and science and education faculties to examine curriculum, strengthen content preparation, and assure that programs are aligned with national standards and develop and implement plan to ensure the articulation.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			6 / 6	100		6 / 6	100
b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Early childhood education and elementary education program completers pass the content examination required for licensure.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%

			282 / 325	87		343 / 364	94
c. Performance Measure		Measure Type	Quantitative Data				
Partner school districts create mechanisms to strengthen teacher understanding of Grade Level Expectations in mathematics and science, develop deeper content knowledge of these teachers and assure that programs are aligned with GLEs.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		3	/		3	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

A cross institutional team from each of the 8 college partners has met regularly this year to analyze national standards, assessments, and best practice in arts and science as they relate to the preparation of teacher education students. The team reviewed appropriate national standards, NCATE requirements and assessments in each program area.

An institute was conducted on 06/24/05 at which Dr. E. Lynne Weisenbach and several arts and science deans provided ideas from the STEP Project that can be replicated at partner institutions. A second institute was conducted during the summer to provide the partners with a deeper understanding of the PRAXIS II Elementary Examination and how the data from this examination could be used to inform content preparation.

Colleges met in arts and science and education work groups on their specific campuses for this grant. This summer 2005 work provided the foundation for this teamwork.

Central Falls increased the alignment between its curriculum and the Math GLEs and worked with faculty to develop an understanding of Science GLEs. Newport conducted school-based study groups to support a deeper understanding of mathematics GLEs with the goal of moving from awareness to implementation. Pawtucket worked with Rhode Island College to increase content understanding of teachers to assure ability to teach to the GLEs.

OMB No.1890 - 0004 Exp.10/31/2007



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award #: **P336B040046**

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

2 . Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Teacher candidates and beginning teachers will increase their ability to use technology effectively to increase K-12 student achievement.

a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Teacher preparation programs identify exemplary users of technology and use the work of these faculty members to model technology integration.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			6 / 8	75		4 / 6	67
b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Teacher preparation programs revise curriculum to assure that technology integration is an integral part of candidate preparation and assessment.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			8 / 8	100		4 / 8	50
c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Partner disticts create technology laboraties in at	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		

least one school and support technology integration in instruction through training and evaluation of instruction.	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			3 / 3	100		3 / 3

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

The Objective 2 Steering Committee continued to meet regularly during the second year of this project. The committee worked together to coordinate efforts across partners, and to track progress on the outcomes for this objective. Each of the higher education partners with colleges of Arts and Sciences at their institution continued their work to collaborate with colleagues in these colleges. This work was focused on helping Arts and Sciences faculty to better integrate technology into the courses that are taken by their pre-service teachers.

Some examples of this work include:

- Training at Roger Williams University in content specific software applications, the use of multimedia equipment, and techniques for using tablet PCs. At RWU, there has also been ongoing work to integrate technology into the pre-service methods courses. This includes hardware and software in the area of assistive technologies, and relevant hardware integration into the math and science methods courses.
- While the Rhode Island School of Design (RISD) does not have a college of Arts and Sciences, they have continued their work with technology integration by creating a new digital design course for their pre-service teachers in their Art and Design Education program. These pre-service teachers have used technology to create digital assessment portfolios and in their practicum work in Providence K-12 schools.
- Providence College (PC) continued their coordination with faculty in their Development of Western Civilization (DWC) program. This partnership continues to work on the integration of technology in to the main DWC course, which is taken by all students at the university, including pre-service teachers. The partners at PC held a workshop for DWC faculty on the use of the campus electronic course management system. A workshop was also held for pre-service teachers, in which DWC faculty to help students learn about the potential uses of technology in civics instruction, and modeled effective integration of technology as well.
- The University of Rhode Island partners also continued their work with colleagues in the College of Arts and Sciences. In coordination with the Dean, a call for proposals was put out in the spring asking faculty to propose activities that coordinate content area instruction and technology. They are now in the process of reviewing those applications, and anticipate the awarding small grants to several winning proposals whose authors will work over the summer to redesign their course curricula to better focus on content area instruction and the integration of technology.

Measurement of pre-service teacher's confidence in their ability to use technology effectively in their teaching continued during the second year of this project as well. Several of the higher education partners used the technology skills confidence survey developed at URI, and at least one partner utilized their own in-house survey.

While two of the three partnership K-12 school districts had not purchased their mobile labs by the end of the first project year, all three districts have now used those funds to buy mobile lab technology and software. Second-year funds have been used to update hardware and software for these mobile labs, and the hardware and software were used during the second year of the project to plan and implement technology training for district teachers.

OMB No.1890 - 0004 Exp.10/31/2007



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award #: **P336B040046**

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

3 . Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Teacher candidates will become skilled in addressing issues of race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, language, and special needs in their instruction and learn to work more closely with families through their clinical experience.

a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Teacher preparation programs revise curriculum to improve preparation of candidates for adapting instruction for diverse learners.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			8 / 8	100		8 / 8	100
b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Teacher preparation programs expand assessment of candidates to include assessment during clinical experiences that address culturally responsive pedagogy.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		8	/		8	/	
c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					

Teacher preparation programs revise curriculum to include working with families to support learning.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		8	/		8	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

A cross institutional team representing the 8 college and 3 school district partners met several times to review common goals at partner institutions that promote valuing the diversity of learners, focus on supporting the academic achievement of these learners and begin to explore the assessment of these experiences during their teacher preparation. The team conducted a symposium for Diversity and Clinical Experiences on 06/28/05 that included teachers, parents, community partners, and teacher education faculty. Dr. Beth Harry of the University of Miami facilitated a discussion of what a teacher coming into each district needs to know and be able to do to succeed with students and families in the districts. A follow-up seminar was conducted on 08/18/05 at which Dr. Asa Hilliard of Georgia State University continued the development work with this group. The Team worked with community groups in each of the partner districts to bring their representatives into the above discussions and summer institutes.

Workshops were developed and conducted in April 2006 for teachers and faculty to discuss the issues of How to incorporate diversity into courses and field placements; How to change our assessment systems; and How to collaborate with cooperating teachers and school districts as well as community partners (to create community based field experiences).

The Team has worked to identify an assessment process for diversity in the clinical experiences. Programs identified the need to develop clinical assessments – assessing quality of student teaching experiences in terms of diversity and what do we expect from clinical experiences. Based on answer to those questions, the team will decide how to assess (ask the students, supervisors, teachers, etc.). Assessment would be embedded within the field placements and classrooms. Diversity would be included among the assessment points. The key criteria to be assessed would be whether one can articulate the components of an exemplary diverse classroom and can teacher candidates differentiate instruction. Once developed, 10% of teacher candidates would pilot these assessments

OMB No.1890 - 0004 Exp.10/31/2007



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award #: **P336B040046**

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

4 . Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.
Develop school-based induction programs to support preservice and beginning teachers that support schol-based initiatives to increase retention of highly qualified teachers.

a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Training will be provided for mentor teachers on an annual basis to support mentoring and induction in partner districts.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			3 / 3	100		3 / 3	100
b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Teacher preparation programs will develop protocols for collecting data from a minimum of 25% of program graduates who become teachers and use the data to improve programs.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			8 / 8	100		8 / 8	100

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)
A cross district coordinating group has met regularly to identify and plan activities for the districts. The decision was made

to focus on district-wide needs for mentoring and induction. The team prioritized the skill and knowledge sets that were most needed in the districts, including work linked to the content, technology, and diversity efforts from the first three objectives and I-Plans for teachers. A summer institute was conducted August 22-25, 2005 to train mentors at Level 1 (Participants 24) and Levels 2&3 (Participants: 15). Another Level 1 training is scheduled for June 2006. In addition, 3 Network Dinner Sessions were conducted with an approximate attendance of 100 participants each time, that included both mentors and mentees.

This month (May 12, 2006) a training session Helping New Teachers Thrive was conducted for representatives of the participating school district partners.

A coordinating team with representatives from the eight colleges and universities has been meeting monthly to design a common process for gathering feedback from graduates. A survey instrument has been developed, and pilot tested. In June 2006, it will be administered to a sample of 2005 graduates at all eight teacher education institutions.

OMB No.1890 - 0004 Exp.10/31/2007



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award #: **P336B040046**

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

5 . Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.
Develop a prototype and implement a non-traditional certification program in a high needs area.

a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number of non-traditional route to teaching programs in Rhode Island	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			1 / 1	100		1 / 1	100
b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of new chemistry, mathematics, physics, and secondary special education teachers in Central Falls and Pawtucket who are highly qualified, including those who meet the definition by being enrolled in a high quality non-traditional route.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	
c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					

Teachers who participate in a non-traditional route to certification in Rhode Island.	PROJ	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		20	/		20	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

A development team composed of district personnel, leadership from four colleges, and the Rhode Island Department of Education has met regularly to provide direction for the development of an alternative certification program in the areas of chemistry, mathematics, physics and secondary special education. The team identified the parameters of this program , conducted 2 public recruiting sessions in April 2006 and currently has identified approximately 20 students who will begin in the summer of 2006.

The leadership team established the structure for admissions, curriculum, and mentoring and identified the faculty and mentors.

OMB No.1890 - 0004 Exp.10/31/2007



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award #: **P336B040046**

SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

6 . Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.
The percentage of highly qualified program completers at partner institutions will increase.

a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data						
		Target			Actual Performance Data			
TQE GPRA Indicator 8.2.1 Total Percentage of students who completed the eight programs and met the No Child Left Behind Definition for Highly Qualified.	GPRA	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%	
			663 / 763	87		777 / 850	91	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

All eight teacher preparation institutions within Rhode Island are partners in this grant. The percentage of program completers who meet the No Child Left Behind Definition for "highly qualified" is equivalent to the state pass rate for program completers as reported for annual Title II reporting, excluding teachers in areas not covered by the definition of highly qualified (e.g., physical education, health, technology education). Early childhood and elementary teachers must pass the PRAXIS II examination. All secondary and all level certificates require a content major or the equivalent. All candidates must pass the a standardized pedagogy test.

Data being reported for this second year period reflect program completers from 6 of the 8 participating institutions of higher education. The 763 candidates represent all program completers who graduated during the second year of the grant in an area that is covered by highly qualified and who took the required tests and reported their scores to the institutions.

There are four limitations on the data that are reported. First, The data report completers from the 2004-2005 academic year

in that the 2005-2006 data are not as yet available. Second, some program completers do not take tests in Rhode Island since they plan to teach in other states. Third, some candidates do not take the tests until they are through or almost through with student teaching and do not receive results until after program completion. Finally, historically teacher education institutions have not requested or received data on test takers.

Through this grant we have worked to address each of the limitations so that in subsequent years, the data are more complete. However, given the timing of this report and the fact that final Title II Reports are not due until the end of May, we will provide as complete and accurate a data set, as possible.

For this second year, the data are based upon the following numbers:

Brown University - 44/46 program completers who provided testing data met the definition.

Johnson and Wales - 1/1 program completers who provided testing data met the definition.

Providence College - 86/87 program completers who provided testing data met the definition.

Rhode Island College - 370/409 program completers who provided testing data met the definition.

Rhode Island School of design - candidates do not provide test data to the college.

Roger Williams University - 87/94 program completers who provided testing data met the definition.

Salve Regina University - 61/71 program completers who provided testing data met the definition.

University of Rhode Island - 128/142 program completers who provided testing data met the definition.

Based upon the data reported above, and the fact that last year the reported pass rate for the state was approximately 85%, this years pass rate of 90.6%, shows marked improvement.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890 - 0004
Expiration: 10-31-2007

PR/Award #:
P336B040046

SECTION B - Budget Information *(See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)*

There were no modifications of project goals or objectives during the second year of our project. For objective five, which focuses on alternative certification, the Providence school district was added to our partnership due to the fact that roughly two thirds of all emergency certified teachers in the state of Rhode Island are in the Providence School District. This required no changes in our budget, personnel, or project objectives.

The only significant change in expenditure that occurred during year two of the project was for objective two. \$15,000 have been budgeted each project year as common funds for consultants for all objective two partners. Discussions in the objective two steering committee gave rise to the possibility of using these common funds to sponsor a statewide technology conference for K-12 and higher education teachers. With approval from our program officer, the common funds from year one and year two of the project were pooled for a combined total of \$30,000. This money was used to fund a statewide technology conference in May that was attended by students and instructors from all partner institutions, as well as participants from several outside, non-partner districts and institutions of higher education.

A significant portion of our second year funds have not been encumbered at this time. While we rolled over a significant portion of our first year project funds, much of the activity that has happened across all five objectives during the second year has been paid using the funds from year one that were rolled over. As a result, we anticipate that we will need to roll over good portion of our second year funds into year three of the project. We would like to emphasize that while we have not expended funds at the anticipated rate, all partners have moved forward during the second year of the project with our activities as planned in the grant proposal. As outlined in the narrative submitted with this annual report, all five objectives are moving forward at the anticipated rate of activity and growth.

Project RITER Governing Board

Partner Institution	Name of Representative	Contact information
Brown University	Lawrence Wakeford – On Sabbatical '05-06	Brown University Box 1938 / Barus Hall 21 Manning Walk Providence, RI 02912
	Eileen Landay Director of English Teacher Education	Voice: 401.863.3428 (Larry) 401.863.3367 (Eileen) FAX: 401.863.1276 Lawrence_Wakeford@brown.edu Eileen_Landay@Brown.edu
Central Falls School Department	Patricia Watkins Superintendent	Central Falls School District 21 Hedley Avenue Central Falls, RI 02863
	Mario Papitto Director of Grants	Voice: 401. 727-7700 FAX: 401.727.7722 rid26444@ride.ri.net (Patricia) ride4897@ride.ri.net (Mario)
Johnson & Wales University	Denise DeMagistris	Johnson and Wales University 8 Abbott Park Place Providence, RI 02903 401.598.1923
	(Henry DeVona – 598-1994)	denise.demagistris@jwu.edu
Newport School Department	Marie Hanley Director of Teaching, Learning and Professional Development	437 Broadway Newport, RI 02840 401.847.2100.x219 rid04925@ride.ri.net
	Hans Dellith Superintendent	Edward J. Creamer Admin. Bldg. Park Place/P.O. Box 388 Pawtucket, RI 02860
Pawtucket School Department	Kimberly Mercer Deputy Superintendent	Voice: 401.729.6315 FAX: 401.727.1641 dellith@psdri.net
	Peni Callahan Chair of Elementary and Special Education	549 River Avenue Providence, RI 02918 401.865.2121 401.865.1021 jcalahan@providence.edu
Rhode Island Board of Governors For Higher Education	Nancy Carriuolo Associate Commissioner	301 Promenade St. Providence, RI 02908 401.222.6560 x132 401.222.2545 carriuol@etal.uri.edu
	Julie Wollman- Bonilla, Dean	Feinstein School of Education & Human Development Horace Mann 107 Providence RI 02908 Voice: 401.456.8113 Fax: 401.456.8590 jwollman@ric.edu
Rhode Island College		
Rhode Island	Paulajo Gaines	255 Westminster St

Department of Education	Director of the Department of Teacher Certification, Preparation, and Professional Development	Providence, RI 02903 401. 222.8805 401. 222.8897 (Anna DiSerio) paulajo.gaines@ride.ri.gov
Rhode Island School of Design	Paul Sproll – on sabbatical '05-'06 John Chamberlin Chair	Art + Design Education Two College Street Providence, RI 02903 Voice: 401.454.6132 (Sproll) Voice: 401.454.6133 (Chamberlin) FAX: 401.454.6694 jchamber@risd.edu psproll@risd.edu
Roger Williams University	Sandra B. Schreffler Interim Dean of Education	Roger Williams University One Old Ferry Road Bristol, RI 02809 401.254.3422 sschreffler@rwu.edu
Salve Regina University	Brian McCadden Chair	100 Ochre Point Newport, RI 02840 Voice 401.341.3154 Fax:401.341.2923 brian.mccadden@salve.edu
	Pete Adamy Team Leader Elementary Education	613 Chafee Building Kingston, RI 02881 Voice: 401.874.7036 Fax: 401.874.5471 adamy@uri.edu
University of Rhode Island	David Byrd Director of the School of Education	Chafee Building Kingston, RI 02881 Voice: 401.874.5484 Fax: 401.874.5471 dbyrd@uri.edu
	Winifred E. Brownell, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences	257 Chafee Social Science Center Kingston, RI 02881 Voice 401.874.4101 Fax: 401.874.2892 winnie@uri.edu

Project update and work plan: The annual report for year one of our TQE project was due May 1, 2005, prior to the completion of year one activities. Between May 1, 2005 and September 30, 2005, \$384,798.65 were expended on year one activities. The project work plan, detailed below, outlines the work accomplished during the second year of our project. It has been expanded to include the three months of work that occurred between the time the first annual report was due, and the commencement of the second project year in October.

Objective #1: Increase collaboration and dialogue among arts and sciences professors, teacher education professors and K-12 teachers and administrators through the development and implementation of a plan to ensure articulation between national content standards, the content knowledge of teacher education candidates and their ability of apply this knowledge.			
Activities	Benchmarks	Timeline	Work Accomplished 6/01/05 – 5/31/06
1.1 Convene teacher education and arts and sciences representatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outline of project goals and review of national content standards each area of certification. After first year review of student content assessments will become a focus within the process. 	September of each year	<p>A cross institutional team from each of the 8 college partners has met regularly this year to analyze national standards, assessments, and best practice in arts and science as they relate to the preparation of teacher education students. The team reviewed appropriate national standards, NCATE requirements and assessments in each program area.</p> <p>An institute was conducted on 06/24/05 at which Dr. E. Lynne Weisenbach and several arts and science deans provided ideas from the STEP Project that can be replicated at partner institutions. A second institute was conducted during the summer to provide the partners with a deeper understanding of the PRAXIS II Elementary Examination and how the data from this examination could be used to inform</p>

			content preparation.
<p>1.2 Campus Dialogue committee participants meet to design a plan to ensure articulation between national content standards and the content knowledge of teacher education candidates and progress made toward and data analyses on their ability of apply this knowledge as beginning teachers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written reports on national standards for the content areas presently related to teacher certification • Completed articulation plans for each program (goal revision of curriculum as required to represent knowledge of content standards) reviewed by Content Knowledge team. • Plan outline and monitoring of plan to ensure articulation between arts and sciences courses and current national and state standards for teachers is reviews annually. • Design and revise a plan for review of assessment activities used to review student content knowledge gained from arts and science curriculum. The next step will be the review of education courses and activities relative to students' ability to apply knowledge gained to educate children and adolescents. Data collection starts after first year. • Institutions report on data on candidate's knowledge, ability to design, implement and 	<p>October of each year November of each year</p> <p>December of each year</p> <p>February of each year</p> <p>May of each year</p>	<p>Colleges met in arts and science and education work groups on their specific campuses for this grant. This summer 2005 work provided the foundation for this teamwork.</p>

	<p>assess instruction and student progress and prepare the report for institutional changes based upon data.</p>		
<p>1.3 District based initiatives to strengthen elementary teacher math and science knowledge.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School based study of GLEs in math and content standards in science. • Assessment of faculty knowledge in these areas and development of school initiative and individual I-Plan goals. • Design and implement content focused professional development for teachers 	<p>March 2005</p> <p>May 2005</p> <p>July 2005</p>	<p>Central Falls increased the alignment between its curriculum and the Math GLEs and worked with faculty to develop an understanding of Science GLEs. Newport conducted school-based study groups to support a deeper understanding of mathematics GLEs with the goal of moving from awareness to implementation. Pawtucket worked with Rhode Island College to increase</p>
<p>Outcomes: This second year found partners working closely with arts and science faculty to establish curriculum alignment plans on their campuses.</p>			
<p>Measures: In subsequent years of the grant state licensure examinations and teacher preparation program measures of content knowledge; Beginning Teachers who meet the definition of “highly qualified”, and program approval standard for content knowledge will provide measures of success.</p>			

Objective # 2: Teacher candidates and beginning teachers will increase their ability to use technology effectively to increase K-12 student achievement.			
Activities	Benchmarks	Timeline	Work Accomplished 6/01/05 – 5/31/06
2.1 SOE/A&S dialogue includes modeling of technology use in the A&S curricula	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ID of A&S instructors who are exemplary users of technology in their IHE courses • Inclusion of examples of technology use in dialogue process 	<p>June of each project year -2005 – 2009</p> <p>Each dialogue – 2005 - 2009</p>	<p>The Objective 2 Steering Committee continued to meet regularly during the second year of this project. The committee worked together to coordinate efforts across partners, and to track progress on the outcomes for this objective. Each of the higher education partners with colleges of Arts and Sciences at their institution continued their work to collaborate with colleagues in these colleges. This work was focused on helping Arts and Sciences faculty to better integrate technology into the courses that are taken by their pre-service teachers.</p> <p>Some examples of this work include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training at Roger Williams University in content specific software applications, the use of multimedia equipment, and techniques for using tablet PCs. At RWU, there has also been ongoing work to integrate technology into the pre-service methods courses. This includes hardware and software in the area of assistive technologies, and relevant hardware integration into the math and science methods courses. • While the Rhode Island School of Design (RISD)

			<p>does not have a college of Arts and Sciences, they have continued their work with technology integration by creating a new digital design course for their pre-service teachers in their Art and Design Education program. These pre-service teachers have used technology to create digital assessment portfolios and in their practicum work in Providence K-12 schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providence College (PC) continued their coordination with faculty in their Development of Western Civilization (DWC) program. This partnership continues to work on the integration of technology in to the main DWC course, which is taken by all students at the university, including pre-service teachers. The partners at PC held a workshop for DWC faculty on the use of the campus electronic course management system. A workshop was also held for pre-service teachers, in which DWC faculty to help students learn about the potential uses of technology in civics instruction, and modeled effective integration of technology as well. • The University of Rhode Island partners also continued their work with colleagues in the College of Arts and Sciences. In
--	--	--	--

			<p>coordination with the Dean, a call for proposals was put out in the spring asking faculty to propose activities that coordinate content area instruction and technology. They are now in the process of reviewing those applications, and anticipate the awarding small grants to several winning proposals whose authors will work over the summer to redesign their course curricula to better focus on content area instruction and the integration of technology.</p> <p>Measurement of pre-service teacher’s confidence in their ability to use technology effectively in their teaching continued during the second year of this project as well. Several of the higher education partners used the technology skills confidence survey developed at URI, and at least one partner utilized their own in-house survey.</p>
<p>2.2 K-12 training designed and implemented</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purchase of district mobile labs • Development K-12 tech training for fall and spring • ID Exemplary K-12 technology users. 	<p>January 2005</p> <p>Summers, 2005 – 2008</p> <p>Each fall & spring –</p>	<p>While two of the three partnership K-12 school districts had not purchased their mobile labs by the end of the first project year, all three districts have now used those funds to buy mobile lab technology and software. Second-year funds have been used to update hardware and software for these mobile labs, and the hardware and software were used during the second year of the project to plan and</p>

	Professional development conducted in districts	2005 - 2009	implement technology training for district teachers.
<p>Outcomes: The team worked to support a redesign of A&S curricula to incorporate technology more effectively into the teacher education experience across disciplines. Changes in preparation will lead to teacher candidates’ and beginning teachers’ use of technology in content-area instruction in the K-12 classroom increasing over the course of the project. Teacher candidates’ and beginning teachers’ confidence in the instructional use of technology with K-12 students will increase.</p>			
<p>Measure: In future years course syllabi and instructor surveys regarding technology use in A&S classes will be examined and an analysis of teacher candidates’ lesson plans and teaching logs to identify frequency and nature of technology integration over time will be conducted. Beginning in 2006 the <i>Confidence in Skills Survey</i> – designed and used for URI PT3 project to measure change in teacher candidates’ confidence in their ability to use technology effectively in their teaching will be administered to a group of candidates.</p>			

Objective #3: Teacher candidates will become skilled in addressing issues of race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, language, and special needs in their instruction and learn to work more closely with families through their clinical experiences.			
Activities	Benchmarks	Timeline	Work Accomplished 6/01/05 – 5/31/06
3.1 Preparation programs work with consultants to redesign curriculum	All teacher preparation programs will revise curricula to include training of candidates in adapting instruction for diverse learners (i.e., racial, ethnic, socio economic, language, and special needs diversity). All teacher preparation programs will include work in the community, outside of schools, as part of the clinical experiences. At least 50% of the teacher preparation programs will establish community advisory groups for their clinical experiences.	June 2006 June 2007 June 2009	A cross institutional team representing the 8 college and 3 school district partners has met several times to review common goals at partner institutions that promote valuing the diversity of learners, focus on supporting the academic achievement of these learners and begin to explore the assessment of these experiences during their teacher preparation. The team conducted a symposium for Diversity and Clinical Experiences on 06/28/05 that included teachers, parents, community partners, and teacher education faculty. Dr. Beth Harry of the University of Miami facilitated a discussion of what a teacher coming into each district needs to know and be able to do to succeed with students and families in the districts. A follow-up seminar was conducted on 08/18/05 at which Dr. Asa Hilliard of Georgia State University continued the development work with this group. The development team worked with community groups in each of the partner districts to bring their representatives into the above discussions and summer institutes.
3.2 Develop, validate, test, and implement	Teacher preparation programs will develop a set of valid assessment tasks that can be incorporated into clinical	June 2006	The Team has worked to identify an assessment process for diversity in the clinical experiences. Programs identified the need to develop clinical

<p>teaching and assessment tasks for clinical experiences to foster culturally responsive teaching.</p>	<p>experiences. 10% of candidates in preparation programs will pilot test the instruments. Preparation program assessment systems modified to include new assessments, including training for clinical faculty and cooperating teachers.</p>	<p>June 2007 June 2008</p>	<p>assessments – assessing quality of student teaching experiences in terms of diversity and what do we expect from clinical experiences. Based on answer to those questions, the team will decide how to assess (ask the students, supervisors, teachers, etc.). Assessment would be embedded within the field placements and classrooms. Diversity would be included among the assessment points. The key criteria to be asses would be can one articulate the components of an exemplary diverse classroom and can teacher candidates differentiate instruction. Once developed, 10% of teacher candidates would pilot these assessments</p>
<p>3.3 Work with community groups to establish ways in which candidates and beginning teachers establish new contacts with parents and students outside of the school.</p>	<p>A community advisory panel with representation of key constituencies from the districts will be established. New structures for working with students and faculty outside of the school will be identified. 10% of students and their cooperating teachers will be engaged in clinical experiences with some level of contact working with students and parents outside of the school. All preparation programs will revise curricula to include working with families to support student learning.</p>	<p>February 2005 June 2005 June 2007 June 2009</p>	<p>The development team has worked with community groups in each of the partner districts to bring their representatives into the development work and summer institutes.</p>
<p>Outcomes: The second year saw the Team leading efforts in helping teacher preparation programs to strengthen clinical experiences and links to the communities by establishing community advisory groups, adding clinical experiences outside of school settings, revising curriculum to strengthen the emphasis on teaching English Language</p>			

Learners, students with special needs, and students from various racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds, increasing the emphasis on working with parents and families as part of teaching, and adding additional assessments to teacher preparation programs that emphasize these skills.

Measure: In subsequent years data collection will focus on assessment processes used for clinical experiences.

Objective #4: Develop school-based induction programs to support preservice and beginning teachers that support school-based initiatives to increase retention of highly qualified teachers.			
Activities	Benchmarks	Timeline	Work Accomplished 6/01/05 – 5/31/06
4.1 Develop school-based induction programs	<p>Six schools will be identified to develop school-based induction programs</p> <p>School teams will identify the specific needs of their building and beginning teachers.</p> <p>All provisionally and professionally certified teachers in these schools will have approved I-Plans</p> <p>24 mentors trained in skills expected by the mentor program standards and tailored to building needs.</p>	<p>October 2004</p> <p>February 2005</p> <p>April 2005</p> <p>July 2005 (and annually)</p>	<p>A cross district coordinating group has met regularly to identify and plan activities for the districts. The decision was made to focus on district-wide needs for mentoring and induction. The team has prioritized the skill and knowledge sets that are most needed in the districts, including work linked to the content, technology, and diversity efforts from the first three objectives and I-Plans for teachers. A summer institute was conducted August 22-25, 2005 to train mentors at Level 1 (Participants 24) and Levels 2&3 (Participants: 15). Another Level 1 training is scheduled for June 2006. In addition, 3 Network Dinner Sessions were conducted with an approximate attendance of 100 participants each time that included both mentors and mentees.</p> <p>This month (May 12, 2006) a training session Helping New Teachers Thrive was conducted for representatives of the participating school district partners.</p>

<p>4.2 Develop a model for intensive intervention for schools in need of support</p>	<p>A team from all partners will build a model for school intervention that culls from the successful practices of the first three years of the project. Three schools in need of improvement will be identified for intervention. Support through pre-service teachers, induction program, and professional development for teachers will be implemented.</p>	<p>April 2007 June 2007 September 2007</p>	<p>The Governing Board has noted that in subsequent years of the project the goal will be to bring the work of the various objectives together for a more focused model for schools in need of improvement.</p>
<p>4.3 Develop a process for gathering feedback from program graduates on the quality of preparation</p>	<p>Survey and telephone protocols will be developed and administered to a sample of 25% of the 2005 graduates of RI teacher preparation programs. Programs will review results and make changes to assure that candidates are better prepared for beginning as teachers. Programs will implement a system for regularly collecting data from graduates to inform curriculum changes.</p>	<p>June 2006 June 2007 June 2009</p>	<p>A coordinating team with representatives from the eight colleges and universities has been meeting monthly to design a common process for gathering feedback from graduates. A survey instrument has been developed, and pilot tested. In June 2006, it will be administered to a sample of 2005 graduates at all eight teacher education institutions.</p>
<p>Outcomes: The project is working with the three school districts to improve mentor training in a way that will help establish a systematic induction program for beginning teachers to improve teacher quality and increase retention. The combination of improved partnerships, school-based induction programs, and professional development in support of I-Plans will be used to develop a comprehensive school support system in later years of the grant. The Survey of program Graduates will assess how effective teacher preparation was in preparing new teachers for their first year experience.</p>			
<p>Measure: Data collection will include data from surveys of beginning.</p>			

Objective #5: Develop a prototype and implement a non-traditional certification program in a high needs area.			
Activities	Benchmarks	Timeline	Work Accomplished 6/01/05 – 5/31/06
5.1 Convene a development team to design a program prototype.	<p>Establish admissions criteria and process for candidates</p> <p>Initial draft of summer curriculum and courses</p> <p>Published criteria for mentors and the curriculum for their training</p> <p>Draft of support processes and assessment during clinical experience</p> <p>Revised materials based upon review and critique of prototype</p>	<p>December 2004</p> <p>March 2005</p> <p>March 2005</p> <p>May 2005</p> <p>June 2005</p>	<p>A development team composed of district personnel, leadership from four colleges, and the Rhode Island Department of Education has met regularly to provide direction for the development of an alternative certification program in the areas of chemistry, mathematics, physics and secondary special education. The team identified the parameters of this program , conduced 2 public recruiting sessions in April 2006 and currently has identified approximately 20 students who will begin in the summer of 2006.</p>
5.2 Design summer training for candidates	<p>Completely designed curriculum and courses</p> <p>Implementation of curriculum with first cohort of 20 candidates.</p> <p>Implementation of revised curriculum with second cohort of 20 candidates.</p> <p>Modified curriculum to address additional certificates</p>	<p>August 2005</p> <p>August 2006</p> <p>August 2007</p> <p>August 2008</p>	<p>The leadership team established the structure for admissions, curriculum, and mentoring and identified the faculty and mentors.</p>
5.3 Design summer training for mentors	<p>Completely designed curriculum</p> <p>Implementation of curriculum with first cohort of 20 mentors.</p> <p>Implementation of revised curriculum with second</p>	<p>August 2005</p> <p>August 2006</p> <p>August 2007</p> <p>August 2008</p>	<p>The leadership team established the structure for admissions, curriculum, and mentoring and identified the faculty and mentors.</p>

	cohort of 20 mentors. Modified curriculum to address additional certificates		
5.4 Design of clinical component and assessments of candidates	Completely designed curriculum and assessments Implementation of curriculum with first cohort of 20 candidates and mentors. Implementation of revised curriculum with second cohort of 20 candidates and mentors. Modified curriculum to address additional certificates	August 2005 August 2006 August 2007 August 2008	The leadership team established the structure for admissions, curriculum, and mentoring and identified the faculty and mentors.
<p>Outcomes: During the second year a non-traditional route to certification was established and mentors were trained for this program. After Year 4, at least 20 teachers will be certified and highly qualified in high needs areas through the non-traditional route.</p>			
<p>Measure: The number of teachers in the identified high needs fields in the school districts that sponsor the program who meet the definition of highly qualified.</p>			