

Transcript for 6A-5.066 November 10, 2014, 2:00 pm, EST

Slide 1: Webex team, please start the recording.

Good day, ladies and gentlemen and welcome to the Rule Development workshop and webinar, with an opportunity for public input on draft rule text for Rule 6A-5.066 – Approval of Teacher Preparation Programs. With me today are members of the Educator Preparation Office, as well as Jason Gaitanis, with the Division of Accountability, Research and Measurement, as well as other Department staff.

So that everyone is aware, we are conducting this workshop both as a webinar via conference call and face-to-face. I would like to go through a few instructions for all of our different groups of people joining us today. For everyone's information, today's webinar and conference call are being recorded and the recording, the presentation materials and the transcripts will be posted to our website within 10 days. It will be extremely helpful if you have the draft rule text available so you can follow along as we go through the rule. The draft rule language was sent to all teacher preparation program listservs, and any members of the public who requested copies on Friday, November 7, with revisions to the main rule document on Sunday, November 9. All of these documents will be posted as soon as possible. For those of you in the room who did not bring a copy of the rule and supporting documents with you, we have copies available in the back of the room.

Slide 2: We are going to conduct our workshop in three sections.

The first part will be an overview presentation of the authorizing statutes that are the underpinnings to this rule and form the basis for this draft rule language. Within this part we will then provide to you the basic rule text itself.

After we have reviewed the statutes and more specifically the rule language being discussed today, there will be two parts that will be interactive.

These interactive portions of today's workshop include Part Two where everyone who is participating, whether it is via the webinar or conference call OR in-person, can ask clarifying questions. This provides an opportunity for someone to make sure he or she understands properly what was said during the presentation, whether it was in the statute or in the draft rule text. These questions – and also the comments that follow – will help the Department to improve the draft rule text.

After the question and answer session has ended, we will go to Part Three, which is the actual public comments' section for this rule development workshop on the rule itself.

During this time, audience participants, whether physically participating by being in the meeting room, or participating by conference call or webinar, who wish to make a comment about the

rule, will have an opportunity to do so. During this time there will be no responses, or questions, or debate.

Slide 3: A few more details about input and participation.

When you are asking a question or making a comment, please state your name and your affiliation, which can be just your institution, your school district, your association, or anything else you want us to know about where you are from.

Persons in the room who wish to ask questions or make comments, we ask that you fill out a speaker's card where you will write your name and your affiliation down so that we have the spelling correct for the record. Please give your Speaker's Card to one of the Department staff prior to the question and comment time.

If you are participating by conference call, please follow the instructions that the operator will provide during part two and three.

If you are participating via the webinar, you can type your question into the text box.

When we get to Part Three, the Comment Section, depending on how many people are in the queue to make comments and depending on how much meeting time we have left, we may limit those comments to a certain amount of time that allows everyone the opportunity to speak who wishes to do so.

If you prefer to submit your questions or comments in writing, you can do this at any time.

You can mail them to us; you can leave them here if you are in the room. You can provide input to the State Board of Education's website as noted on this slide or you can submit questions or comments via a special email box that has been established for this rule – TeacherPrepRuleDev@fldoe.org.

Slide 4: One last thing about input and participation.

This rule is being advertised for public comment. It is draft rule text.

It is extremely important to us that we have your comments and suggestions for change.

This can be things like "Please keep this text."

"Please delete this section."

"Please add something about dot dot dot"

Or “I like where you are going on this except that I think that you need to change it to – or clarify it to say – such and such.

In order to improve the rule text, we also ask that you be as specific as possible.

So let’s go ahead into Part One, which is the part of the presentation regarding what’s in the law and an overview of what is in the draft rule text.

Slide 5: The first item we should discuss and share is the rule adoption timeline.

As I mentioned, we are currently in rule development – and we have been since August 2013 when we conducted two public workshops in which we reviewed the changes in the laws that impact state-approved teacher preparation programs in Florida.

Then on June 25 and 27 we conducted additional rule development workshops with presented draft rule language at that time.

Throughout July, August, September, October and up to today, we have reviewed public feedback and comments from these workshops. Public input and feedback will remain open all the way until this rule goes to the State Board of Education for possible adoption. Throughout this time the public comment avenues are open to you and changes to the proposed language being presented to you today for your consideration will continue.

In December, after reviewing any additional public input or comment we have received as a result of today’s workshop, we anticipate that we will publish a final version which the Commissioner will present to the State Board of Education for consideration at the January 2015 Board meeting.

If the rule is adopted, we anticipate that we will begin training immediately on the new initial and continued approval standards and begin accepting new program folios in the spring of 2015.

We also anticipate that all approved programs will submit their annual program evaluation plans, the IPEPs, APEPs and DPEPs, by the usual time, November 15, 2015, responding to the newly established standards. We will discuss this more during the technical assistance period throughout the spring, summer and fall of 2015.

In addition, if the rule is adopted, Continued Approval Site Visits would resume in Fall 2016, a change from what has been announced in the past. This will provide an opportunity for programs to familiarize themselves with the new standards and prepare for their full implementation.

Slide 6: So let's begin a discussion of Rule 6A-5.066, Approval of Teacher Preparation Programs.

We first will begin with a brief discussion of rule authority and what the law says is the content for this rule.

Slide 7: Florida has three types of state-approved teacher preparation programs – each one with its own statutory authority.

The first one we will discuss is what we call “Initial Teacher Preparation” programs or ITPs. These are your traditional teacher preparation programs that are in our colleges and universities and they often lead to a bachelor's or higher degree.

In Spring 2013 and effective July 1, 2013, Section 1004.04 of the Florida Statutes was revised. There were three major revisions to this law:

First – the law revised and streamlined what is called the Uniform Core Curricula and Candidate Assessment for these programs.

Second, the law revised the process for the initial and continued approval of these state-approved programs.

And third, the law revised the requirements for preservice field experiences, including the qualifications of college/university faculty and supervisors of these field experiences, and the qualifications of the school district personnel who oversee our candidates in the classroom during field experiences.

Slide 8: The second statute that impacted state-approved teacher preparation programs was Section 1004.85 of the Florida Statutes, titled Postsecondary Educator Preparation Institutes or, as we call them, EPIs.

This law was also revised in Spring 2013 and went into effect on July 1, 2013.

It also had four major changes:

First, it revised the definition of the term “educator preparation institute.”

Second, it authorized a qualified private provider to be able to offer an EPI if it sought approval and met requirements to offer a competency-based certification program like the colleges and universities are able to do in Florida.

Third, it revised the criteria for approval of these preparation programs.

And fourth, it required passing scores on all Florida Teacher Certification Examinations in order to be considered a Program Completer.

Slide 9: And finally, there is a third statute that governs the third type of state-approved teacher preparation programs – professional development certification programs, formerly called district alternative certification programs.

These programs are authorized through Section 1012.56 of the Florida Statutes and changes to the law were effective July 1, 2013, just like the other two.

The changes in law not only changed the name of this program, but gave school districts the opportunity to choose whether or not it wished to offer the program to its instructional personnel. The former law required school districts to offer this program.

Second, the law revised the requirements for demonstrating mastery of professional education competence.

And third, it also required passing scores on all Florida Teacher Certification Examinations in order to be considered a Program Completer.

Slide 10: Furthermore, revisions to Section 1004.04, Florida Statutes, emphasized that Continued Approval of a teacher preparation program shall be based on:

One – evidence that the program continues to implement the requirements for initial approval;
and

Two – significant, objective, and quantifiable measures of the program and the performance of the program completers.

Slide 11: It is this second statement -- significant, objective, and quantifiable measures of the program and the performance of the program completers – that drives one of the major reasons why there was a need for rule revisions and why we are here today.

All three statutes – 1004.04, 1004.85 and 1012.56 – include the same criteria for continued approval of state-approved programs based on evidence of completer performance in six different metrics that were cited in law. There is one exception as noted by the asterisk on this slide – professional development certification programs do not include a metric for placement rate in instructional positions given that the nature of these programs includes the fact that candidates in these programs are already teachers of record and district instructional employees.

The three statutes include changes in law that cites the criteria for continued approval shall include evidence of performance in each of the following six areas as noted on this slide:

1. Placement rate of program completers into instructional positions;

2. Rate of retention for employed program completers;
3. Performance of students in prekindergarten through grade 12 on statewide assessments taught by in-field program completers;
4. Performance of students by student subgroup, as a measure of how well the program prepares teachers to work with a diverse population of students in a variety of settings;
5. Results of program completers' annual evaluations; and
6. Production of program completers in statewide critical teacher shortage areas.

Slide 12: All three laws authorize the State Board of Education to adopt rules for continued approval of these three teacher preparation programs and that the rules must include:

1. A program review process
2. Continued approval timelines; and
3. Performance level targets for each of the continued approval criteria – the performance metrics we just named.

Slide 13: So now, let's turn to the draft rule language itself for your review and consideration.

Slide 14: The draft rule language being proposed for your consideration has been heavily contributed to and influenced by a large number of stakeholders across the state.

First, since Spring of 2011, the Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee, the TLPIC, a Race to the Top stakeholder group, has been providing input, feedback and recommendations to the state on the development and implementation of performance standards and targets for the continued approval of state-approved teacher preparation programs.

This group began with 24 key members of which a third of them represent teacher preparation programs in our colleges and universities and school districts, two school district superintendents, school principals, teachers, district staff, professional development state association representative and others. It was this group that made very specific recommendations to the Uniform Core Curriculum, the six performance metrics, and the changes to the qualifications of individuals who supervise field and clinical experiences that later became the language in Senate Bill 1664 which resulted in changes to the three statutes that govern Florida's state-approved teacher preparation programs.

Second, the Department contracted with the leadership of the teacher preparation programs at the University of Florida to work with all colleges and universities across Florida to review and propose revisions to the Initial and Continued Approval Standards. Based on UF's work with colleges and universities through face-to-face regional meetings, webinars and conference calls, draft recommendations were submitted to the Commissioner for consideration for changes to the standards. These recommendations formed a major part of the draft rule language you see today.

Third, several institutions, along with a core team of teacher preparation program experts and leaders, worked for the past year on taking those standards and operationalizing them into two Pilot Site Visits whereby the revised standards were used to provide guidance for continued approval decisions. Members of these teams, all from teacher preparation programs within the state, have helped to revise and fine tune the processes needed for making continued approval decisions.

And fourth, as mentioned before, two Rule Development Workshops were conducted in August 2013, as well as two in June 2014, at which time public input was sought on recommendations to revisions to the rule language. Public comments were a major contributor to the process and proposed draft rule language being presented to you today.

Slide 15: So let's review the revised structure of Rule 6A-5.066.

1. The first major section of the rule includes a definition section of the terms used in initial and continued approval of teacher preparation programs. This sets forth a common language to ensure we all understand what is meant by any and all terms in this process.
2. Second, you will note that the proposed initial approval processes for your consideration are now all identical, no matter what type of program we are referencing – the initial or traditional teacher preparation programs; educator preparation institutes; or the professional development certification programs.
3. Third – the same is true for the proposed language for your consideration for the 'continued approval processes.' These processes are the same for all three types of programs.
4. Fourth, the proposed rule language for your consideration includes performance targets for each of the metrics that are specified in law. As we have already stated, each of the laws states that the State Board of Education will set those performance targets. Initially, the TLPIC recommended performance targets after reviewing data based on each of the performance metrics over a period of years and over numerous cohorts of completers to determine the impact of these performance targets on individual programs. The proposed draft rule language for your consideration today includes public input received since June when the initial language was proposed, and the continued review of data from all

programs over a period of up to six years to help inform recommendations for draft rule language – for your consideration and the consideration by the State Board.

5. Finally, you will note that the proposed rule language being presented today includes at the end an incorporation of seven documents into the rule. These seven documents include the initial and continued approval standards for each type of program and the procedures that guide their implementation.

Slide 16: So let's walk through the proposed language of the rule that is being presented to you for your review and consideration:

First, as there was when you last reviewed the draft rule language, there is a definitions section to establish a common language of terms used in teacher preparation programs.

It consists of 30 definitions for your review and consideration.

Based on public input and feedback, there have been several changes made to draft language for your consideration. I will review a few of these changes here:

First, “Annual demonstration of experience in relevant pre-kindergarten through grade 12 school settings.” The draft language being presented to you today includes additional language that specifies that these yearly school-based experiences are related to the subject matter and grade levels of the field experience course or courses or field experiences or internships that the program faculty are assigned to teach or supervise.

Second, equivalent program's definition has been further clarified with language that states that equivalent programs are a teacher preparation program that are offered in more than one institution or school district preparing candidates in the same specific educator certification subject area or areas. An equivalent program is based on the program code that is assigned. Therefore, if elementary education with a reading endorsement and an ESOL endorsement – program code 494 – is offered at institution A and it is also offered at institution B – then these are equivalent programs. A program that is Not Equivalent would be an elementary ed program with only the ESOL endorsement. Only another elementary ed program with both the reading endorsement and ESOL endorsement would be equivalent.

For the purposes of the Report Cards, an equivalent program does not distinguish whether the program terminates in a bachelor's degree or in a higher degree. For example, if an institution has both a bachelor's and a master's level program, there is no differentiation since the equivalent program code does not distinguish between degree levels.

In addition, we propose to you that all World Languages programs be considered one program due to the very low numbers of completers in almost all of these programs across the state. For

those institutions that have programs that prepare individuals in any of the World Languages, your input and comment would be appreciated on this topic.

Another definition that was slightly modified was “in-field teacher” to indicate a program completer is both trained and certified in the specific subject area.

We also want to bring to your attention that the definitions for both Placement and Retention contain features to include employment data on program completers from both p-12 out-of-state and private schools, if the data are available and have been verified, for program completers employed in either their first or second year following program completion. Through technical assistance, a means for verifying the data for acceptance for both placement and retention will be provided.

Slide 17: We also want to bring to your attention that new language has been inserted into the definitions section that addresses requirements for program completers that must have the ESOL endorsement. This impacts only the ITP or Initial Teacher Preparation Programs. This requirement used to be in Statute prior to July 1, 2013. We are adding it into the rule. The requirement that ITP or initial teacher preparation program completers of primary language certification program areas – that is, Pre-K/Primary Education, Elementary Education, Middle Grades English, English 6-12, and Exceptional Student Education – these completers must all meet ESOL Endorsement requirements as part of program completion requirements. All other certification areas must complete an ESOL survey course.

Slide 18: The second section of the proposed revised rule includes the section on Initial Approval Processes.

You will note that the processes are the same – identical – for all state-approved programs.

The rule also incorporates a new form – the Request to Submit Form – and we request that you review that form for clarity and understanding.

The rule specifies that new programs will be submitted as electronic folios – and specifications for what must be in an initial folio in order to meet requirements are cited in the appropriate document for that type of program.

For example, if the new folio is for an “initial teacher preparation program, “the initial approval standards are detailed and explained in the form ITP IAS-2014. IAS stands for “initial approval standards.” EPIs and PDCPs have their own forms – but you will note, even the standards are closely aligned and very similar.

Within the rule, there are proposed specifications for the review timelines – and specification for a final decision about the Initial Folio.

If the proposed draft language is adopted by the State Board, new programs will either be approved or denied. Programs that are denied – after being given an opportunity to resubmit information on deficiencies within a specified timeframe – may submit another complete folio for review and possible approval.

Slide 19: So, moving on to the next section in the rule, Section 3 – for your consideration and comment:

In section three, again you will note that the proposed continued approval processes are identical for all three programs.

The draft language describes the program requirements for continued approval, including:

1. Programs must submit candidate and completer data annually to the department through the authorized channels (for example to the Board of Governors for SUS institutions or CCTCMIS for state colleges);
2. Annual program evaluation plans – the IPEPs, APEPs and DPEPs that are due November 15 of each year;
3. An Annual Program Performance Report Card or APPR for each program that is based on the six performance metrics and performance targets (except for PDCP programs, they have five performance metrics and targets);
4. Draft rule language also proposes that the performance level targets for each metric will each yield a score of 1 to 4 – which was recommended by the TLPIC; and
5. Each APPR or Annual Program Performance Card will have a summative rating score that will range from 1.0 to 4.0.

Slide 20: The next part of the proposed draft rule language includes the six performance **metrics** cited in each of the laws governing each teacher preparation program, and the performance **targets**. You will note that the definitions for the performance metrics may have changed since the last time you reviewed the metrics. The changes in definitions or parameters were based on public input and comment and also on a continued review of data across all programs and up to six years.

The first one – Placement Rate – which is the percentage of program completers who become employed their first or second year. As mentioned in the Definitions Section, that is subsection (1) of the rule, we propose adding additional language in this section to not only include “employed in an instructional position in a Florida public school,” but also “employed in p-12 private schools and out-of-state schools when data are available and verifiable.”

Slide 21: On this slide you can see the four Performance Target levels being proposed for your consideration and comment for the Performance Metric on Placement Rate. The Performance Target levels of 4, 3, 2 and 1 are determined by the upper and lower confidence intervals for the aggregate of all equivalent programs across the state.

Slide 22: The second Performance Metric – Retention Rate – is the average number of years program completers were employed in a 5-year period following initial placement. Initial placement, in this instance, is defined as the first employment in either of the 2 subsequent years following program completion.

Just as we proposed in the Placement metric, we propose adding additional language to not only include employed in an instructional position in a Florida public school, but in p-12 private schools and out-of-state schools when data are available and verifiable.

Slide 23: On this slide you can see the four levels being proposed for your consideration and comment for Retention Rate and its four Performance Targets.

Each Performance Target Level, beginning with 4 and moving to the right, 3, 2 and 1, we are proposing this Performance Target is determined by the average number of years employed in a 5-year period following initial placement and setting specific cut scores for each. These cut scores were based on reviewing data across all programs and across the past six years.

Slide 24: The third performance metric with Performance Target Levels being proposed in draft rule language is on “Student Learning Growth” data. Student Learning Growth is the performance of prekindergarten through grade 12 students on statewide assessments using the results of the student learning growth formula per section 1012.34, Florida Statutes.”

The score for this Performance Metric is based on in-field program completers from the previous 3-year period who received a student learning growth score from the most recent year. As you know, not all programs would receive data on this particular metric. Only programs whose program completers were trained and are in-field to teach English/Language Arts/ Reading courses in grades 4 through 10, and/or Mathematics in grades 4 through 8, would have results reported for this metric.

Slide 25: Slide 25 presents the proposed Performance Target levels that are based on student learning scores above or below the standard for evaluation using the standard error and the derived confidence intervals for local determination using zero as the baseline. For this particular Performance Target, you will note that there are only 3 levels described, Level 4 for 4 points, Level 3 for 3 points, and Level 1 for 1 point.

Slide 26: The fourth performance target being proposed in draft rule language for your review and consideration is on “Student performance by subgroup” – which is a measure of how well each program prepares teachers to work with a diverse population of students in a variety of settings throughout Florida’s schools.

This Performance Metric’s score is based on completers from the previous 3-year period who received a student learning growth score from the most recent year.

The target levels under consideration for this performance target are based on the percentage of subgroups that meet or exceed the state standard for performance. The eight subgroups are listed on this slide – as described in Federal law under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Note that data are available only for program completers who have students with statewide assessment results associated with them. Therefore, only programs that have data for Performance Target Three on Student Learning Growth Data would receive data on this metric.

The Performance Target Levels take into consideration the statewide average of all students in the specific subcategory for Reading and again for Math. It provides data on how students in a specific category performed while being taught by in-field, trained in-program completers as compared to the average of the statewide performance of all students in that category taught by all teachers, (that is, the *Reading statewide average of all students and/or the Math statewide average of all students.*)

Slide 27: On this slide you can see the four Performance Target levels being proposed for your consideration and comment. The language for these Performance Target Levels is the same as the last rule development workshop.

Slide 28: The fifth performance target being proposed in draft rule language for your review and consideration is on “teacher evaluation results,” which includes the annual evaluation results for all program completers as measured by each public school district’s state-approved instructional personnel evaluation system. This performance target includes a breakdown of the most recent annual evaluation results among the most recent three cohorts of program completers who were employed in an instructional position in a Florida public school district – including charter schools.

Slide 29: On this slide you can see the four levels being proposed for your consideration and comment. The four Performance Target Levels being proposed for your consideration are based on the percentage of program completers who received highly effective and effective ratings. This language was presented to you in the last public workshop.

Slide 30: And last, the sixth performance target being proposed in draft rule language for your review and consideration is on “the production of program completers in critical teacher shortage area” as identified in statute. This Performance Metric received quite a bit of public comment and input. Based on the public comment, we are proposing that this metric be a Bonus Only

metric with a score based on the number of completers from the most recent year compared to the number of completers from the previous year in which completers successfully completed a critical teacher shortage area identified by the State Board. Endorsement stand-alone programs or programs that include a reading endorsement and/or ESOL endorsement would not qualify the program as a critical shortage area.

Slide 31: On this slide you can see that only 1 Performance Target Level is identified – Level 4 worth 4 points. If the critical teacher shortage program increased the number of program completers compared to the year before with a minimum of 2 completers in each year, then the program will receive the Bonus of 4 points.

Slide 32: This slide presents the proposed calculation for the Bonus Points earned in the sixth metric. If a program is eligible for the Bonus, the summative rating for the APPR, or annual program performance report, is weighted and calculated as follows.

1. The average is taken of all other performance target level scores earned. This would be at least 2 measures, but up to 5 measures.
2. Then multiply that average by 0.8. Add this to the
3. Bonus Score of 4 that is multiplied by 0.2.
4. The resulting score is the Summative Rating Score when a Bonus is applied.

For example, a program has the following Performance Target Level Scores:

1. Placement – 3.0
2. Retention – 3.0
3. Student performance - 3.0
4. Student performance by subgroup – 2.0
5. Annual evaluations – 3.0

Average is 2.8 – multiplied by 0.8 = 2.24

Bonus score of 4 – multiplied by 0.2 = 0.8

$2.24 + 0.8 = 3.04$ /Summative Rating Score for APPR

Slide 33: On this slide we propose for your consideration and comment the minimum requirements needed for a program to receive an APPR:

The program must have 3 or more completers in the selected cohort period for Placement or Retention AND

The program has 2 or more completers who received an annual evaluation for the Annual Evaluation metric.

So, in order to receive a report card, a program must receive a score – at a minimum – for two Performance Metrics, that is either the Placement metric OR the Retention metric AND the Annual Evaluation metric.

In addition, we propose that if a program does not receive an Annual Program Performance Report, that the Summative Rating Score of zero is applied for that reporting year.

Your feedback on this is appreciated.

Slide 34: In the previous draft language for this rule, it was proposed that each program would have 30 days to review the APPR data that was presented to it by the department and report any potential errors or omissions to the department. Based on public feedback, we are now recommending that this 30 day period be extended to 45 days.

In addition, we recommend that the review and response period before the APPR is made public be extended from 10 days to 15 days. We ask for your input and comment about these changes.

Slide 35: So moving on beyond the Performance Targets – additional elements that are proposed in the draft rule language include:

1. The proposed draft language continues to include a provision for the continued approval period to be 5 years.
2. The process for site visits would include a review of the evidence of each program's implementation of its Continued Approval Standards during the final year of the 5-year period. This review would include a review of all IPEPs, APEPs or DPEPs in that 5-year period; it would include a summary report from each program which includes a summarization of what has occurred across the 5-year period in relationship to the Continued Approval Standards; it would include an off-site review all documentation included in the eIPEP and the Summary Reports; and an on-site review that would validate the information reviewed through interviews. The Continued Approval Site Visit would result in a summative rating score of 1 to 4.

Slide 36: In this slide we propose draft language that addresses those programs that do not have any program completers for 3 consecutive years within a continued approval period. For these programs, and for your consideration and public comment, we propose that these programs shall not receive a continued approval site visit due to no completers in the 3 consecutive years, and therefore no summative rating score for the site visit that did not occur. Again, please review and provide feedback and comment.

Slide 37: Again, on this slide we wish to point out that the Continued Approval Processes are the same for all three types of teacher preparation programs.

The third section of the draft rule language being proposed for your consideration and comment focuses on the **Continued Program Approval Decisions**.

It is proposed that the decision for Continued Approval shall be based on two elements:

1. **The average summative rating score** for all APPRs that were issued during the Continued Approval Period. That score would then be **ADDED TO**...
2. **The summative rating score** for the Continued Approval Site Visit
3. The resulting sum of these two scores would then be averaged – or divided by 2 – yielding an overall Continued Approval Summative Score or CASS of one point zero (1.0) to four point zero (4.0).

Slide 38: That Continued Approval Summative Score – the CASS – would then be attributed to one of the following:

If the Continued Approval Summative Score – or CASS -is above 3.5, the program would be granted “Full Approval with Distinction”

If the Continued Approval Summative Score – or CASS – is 2.4 to 3.5, the program would be granted “Full Approval.”

If the Continued Approval Summative Score -- or CASS – is below 2.4, the program would be designated “Denied” approval.

For those programs that receive a rating of “Denied,” they may apply for initial approval by going through the initial folio request process.

For the record, this Continued Approval process also was a recommendation from the TLPIC and the various level scores for Continued Approval Decisions were based on the review of all programs’ performance since 2006-2007.

Your input and comment on these proposed draft continued approval processes and decisions are welcomed and encouraged.

Slide 39: So let’s move on to the remaining sections of the rule.

Slide 40: The next section of the rule includes a few clarifying language revisions to the current rule pertaining to the Professional Training Option for Content Majors.

As a reminder this option is available to institutions which have an approved “initial teacher preparation program” and it meets the professional preparation coursework requirements prescribed in Rule.

This program includes training in the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices, Reading Competency 2, and it includes school-based field experiences throughout.

Again, the proposed language for your consideration is clarifying language. There are no changes to policies in draft rule text. Your comments are appreciated and welcomed.

Slide 41: The rule in section 5 includes language on the authority of the Commissioner to grant continued approval. The governing statutes provide that authority to the Commissioner.

Slide 42: And finally, in section six, the proposed rule language for your consideration and comment includes the incorporation of all forms that are listed here into the rule by reference.

These forms were sent to you via email on Friday and we ask that you review them as soon as possible. All of them have had changes made to them based on public comment and input. They will also be posted on the department website listed on this slide as soon as possible.

Your review and consideration for these forms is also requested. Please submit comments on these forms.

Slide 43: That concludes the overview of what the laws state and the draft rule language for 6A-5.066 – which was Part One of today’s workshop. Now we will move to Part Two, which is to provide you an opportunity to ask clarifying questions.

As a reminder, you may ask questions to clarify anything in the presentation or the draft text. If we are unable to provide an answer today, we will take your questions and get back with you for a response.

Slide 44: As a reminder, you may ask questions to clarify anything in the presentation or the draft text.

When we get to the comment section, if there many individuals who wish to comment, we may need to limit the time to allow as many as possible to comment before we run out of time.

Remember that input may be provided at any time online at the two addresses noted on this slide.

Slide 45: As you think about the input you might provide, please keep these guidelines in mind.

Slide 46: So let's begin with those who are on the conference call line and then go to those who are in the room. For those who are in the room, we have a microphone so that our recording of today's workshop will capture your question.

Operator, will you please compile the queue for questions and answers at this time.

Let's turn to our audience present today in this room. Does anyone wish to ask a clarifying question?

We will also check the chat area on the webinar for clarifying questions.

Slide 47: With the time remaining, let's turn to comments. We will begin with those in the room and if we have time, will move to those online. Remember, you can add comments via the two websites. Either website is fine

Comments from the conference line? Operator, please compile the queue for comments.

Comments from the chat feature on the webinar?

Slide 48: This concludes our Rule Development Workshop for today. Thank you for your participation throughout – and have a good day.

Slide 49: Webex Team. Please stop the recording.