



Renewing Educator Preparation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

US PREP ..... PAGE 3  
Teacher Preparation Model ..... PAGE 4  
Goals, Outcomes & Commitments ..... PAGE 14  
Services & Supports ..... PAGE 25  
Joining US PREP ..... PAGE 28  
Coalition References ..... PAGE 30  
Citation References ..... PAGE 31

---

***University School Partnerships for the Renewal of Teacher  
Preparation (US PREP)***

---

The University-School Partnerships for the Renewal of Educator Preparation National Center (US PREP) is a comprehensive, multi-organizational collaborative with the mission of attracting, training and retaining high quality, racially diverse teachers for high-need communities across the country. US PREP delivers on-the-ground support and services to university providers to create classroom-ready teachers and advance learning and innovation in teacher preparation. The coalition currently includes eight colleges of education: Texas Tech University, University of Memphis, University of Houston, Jackson State University, Southeastern Louisiana University, University Kansas City Missouri, Sam Houston State University, and University of North Texas Dallas.

---

### *The US PREP Teacher Preparation Model*

---

The US PREP model is built from the work at [Texas Tech University](#). There is a large body of research on the aspects of teacher preparation that have the most impact on quality teaching. From this literature, one can identify five key attributes that researchers have found to be associated with increased teacher preparedness: 1) a focus on practice; 2) mentoring and coaching; 3) a coherent vision of teaching; 4) integration of coursework and clinical experiences; and 5) partnerships as the driving force for change and improvement. US PREP embodies all of these elements. Using a shared leadership council, the Center assists school-university leaders in strategic planning, piloting, and scaling of the teacher preparation components as outlined below.

**1. *Intensive clinical experience.*** Increasingly, teacher preparation programs are understanding from a variety of research studies (e.g., Ball & Cohen, 1999; Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Guyton & McIntyre, 1990; Moore, 2010) the importance of clinical practice for teacher training. Furthermore, Boyd et al., (2009) suggest that particular characteristics of clinical experience in teacher education programs are associated with later student achievement gains. Other research confirms the rationale for improving the clinical teaching experience of teacher candidates (TCs). For example, a four-year study of U.S. teacher education programs found that 63 percent of recent graduates reported feeling unprepared for classroom realities (Levine, 2010). Studies have consistently shown that, on average, teachers with some classroom experience are more effective than those with no experience (Clotfelter, Ladd & Vigdor, 2007; Harris & Sass, 2007; Kane, Rockoff & Staiger, 2006; King, 2010; Ladd, 2008). In addition, we

know that classroom teaching experience has a larger effect on student achievement than most observable teacher characteristics, including licensure test scores, obtaining a master's degree, and National Board certification (King, 2010). In short, classroom experience informs practice, bearing in mind that school context is also important (Anderson & Stillman, 2010).

The US PREP teacher preparation model is constructed around the schedule of K-12 schools, not the university calendar, thus enabling an authentic, year-long clinical experience. Candidates begin two to three days per week clinical experiences for their first semester (e.g. August to December), and then spend the rest of the school year working alongside their cooperating teacher almost full-time (January to June). This allows candidates to prepare and begin a new school year, transition through holidays, experience the intensity of accountability testing, and wrap up the school year on task and still striving to impact student learning.

**2. *One year of mentoring provided by the Site Coordinator:*** In the US PREP model, universities re-design the role of the traditional student teaching supervisor into a full-time faculty position called a [Site Coordinator](#) (SC). The role of the SC is the bridge to the theory-practice and university-school divide. By embedding faculty as university representatives and district collaborators, we allow for a direct connection between theory and practice. SCs collaborate with cooperating teachers to improve practice in the K-12 classroom, become a content pipeline for methods taught at the university and assess the more holistic needs of the community in which they serve (Ferman & Hill, 2004).

SCs serve as the liaison between the university and school districts. Their quarterly reporting to community stakeholders and ongoing work with professional development for both

pre-service and staff builds the capacity for stronger relationships. It also helps to meet school district hiring needs, specifically in urban and rural areas (Glennie, Coble & Allen, 2004).

SCs serve as instructors for college courses. They collaborate with cooperating teachers, school system personnel, and university faculty to generate and enact course content. By connecting the topics to context specific experiences, TCs “share their insights with their peers, and make stronger connections with coursework and experience” (Goodnough, Falkenberg, & MacDonald, 2016, p. 13). Mentoring becomes a way to transmit the culture of the educational context and becomes a means for teaching and learning community (Wang & Odell, 2002), and supports culturally responsive pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1994).

SCs are also instructional coaches. They use the Framework for Teaching<sup>1</sup> to define effective instruction, and to support cooperating teachers and candidate improvement. Using state-of-the-art digital technology, candidates capture and review their teaching behaviors for reflection and improvement. The SC conducts ongoing cooperating teacher training and support, shared governance meetings with district leadership and receives constant professional development from university [Site Coordinator/ Program Coaches](#), who coach and support SCs. Comprehensive mentoring for beginning teachers such as this has been shown to have a positive effect on student achievement in subsequent years of teaching (Glazerman et al., 2010).

**3. University-school partnerships with high-need schools.** Universities within US PREP partner with Title I school districts. It is a universal belief that meaningful partnerships between universities and school districts will improve the education system (RAND Corporation, 2006). Goodlad (1994) summarized the importance of the school-university relationship:

---

<sup>1</sup> Most coalition members use the NIET TAP Rubric.

There must be a continuous process of educational renewal in which colleges and universities, the traditional producers of teachers, join schools, the recipients of the products, as equal partners in the simultaneous renewal of school and the education of educators. (p. 2)

One method of implementing the concept of simultaneous renewal is through school-university quarterly partnership governance meetings. SCs convene university staff and district staff on a quarterly basis. These governance meetings provide for university faculty members and district stakeholders to come together as a shared decision-making team. During these meetings, school and university leaders discuss data, tackle challenges together, celebrate their successes, and jointly shape future programming (Ferman & Hill, 2004; Crocco, Faithfull, & Schwartz, 2003). When the university and K-12 systems are working together, these partnerships become incubators of improvement, allowing students and communities to increase the number of effective educators who are committed to and capable of teaching students of color living in poverty (García, Arias, Harris-Murri, & Serna, 2010).

**4. Performance-based assessment.** TCs are evaluated through a rigorous, performance assessment conducted twice a semester using a valid and reliable instructional rubric. Every TC receives an iPad and Swivl to video capture and self-evaluate his/her teaching relative to the instructional rubric. SCs provide ongoing classroom observation, feedback and clinical shaping through classroom walk-throughs and multiple pre-conference, observation, and post-conference cycles (POP) on the instructional rubric over the duration of the program.

The first step of the POP cycle, the Pre-conference, is a discussion of the lesson to be delivered. The goal is to ensure that the TC is clear and prepared with the needed academic content knowledge for teaching. The next step, Observation, occurs when the TC teaches the lesson. The SC and cooperating teacher, physically present in the classroom, script the lesson. At

the same time the lesson is video-captured on an iPad. At the end of the lesson the SC and cooperating teacher confer and score the instructional rubric, then the TC is released to review the student assessment data, and watch and score her/his video of instruction. A Post-conference between the TC and SC is held during the same week to ensure relevance of the feedback. They discuss student assessment data, the scripting data, and video evidence to reach consensus on reinforcements and refinements.

All TCs are required to reach proficiency in the agreed upon indicators on the instructional rubric in order to successfully complete the program. If a TC is not making progress toward proficiency, the SC is required to develop and implement an intervention plan to support the TC's development. If a TC does not demonstrate proficiency by the end of the second semester, he/she is given the option to continue the clinical experience for an additional semester and/or is dismissed from the program. To ensure inter-rater reliability as well as common agreement amongst all teacher preparation faculty, a small percentage of all performance assessments are co-scored by teacher educator faculty.

**5. *Student perception survey.*** TCs administer a K-12 student perception survey within the first two months of their clinical experience and at the conclusion of the clinical experience. Student perception survey data can enable teachers to learn about patterns in their teaching that influence student learning, and their students' social and emotional abilities. In the US PREP model, the [\*Colorado Student Perception Survey\*](#) (Colorado Education Initiative, 2014) is used. The survey is a 34-question instrument that asks students about their classroom experience. The survey focuses on four constructs: student learning, student-centered environment, classroom community, and classroom management. Through the administration of the survey, students are



given a forum in which they can be ‘heard’. Also, teacher candidates are able to use student perception data for the development and application of specific intervention strategies, aimed at improving student perceptions, and, also leading to improved student academic achievement.

**6. *Highly effective cooperating teachers.*** Research points to the importance of high-quality cooperating teachers in a teacher preparation program, but how do school partners and universities work together to achieve this? How do school partners and universities carefully select and train mentors together? How do school partners and universities work together to ensure that mentors are effective coaches of teacher candidates? How do school partners and universities determine whether mentors are positively impacting teacher candidate practice? In US PREP, teacher candidates work in partner districts alongside intentionally selected, and trained mentor teachers who are committed to the professional growth of their teacher candidates. In addition to being trained on how to effectively coach teacher candidates, cooperating teachers receive training on the implementation of co-teaching. Cooperating teachers and candidates use co-teaching strategies to plan, carry out, evaluate and adjust instruction

Co-teaching has been used most often in special education contexts (e.g., Friend, 2008; Murawski, 2006; Solis et al., 2012). A meta-synthesis of this work reported that teachers generally benefited from this approach (Scruggs, Mastropieri, and McDuffie, 2007). A few have examined its effects on student outcomes. One study found that students in a classroom that used the co-teaching model of student teaching statistically outperformed their peers in classrooms that were taught by either a single teacher or a cooperating teacher and TC using a non-co-teaching model of student teaching (Bacharach, Heck, & Dahlberg, 2010). Recently, co-teaching has been adopted as a model with English language learners and in some teacher preparation

programs with positive results (Kamens, 2007; Graziano & Navarrete, 2012). Figure 1 describes the six co-teaching configurations utilized by cooperating teachers (Cook & Friend, 1995; Friend, 2008).

**Figure 1: Six types of co-teaching defined by Cook and Friend (1995)**

Type of Co-Teaching	Application
One Teach, One Observe	Teachers decide in advance what types of specific observational information to gather during instruction and agree on a system for gathering the data. Afterward, the teachers analyze the information together.
One Teach, One Assist	One teacher keeps primary responsibility for teaching while the other teacher circulates through the room providing unobtrusive assistance to students as needed.
Parallel Teaching	Teachers are both teaching the same information but they divide the class and do so simultaneously.
Station Teaching	Teachers divide content and students. Each teacher then teaches the content to one group and subsequently repeats the instruction for the other group. If appropriate, a third “station” could require that students work independently.
Alternative Teaching	One teacher takes responsibility for the large group while the other teacher works with a smaller group.
Team Teaching	Both teachers deliver the same instruction at the same time. One may model while the other speaks. One may demonstrate while the other explains. The teachers may role play or they may take turns delivering instruction.

An internal evaluation study was conducted recently on the TTU co-teaching model. The study included a cooperating teachers’ value added scores during the year when they worked with TCs, and the previous year’s value-added scores when they worked alone in their classroom. Over 75% of teachers with lower growth scores in 2015 showed increases by at least one level in 2016; and 60% of teachers with average growth in 2015 had increases in 2016. These results suggest that the presence of the TC had positive impact on student growth that was

above what the cooperating teacher was able to bring about alone. Moreover, the increases were greatest for the lowest-performing teachers.

**7. *Practice-based coursework.*** Coursework is practice-based, meaning that the program curriculum focuses largely on teaching core teaching practices rather than an overload of theory and abstract concepts, although the program is solidly learning-theory-based. To foster practice-based programming, it is recommended that courses follow a structured cyclical process using [\*Teacher Education by Design\*](#). These include: introducing a teaching practice, preparing candidates to enact the practice with K-12 students, observing candidates enacting the practice, and analyzing the implementation. In lieu of textbooks, courses include extensive use of classroom video demonstrating best practices around the instructional framework practices, social and emotional learning, and culturally relevant pedagogy. Through the process of design-based research, data are used to examine the impact of each course on TC learning and development. Data are then used to inform coursework revisions.

**8. *Student teaching course.*** During the clinical experience, SCs meet with their TCs to provide them with professional development informed by data from their performance assessments and walkthroughs. Site Coordinators collect and analyze teacher candidate data from performance assessments, walkthroughs, K-12 student perception surveys, and the professionalism rubric. Site Coordinators meet weekly with their teacher candidates to provide them with data-driven professional development. To earn a passing grade in the course, teacher candidates must demonstrate proficiency on the performance assessments and the professionalism rubric.

**9. *Effective teacher educators.*** Research states the single-most influential in-school factor in student success is the K-12 classroom teacher (Chetty, Friedman & Rockoff, 2011; Hamre & Pianta, 2007; McCaffrey, Lockwood, Koretz, & Hamilton, 2003). The same could be said about the teacher educators (including course instructors, site coordinators, and cooperating teachers) who play a formal role in the training of novice teachers -- studies have shown that purposeful teacher education, grounded in specific and research-based teacher educator pedagogies, practices and principles, can positively influence novice teacher practice, efficacy, and effectiveness (Sharma & Sokal, 2015; Brouwer & Korthagen, 2005; Day, 1999). Darling-Hammond, Hammerness, Grossman, Rust, & Shulman (2005) studied teacher preparation programs and found that effective programs had an agreed upon set of teaching practices that guide and assess clinical work and coursework. Programs that had clear and consistent goals, that used pedagogies linking theory and practice, were more influential at supporting student teacher learning (Darling-Hammond et al., 2005). To ensure teacher educators are supported in their development, professional development and feedback measures become part of the culture of the college of education. The initial work around this is grounded in the [Teacher Educator Practice Framework](#), aimed at improving curriculum, teaching, and coaching. Over time, teacher educators revise this framework to align with their context and needs.

**10. *Data for continuous improvement.*** CAEP Standard 5 encourages data use for continuous improvement and evidence-based decision making, including gathering data about impact on K-12 student achievement. In US PREP, university providers use data at every level:

- TCs utilize their performance assessment, student perception survey, and classroom student achievement data to create instructional goals and interventions.

- SCs utilize TC data to inform topics for their weekly student teaching course, mentor trainings, and governance meetings.
- Course instructors utilize data from the design based research assessments to inform student interventions and revisions to the courses.
- Program administrators examine data across all the programs to make informed decisions about program strengths and weaknesses.

At the conclusion of each semester, all faculty meet for Data Day. This process involves vertical data analysis that includes data from K-12 students, TCs, course and clinical faculty, and program “quality control” data to inform, direct, and evaluate programs. Faculty members present program data and discuss the ways in which they use data results to make improvements in their policies and practices (Hamman, 2013; Hamman, Wang, Ridley, Heider, & Howard, 2016). The allows teacher educators to interpret data collectively, transforming the rhetoric of data-based decision making into actual practice.

*US PREP Goals, Outcomes & Commitments*

*CAEP Standards Alignment*

<p><b>Goal 1: Program builds teacher candidate competency to meet the needs of Black, Latino, and low-income students.</b></p> <p><b>Outcomes:</b></p> <p><b>(1) The teacher preparation program and school district partners have a common understanding and interpretation of teacher candidate competencies.</b></p> <p><b>(2) The Teacher preparation program provides opportunities for aspiring candidates to develop, practice, and demonstrate competencies, including content and pedagogical knowledge and skills that promote learning for all students.</b></p>		
<b>Commitments</b>	<b>CAEP Alignment</b>	<b>US PREP Support &amp; Services</b>
<p>Teacher educator faculty are trained and calibrated (annually) in the observation rubric used to evaluate teacher candidate instructional practices and (2) the professionalism/disposition rubrics used to support and evaluate teacher candidate professionalism.</p>	<p>Standard 4 Program Impact</p> <p>The provider demonstrates, through structured and validated observation instruments and student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.</p>	<p>Provide initial and on-going instructional rubric training to faculty.</p> <p>Facilitate trainings to faculty on the professionalism rubric and expectations for students.</p>
<p>Teacher educator faculty co-score teacher candidate (TC) videos each semester to engage in rich discussion around TC performance as well as track inter-rater reliability in the instructional rubric.</p>	<p>Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships &amp; Practices</p> <p>The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all</p>	<p>Facilitate co-scoring sessions with teacher educator faculty.</p> <p>Develop measures to gather evidence and scores and use the data to inform and guide discussions.</p>

	<p>P-12 students' learning and development.</p> <p>Standard 4 Program Impact</p> <p>The provider demonstrates, through structured and validated observation instruments and student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.</p>	
<p>Clinical experiences include the administration of a pre-and post- K-12 student perception survey and interventions.</p>	<p>Standard 4 Program Impact</p> <p>The provider's quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. The provider demonstrates, through structured and validated observation instruments and student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.</p>	<p>Monthly site visits from a US PREP clinical coach to support the facilitation of the SPS survey and assignment.</p>
<p>Clinical experiences that include an extended clinical experience (e.g. 3-5 days per week for two semesters) where teacher candidates experience all aspects of teaching from the start of the school year to the end.</p>	<p>Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships &amp; Practices</p> <p>The provider works with partners to design 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.</p>	<p>Provide support in the design, development, and implementation of a program progression that ensures candidates experience all aspects of teaching.</p>

<p>Clinical experiences include a minimum of 4 formal observations and 8 formative walkthroughs. For each formal observation, the site coordinator conducts a pre-and post-conference.</p>	<p>Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships &amp; Practices</p> <p>Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates' development of the knowledge, skills, and professional disposition.</p>	<p>Provide support with the development/revision of student teaching handbooks.</p> <p>Provide planning and training support for the site coordinators in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Conducting pre-and post-conferences</li> <li>● Conducting walkthroughs</li> <li>● Coaching models and strategies</li> </ul>
<p>Teacher Candidates utilize video capture technology (i.e. iPads) to film themselves teaching during the formal performance assessments and use the videos as a basis for reflection.</p>	<p>Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships &amp; Practices</p> <p>Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates' development of the knowledge, skills, and professional disposition.</p>	<p>Provide training support for teacher educator faculty/supervisors/site coordinators and teacher candidates in the use of iPads.</p> <p>Assist in handbook and/or syllabi development to include video capture protocols.</p> <p>Training support for site coordinators in the implementation of video protocols- assisting teacher candidates with video capture and evidence gathering tools.</p>
<p><b>Curricula</b> that teaches and assesses key content (e.g. College and Career Readiness Standards) and instructional rubric practices, and provides opportunities for teacher candidates to rehearse skills in a safe setting, and apply skills in the K-12 classroom.</p>	<p>Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge</p> <p>The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-</p>	<p>Provide facilitation and training support for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Faculty course alignment with the instruction rubric practices and professionalism rubric</li> <li>● Training for teacher educators in teacher educator pedagogies (i.e.</li> </ul>



	readiness standards.	rehearsal) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Training and examples of course assignments that support teacher candidates in applying competencies in the K-12 classroom</li> </ul>
Site coordinators conduct a weekly student teaching course session. The course includes the following instructional topics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Instructional Rubric practices</li> <li>● Student perception survey administration and assignment</li> <li>● Professionalism/Disposition competencies</li> </ul>	Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge  Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s)2 in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.	Planning and support with the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Designing and revising the student teaching course syllabus</li> <li>● Training the site coordinators on the SPS and intervention assignment.</li> <li>● Developing course materials aligned to the instructional rubric and professionalism rubric.</li> </ul>
Program performance gates, utilized to shape candidate competencies throughout the program, have clearly articulate performance criteria.	Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and selectivity  The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program.	Support with designing performance gateway assessments throughout the teacher preparation program to gauge teacher candidate development.

<p>A final culminating performance gate is established to ensure teacher candidates are able to teach effectively (e.g. proficient scores on the instructional rubric) by the completion of the program.</p>	<p><b>Standard 4: Program Impact</b>  The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.</p>	<p>Planning, training, and support with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designing performance gateway assessments throughout the teacher preparation program to gauge teacher candidate development.</li> </ul>
<p>A clear intervention process is implemented when teacher candidates do not meet performance gate expectations.</p>	<p><b>Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and selectivity</b>  The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program.</p>	<p>Planning, training, and support with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designing a clear intervention process</li> <li>• Developing a tracking system to document and monitor intervention outcomes.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Goal 2: Program demonstrates commitment to using data for continuous improvement.</b></p> <p><b>Outcomes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The provider/university systematically collects, analyzes, and uses pre-service teacher candidate data, K-12 school system feedback, and graduate data (attitudinal, observational, outcome) to make instructional and programmatic decisions.</b></li> <li>• <b>The teacher preparation program monitors the reliability of data about candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions.</b></li> <li>• <b>The teacher preparation program systematically measures the fidelity of program implementation and assesses whether key</b></li> </ul>
---

<b>program features correlate to desired outcomes.</b>		
<b>Commitments</b>	<b>CAEP Alignment</b>	<b>US PREP Support &amp; Services</b>
<p>Site coordinators utilize data to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● inform mentor training topics</li> <li>● student teaching course topics</li> <li>● coach teacher candidates during walkthroughs and the performance assessment process</li> <li>● develop and implement intervention plans</li> <li>● inform quarterly governance meetings</li> </ul>	<p>Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement</p> <p>The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Training and one-on-one coaching support for site coordinators to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A week-long training to support site coordinators' use of data and capacity to plan and facilitate mentor trainings, governance meetings, and conduct pre-and post-conferences with teacher candidates</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Monthly site visits from a US PREP clinical coach to support the facilitation of pre-and post-conferences, mentor trainings, and governance meetings.</li> </ul>
<p>Course instructors utilize teacher candidate performance assessment data and course assessment data to make adjustments in their teaching and coursework.</p>	<p>Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement</p> <p>The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Support with re-designing faculty collaboration sessions so that they are informed by data</li> <li>● Bi-weekly support provided by Design Based Research Coaches to reform courses using the DBR process.</li> </ul>

	and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.	
Program leaders utilize data to inform the topics for bi-monthly (every two months) professional development sessions.	Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement  The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Support with re-designing faculty collaboration sessions so that they are informed by data</li> <li>● Monthly site visits from the US PREP Regional Support Specialist to support the planning and co-delivery of faculty collaboration sessions.</li> </ul>
Program leaders and deans convene at the end of each semester for “data day/data summit” to review data. Program improvement plans are put in place to document actionable next steps.	Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement  Measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on P-12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Support with developing data systems and dashboards for visualization</li> <li>● Monthly site visits from the US PREP Regional Support Specialist to support the planning and protocols for data day/summits.</li> </ul>
Implementation of an Annual Program Review to examine program integrity and to track developmental progress towards the key goals and scale.	Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement  The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Monthly site visits from the US PREP Regional Support Specialist to support the implementation of the key goals</li> <li>● Support with designing measures that align with the key goals.</li> <li>● Support with the collection and analysis of data, and development of reports to allow for data to be used</li> </ul>

		formatively to inform improvement.
Teacher Educator Framework is implemented to support site coordinators, cooperating teachers, and course instructors with getting feedback on their practices.	<p>Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monthly site visits from the US PREP Regional Support Specialist to support the planning and co-delivery of faculty professional development and teacher educator feedback protocols.</li> </ul>
<p>Provider collects program impact data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demographics of candidates and completers</li> <li>Outcomes on state content and certification exams</li> <li>Completer effectiveness: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Graduate employment</li> <li>Graduate value added (e.g. student achievement growth)</li> <li>Graduate Retention</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement</p> <p>The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development.</p> <p>Measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on P-12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support with the collection and analysis of data, and development of visual reports to allow for data to be used formatively to inform improvement.</li> </ul>

**Goal 3: The teacher preparation program ensures teacher educators are effective in preparing novices to work with Black, Latino, and low-income students.**  
**Outcomes:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>The program sets expectations for effective teaching for teacher educators.</b></li> <li>● <b>The preparation program systematically provides feedback to teacher educators.</b></li> <li>● <b>The preparation program provides multi-modal access to high quality professional development content based on teacher educators’ needs, teacher candidate performance, and program completers performance.</b></li> </ul>		
Commitments	CAEP Alignment	US PREP Support & Services
<p>Cooperating teachers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● There is a clear job description and selection process for cooperating teachers.</li> <li>● Cooperating teachers attend at least four professional development sessions with the site coordinator each year</li> <li>● Multiple measures (e.g. teacher candidate evaluation, cooperating teacher self-evaluation, and site coordinator evaluation) are employed to determine mentor effectiveness.</li> </ul>	<p>Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships &amp; Practices Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates’ development and P-12 student learning and development. In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications to establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings.</p>	<p>Monthly site visits from the US PREP Clinical Coach to provide support in developing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Clear job description for cooperating teachers</li> <li>● Clear selection processes in collaboration with the district partners</li> <li>● Trainings for cooperating teachers</li> <li>● Measures to assess the effectiveness of cooperating teachers</li> </ul>
<p>Site Coordinators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● There is a clear job description and selection process for /site coordinators.</li> <li>● Site Coordinators attend training and participate in faculty professional developments with teacher preparation faculty.</li> <li>● Multiple measures (i.e. teacher</li> </ul>	<p>Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships &amp; Practices Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates’ development and P-12 student learning and development. In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications to establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional</p>	<p>Monthly site visits from the US PREP Clinical Coach to provide support in developing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Clear job description for site coordinators</li> <li>● Clear selection processes in collaboration with the district partners</li> <li>● Trainings for site coordinators</li> <li>● Measures to assess the effectiveness of site coordinators</li> </ul>

<p>candidate evaluation, program development review, and site coordinator self-evaluation) are employed to determine site coordinator effectiveness.</p>	<p>development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings.</p>	
<p>Course Instructors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Clear criteria have been established for defining effective teacher educator practice</li> <li>● Teacher educators participate in professional development, informed by data, to support their professional growth</li> <li>● Multiple measures (i.e. peer observation, tc perception surveys, and self-evaluation) are employed to provide teacher educators with feedback on their practices</li> </ul>	<p>1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge</p> <p>The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.</p> <p>Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement</p> <p>The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.</p>	<p>Monthly site visits from the US PREP Regional Transformation Support Specialist to provide support in developing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A collaborative framework that defines effective teacher educator practice</li> <li>● Professional development for teacher educators</li> <li>● Measures to support teacher educators with getting feedback on their practices.</li> </ul>

**Goal 4: Teacher preparation program is responsive to K-12 school systems and the communities they serve.**

**Outcomes:**

- **The teacher preparation program collaboratively recruits and trains candidates to meet the needs of students in their communities.**
- **The teacher preparation program has mutually beneficial partnerships with shared governance of teacher preparation programming.**


<b>Activities</b>	<b>CAEP Alignment</b>	<b>US PREP Support &amp; Services</b>
<p>The site coordinators plan and facilitate quarterly governance/partnership meetings between the district and university that include shared data and decision making.</p>	<p>Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships &amp; Practices</p> <p>Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for candidate outcomes.</p>	<p>Monthly site visits from the US PREP Clinical Coach to provide support in planning and facilitating shared governance meetings.</p>
<p>University-school partners co-develop strategic teacher recruitment plans in order to contribute to a teaching workforce that reflects the need (skills, dispositions, and subject), and demographics of the school district partners. Recruitment plans contain focused, measureable, and time-bound goals/benchmarks.</p>	<p>Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and selectivity</p> <p>Diverse Candidates Who Meet Employment Needs: The provider presents plans and goals to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish the mission.</p>	<p>Monthly site visits from the US PREP Clinical Coach to provide support in developing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Planning and facilitating shared governance meetings</li> <li>● Provide support with the development of recruitment plans</li> <li>● Provide examples of successful marketing and recruitment strategies</li> </ul>



---

## *US PREP Support & Services*

---



Providers who join US PREP make a 3-year commitment to pilot and scale the transformation commitments, ensuring all candidates are trained through the transformed model. In Year 1, the Center will work with the teacher preparation program leaders to create and implement an annual Individualized Transformation Plan (ITP) to include: a) clear goals, timelines and benchmarks, b) accountability measures, and c) budgets. The ITP will also outline the support that US PREP staff will give to help the member institution achieve the actions and goals on the designated timelines. The implementation plan will be highly supported, monitored quarterly and evaluated, through a Program Development Framework Review, at the end of the year to ensure that appropriate progress is achieved. Teacher preparation leaders' commitment and measurable progress will be required for continued membership.

Based on the goals, actions, and timelines designated in the ITP, the US PREP Center will allocate a team of US PREP Transformation Specialists and Clinical Coaches to assist the member institution with piloting and scaling the transformation initiatives.

In addition to the services outlined in the tables above, US PREP coalition members benefit from the following:

- US PREP holds back funding every two years (\$100,000) for the purpose of fostering innovation within the coalition universities and their school district partners. Every coalition member has the the opportunity to submit a proposal for the *US PREP*

*Innovation Pilot.* The topics for the Innovation Pilot are developed by the coalition members and their school district partners. The innovation pilots yield industry-leading advancement of teacher preparation programming that proactively address unmet needs and future trends in teaching and learning. To access the 2016 and 2018 Innovation Pilot RFPs, click below:

- 2016 RFP: [Social & Emotional Learning](#)
- 2018 RFP: [Culturally Relevant Teaching](#)
- Participation in the *US PREP Research Hub* where the purpose is learning. Members will focus on common research questions and problems, and seek answers and solutions through improvement science. Specifically, members will analyze problems, use research to develop appropriate solutions, measure outcomes, and incorporate plan-do-study-act (PDSA) cycles to refine approaches to core challenges germane to educator programs.
- Deans Network Improvement Community: Deans will convene twice a year face-to-face to collaborate, share problems of practice, and receive leadership support/training from experts in the field. Deans will also convene on a quarterly basis in smaller groups (e.g. triads) via virtual meetings to share leadership progress updates and support each other in leading change efforts.
- Access to the US PREP Toolkit where teacher preparation resources continue to be updated and developed for all teacher preparation stakeholders.
- Access to the US PREP Bi-Annual Conferences and Clinical Quality Trainings (Travel paid for by US PREP)

- Access to Data Dashboard systems with corresponding assistance & support through training seminars, materials, and on-demand support to ensure that members maximize the value and usability of their dashboard system.
- Advocacy: As the coalition expands, our voices become louder as we advocate for high-quality educator preparation programs at the state and policy level. As we continue our work with SREB & Educate Texas, we have developed relationships that enable US PREP to connect coalition providers to their state legislatures.

---

### *Joining US PREP*

---

Providers who join US PREP make a three-year commitment to piloting and scaling the transformation commitments. Each provider receives a \$100,000 sub-award each year for three years. This award is provided to support the initial costs of implementing the transformation goals.

Before they are selected to join US PREP, potential university partners engage in an application process to include submission of an application, participating in interviews, and submission of letters of support. This is to ensure their strong and clear commitment to implementing and fully scaling the transformation goals. After a series of vetting discussions with teacher educators and administrators, all key leaders within the partnership (including the university college presidents, provosts, deans and partner district superintendent) are asked to sign a Memorandum of Understanding committing their institution to specified requirements. Each partner site commits to sharing teacher candidate performance data, student perception survey outcomes, and completer outcome data. Data are transparently shared during US PREP coalition meetings for the purpose of trend analysis, learning, and continuous improvement.

Below are the application steps:

Step 1: Attend a pre-orientation meeting with US PREP

Step 2: May 1-May 23: Complete the US PREP application (this application includes the budget narrative and spreadsheet) and send to Sarah Beal ([sarah.beal@ttu.edu](mailto:sarah.beal@ttu.edu)) by COB on May 23

Step 3: Submit 4 Letters of Support (Dean, President, Provost, and District Chancellor/Superintendent) (by June 3)

Step 4: Upon submission of these documents, US PREP will contact you to set up a virtual meeting (June 7 or 8) to review the grant outcomes as well as conduct the US PREP Provider Readiness Survey. During this interview, please include your leadership team and a representative from your district partner.

\*Please note, once the grant is awarded, all stakeholders will sign the US PREP MOU.

---

*US PREP Current Coalition Partner References*

---

- **University of Houston:**
  - Amber Thompson, Associate Department Chair: [amthompson10@uh.edu](mailto:amthompson10@uh.edu)
  - Robert McPherson, Dean: [RMcPherson@Central.UH.EDU](mailto:RMcPherson@Central.UH.EDU)
- **University of Memphis:**
  - Chris Mueller, Department Chair: [cemuellr@memphis.edu](mailto:cemuellr@memphis.edu)
  - Kandy Hill-Clarke, Dean: [K.Hill-Clarke@memphis.edu](mailto:K.Hill-Clarke@memphis.edu)
- **Jackson State University:**
  - Nadine Gilbert, Department Chair Coordinator: [nadine.s.gilbert@jsums.edu](mailto:nadine.s.gilbert@jsums.edu)
  - Daniel Watkins, Dean: [daniel.watkins@jsums.edu](mailto:daniel.watkins@jsums.edu)
- **Texas Tech University:**
  - Doug Hammon, Department Chair: [doug.hamman@ttu.edu](mailto:doug.hamman@ttu.edu)
  - Scott Ridley, Dean: [scott.ridley@ttu.edu](mailto:scott.ridley@ttu.edu)

---

### *Citation References*

---

- Alvarez, H. K. (2007). The impact of teacher preparation on responses to student aggression in the classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(7), 1113-1126.
- Anderson, L. & Stillman, J. (2010). Opportunities to teach and learn in high-needs schools: student teachers' experiences in urban placements. *Urban Education*, 45(2), 109-141.
- Bacharach, N., Heck, T. W., & Dahlberg, K. (2010). Changing the face of student teaching through coteaching. *Action in Teacher Education*, 32(1), 3-14.
- Ball, D., & Cohen, D. (1999). Developing practice, developing practitioners: Toward a practice-based theory of professional education. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession* (pp. 3-32). San Francisco: Josey-Bass.
- Boyd, D.J., Grossman, P.L., Lankford, H., Loeb, S. & Wyckoff, J. (2009). Teacher preparation and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 31(4), 416-440.
- Brouwer, N., & Korthagen, F. (2005). Can teacher education make a difference?. *American Educational Research Journal*, 42(1), 153-224.
- Chetty, R., Friedman, J. N., & Rockoff, J. E. (2011). *The long-term impacts of teachers: Teacher value-added and student outcomes in adulthood* (No. w17699). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Clotfelter, C.T., Ladd, H., & Vigdor, J.L. (2007). How and why do teacher credentials matter for student achievement? *CALDER Working Paper 2*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Cochran-Smith, M. & Zeichner, K. (2005). *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.

- Cook, L., & Friend, M. (1995). Co-teaching: Guidelines for creating effective practices. *Focus on exceptional children*, 28(3), 1-16.
- Crocco, M. S., Faithfull, B., & Schwartz, S. (2003). Inquiring minds want to know: Action research at a New York City professional development school. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 54(1), 19-30.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hammerness, K., Grossman, P., Rust, F., & Shulman, L. (2005). The design of teacher education programs. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford, (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world* (pp. 390-441). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Day, C. (1999). *Developing teachers: The challenges of lifelong learning*. Psychology Press.
- Ferman, B., & Hill, T. L. (2004). The challenges of agenda conflict in higher-education-community research partnerships: Views from the community side. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 26(2), 241-257.
- Friend, M. (2008). Co-teaching: A simple solution that isn't simple after all. *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 2(2), 9-19.
- García, E., Arias, M. B., Harris Murri, N. J., & Serna, C. (2010). Developing responsive teachers: A challenge for a demographic reality. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 132-142.
- Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of teacher education*, 53(2), 106-116.
- Glazerman, S., Isenberg, E., Dolfen, S., Bleeker, M., Johnson, A., Grider, M., & Jacobus, M. (2010). *Impacts of comprehensive teacher induction: Final results from a randomized controlled study* (NCEE 2010-4027). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.



- Glennie, E., Coble, C. R., & Allen, M. (2004). Teacher perceptions of the work environment in hard-to-staff schools. *Education Commission of the States. Duke University. Retrieved June 1, 2017.*
- Goodlad, J. I. (1994). *Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools*. Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, PO Box 44305, San Francisco, CA 94144-4305.
- Goodnough, K., Falkenberg, T., & MacDonald, R. (2016). Examining the nature of theory-practice relationships in initial teacher education: A Canadian case study. *Canadian Journal of Education, 39*(1), 1.
- Graziano, K. J., & Navarrete, L. A. (2012). Co-teaching in a teacher education classroom: Collaboration, compromise, and creativity. *Issues in Teacher Education, 21*(1), 109.
- Guyton, E., & McIntyre, D.J. (1990). Student teaching and school experiences. In W.R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education*. (pp. 514-535). New York: MacMillan.
- Hamman, D., Center for Research Evaluation and Accountability for Teacher Education, "Preparing for accountability: Using formative evaluations of instructional competency to predict impact on K-12 student learning.", CREATE, Austin, TX, (November 2013).
- Hamman, D., Wang, J., Ridley, S., Heider, S., Howard, S. (2016). Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, "The view from the classroom: Linking student perceptions of engagement to teacher candidate instructional competency", AACTE, Las Vegas, NV, (February 23).

- Hamre BK, Pianta RC. (2007). Learning opportunities in preschool and early elementary classrooms. In: Pianta R, Cox M, Snow K, editors. *School readiness & the transition to kindergarten in the era of accountability*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes; pp. 49–84.
- Hargreaves, L. (2009). The status and prestige of teachers and teaching. In *International handbook of research on teachers and teaching* (pp. 217-229). Springer US.
- Harris, D.N., & Sass, T.R. (2007). Teacher training, teacher quality, and student achievement. *CALDER Working Paper 3*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Howey, K. & Zimpher (2010). Educational partnerships to advance clinically rich teacher preparation. Prepared for the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Smith, T. M. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational leadership*, 60(8), 30-33.
- Kamens, M. W. (2007). Learning about co-teaching: A collaborative student teaching experience for preservice teachers. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 30(3), 155-166.
- Kane, T.J., Rockoff, J.E., & Staiger, D.O. (2006). What does certification tell us about teacher effectiveness? Evidence from New York City. *Working Paper 12155*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- King, J.A. (2010). *The impact of teacher experience: examining the evidence and policy implications*. National Center of Longitudinal Data in Education Research.
- Koerner, M., Rust, F., & Baumgartner, F. (2002). Exploring roles in student teaching placements. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 29(2), 35–58.

- Koller, J. R., Osterlind, S. J., Paris, K., & Weston, K. J. (2004). Differences between novice and expert teachers' undergraduate preparation and ratings of importance in the area of children's mental health. *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion*, 6(2), 40-45.
- Ladd, H.F. (2008). Value-Added modeling of teacher credentials: Policy implications. Paper presented at the second annual CALDER research conference, "The Ins and Outs of Value-Added Measures in Education: What Research Says," Washington, D.C., November 21.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American educational research journal*, 32(3), 465-491.
- Levine, M. (2010). Developing principles for clinically based teacher education. Prepared for the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).
- McCaffrey, D. F., Lockwood, J. R., Koretz, D. M., & Hamilton, L. S. (2003). *Evaluating Value-Added Models for Teacher Accountability. Monograph*. RAND Corporation. PO Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138.
- Moore, R. (2010). *Teacher leaders advise on clinical preparation*. Prepared for the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).
- Scruggs, T. E., Mastropieri, M. A., & McDuffie, K. A. (2007). Co-teaching in inclusive classrooms: A metasynthesis of qualitative research. *Exceptional Children*, 73(4), 392-416.

- Sharma, U., & Sokal, L. (2015). The impact of a teacher education course on pre-service teachers' beliefs about inclusion: an international comparison. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 15*(4), 276-284.
- Solis, M., Vaughn, S., Swanson, E., & Mcculley, L. (2012). Collaborative models of instruction: The empirical foundations of inclusion and co-teaching. *Psychology in the Schools, 49*(5), 498-510.
- Sutcher, L., Darling-Hammond, L., & Carver-Thomas, D. (2016). A coming crisis in teaching? *Teacher supply, demand, and shortages in the US*. Washington, DC: Learning Policy Institute. Available at: [https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/A\\_Coming\\_Crisis\\_in\\_Teaching\\_REPORT.pdf](https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/A_Coming_Crisis_in_Teaching_REPORT.pdf).
- Walter, Gouzem, & Kim, 2006
- Wang, J., & Odell, S. J. (2002). Mentored learning to teach according to standards-based reform: A critical review. *Review of educational research, 72*(3), 481-546.
- Wentzel, K. R. (2003). Sociometric status and adjustment in middle school: A longitudinal study. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 23*(1), 5-28.
- Yuan, P., Bare, M. G., Johnson, M. O., & Saberi, P. (2014). Using online social media for recruitment of human immunodeficiency virus-positive participants: a cross-sectional survey. *Journal of medical Internet research, 16*(5), e117.