



**Rhode Island Educator Preparation Programs/Providers
(EPP)**

Rhode Island Local Education Agencies (LEA)

Rhode Island Department of Education (SEA)

**State-Recognized
Partnership Agreement
Tier 2**

Tier 1: Denotes a state-wide agreement between EPPs, LEAs, and RIDE in collaboration for the preparation of high-quality teachers in clinical practice.

Tier 2: Denotes a local partnership agreement formed between an EPP, and a LEA. When in conflict, Tier 1 agreements take priority.

A state-recognized partnership AGREEMENT formalizes any relationship wherein EPPs place pre-service educator candidates in schools/districts for any length of field experience, practicum, or student-teaching.

This collaborative agreement will undergo a vetting process that includes EPPs, LEAs, SEAs, and other appropriate constituents and those who have vetted this document will be listed in the document

This collaborative agreement, supported by RIDE is designed to include all EPPs and LEAs that wish to participate under the terms of this document.

UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS (for discussion)

Questions:

1. *How do we put a structure in place to ensure that this partnership will survive leadership/personnel changes?*
 - A. Tier 1 and Tier 2 partnership agreements should be visited regularly, informally
 - B. Tier 1 and Tier 2 partnership agreements should be formally reviewed every three years.
 - C. Personnel, titles, names, and contact information should be noted on Tier 2 document upon triannual review.
2. *How many districts are capable of doing this? (From a time and resources angle), and what compels a district to enter into an agreement like this?*
 - A. Professional partnerships require commitment from both sides of the partnerships.
 - B. Local partnerships can identify one liaison from the district and one liaison from the EPP that would do the monitor the partnership, identify review cycles, review and revise Tier 2 agreements to better serve the local context.
 - C. Partnership agreements identify protocols for operation that are equitably and fairly administered. Effective agreements can protect the partnership from legal challenges.
3. *How to define terms so that all parties understand and agree upon?*
 - A. It is highly recommended that a glossary be included in all agreements
 - B. This effort will build a catalog of professional vocabulary that will align communications across the profession.
4. *How do we authentically build partnerships (and create this document)? Need to include districts. How did TN do this?*
 - A. PK-12 and EPP partnerships must come together, in person, to address each of the prompts in a process agreed to by both.
 - B. Any constituent group whose signature (and subsequent agreement to the document) are requested should be included in the development of the Tier 1 document
5. *How can RIDE support us in the implementation of these types of partnerships?*

- A. RIDE will warehouse these documents in a public repository on the RIDE website (already built)
 - B. RIDE will publicly celebrate the development of Tier 1 and Tier 2 agreements as a statement of cooperation and a recognition that working together in partnership improves outcomes for teacher candidates, and PK-12 students.
6. What would district and EPP need for this to be successful?
- A. The compulsion to see partnerships as mutually beneficial
 - B. An allotment of time to dive into the partnership agreement, implement it, and evaluate its effectiveness.
 - C. A commitment to continuous agreement and growth for the partnership
7. In terms of statewide agreement- what do we do if an LEA or EPP doesn't want to sign on?
- A. This is not a requirement, but a recommendation to ease the efforts of everyone involved
 - B. If we agree that Clinical Practice is effective, (see research in Tier 1), then it is our humble hope that all LEA's and EPP's would engage in this worthwhile process

PROMPTS

Each Prompt identifies a scope of work to be mutually negotiated and agreed upon between the EPP/PK-12 entity. The goal of each prompt is to articulate and maximize mutual benefit for all constituents. A list of high-leverage instructional practices (HLPs) can be found on Page 7. These practices are included as a resource and guide to contextualize each prompt. Use as needed along with state standards and other local documents that provide guidance for your specific partnership. (A template is provided at the end of this document as a space for you to collaboratively generate your responses to each prompt.)

Prompt 1: Identify how the entities will collaborate to identify recruitment and selection strategies and goals for teacher candidate participation in this partnership, including district orientation and program benchmarks.

Prompt 2: Identify how entities will collaborate to select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high quality clinical educators, both provider and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and pre-K-12 learning and development.

Prompt 3: Identify how entities will determine mutually-agreed upon expectations for teacher candidate preparation that link theory and practice, maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation, and establish shared accountability for candidate outcomes.

Prompt 4: Identify how and when LEA stakeholders will be included in teacher preparation program review and redesign (e.g. assessments, student teaching products and expectations, etc.).

- Prompt 5: Identify how entities will collaborate to incorporate clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration at the LEA site.*
- Prompt 6: Identify how teacher candidates will demonstrate and measure their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development.*
- Prompt 7: Identify what the EPP can offer the LEA in terms of support (e.g. ongoing professional development, clinical educator compensation, PLUs, research, participation in conferences, access to resources, consultation, onsite classes, etc.)*
- Prompt 8: Identify how entities will set goals, collect data, and share data to determine partnership effectiveness.*

****Adapted from the CEEDAR-TN Partnership Agreement**

High-Leverage Practices

High-leverage practices, or HLPs, can be used to help partners identify mutually agreed upon expectations for candidate preparation that link theory and practice, maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation, and establish shared accountability for candidate outcomes. HLPs are a core set of educational practices that are considered the basic fundamentals of teaching. These practices are used constantly and are critical to helping students learn important content. High-leverage practices are also central to supporting students' social and emotional development. They are used across subject areas, grade levels, and contexts. They help us describe **how** teachers deliver effective instruction.

HLPs are intended to provide those who work in school districts in beginning teacher induction and residency programs, or who provide professional development for teachers, with a clear vision of effective teaching. While core HLPs have been identified for general educators ([Teaching Works](#)) and special educators ([CEC/CEEDAR](#)), CEC's HLPs, and their incorporation of culturally responsive approaches, might also be considered effective practice for general education teachers

In the development of mutually beneficial partnerships, HLPs can be used as a guide and a resource to help educator preparation programs and districts focus their scope of work while working through

the prompts above. As such, the table below lists all practices that are culturally relevant and critical for providing high quality K-12 instruction. The select HLPs were chosen for their relationship to the RI CEEDAR State Leadership Team (SLT) goal areas. After completing the prompts above, consider how your responses are aligned to these best practices and the extent to which your partnership will lead to high quality, practice-based teacher preparation using these high-leverage practices.

Reflection: High-Leverage and Culturally Responsive Practices In Clinical Practice/Partnership

High-leverage Practices (Teaching Works)	High-Leverage Instructional Practices (CEC/CEEDAR)	Culturally Responsive Education Themes and Practices	Reflection: Was the HLP addressed in any of your prompts above? If so, which one(s)?
<u>Explaining and modeling content, practices, and strategies</u>	Use explicit instruction	Modeling	
	Teach cognitive and metacognitive strategies to support learning and independence	Child Centered Instruction Critical Thinking	
Diagnosing particular common patterns of student thinking and development in a subject-matter domain	Systematically design instruction towards a specific learning goal	Assessment Responsive Feedback Problem-Solving Approach	
	Adapt curriculum tasks and materials for specific learning goals	Assessment Materials	

Coordinating and adjusting instruction during a lesson	Scaffold instruction	Instructional scaffolding	
Setting up and managing small- group work	Use flexible grouping	Child-centered instruction	
	Use strategies to promote active student engagement	Instructional engagement	
Specifying and reinforcing productive student behavior	Provide positive and constructive feedback to guide students' learning and behavior	Responsive feedback	

Identify how you will work together to incorporate the above practices into the scope of work of your partnership.

SIGNATURE PAGE

Local Education Agency Representative (LEA)

Educator Preparation Program/Provider (EPP)

Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE)

VETTING PARTNERS

**RISSA
RIACTE
RISCA
RIDE**

CC:

Appendix A

Tier # 2
Primary Partnership Agreement Template

Educator Preparation Provider (EPP)	
--	--

Local Education Agency (LEA)	
-------------------------------------	--

Term of Agreement	
--------------------------	--

EPP Contact/Designee	
-----------------------------	--

Name:	Title:
Email Address:	Phone Number:

LEA Contact/Designee	
-----------------------------	--

Name:	Title:
Email Address:	Phone Number:

Other Key Staff	
Name:	Name:
Title:	Title:
Name:	Name:
Title:	Title:

Certification (signatures verify partnership)	
EPP Head Administrator	Name: Date:
	Title:
	Signature:
LEA Director of Schools	Name: Date:
	Title:
	Signature:

Prompt 1: Identify the collaboratively-developed **recruitment and selection strategies and goals.** (500 words)

Prompt 2: Identify how entities will collaborate to **select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high- quality clinical educators**, both provider and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and pre-K-12 learning and development. **(500 words)**

Prompt 3: Identify mutually-agreed upon **expectations for candidate preparation** that link theory and practice, maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation, and establish shared accountability for candidate outcomes. **(500 words)**

Prompt 4: Identify mutually-agreed upon **key assessments, transition points, and exit requirements.** (500 words)

Prompt 5: Identify mutually-agreed upon **design of clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration** to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. **(500 words)**

Prompt 6: Identify how teacher candidates will demonstrate and measure their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. (500 words)

Prompt 7: Identify what the EPP can offer the LEA in terms of support (e.g. ongoing professional development, clinical educator compensation, PLUs, research, participation in conferences, access to resources, consultation, onsite classes, etc. **(500 words)**)

Prompt 8: Identify how entities will set goals, collect data, and share data to determine partnership effectiveness. **(500 words)**
