TN Department of Education

2020-21
Tennessee Comprehensive Review Handbook for Educator Preparation Providers

Contents

Introduction to the Comprehensive Review 3
- Purpose and Process 3
- Introduction to this Handbook 5
- Value of the Self-Study 5
- Standard Guidance Structure 5
- Exhibits 6
- Considering the Evidence 6
- Diversity and Technology Cross-cutting Themes 6
- Rubric Overview and Structure 7

Standard 5 11
- Introduction to the Standard 11
- Exhibits 11
- The Standard 5 Components and Indicator Detail 12
- Rubrics 15

Standard 1 25
- Introduction to the Standard 25
- Exhibits 25

Standard 1 Component and Indicator Detail 26
Rubrics 30
Annual Reports Metrics 34
Standard 2 39
Introduction to the Standard 39
Exhibits 39
Standard 2 Component and Indicator Detail 40
Rubrics 43
Standard 3 58
Introduction to the Standard 58
Exhibits 58
Standard 3 Components and Indicator Detail 59
Rubrics 66
Annual Reports Metrics 68
Standard 4 80
Introduction to the Standard 80
Exhibits 81
Standard 4 Component and Indicator Detail 82
Rubrics 86
Annual Reports Metrics 86
Appendix A 92
A.5 Exhibits for Standard 5 92
A.1 Exhibits for Standard 1 93
A.2 Exhibits for Standard 2 94
A.3 Exhibits for Standard 3 95
A.4 Exhibits for Standard 4 96

Introduction to the Comprehensive Review

Purpose and Process

In 2014, the State Board of Education adopted a revised Educator Preparation Policy (5.504), setting the stage for a completely revamped educator preparation provider (EPP) comprehensive review process for ongoing state approval. The policy requires EPPs to demonstrate that they meet the 2013 Council for the Accreditation of Education Preparation (CAEP) Standards. The standards set a framework that promotes continuous improvement of EPPs to ensure that all new teachers are prepared to effectively educate a diverse group of students and meet the needs of Tennessee's local education agencies (LEA).

The comprehensive review requires several steps throughout the process, which are outlined below.

- TNAtlas opens for comprehensive review
- EPP assigns contributors to the review
- EPP responds to comprehensive review self-study prompts and supplies artifacts
- Department assigns review team
- EPP submits self-study
- Review team completes formative feedback report; report is submitted to the EPP
- TNAtlas re-opens for EPP to complete revisions
- EPP completes and submits addendum
- On-site visit
- Department convenes the Advisory Committee on Educator Preparation
- Department delivers recommendation to the state board
- State board determines outcome of comprehensive review

Department EPP Reviewer State Board

The revised Tennessee comprehensive review process shifts toward outcomes and impact of program completers as well as candidates completing a program with a job-embedded clinical practice. To this end, the department has produced the EPP Annual Reports since 2017, which examine metrics across five domains ranging from candidate recruitment and selection to completer effectiveness and impact.

Annual Reports are comprised of two distinct reports: the Insights Tool and the Performance Report. The Insights Tool supports EPP improvement by providing data across multiple metrics and allowing the EPP to disaggregate these data (e.g., by endorsement area, clinical practice type, and program level). The Performance Report is an accountability report with a specific set of metrics and applied thresholds that indicate if a provider has met minimum expectations. EPPs that fall below expectations on the Performance Report in two consecutive years are required to engage in an interim review process. The Performance Report informs the Tennessee comprehensive review process through the direct connection of Annual Reports metrics and CAEP standards.

Through the engagement of representatives from EPPs, LEAs, and education advocacy groups, several implementation tools were developed to guide the comprehensive review process. The state board policy also called for the creation of a task force to advise the department on the implementation of a program approval integrated with Annual Reports. From 2015 through 2016, the department convened a select group of individuals to serve on the Implementation Working Group (IWG). This group set the initial framework for implementation of the educator preparation policy, including the development of business rules for calculating metrics for the Annual Reports. For each of the five CAEP standards, the IWG developed a series of Tennessee-specific expectations, procedures and tools for a standardized evidence collection, and a set of metrics to assess outcomes and impact through the EPP Annual Reports process.

In January 2017, the department convened the Educator Preparation Working Group (EPWG). This group further defined the expectations for the comprehensive review process and Annual Reports, including the identification of key metrics and accountability thresholds for the Annual Reports. The EPWG meets quarterly to advise the department on all aspects of the program approval process and other critical educator preparation initiatives.

The Tennessee comprehensive review process was revised to:

- Meet the specific needs of Tennessee, without creating an overly burdensome process;
- Provide clarity in standard-level expectations, building on the promising practices outlined in CAEP guidance;
- Support systems thinking and continuous improvement for EPPs to ensure the process is not solely one of accountability; and
- Create a symbiotic approach to the collection and use of quantitative and qualitative data and information.

Introduction to this Handbook

The Tennessee Comprehensive Review Handbook was created to support EPPs that are preparing for an upcoming state-managed comprehensive review during the 2020-21 academic year. While this handbook may provide useful guidance for all EPPs, EPPs seeking CAEP accreditation will need to follow guidance and expectations developed by CAEP, including processes for uploading evidence into the CAEP submission system (currently AIMS). This handbook is intended to serve as a companion to the TNAtlas system, where EPPs will upload all required evidence and respond to narrative prompts during the completion of the self-study. The self-study process is a significant component of the comprehensive review, requiring EPPs to address all components of the CAEP standards. In addition to this handbook, the department recommends a careful review of the CAEP Handbook for Initial-Level Programs (2018), which served as a foundation for the generation of this handbook.

Value of the Self-Study

Tennessee's redesigned comprehensive review process is intended to support providers in preparing for and completing the self-study. The purpose of the self-study is, in part, to allow providers the opportunity to systematically assess their program design, implementation, and impact. Historically, the on-site review has been heavily relied upon to illuminate numerous aspects of providers' operations that are addressed in the self-study. The revised process is designed to support a more robust self-study and iterative off-site review. This will support the development of a more valuable formative feedback report as a preliminary deliverable in support of the overall approval process. A provider engaging deeply and thoughtfully in the self-study process should begin to identify programmatic strengths and interrogate root causes of areas for growth long before the site visit and receipt of the final feedback report.

Standard Guidance Structure

Each of the five standards are accompanied by specific guidance listed in each of the sections below. **Each standard has the following accompanying guidance:**

1. *Introduction to the Standard*: Simplified high-level overview of the standard
2. *Exhibits*: Appendix links to all narrative responses, required and optional exhibits, and Annual Reports metrics by indicator
3. *Component and Indicator Detail*: In-depth information about specific expectations for each component
4. *Rubrics*: Rubrics at the component and indicator levels for the entire standard
5. *Annual Reports Metrics* (if applicable): Rubrics for each indicator appear in order, with those specifically addressed in Annual Reports clearly marked

Standard 5 is presented first, with standards 1-4 following in sequence. Standard 5 appears first to support providers' systems thinking (i.e., a holistic approach to analysis that focuses on the way that a system's parts interrelate and how systems work over time and within the context of larger systems) and to highlight the importance of developing a strong and effective Quality Assurance System (QAS). The QAS enables continuous improvement, and supports effective management so that providers can generate information to evaluate progress, identify gaps and potential improvements, frame appropriate actions, and track the outcomes of change over time.

Exhibits

When responding to the self-study, prompts are provided at the indicator level. Prompts require completing a narrative response, uploading a required document or data file attachment, uploading an optional document or data file attachment, indicating that Annual Reports metrics will be supplied by the department, or including some combination of exhibits.

When responding to the narrative prompt questions, providers must respond to each of the non-italicized questions. Any italicized questions included under the required prompts are guiding questions and are meant to support providers' thinking as they formulate their responses. The italicized questions do not require a response; however, they should be considered as providers think through the requirements of the components and indicators.

Required document or data files may be specified as templates developed and provided by the department, or may require that criteria are met related to content, format, or information provided. Specific criteria for required exhibits for each standard are provided in the *Component and Indicator Detail* section, which follows the *Exhibits* section. Some indicators may allow providers to supply optional exhibits to support the preceding narrative response, though optional exhibits may be limited.

Considering the Evidence

During the self-study, the provider will respond to prompts with both narrative exhibits and required or optional document and data file exhibits as attachments/uploads. These are all sources of evidence of the degree to which the provider meets or does not meet expectations on an indicator, component, and/or standard.

As the provider begins to think through the evidence needed to meet expectations for the comprehensive review, the following guiding questions provided by CAEP may be helpful:

- What have you learned from the data? What supports your case?
- What contrary evidence have you found, and how do you explain it?
- What are your interpretations of the meaning of the data?
- What questions have emerged that need more investigation?
- Explain how you know that the evidence you are assembling to justify your case for each standard is valid and consistent.
- Describe the uses you are making of the evidence for each standard by involving stakeholders and undertaking or planning modifications in your preparation courses and experiences.

Diversity and Technology Cross-cutting Themes

Aligned with CAEP's approach, concepts of diversity and technology have been interwoven throughout the standards and expectations. This is particularly evident in Standards 1, 2, and 3. Required evidence and language throughout rubrics demonstrate an emphasis of these concepts. EPPs are encouraged to review pages 51-53 of the CAEP Handbook for Initial-Level Programs (2018) for additional guidance related to these concepts.

TN Department of Education

Rubric Overview and Structure

Each standard is accompanied by a set of rubrics.

Each set of rubrics is introduced with the overall standard language.

Each component within a standard is introduced with the component heading number followed by the full language of the component.

Components may be divided into multiple indicators, each denoted by an indicator heading.

Each indicator has one or more narrative prompts. 3.1.1.A is an example of a narrative prompt, which can contain additional optional or required questions to guide the provider.

3.1.1.D and 3.1.1.E are examples of exhibits for the provider to upload a document or data file.

Rubrics

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 through admission, the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and through decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for licensure. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program.

Component 3.1 Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs
The provider presents plans and goals to recruit and support the completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission. The admitted pool of candidates increasingly reflects the diversity of Tennessee's pre-K–12 students. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields, currently STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities.

Indicator 3.1.1 Plan for Recruitment

3.1.1 Narrative Prompts:

A. Describe the process by which the provider and primary LEA partner developed a recruitment plan that focuses on under-represented groups (i.e., racial and/or ethnic, males, and hard-to-staff/shortage fields).
- *How are roles and responsibilities identified and communicated?*
- *How were dedicated resources (human and fiscal) identified?*
- *How are strategies and accompanying goals for recruitment informed by data and aligned to local and/or state needs?*
- *How are timelines, including milestones and deliverables/outcomes, determined? How and by whom is progress monitored, measured, and communicated?*
- *What processes are in place to support, retain, and improve the proficiencies of under-represented at-risk candidates?*

B. Describe how the recruitment plan will result in the increased diversity of the candidate pool and target areas of teacher shortage.
- *What is the provider's theory of action to support the rationale for why the proposed activities outlined in the recruitment plan will have a positive impact on increasing the diversity of the candidate pool and target areas of teacher shortage?*
- *How is the data used to support additional efforts to increase the recruitment of candidates that meet these areas of need?*

C. How does the provider ensure that the plan includes a continuous improvement process for recruitment of candidates from all under-represented groups?
- *What is the current status of your recruitment efforts and where do you see your provider in relation to future milestones and benchmarks from your recruitment plan?*
- *Describe the process of reviewing the recruitment plan and making adjustments based on outcome data.*
- *What evidence demonstrates the allocation of resources toward identified targets and away from low-need employment area?*

3.1.1.D Required File Upload(s): Recruitment plan (see component and indicator section above for details)

3.1.1.E Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative responses to 3.1.1, if desired.

The rubric criteria to be used to score Indicator 3.1.1 follow all the narrative and file upload prompts for the component. All rubrics follow this basic format.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Below Expectations
• The provider meets all expectations for this indicator. **and** • The provider has a clearly articulated theory of action that provides the foundation for the plan. • The provider articulates an approach that is unique to its context, addresses specific partner-defined needs, and has preliminary outcome data to show impact of recruitment targeting the three areas of focus.	• The plan focuses on the recruitment of candidates in all under-represented areas and addresses **all** of the following: o identifies dedicated resources (human and fiscal), o outlines strategies and accompanying goals that are informed by data and aligned to state and/or local needs, o provides timelines and deliverables, and o identifies roles and responsibilities. • The provider and its primary partner have a **formal** process for reviewing the recruitment plan and making adjustments based on outcomes.	• The plan focuses on the recruitment of candidates of under-represented areas and addresses **some** of the following: o identifies dedicated resources (human and fiscal), and o outlines strategies and accompanying goals that are informed by data and aligned to state and/or local needs, o provides timelines and deliverables, and o identifies roles and responsibilities. • The provider and its primary partner have an **informal** process for reviewing the recruitment plan and making adjustments based on outcomes.	• The plan does not focus on the recruitment of candidates of underrepresented areas and addresses **few or none** of the following: o identifies dedicated resources (human and fiscal), o outlines strategies and accompanying goals that are informed by data and aligned to state and/or local needs, o provides timelines and deliverables, and o identifies roles and responsibilities. • The provider and its primary partner have **no process** for reviewing and making adjustments to the recruitment plan.

Each component with indicators requiring Annual Reports metrics is clearly labeled and provides an introduction to assist the provider in navigating these quantitative indicators.

Indicators requiring Annual Reports data are presented with the indicator heading followed by the corresponding domain and expectation for each metric.

The department provides Annual Reports data, so there is no prompt or file upload for these indicators.

If the provider does not meet expectations on a purely quantitative indicator, the provider must complete a narrative response for the component to address any indicators with unmet expectations.

Annual Reports Metrics

The rubrics below accompany quantitative metrics from the Annual Reports for components 3.1 and 3.2 Note that 3.2.1 requires providers to upload data not currently included on the Annual Reports. Providers are not required to provide responses to the indicators below, with the exception of 3.2.1, as data from the department-generated Annual Reports will be used.

If a provider is falling below expectations on any of the Annual Reports indicators, or on Indicator 3.2.1, the provider is required to provide a narrative response. The narrative purpose is two-fold. First, the narrative process is intended to engage the provider in preliminary analysis of issues related to metrics falling below expectations and the identification of potential solutions (i.e., root cause analysis). Second, narrative exhibits will provide additional context to reviewers and support a broader understanding of the whole provider, including how performance on these metrics may impact or be influenced by other programmatic areas.

Indicator 3.1.2 Percentage of completers from an underrepresented racial/ethnic group **Domain 1 –** Candidate Recruitment and Selection**; Metric –** Under-representation – racial and/or ethnic group **Expectation –** Candidates belonging to under-represented racial and/or ethnic groups represent at least 22 percent of the cohort OR the percentage of candidates from these groups increased.		
Exceeds Expectations	**Meets Expectations**	**Below Expectations**
The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 3 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on fewer than 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports
Indicator 3.1.3 Percentage of male completers **Domain 1** – Candidate Recruitment and Selection; **Metric** – Underrepresentation – gender **Expectation** - Male candidates represent at least 22 percent of the cohort **or** the percentage of male candidates increased		
Exceeds Expectations	**Meets Expectations**	**Below Expectations**
The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 3 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on fewer than 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports
Indicator 3.1.4 Percentage of completers who receive a high-needs endorsement **Domain 1** – Candidate Recruitment and Selection; **Metric** – High-needs endorsements **Expectation** – Production of candidates earning high-needs endorsements places the provider in the top quartile OR the percentage of candidates earning high-needs endorsements increased		
Exceeds Expectations	**Meets Expectations**	**Below Expectations**
The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 3 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on fewer than 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports
Required Narrative Prompt if the provider does not meet expectations on any Annual Reports indicators for 3.1. For each Annual Reports indicator which the provider did not meet expectations, provide a rationale why expectations were not met.		

TN Department of Education

2020-21
Tennessee Comprehensive Review Handbook for Educator Preparation Providers

Standard 5

Standard 5

Introduction to the Standard

Standard 5 is critical in that it undergirds the ability of the provider to meet Standards 1-4. A provider's capacity for operational and strategic effectiveness is dependent upon a well-designed system for quality assurance that addresses needs at the provider and specialty area program levels. Data-driven and evidence-based decision making requires purposeful engagement with personnel across provider and program, and strategic involvement of stakeholders from both within the provider's larger institutional structures and external partners (e.g., higher education institution leadership inside and outside the college of education, advisory boards, district partners, and other education community stakeholders).

The focus of Standard 5 is to underscore the importance of maintaining a quality assurance system (QAS), and using the data and information gathered by that system for the purpose of testing programmatic changes and innovations requisite to continuous improvement. The provider's QAS enables provider and program monitoring, performance assessment, and data-driven decision making for effective management and to support continuous improvement. A QAS is not simply a software platform or database. The QAS is an overarching system and related processes by which the provider gathers, stores, aggregates, disaggregates, analyzes, and uses data. QAS data may reflect any aspect of the provider's operations.

The QAS can be designed in any number of ways, depending on the institutional characteristics and unique context of the provider. The QAS is the sum total of processes, procedures, structures, and resources (personnel, fiscal, and tools) that enable the provider to monitor, evaluate, and ensure operational effectiveness, quality of preparation, and completer impact. The QAS must support administrative decision making, as well as faculty decision making related to program characteristics and design. While the QAS is supported by technology and software tools, it is not limited to the platforms or data systems that collect, store, and transform data. The QAS includes any regular processes and means by which the provider engages in a quality assurance process and assessing performance against internal and external expectations and against its own mission, vision, and goals.

The responses to the Standard 5 section of the self-study provide the opportunity to set the context for how the QAS can and does enable the provider to demonstrate provider performance and candidate effectiveness related to Standards 1-4.

Exhibits

Specific criteria for required exhibits are provided in the Components and Indicator Detail section below. Standard 5 exhibits can be found in Appendix A.5. Some indicators may prompt providers to supply optional exhibits in support of the corresponding narrative prompt for the component. Note that optional exhibits may be limited.

TN Department of Education

The Standard 5 Components[1] and Indicator Detail

This information provides definitions of terms, highlights specific Tennessee considerations, and details the integration of Annual Reports data related to the recruitment and selection of candidates for each of the Standard 5 components. Providers should review this information carefully as they compile the evidence needed to adequately meet Standard 5 expectations.

Standard 5

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on pre-K–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 and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on pre-K–12 student learning and development.

Quality and Strategic Evaluation

5.1 The provider's quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. Evidence demonstrates that the provider satisfies all CAEP standards.

This component focuses on quality and strategic evaluation utilizing multiple measures for provider monitoring and satisfaction of all standards. When responding to the narrative prompt for this component, the provider will introduce its QAS and provide a high-level overview of the multiple measures used within the monitoring and assessment of candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. The component 5.1 narrative allows providers the opportunity for a high-level overview of the engaged personnel, processes, and tools which comprise the QAS and enable the provider to collect, monitor, analyze, and report data and information related to quality and strategic evaluation. Though the provider will describe the information system(s), software, and tools that are essential to the functioning of the QAS (e.g., generic or specialized software, databases, or manual processes of systematically gathering and maintaining data and information), this component is not focused on software or databases alone. The systematic engagement of multiple functional areas to support an overarching set of processes and tools that support quality assurance will also be described in this component.

The provider is encouraged to provide a flow chart of how data systems connect/interrelate to support reviewer understanding of the flow of data and information among relevant stakeholders. The intent is not to capture in a flow chart each data element and its flow, nor the highest level of detail as to say (measures of candidate progress like assessments go into the student tracking system). Rather, the purpose of the flow chart is to support reviewer understanding of how information flows among personnel and how it is used to support the provider in a systems-focused approach, which is central to the whole comprehensive review process.

[1] Standard and component language is adapted from CAEP Standards (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, 2015) and has been edited to include Tennessee-specific expectations for educator preparation providers seeking state-only approval. Tennessee's standards are aligned to the CAEP standards, to ensure fairness for providers who elect to complete the national accreditation process by CAEP in lieu of state approval.

Responses to prompts in 5.1 should be brief, but should also effectively introduce the reviewer to the key measures used by the provider to monitor and assure quality in each of these three areas. Not every single measure needs to be described in the narrative, but key measures that are used across the provider and will be seen in greater detail in the narratives and artifacts submitted in Standards 1-4.

"Multiple measures" is a twofold reference. First, the QAS should include multiple measures, and second, multiple measures should be included in the QAS to monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness monitoring. Evidence provided under 5.1 may include examples of reports used by the provider that incorporate multiple sources of candidate data and information that are generated, collected, and stored as a result of QAS capabilities (reports might be of any length, such as a brief, and could include narrative and/or data summaries of provider analyses).

Quality and Strategic Evaluation
5.2 The provider's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

The provider's response to component 5.2 should clearly explain how the provider regularly reviews existing measures and adjusts as appropriate to ensure data quality and actionable outputs. Representativeness, as used in Component 5.2, may be understood as data/information samples, which at a minimum, capture data/information from all specialty areas offered by the provider. The provider should describe the characteristics of the sample and the representativeness of data collected as evidence of completer impact. A representative sample is one that is systematic and progressive, rather than merely a convenience sample.

Continuous Improvement - Provider Performance Assessment
5.3 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.

To support the narrative response to component 5.3, it may be helpful to review Standard 3 in order to describe how the provider tests the effects of selection criteria (selectivity at admission, during preparation, and at completion) on subsequent candidate progress and completion. Component 5.3 provides the opportunity for the provider to elaborate on how data, analyses, and interpretations from the QAS support accurate, actionable decision making relevant to the provider's goals and relevant standards for provider performance. In responding to the 5.3 narrative, providers are also asked to highlight the areas of program strength and growth that are most salient.

Continuous Improvement - Measures of Completer Impact
5.4 Measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on pre-K–12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.

In preparing the narrative response to component 5.4, providers should review the impact measures from Standard 4: completer impact on P-12 student learning and development; indicators of teaching effectiveness, observation instruments, and student surveys; employer satisfaction and completer persistence; and completer satisfaction. The provider is asked to reflect upon the insights gained from reviewing and analyzing annual completer impact measures from Annual Reports and other resources from the QAS.

Continuous Improvement - Stakeholder Involvement

5.5 The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.

In crafting a narrative response to Component 5.5, the provider should describe how stakeholders are engaged in program evaluation, including the interpretation of data, improvement processes, and identification of models of excellence. Identify which stakeholders are engaged, how provider leadership is involved, and the processes and procedures that support and structure these interactions to create opportunities for continuous improvement.

TN Department of Education

Rubrics

Standard 5: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on pre-K–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 and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on pre-K–12 student learning and development.

Component 5.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation (Multiple measures for provider monitoring and satisfaction of all standards)
The provider's quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. Evidence demonstrates that the provider satisfies all CAEP standards.

Indicator 5.1.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation (Multiple measures for provider monitoring and satisfaction of all standards)

5.1.1 Narrative Prompts:

A. Provide a high-level overview of the processes and tools that support the QAS with a brief description of each of the following:
- Roles and responsibilities of personnel who use and contribute to the QAS, including who is primarily responsible for collecting, monitoring, analyzing, and/or reporting data and information.
- Data and information system(s), software, and tools that are essential to the functioning of the provider's QAS (e.g., generic or specialized software, databases, or manual processes of systematically gathering and maintaining data and information). If multiple data systems and processes are involved, describe how data systems are connected and/or provide a flow chart of how data systems connect/interrelate.

B. List and briefly describe the multiple measures that comprise the QAS that enable the provider to monitor:
- candidate progress,
- completer achievements, and
- provider operational effectiveness.

C. How is the QAS evaluated to ensure the evidence derived from the key measures will inform actionable next steps related to program design and implementation?

D. Describe the timelines and related processes for continuous/ongoing review of QAS data and information, roles and responsibilities of engaged personnel/stakeholders, and opportunities for improvement found during the use of these data and information. This may include evidence of sufficiency of the QAS data and information for use in response to faculty, leadership, and stakeholder questions about candidate preparation across and within specialty area programs, program status/overall health, quality, and other relevant aspects of program management.

5.1.1.E Required File Upload(s): Upload 1-3 artifacts referenced in the 5.1.1 narrative that document QAS capabilities (what the QAS *can* do) that support provider quality and strategic evaluation, including multiple measures for provider monitoring and satisfaction of all standards.

5.1.1.F Optional File Upload(s): Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 5.1.1, if desired.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Below Expectations
• The provider demonstrates that all expectations for this component are met. **and** • The provider demonstrates that there is a clear, systematic process for evaluating the QAS and a continuous improvement cycle to test changes and make improvements to the QAS.	• The provider demonstrates a clear process for quality assurance which is supported through the use of available and dedicated resources, including **all** of the following elements: o personnel serving in roles with clear responsibilities for use of and contribution to the QAS, including the collecting, monitoring, analyzing, and/or reporting data and information, **and** o data and information systems, software, and other tools. • The provider's QAS is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, **and** provider operational effectiveness.	• The provider demonstrates a process for quality assurance which is supported through the use of available and dedicated resources, which **address some, but not all,** of the following elements: o personnel serving in roles with clear responsibilities for use of and contribution to the QAS, including the collecting, monitoring, analyzing, and/or reporting of data and information, **and** o data and information systems, software, and other tools. • The provider's QAS is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, **and/or** provider operational effectiveness; **however**, available measures for each area are either inconsistently available **or** more measures are needed for effective monitoring across and within programs.	• The provider does not demonstrate a systematic process for quality assurance, such as dedicated resources, defined stakeholders, and/or lacks multiple measures for monitoring candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness.

TN Department of Education

Component 5.2 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
The provider's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

Indicator 5.2.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation (Relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures; valid and consistent interpretations of data)

5.2.1 Narrative Prompts:

A. How does the provider know that the QAS relies upon measures that are relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable? **Address each of the following prompts:**

- What processes are developed and implemented to ensure that data files are complete and accurate?
- Describe the processes in place for analyzing and assuring convergence (e.g., correlation across multiple measures of the same construct) and consistency analyses (e.g., inter-rater reliability), and how the provider ensures that the processes are conducted accurately.
- How does the provider determine that convergence/consistency is of sufficient magnitude and statistically significant, if appropriate?
- How do data results align to measures of performance to inform program evaluation and continuous improvement?

B. What empirical evidence is produced by the QAS to indicate that interpretations of data are valid and consistent?

- *Describe the ways in which assessment instruments are aligned with the constructs being measured (i.e., does the assessment meet its intended purpose).*
- *Describe the ways in which scoring mechanisms are clearly aligned to assessment requirements.*
- *How does the provider ensure that interpretations of assessment results are unambiguous?*
- *How does the provider ensure that data generated from assessments are complete and accurate?*

5.2.1.C Required File Upload(s): Provide 1-2 exhibits referenced in the 5.2.1 narrative responses that support the provider's case that the QAS relies on measures that are relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable.

5.2.1.D Required File Upload(s): Provide 1-2 exhibits referenced in the 5.2.1 narrative responses that support the provider's case that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

5.2.1.E Optional File Upload(s): Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 5.2.1, if desired.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Below Expectations
• The provider demonstrates that all expectations for this component are met. **and** • Outputs of the analyses are evaluated and used to create actionable next steps that inform program design,	• The QAS relies upon measures that are relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable, and **includes all of the following**: o complete and accurate data files; o processes for ensuring convergence and consistency analyses (of a	• The QAS relies upon measures that are relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable; and the provider's QAS supports but **does not consistently include all of the following:** o complete and accurate data files; o processes for ensuring	• The QAS does not rely upon measures that are relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable. **and/or** • The provider lacks empirical evidence from the QAS to indicate that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

implementation, and improvement.	sufficient magnitude and statistically significant, if appropriate) are conducted accurately; and o data align to measures of performance to inform program evaluation and continuous improvement. • Empirical evidence from the QAS indicates that: o interpretations of data are valid, consistent; o assessment instruments are aligned with the constructs being measured; o scoring mechanisms are clearly aligned to assessment requirements; o interpretations of assessment results are unambiguous; **and** o data generated from assessments are complete and accurate.	convergence and consistency analyses (of a sufficient magnitude and statistically significant, if appropriate) are conducted accurately; and o data align to measures of performance to inform program evaluation and continuous improvement. • The QAS **does not consistently** indicate all of the following: o interpretations of data are valid and consistent; o assessment instruments are aligned with the constructs being measured; o scoring mechanisms are clearly aligned to assessment requirements; o interpretations of assessment results are unambiguous; **and** o data generated from assessments are complete and accurate	

Component 5.3 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.

Indicator: 5.3.1 Performance Assessment

5.3.1 Narrative Prompt:

A. How do data, analyses, and interpretations from the QAS support accurate, actionable decision making relevant to the provider's goals and relevant standards for provider performance?
- *Describe the processes by which the provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards for provider performance.*

B. How are performance results tracked and analyzed over time, related to program strength and growth (may include use of Annual Reports' Insights Tool)?
- *What areas of program strength and growth are most salient?*

C. How does the provider test the effects of selection criteria (selectivity at admission, during preparation, and at completion) on subsequent candidate progress and completion?
- *Provide 1-3 examples of tests of selection criteria and, if successful, what program or process changes resulted.*
- *Provide 1-3 examples of targeted innovations which the provider tested, and how (if successful) the tests resulted in programmatic change*.

5.3.1.D Optional File Upload(s): Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 5.3.1, if desired.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Below Expectations
• The provider demonstrates that all expectations for this component are met. **and** • The provider documents data-driven innovations, experimentation, and/or changes drawn on research and evidence from the field.	• Data, analyses, and interpretations from the QAS **support** accurate, actionable decision making relevant to the provider's goals and relevant standards for provider performance. • Performance results related to program strength and growth are systematically tracked and analyzed over time. • The provider tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria (selectivity at admission, during preparation, and at	• Data, analyses, and interpretations from the QAS **sometimes support** accurate, actionable decision making relevant to the provider's goals and relevant standards for provider performance. • Performance results related to program strength and growth are **not** systematically tracked and/or analyzed over time. • The provider **infrequently or rarely** tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria (selectivity at admission, during	• Data, analyses, and interpretations from the QAS **do not support** accurate, actionable decision making relevant to the provider's goals and relevant standards for provider performance.

	completion) on subsequent candidate progress and completion.	preparation, and at completion) on subsequent candidate progress and completion.	

TN Department of Education

Component 5.4 Continuous Improvement
Measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on pre-K–12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision making related to programs, resource allocation (budget, human capacity, etc.), and future direction.

Indicator: 5.4.1 Measures of Completer Impact

5.4.1 Narrative Prompts:

A. Describe the insights gained from reviewing and analyzing annual completer impact measures from Annual Reports and other resources from the QAS. Note: Impact measures include those from Standard 4: completer impact on P-12 student learning and development; indicators of teaching effectiveness, observation instruments, and student surveys; employer satisfaction and completer persistence; and completer satisfaction. **Address each of the following prompts**:

- Provide analysis of trends, comparisons with benchmarks, identification of changes made in preparation curricula, candidate experiences, and/or resource allocations affected by the provider's uses of the information, and indications of future directions.
- Are measures of completer impact used that are not included in the Annual Reports? If so, how are they summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, and acted upon in decision-making?

B. How, where, and with whom are measures of completer impact and results of analyses shared? Note any differentiation between audiences and methods across/within programs?

5.4.1.C Optional File Upload(s): Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 5.4.1, if desired.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Below Expectations
• The provider demonstrates that all expectations for this component are met. **and** • Regularly engages with other providers to share completer impact data and collaborate on similar data points and goals.	• The provider **clearly** demonstrates that measures of completer impact include: o measures completer impact on pre-K–12 student learning and development; o indicators of teaching effectiveness, observation instruments, and student surveys; o employer satisfaction and completer persistence; **and** o completer satisfaction are ▪ summarized; ▪ externally benchmarked;	• The provider summarizes and analyzes measures of completer impact. • Measures of completer impact are shared within the institution. • The provider uses measures of completer impact to make decisions related to program changes **and/or** resource allocation.	• The provider **does not** demonstrate that measures of completer impact are summarized, analyzed, or shared within the institution and/or the provider does not use measures of completer impact to make decisions related to program changes and/or resource allocation.

	▪ analyzed; ▪ shared widely with all relevant stakeholders within and outside the EPP; **and** ▪ acted upon in decision making related to programs, resource allocation (budget, human capacity, etc.), and future direction.		

Component 5.5 Continuous Improvement
The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.

Indicator: 5.5.1 Stakeholder Involvement
5.5.1 Narrative Prompts: **A.** How does the provider involve multiple stakeholders in program evaluation, including the interpretation of data, improvement processes, and identification of models of excellence? • Which stakeholders are involved and how are appropriate stakeholders identified by the provider for routine, ongoing, and/or targeted engagement? • How do provider leaders engage with appropriate stakeholders and management procedures regarding input, analysis, interpretation, and use of data and information from the QAS to support continuous improvement? **B.** Provide 1-3 examples of program improvement insights resulting from past collaboration with stakeholders. Describe any opportunities for improvement and/or recommendations for programmatic change that resulted from these collaborations.
5.5.1.C Required File Upload(s): Provide 1-2 additional exhibits referenced in the narrative response to 5.5.1, to support the examples of program improvement insights resulting from past collaboration with stakeholders.
5.5.1.D Optional File Upload(s): Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 5.5.1, if desired.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Below Expectations
• The provider demonstrates that all expectations for this component are met. **and** • There is a clearly defined process to ensure that all appropriate stakeholders are **regularly** and **systematically** involved in all continuous improvement processes. • The provider demonstrates that stakeholder involvement in continuous improvement processes has led to the testing and/or implementation of programmatic changes and innovations.	• The provider demonstrates that appropriate stakeholders (i.e., alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider) are consistently involved in: o program evaluation, program improvement, and o identification of models of excellence.	• The provider demonstrates that **some but not all** of the appropriate stakeholders (i.e., alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider) are involved in **some but not all** of the following continuous improvement processes: o program evaluation, and o identification of models of excellence.	• The provider does not demonstrate appropriate stakeholder involvement in continuous improvement processes.

2020-21
Tennessee Comprehensive Review Handbook for Educator Preparation Providers

Standard 1

Standard 1

Introduction to the Standard

Standard 1 addresses candidates' competencies in specialized content and pedagogical content knowledge and the skills to apply this knowledge with all pre-K–12 students. Providers are required to demonstrate programmatic design to ensure candidates can demonstrate an understanding of the InTASC standards, use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and measure pre-K–12 student progress, and model and apply technology to engage students and improve learning. Program design is considered in relation to candidate outcomes (e.g., content, literacy, and pedagogical assessment data) to ensure providers are equipped to prepare candidates to lead students toward college- and career-readiness standards.

Exhibits

Specific criteria for required exhibits are provided in the Component and Indicator Detail section below. Standard 1 exhibits can be found in Appendix A.1. Some indicators may prompt providers to supply optional exhibits in support of the corresponding narrative prompt for the component. Note that optional exhibits may be limited.

Standard 1 Component[2] and Indicator Detail

This section provides definitions of terms, highlights specific Tennessee considerations, and details the integration of Annual Reports data related to candidates' competencies in specialized content and pedagogical content knowledge and the ability to apply this knowledge with pre-K–12 students. Providers should review this information carefully as they compile the evidence needed to adequately meet Standard 1 expectations.

Standard 1

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[3] practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.

Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

1.1 Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the following categories: the learner and learning, content, instructional practice, and professional responsibility.

In this component, the provider should illustrate the design of the coursework, clinical experiences, assessments that support candidate understanding of the InTASC standards. The provider must demonstrate how programs are designed to support candidates' abilities to develop more complex teaching practices over time.

Measurement of candidates' developmental abilities (i.e., how candidates progress throughout preparation) may overlap with the programmatic transition points (*Indicator 3.4.1*) determined by the provider. However, **candidate learning progressions** and provider **transition points** are not synonymous terms. Both require a synthesis of data and information to determine whether a candidate meets the appropriate expectations before moving forward in preparation. However, candidate developmental learning progressions are fluid, and specific to the individual candidate depending on his/her abilities, backgrounds and needs, whereas transition points are transactional, generally the same for all candidates, and occur at a specific moment in time.

Research and Evidence

1.2 Providers ensure that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession, and use both to measure their pre-K–12 students' progress and their own professional practice.

As providers consider how candidates should use research and evidence to understand the teaching profession, they may consider, but are not limited to, how they prepare candidates to:

- create and maintain an inclusive classroom environment (e.g., classroom management systems, responsive teaching practices)

[2] Standard and component language is adapted from CAEP Standards (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, 2015) and has been edited to include Tennessee-specific expectations for educator preparation providers seeking state-only approval. Tennessee's standards are aligned to the CAEP standards to ensure fairness for providers who elect to complete the national accreditation process by CAEP, which can inform state approval.

[3] Discipline-specific refers to the practices specific to the discipline or profession, rather than broad knowledge of practices in the teaching and learning field.

- support pre-K–12 student learning (e.g., differentiated instruction, navigating unique learning styles, theories of assessment)
- analyze teaching effectiveness (e.g., reflective practice, evidence-based decision making)

Among other methods, providers may consider possible connections to edTPA when gathering evidence for component 1.2. A fundamental question asked across edTPA handbooks requires candidates to consider: How is the teaching you propose supported by research and theory about how students learn?

Candidate Assessment

1.3 Providers ensure that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments (e.g., literacy assessment [Teaching Reading: Elementary Education or Reading across the Curriculum: Elementary, specialty area assessments], Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT), and edTPA).

Annual Reports Data for 1.3
Metrics in Domain 3 use data obtained for completers from required pedagogical, literacy, and specialty area assessments.

Domain 3: Candidate Assessment		
Metric	**Annual Reports Expectation**	**Metric Detail**
Pedagogical Assessment (Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) or edTPA)	90 percent of completers pass the required pedagogical assessment (edTPA) within two attempts	Percentage of completers is calculated by dividing the sum of reported edTPA scores by the total number of individuals with a reported edTPA score.
	90 percent of completers pass the required pedagogical assessment (PLT) within two attempts	Percentage of completers is calculated by dividing the number of passing scores for each PLT assessment by the total number of PLT scores reported. If an individual attempted an assessment multiple times, the first two attempts are included in the calculation.
Literacy Assessment (Teaching Reading: Elementary Education or Reading Across the Curriculum: Elementary)	90 percent of completers pass the required literacy assessment within two attempts	Percentage of completers is calculated by dividing the passing scores for each assessment by the total number of scores reported. If an individual attempted an assessment multiple times, the first two attempts are included in the calculation.
Specialty Area Assessments	90 percent of completers pass the required specialty area assessments within two attempts	Percentage of completers is calculated by dividing the number of passing scores for each assessment by the total number of scores reported. If an individual attempted an assessment multiple times, the first two attempts are included in the calculation

College and Career Readiness
1.4 Providers ensure that candidates demonstrate the skills and commitment that afford **all** pre-K–12 students access to rigorous instruction aligned to college- and career-ready standards (e.g., SPA (content) standards, pedagogical standards, literacy standards, and state initiatives such as RTI[2] and Tennessee-specific literacy initiatives).

In the context of component 1.4, **skills** refer to the candidates' ability to deliver developmentally appropriate instruction to diverse learners in various contexts. **Commitment** refers to the candidates' deepening awareness and understanding of the strengths and needs of diverse learners when planning and adjusting instruction that incorporates the histories, experiences, and representations of students and families from diverse populations.

Technology throughout Preparation
1.5 Providers ensure that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement, and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice.

The International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) Standards for Educators serve as a resource for providers as they consider the technology needs of candidates within preparation; however, these are not a requirement for specialty area program (SAP) alignment.

Rubrics

Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

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.

Component 1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the following categories: the learner and learning, content, instructional practice, and professional responsibility.

Indicator 1.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
1.1.1 Narrative Prompts: **A.** Describe the progression levels of candidate competence from basic to more complex teaching practices across programs and provide 1-2 within specialty area program examples. • *How are courses and clinical practices aligned to support candidate understanding of the InTASC standards?* • *How does the provider determine when the appropriate progression levels correlate with the appropriate transition points within and across programs?* **B.** Describe the process for measuring candidate understanding of the four InTASC categories (the learner and learning, content, instructional practice, and professional responsibility) at the appropriate progression levels across programs. Provide 1-2 within specialty area program examples. Ensure the response includes the use of multiple measures. **C.** How does the provider use assessment data (within program and preservice exit assessments, both provider-developed and state licensure assessments) to ensure candidates have demonstrated an understanding of the InTASC standards?
1.1.1.D Required File Upload(s): Artifacts supporting narrative response such as key candidate assessments with results and subsequent analyses (e.g., candidate and/or pre-K–12 student pre- and post-assessments, candidate major content exams, pre-service exit measures, dispositional assessments, assessments of understanding of professional responsibilities).
1.1.1.E Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 1.1.1, if desired.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Below Expectations
• The provider meets all expectations for this indicator. **and** • The provider demonstrates a systematic and differentiated process for measuring candidate understanding of the InTASC standards using a continuous improvement cycle to make program design improvements.	• The provider **clearly** defines when the progression levels occur within and across programs, aligning course content and clinical practice to support candidate understanding of the 10 InTASC standards. • Candidate understanding of the four InTASC categories is **clearly** measured at the appropriate progression levels using multiple indicators or measures. • The provider **clearly** demonstrates candidates' understanding of the 10 InTASC standards, through assessment data (within program and preservice exit assessments, both provider-developed and state licensure assessments).	• The provider defines when the progression levels occur within and across programs, with **some** alignment of course content and clinical practice to support candidate understanding of the 10 InTASC standards. • Candidate understanding of the four InTASC categories is **somewhat** measured at the appropriate progression levels using multiple indicators or measures. • The provider demonstrates candidates' understanding of the 10 InTASC standards, though assessment data evidence **may be lacking**.	• The provider **does not** define when the progression levels occur within **and/or** across programs, aligning course content and clinical practice to support candidate understanding of the 10 InTASC standards. • Candidate understanding of the four InTASC categories is **not** measured at the appropriate progression levels using multiple indicators or measures. • The provider **does not** demonstrate candidates' understanding of the 10 InTASC standards.

Component 1.2 Research and Evidence – Providers ensure that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure their pre-K–12 students' progress and their own professional practice.

Indicator 1.2.1 Research and Evidence
1.2.1 Narrative Prompts: **A.** How are candidate experiences designed such that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession across programs? What data are collected and analyzed that indicate experiences result in candidate use of research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession? **B.** How does the provider ensure that candidates within programs use discipline-specific research and evidence of the teaching profession? Provide 1-2 examples. **C.** How are candidate experiences designed such that candidates use research and evidence to measure their pre-K–12 students' progress and their own professional practice across programs? What data are collected and analyzed that indicate experiences result in candidate use of research and evidence to measure their pre-K–12 students' progress and their own professional practice? **D.** How does the provider ensure that candidates within programs use discipline-specific research and evidence to measure pre-K–12 student progress and their own professional practice? Provide 1-2 examples.
1.2.1.E Required File Upload: Artifacts supporting narrative response such as key assessments, observational instruments, and resultant data that are used to evaluate candidates' knowledge and proficiency of evidence-based instructional practices and measurement of student progress.
1.2.1.F Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 1.2.1, if desired.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Below Expectations
• The provider meets all expectations for this indicator. **and** • Using data and innovative outcomes, the provider generates actionable next steps to continuously improve program elements and processes related to candidate experiences with research and evidence.	• The provider **clearly** demonstrates that candidate experiences are designed (and submitted artifacts are aligned) such that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession. • The provider **clearly** describes within-program examples of how candidates use discipline-specific research and evidence of the teaching profession. • The provider **clearly** demonstrates that candidate experiences are designed (and	• The provider demonstrates that candidate experiences are designed such that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession, but alignment to the submitted artifacts may not be clear. • The provider **somewhat** describes within-program examples of how candidates use discipline-specific research and evidence of the teaching profession. • The provider demonstrates that candidate experiences are	• The provider **does not** demonstrate that candidate experiences are designed such that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession. • The provider **does not** describe within-program examples of how candidates use discipline-specific research and evidence of the teaching profession. • The provider **does not** demonstrate that candidate experiences are designed such that candidates use research

	submitted artifacts are aligned) such that candidates use research and evidence to measure pre-K–12 students' progress and their own professional practice. • The provider describes **specific** within-program examples of how candidates use discipline-specific research and evidence to measure pre-K–12 student progress and their own professional practice.	designed such that candidates use research and evidence to measure pre-K–12 students' progress **and/or** their own professional practice, but alignment to the submitted artifacts may not be clear. • The provider **somewhat** describes within-program examples of how candidates use discipline-specific research to measure pre-K–12 student progress **and/or** their own professional practice.	and evidence to measure pre-K–12 students' progress or their own professional practice. • The provider describes **few or no** within-program examples of how candidates use discipline-specific research to measure pre-K–12 student progress or their own professional practice.

Component 1.3 Candidate Assessment – Providers ensure that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments (e.g., edTPA and Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT), Literacy Assessment [Teaching Reading: Elementary Education or Reading Across the Curriculum: Elementary, Specialty Area Assessments]).

Annual Reports Metrics

The rubrics below accompany quantitative metrics from the Annual Reports for component 1.3.

If a provider is falling below expectations on any of the Annual Reports indicators, the provider is required to provide a narrative response. The purpose for the narrative is two-fold. First, the narrative process is intended to engage the provider in preliminary analysis of issues related to metrics falling below expectation and the identification of potential solutions (i.e., root cause analysis).

Second, narrative exhibits will provide additional context to reviewers and support a broader understanding of the whole provider, including how performance on these metrics may impact or be influenced by other programmatic areas.

Indicator 1.3.1 Pedagogical Assessment **Domain 3** – Candidate Assessment; **Metric** – Pedagogical Assessment (edTPA or PLT) **Expectation** – 90 percent of completers pass the required pedagogical assessment within two attempts		
Exceeds Expectations	**Meets Expectations**	**Below Expectations**
The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 3 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on fewer than 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.

Indicator 1.3.2 Literacy Assessment **Domain 3** – Candidate Assessment; **Metric** – Literacy Assessment (Teaching Reading: Elementary Education and Reading Across the Curriculum: Elementary) **Expectation** – 90 percent of completers pass the required literacy assessment within two attempts		
Exceeds Expectations	**Meets Expectations**	**Below Expectations**
The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 3 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on fewer than 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.

Indicator 1.3.3 Specialty Area Assessments **Domain 3** – Candidate Assessment; **Metric** – Specialty Area Assessments **Expectation** – 90 percent of completers pass the required specialty area assessment within two attempts		
Exceeds Expectations	**Meets Expectations**	**Below Expectations**
The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 3 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on fewer than 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.
Required Narrative Prompt only if the provider does not meet expectations on any Annual Reports indicators for 1.3. For each Annual Reports indicator which the provider did not meet expectations, provide a rationale for why expectations were not met and potential action steps.		

Component 1.4 College and Career Readiness – Providers ensure that candidates demonstrate the skills and commitment that afford **all** pre-K–12 students access to rigorous instruction aligned to college- and career-ready standards (e.g., SPA (content) standards, pedagogical standards, literacy standards, and state initiatives such as RTI[2] and Tennessee-specific literacy initiatives).

Indicator 1.4.1 College and Career Readiness

1.4.1 Narrative Prompts:

A. How does the provider prepare candidates across disciplines to deliver developmentally appropriate instruction to diverse learners in various contexts?

- *How does the provider support candidate proficiency in creating inclusive learning environments that support individual and collaborative learning for all students?*
- *How does the provider support candidate development of rapport with students, including deep knowledge of their students' backgrounds, interests, and needs?*
- *How does the provider measure and assess candidates' instructional proficiencies related to diverse learners and contexts across disciplines?*

B. Describe opportunities for candidates to demonstrate commitment that affords all pre-K–12 students access to rigorous instruction aligned to college- and career-ready standards.

- *How does the provider measure and assess candidates' commitment throughout the program?*

1.4.1.C Required File Upload: Artifacts supporting narrative response such as key assessments and data (e.g., observation instruments, edTPA, dispositional data) used to prepare candidates for instructional proficiencies and commitment that afford all students access to rigorous instruction.

1.4.1.D Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 1.4.1, if desired.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Below Expectations
• The provider meets all expectations for this indicator. **and** • The provider has a **regular and systematic** process for monitoring candidate demonstration of skills and commitment that afford all pre-K–12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards, and has implemented a continuous improvement cycle for assessing and modifying program design as a result of candidate outcomes.	• The provider **clearly** demonstrates how candidates across disciplines are prepared to deliver developmentally appropriate instruction to diverse learners in various contexts. • The provider **clearly** describes opportunities for candidates to demonstrate commitment that affords all pre-K–12 students access to rigorous instruction aligned to college- and career-ready standards.	• The provider **somewhat** demonstrates how candidates across disciplines are prepared to deliver developmentally appropriate instruction to diverse learners in various contexts. • The provider **somewhat** describes opportunities for candidates to demonstrate commitment that affords all pre-K–12 students access to rigorous instruction aligned to college- and career-ready standards.	• The provider **does not demonstrate** a clear process to ensure candidates are prepared to deliver developmentally appropriate instruction to diverse learners in various contexts. • The provider **does not** describe the opportunities for candidates to demonstrate commitment that affords all pre-K–12 students access to rigorous instruction aligned to college- and career-ready standards.

Component 1.5 Technology throughout Preparation – Providers ensure that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement, and assess learning experiences to engage all students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice.

Indicator 1.5.1 Technology throughout Preparation
1.5.1 Narrative Prompts: **A.** How are candidate opportunities (coursework, assessments, clinical experiences) designed such that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement, and assess learning experiences to engage all students and improve learning within and across programs? • *How does the provider prepare candidates to be flexible and adaptive to a range of technology resources (or lack thereof) that may be available in different school settings?* **B.** What data are collected and analyzed that indicate opportunities result in candidate knowledge and skills applicable to technology standards?
1.5.1.C Required File Upload: Cite the technology standards referenced in the narrative prompts.
1.5.1.D Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 1.5.1, if desired.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Below Expectations
• The provider meets all expectations for this indicator. **and** • The provider has a regular and systematic process for monitoring candidate modeling and application of technology standards, and has implemented a continuous improvement cycle for assessing and modifying program design as a result of candidate outcomes.	• Within and across programs, the provider **clearly** demonstrates how candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences, including: o designing and delivering effective technology-based learning to engage all pre-K–12 students; and o using technology to assess, document, monitor/track, and share student learning and progress • The provider demonstrates a **clear** process for collecting and analyzing data that indicate opportunities result in candidate knowledge and skills applicable to technology standards.	• With some inconsistencies, the provider demonstrates how candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences, including: o designing and delivering effective technology-based learning to engage all pre-K–12 students; and o using technology to assess, document, monitor/track, and share student learning and progress • The process is **somewhat clear** for collecting and analyzing data. **or** • The process does not clearly indicate the opportunities that result in candidate knowledge and skills applicable to technology standards.	• The provider **does not** demonstrate how candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning.

2020-21
Tennessee Comprehensive Review Handbook
for Educator Preparation Providers

Standard 2

Standard 2

Introduction to the Standard

High-quality clinical experiences are a unique and critical feature for educator preparation at any level. Standard 2 encourages providers to:

- develop and sustain partnerships with local education agencies and appropriate education advocacy groups to ensure the co-construction of mutually beneficial pre-K–12 school and community arrangements and shared responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation; and
- provide opportunities for candidates to practice the application of course knowledge under diverse instructional conditions with students who have differing needs.

Standard 2 addresses the need for providers to ensure that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical experiences are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate a positive impact on all pre-K–12 students' learning and development.

Partnerships and clinical experiences should keep a clear focus on candidate experiences that have positive effects on pre-K–12 student learning. The partnerships should be continued over time and should feature shared decision making about crucial aspects of preparation experiences for candidates and the managing of the partnerships among all clinical educators.

Exhibits

Specific criteria for required exhibits are provided in the Component and Indicator Detail section below. Standard exhibits can be found in Appendix A.2. Some indicators may allow providers to supply optional exhibits to support the preceding narrative response, though optional exhibits may be limited.

Standard 2 Component[4] and Indicator Detail

The information below provides definitions of terms, highlights specific Tennessee considerations, and details the integration of state-recognized and primary partnership agreements. Providers should review this information carefully as they compile the evidence needed to adequately meet Standard 2 expectations.

Standard 2

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 a positive impact on all pre-K–12 students' learning and development.

Partnerships for Clinical Practice

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial pre-K–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.

Commonly used terms such as **collaboratively developed** and **mutually agreed upon** are referenced frequently within the rubrics for this component; these terms align with the prompts on the state-recognized and primary partnership agreements. Collaboratively developed assumes that both the provider and its district partner(s) work jointly to develop protocols and processes, such as candidate recruitment and selection strategies and goals. Mutually agreed upon expectations may not necessarily be collaboratively developed; however, it is assumed that both partners discuss and consent to the criteria, protocols, processes, and decisions related to candidate preparation and clinical experiences.

Indicator 2.1.1 focuses on state-recognized partnerships between the provider and district, which includes, but is not limited to, the state-recognized agreement. Providers have the option to submit evidence from a memorandum of understanding (MOU) or agreement (MOA) as long as the MOU/MOA or some other formal documentation between the provider and district clearly addresses the two prompts on the state-recognized agreement.

Indicator 2.1.2 focuses on primary partnerships between the provider and district, which includes, but is not limited to, the primary partnership agreement. This indicator incorporates the plans (i.e., the primary partnership agreement) for how partners will collaborate to ensure that candidates participate in high-quality clinical experiences, as well as additional criteria for providers to demonstrate the outcomes of these plans. Providers are required to include their primary partnership agreement as evidence to support their narrative responses.

Clinical Educators

2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, observe, and provide actionable feedback to support and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-

[4] Standard and component language is adapted from CAEP Standards (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, 2015) and has been edited to include Tennessee-specific expectations for educator preparation providers seeking state-only approval. Tennessee's standards are aligned to the CAEP standards to ensure fairness for providers who elect to complete the national accreditation process by CAEP, which can inform state approval.

based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and pre-K–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, observation and/or evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings.

This component focuses on the co-selection, preparation, observation, and development and retention of clinical educators. Clinical educators are defined as individuals who assess, support, and develop candidates' knowledge, skills, and/or professional dispositions at some stage during clinical experiences. Clinical educators are inclusive of school-based clinical mentors and provider-based clinical supervisors.

Indicator 2.2.1 emphasizes the co-selection, preparation, and observation of clinical educators, whereas *Indicator 2.2.2* emphasizes the development and retention of clinical educators.

The observation of clinical educators, and subsequent actionable feedback provided, should be focused on clinical educators' roles and responsibilities as it relates to supporting candidates and not as it relates to clinical mentors' pre-K–12 instructional effectiveness as a teacher of record.

In *Indicator 2.2.2*, the **development** of clinical educators is defined as intentional support through targeted professional learning as it relates to their roles and responsibilities as clinical educators.

Clinical Experiences

2.3 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. 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 dispositions, as delineated in Standard 1, that are associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all pre-K–12 students.

Clinical experiences are guided, hands-on, practical applications and demonstrations of professional knowledge of theory to practice, skills, and dispositions through collaborative and facilitated learning in field-based assignments, tasks, activities, and assessments across a variety of settings. Clinical experiences include field experiences and clinical practice (i.e., student teaching, internship, job-embedded).

In *Indicator 2.3.1* as it relates to clinical experiences, **coherence** is intentionally sequenced clinical practices, with logical interconnection, to ensure candidate developmental progression across the continuum of clinical experiences; **depth** is intentional programmatic design (i.e., the relationship between clinical experiences, coursework, and candidate assessments) that support candidates as they build content and pedagogical knowledge throughout preparation; **breadth** is the learning that refers to the full span of knowledge of a subject; **diversity of clinical experiences** refers to the opportunities candidates are provided within preparation to observe and practice within a wide variety of settings, which should include working with students of varied learning needs and backgrounds; **duration** of a clinical experience refers to the time in which candidates spend in clinical experiences.

Indicator 2.3.2 focuses on the design of performance-based clinical experience assessments. For this indicator, providers should clearly define the purpose

of each assessment, how the intended outcomes of the assessment will measure increasing levels of candidate competencies, and determine when the assessments will be given throughout preparation. The outcomes of these performance-based assessments should be reflected within the evidence submitted for Standard 1.

TN Department of Education

Rubrics

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

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 a positive impact on all pre-K–12 students' learning and development.

Component 2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Practice
Partners co-construct mutually beneficial pre-K–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.

Indicator 2.1.1 State-Recognized Partnerships

2.1.1 Narrative Prompts:

A. Briefly describe the process for establishing state-recognized partnerships and determining clinical educators' roles and responsibilities. Include how technology is utilized to facilitate partner collaboration.

B. Describe the expectations for clinical educators regarding ongoing candidate support. Include the expectations for providing candidate observation and feedback processes.
- *What supports are in place to help educator candidates improve?*
- *How often do candidates participate in support activities?*

C. Describe the process for observing and providing feedback for clinical educators regarding their roles and responsibilities.
- *What supports are in place to help clinical educators improve?*
- *How often do clinical educators participate in activities designed to improve their ability to support candidates?*

D. Describe the process the partnership uses to annually determine the effectiveness of agreed upon expectations and processes for clinical experiences

2.1.1.E Required File Upload(s): State-recognized partnership agreement(s) with at least one, but no more than three, district partners or at least one MOU/MOA that addresses the requirements of the state-recognized agreement

2.1.1.F Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 2.1.1, if desired.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Below Expectations
• The provider meets all expectations for this indicator. **and** • The provider demonstrates that the partnership has a **clear**	• State-recognized partnership agreement(s) and related evidence **clearly address all** of the following elements:	• State-recognized partnership agreement(s) and related evidence **address some, but not all,** of the following elements:	• The provider **did not provide** a state-recognized partnership with applicable districts.

continuous improvement process for evaluating partnership effectiveness as evidenced by **any** of the following: o a formal, annual review of the partnership agreement with adjustments made as needed o ongoing needs assessment and progress monitoring, with changes made based on the analysis of partnership outcomes o clear connections to measurable outcomes and their impact	o collaboratively developed roles and responsibilities for provider- and school-based clinical educators o expectations for clinical educators regarding candidate support (e.g., direct mentoring, coaching), and frequency and duration of support activities o expectations for clinical educators regarding candidate observation and feedback, including observation frequency and feedback/progress monitoring procedures o the process for observing and providing feedback to clinical educators regarding their roles and responsibilities • The provider demonstrates that the partners review state-recognized agreements annually to determine the effectiveness of agreed upon expectations and processes for clinical experiences.	o collaboratively developed roles and responsibilities for provider- and school-based clinical educators o expectations for clinical educators regarding candidate support (e.g., direct mentoring, coaching), and frequency and duration of support activities o expectations for clinical educators regarding candidate observation and feedback, including observation frequency and feedback/progress monitoring procedures o the process for observing and providing feedback to clinical educators regarding their roles and responsibilities o The provider demonstrates that the partners review state-recognized agreements annually to determine the effectiveness of agreed upon expectations and processes for clinical experiences.	

Component 2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Practice
Partners co-construct mutually beneficial pre-K–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.

Indicator 2.1.2 Primary Partnerships

2.1.2 Narrative Prompts:

A. Briefly describe the process used to co-develop the primary partnership(s). Include how candidate recruitment and selection goals and strategies, and the observation and feedback processes for educator candidates, were identified and developed.
- *What supports are in place to help educator candidates improve?*

B. Describe the process for how clinical educator selection criteria and protocols were identified and developed.

C. Describe the clinical educators' roles and responsibilities, providing examples of each.

D. Describe the observation and feedback processes for clinical educators.
- *What supports are in place to help clinical educators improve?*
- *What professional learning opportunities are provided to clinical educators (i.e., coaching and mentoring) to better support candidates?*

E. Describe strategies used to ensure educator candidates demonstrate connections linking theory to practice.

F. How does the provider and its district partner maintain coherence across preparation and share accountability for candidate outcomes? To what extent is the district engaged in program design and content delivery?
- *In what ways does preparation build in complexity across the program?*
- *How are courses/modules and clinical experiences logically integrated to support candidate development?*

G. Describe the process for evaluating partnership effectiveness. Include how the partnership assesses its ongoing needs and monitors progress toward meeting these needs.
- *Describe how the provider uses the results of the primary partnership inventory to determine the effectiveness of the partnership.*

2.1.2.H Required File Upload(s): Primary partnership agreement with at least one, but no more than three, district partners.

2.1.2.I Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 2.1.2, if desired.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Below Expectations
• The provider meets all expectations for this indicator. **and** • The provider demonstrates that the partners have collaboratively developed **any** of the following: o short- and long-term visions for the partnership o shared professional development for educator candidates and clinical mentors o support strategies for early-career educators following program completion o systematic strategies for district engagement in program design and delivery of program content to support connections between theory and practice o a **clear continuous improvement** process for evaluating partnership effectiveness, using an ongoing needs assessment and progress monitoring, with shifts in preparation pipelines, structures, and systems being made based on the analysis of partnership outcomes	• The primary partnership agreement and related evidence **clearly address all** of the following collaboratively developed elements: o educator candidate recruitment and selection goals and strategies o roles and responsibilities for both provider- and school-based clinical educators o clinical mentor selection criteria and protocols that ensure clinical mentors are rated highly effective and are appropriately licensed and endorsed in the same/closely related area to the candidate(s) they support o clinical supervisor selection criteria and protocols • The primary partnership agreement and related evidence demonstrate **clear expectations for all** of the following elements: o candidate support, such as direct mentoring and coaching, as well as frequency and duration of support activities	• The primary partnership agreement and related evidence **address some, but not all,** of the following collaboratively developed elements: o educator candidate recruitment and selection goals and strategies o roles and responsibilities for both provider- and school-based clinical educators o clinical mentor selection criteria and protocols that ensure clinical mentors are rated highly effective and are appropriately licensed and endorsed in the same/closely related area to the candidate(s) they support o clinical supervisor selection criteria and protocols o The primary partnership agreement and related evidence demonstrate **clear expectations for some, but not all,** of the following elements: o candidate support, such as direct mentoring and coaching, as well as frequency and duration of support activities	• The primary partnership agreement was developed solely by the provider. **or** • The provider **has not established** a primary partnership with at least one district.

	o candidate observation and feedback, including the frequency of observations and feedback, as well as progress monitoring procedures • The provider and its district partner(s) have **clearly** identified: o mutually agreed upon strategies to ensure candidates demonstrate connections linking theory and practice, with some district engagement in program design and delivery of program content to support connections between theory and practice o mutually agreed upon key candidate assessments, transition points, and exit requirements o mutually agreed upon design of clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration • The provider and its district partner(s) have a **clear process** for evaluating partnership effectiveness as evidenced by: o a formal, annual review of the partnership agreement,	o candidate observation and feedback, including the frequency of observations and feedback, as well as progress monitoring procedures • The provider and its district partner(s) have **somewhat** identified: o mutually agreed upon strategies to ensure candidates demonstrate connections linking theory and practice, with some district engagement in program design and delivery of program content to support connections between theory and practice o mutually agreed upon key candidate assessments, transition points, and exit requirements o mutually agreed upon design of clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration • The provider and its district partner(s) have a process for evaluating partnership effectiveness, which includes any of the following:	

	with adjustments being made as needed, o clear connections to measurable outcomes and their impact, **and** o the results and analysis of the primary partnership inventory data.	o limited review of the partnership agreement, o limited connections to measurable outcomes and their impact, **or** o the results and analysis of the primary partnership inventory data	

Component 2.2 Clinical Educators – Partners co-select, prepare, observe, and provide actionable feedback to support and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and pre-K–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.

Indicator 2.2.1 Co-Selection, Preparation, Observation, and Feedback for Clinical Educators

2.2.1 Narrative Prompts:

A. Describe how the provider ensures that partners co-select high-quality clinical educators.
- *Are there additional criteria used to co-select high-quality clinical educators beyond the criteria in the policy 5.504 (e.g., highly effective and appropriately licensed and endorsed in the area the specialty area of mentorship)? If so, please describe.*

B. Describe how the provider ensures that partners develop and implement criteria and protocols for preparing high-quality clinical educators.
- *Are there formal opportunities (e.g., orientations, online trainings) to prepare clinical educators? If so, please describe.*

C. Describe how clinical mentors and supervisors are observed and provided actionable feedback related to their roles and responsibilities as clinical educators so that they are prepared to positively impact candidates' development and, ultimately, pre-K–12 student learning and development.

D. Describe plans for tracking clinical educator assignment to candidates and a process for analyzing connections between clinical educators and program completer in-service impact on pre-K-12 student learning and development.

E. How does the partnership share and use observation, feedback, and candidate perception data to make improvements to the overall clinical experience?

F. Describe any technology-based applications and how they support partners in selecting, preparing, observing, and providing feedback for clinical educators.

2.2.1.G Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 2.2.1, if desired.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Below Expectations
• The provider meets all expectations for this indicator. **and** • The provider demonstrates that the partners have co-developed a clear, systematic process for sharing and using clinical educator observation and assessment data using a continuous improvement cycle to make improvements to the clinical experience.	• The provider works with district partner(s) to **consistently** meet minimum expectations for clinical educators as outlined in the educator preparation policy (5.504). • The provider presents evidence of a **clear** process for how partners co-select high-quality clinical educators.	• The provider works with district partner(s) to **sometimes** meet minimum expectations for clinical educators as outlined in the educator preparation policy (5.504). • The provider presents evidence of a process for how partners co-select clinical educators. • The provider presents evidence of a process for development	• Clinical educators are **not** or are **rarely** observed and provided actionable feedback using identified assessment tools and protocols. **or** • Clinical educators are observed and provided feedback using assessment tools and protocols; however, related data is rarely shared with partners.

	• The provider presents evidence of a **clear** process for development and implementation of criteria and protocols for preparing high-quality clinical educators to ensure that they are provided sufficient growth opportunities (orientation, etc.) to support candidates. • Clinical mentors are observed and provided actionable feedback using tools and protocols on performance of mentor roles and responsibilities. • Clinical supervisors are observed and provided actionable feedback using tools and protocols on how well they perform and carry out the expectations of supervisor roles and responsibilities. • The partners develop plans for sharing and using clinical educator observation and/or assessment data to modify selection criteria and determine future assignments of candidates. • The provider demonstrates plans for tracking clinical educator assignment to candidates and a process for analyzing connections between	and implementation of criteria and protocols for preparing high-quality clinical educators to ensure that they are provided sufficient growth opportunities (orientation, etc.) to support candidates. • Clinical mentors are observed and provided **limited** actionable feedback using tools and protocols, on performance of mentor roles and responsibilities. • Clinical supervisors are observed and provided **limited** actionable feedback using tools and protocols on performance of supervisor roles and responsibilities.	

	clinical educator assignments and program completer in-service impact on pre-K-12 student learning and development.		

Component 2.2 Clinical Educators – Partners co-select, prepare, observe, and provide actionable feedback to support and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and pre-K–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.

Indicator 2.2.2 Development and Retention of Clinical Educators

2.2.2 Narrative Prompts:

A. How do the provider and district partner(s) demonstrate that clinical educators are provided and participate in professional learning opportunities designed to help them continuously improve practices related to their roles and responsibilities?

B. How do the provider and district partner(s) develop plans for offering appropriate support to ineffective clinical educators?

C. If support efforts are unsuccessful, how does the provider and district partner(s) demonstrate a mutually agreed-upon process is in place to identify and remove ineffective clinical educators?

- *How does the partnership determine retention or non-retention of clinical educators?*
- *Provide examples of ongoing support and professional learning opportunities that improve the quality of clinical educators who are retained*.

D. Describe any technology-based applications and how they support partners in developing and retaining clinical educators.

E. How does the provider and district partner(s) co-develop plans to implement a shared process to use data to maintain a pool of effective clinical educators?

- *How does the provider and district partner(s) share and use development and retention clinical educator data to make improvements to the overall clinical experience?*

2.2.2.F Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 2.2.2, if desired.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Below Expectations
• The provider meets all expectations for this indicator. **and** • The provider and its district partner(s) co-developed a clear, systematic process for sharing	• The provider and district partner(s) develop and implement criteria and protocols for professionally developing high-quality clinical educators.	• The provider and district partner(s) demonstrate that professional development (provider or district-led) activities, related to roles and responsibilities of clinical	• The provider and its district partner(s) do not have a process for developing and retaining effective clinical educators, OR the process is unilaterally

and using clinical educator preparation and retention data in a continuous improvement cycle for clinical experiences; • The partnership's preparation and retention criteria and protocols for clinical educators includes evidence of demonstrated competencies related to feedback, coaching, assessment, and progress monitoring; or • The provider and its district partner(s) use collaboratively-developed strategies to develop and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based.	• The provider and district partner(s) develop plans to offer appropriate support to ineffective clinical educators. • The provider and district partner(s) demonstrate a mutually agreed-upon process is in place to identify and remove ineffective clinical educators. • The provider and district partner(s) co-develop plans to implement a shared process to use data to develop and maintain a pool of effective clinical educators.	educators, are reactionary rather than provide support for continuous improvement of mentors **and/or** supervisors. • The provider and district partner(s) do not have a mutually agreed-upon process to identify, support, develop, and remove ineffective clinical educators. • The provider or district partner(s) do not develop plans to implement a shared process for developing and maintaining a pool of effective clinical educators.	developed and implemented by only one entity.

Component 2.3 Clinical Experiences – 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. 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 dispositions, as delineated in Standard 1, that are associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all pre-K–12 students.

Indicator 2.3.1 Design of High-Quality Clinical Experiences (Coherence, Depth, Breadth, Diversity, Duration)

2.3.1 Narrative Prompts:

A. In what ways does the provider work with district partner(s) to design clinical experiences to ensure a developmentally appropriate progression for candidates across the continuum that leads to a positive impact on student learning?

B. Describe the shared goals for each clinical experience. Include the focus, purpose, and variety for each.

C. How does the provider ensure the program is intentionally designed to support candidates as they build knowledge of content and pedagogy throughout preparation?

- *Describe the relationship between clinical experiences, coursework, and candidate assessments.*

D. Describe the opportunities candidates have to observe and practice in a wide variety of settings (e.g., within and across schools, during different times of day, across different types of instruction).

- *How does the provider ensure candidates are provided opportunities to work with students of varied backgrounds and learning needs?*

E. Clearly explain the expectations for the duration of clinical experiences.

- *How does the provider ensure the requirements of the duration of clinical experiences are met?*

2.3.1.F Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 2.3.1, if desired.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Below Expectations
• The provider **meets all expectations** for this indicator. **and** • The provider includes evidence that clearly demonstrates alignment to theory and practice; or • Partners use data from clinical experiences, coursework, candidate assessment, and impact on student learning, using a continuous improvement cycle, to make	• The provider **engages** district partner(s) in the design of coherent clinical experiences that demonstrate a clear, well-defined sequence to ensure developmental progression across the continuum of clinical experiences (i.e., field experiences and clinical practice). • Shared goals for **each** of the clinical experiences are **consistently** appropriate and **clearly** articulate the focus,	• The provider has **limited engagement** with district partner(s), in the design of coherent clinical experiences that demonstrate a clear, well-defined sequence to ensure developmental progression across the continuum of clinical experiences (i.e., field experiences and clinical practice). • Shared goals for **some** of the clinical experiences are appropriate and articulate the	• The provider **does not engage** district partner(s), to design coherent clinical experiences that demonstrate a clear, well-defined sequence to ensure developmental progression across the continuum of clinical experiences (i.e., field experiences and clinical practice). • Goals for each of the clinical experiences **are not, or are rarely,** appropriate and clearly articulated.

changes to the design (depth and coherence) of clinical experiences.	purpose, and variety of these experiences. • Through an intentional programmatic design (i.e., the relationship between clinical experiences, coursework, and candidate assessments) the partners support candidates as they build knowledge of content and pedagogy throughout preparation. • Candidates have **consistent** opportunities to observe and practice in a wide variety of settings. • For **all** programs, the provider has clearly defined expectations for the duration of clinical experiences, including the minimum number of hours or days for both field experiences and the clinical practice. • The provider works with district partner(s) to **consistently** meet minimum expectations for clinical experiences as outlined in the educator preparation policy (5.504).	focus, purpose, and variety of these experiences. • Through a **somewhat** intentional programmatic design, the provider supports candidates as they build knowledge of content and pedagogy throughout preparation. • Candidates have **inconsistent** opportunities to observe and practice in a wide variety of settings. • For **most** programs, the provider has clearly defined expectations for the duration of clinical experiences, including the minimum number of hours or days for both field experiences and the clinical practice. • The provider works with district partner(s), but **inconsistently** meets minimum expectations for clinical experiences as outlined in the educator preparation policy (5.504).	• The provider **does not** intentionally design programs to support candidates as they build knowledge of content and pedagogy throughout preparation. • Candidates **do not** have opportunities to observe and practice in a wide variety of settings. • The provider **has not** defined expectations for the duration of clinical experiences, including the minimum number of hours or days (as required) for both field experiences and the clinical practice. • The provider **does not** work with district partner(s) to meet minimum expectations for clinical experiences as outlined in the educator preparation policy (5.504).

Component 2.3 Clinical Experiences – 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. 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 dispositions, as delineated in Standard 1, that are associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all pre-K–12 students.

Indicator 2.3.2 Clinical Experience Assessments

2.3.2 Narrative Prompts:

A. Describe the key points within programs in which candidates will engage in multiple performance-based assessments during clinical experiences.

B. Define the purpose of each performance-based assessment and describe how the intended outcomes will measure increasing levels of candidate competency.

- *How do the performance-based assessments measure candidates' knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions associated with positively impacting student learning?*

C. Describe how candidates engage in technology-enhanced learning opportunities to assist in the demonstration of their knowledge, skills, and professional disposition development.

2.3.2.D Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 2.3.2, if desired.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Below Expectations
• The provider meets all expectations for this indicator. **and** • Providers regularly review the design of the performance-based assessments and technology-enhanced learning opportunities for candidates within clinical experiences.	• The provider demonstrates evidence of the key points within programs in which candidates will engage in **multiple** performance-based assessments during clinical experiences. • The provider defines the purpose of **each** performance-based assessment and how the intended outcomes will measure increasing levels of candidate competency (i.e., candidates' knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions associated with positively impacting student learning).	• The provider demonstrates **some** evidence of the key points within programs in which candidates will engage in performance-based assessments during clinical experiences. • The provider defines the purpose of **some** performance-based assessments and how the intended outcomes will measure increasing levels of candidate competency (i.e., candidates' knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions associated with positively impacting student learning).	• The provider **does not** demonstrate evidence of the key points within programs in which candidates will engage in performance-based assessments during clinical experiences. • The provider **does not define** the purpose of the performance-based assessment and how the intended outcomes will measure increasing levels of candidate competency (i.e., candidates' knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions

	• The provider offers **multiple** opportunities for candidates to engage in technology-enhanced learning opportunities to assist in the demonstration of their knowledge, skills, and professional disposition development.	• The provider offers **some** opportunities for candidates to engage in technology-enhanced learning opportunities to assist in the demonstration of their knowledge, skills, and professional disposition development.	associated with positively impacting student learning). • The provider offers **few or no** opportunities for candidates to engage in technology-enhanced learning opportunities to assist in the demonstration of their knowledge, skills, and professional disposition development.

2020-21
Tennessee Comprehensive Review Handbook
for Educator Preparation Providers

Standard 3

Standard 3

Introduction to the Standard

Standard 3 addresses the need for providers to engage in strategic recruitment of candidates who meet Tennessee's diverse employment needs and to support candidate success from admission through completion. Doing this well requires systematically developing the whole candidate by assessing both academic and non-academic attributes, including professional skills and dispositions.

Standard 3 communicates the importance of deliberate recruitment plans and goals to select high-quality candidates who reflect the diversity of Tennessee's pre-K–12 students and prepare these candidates to meet students' needs. The provider is responsible for setting high standards for candidate monitoring through intentional, well-defined, and evidence-based progression gateways in an effort to increase the likelihood that candidates will positively impact pre-K–12 student learning prior to recommendation for licensure.[5]

Recruitment and selection efforts should have an intentional focus on providing diversity in the educator workforce that is reflective of the diversity of Tennessee students. Diversity in educator workforce has been shown to contribute to student achievement. A selection of research that may support providers in thinking critically about candidate recruitment and selection appears in CAEP's Rationale for Standard 3, summarized and with full citations of several important publications on this topic.

Exhibits

Specific criteria for required exhibits are provided in the Component and Indicator Detail section below. Standard 3 exhibits can be found in Appendix A.3. Some indicators may prompt providers to supply optional exhibits in support of the corresponding narrative prompt for the component. Note that optional exhibits may be limited.

[5] See Component and Indicator Detail for Standard 3 for more information regarding candidates completing job-embedded clinical practice.

Standard 3 Components[6] and Indicator Detail

This information provides definitions of terms, highlights specific Tennessee considerations, and details the integration of Annual Reports data related to the recruitment and selection of candidates for each of the Standard 3 components. Providers should review this information carefully as they compile the evidence needed to adequately meet Standard 3 expectations.

Standard 3

The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment through admission, in the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and through decisions that ensure that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for licensure. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program.

Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs

3.1 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 their mission. The admitted pool of candidates increasingly reflects the diversity of Tennessee's pre-K–12 students. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields, currently STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities.

Recruitment plans, according to CAEP's definition, are documentation that a provider periodically examines the employment landscape—to identify shortage areas, openings, forecasts, and related information—in the community, state, regional, or national market for which the provider is preparing completers. An appropriate plan should document base points on current measures of (1) academic achievement, (2) diversity, and (3) provider knowledge of employment needs, and include target outcomes for each of three or more ensuing years.[7]

Recruitment of an increasingly diverse and strong pool of candidates is strategic and informed by evidence and knowledge of employer needs in Tennessee and within the field of pre-K–12 education more broadly. During the 2016-17 academic year, Tennessee's pre-K–12 student population was 36.6 percent non-white.[8] The provider has an explicit focus on recruitment of individuals from under-represented groups (i.e., males, racial/ethnic, and those from hard-to-staff/shortage fields).

[6] Standard and component language is adapted from CAEP Standards (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, 2015) and has been edited to include Tennessee-specific expectations for educator preparation providers seeking state-only approval. Tennessee's standards are aligned to the CAEP standards to ensure fairness for providers who elect to complete the national accreditation process by CAEP in lieu of state approval.

[7] CAEP 2018 Initial-Level Handbook (2018, p. 41)

[8] Tennessee Department of Education, Tennessee State Report Card (2017)

As a result of ongoing collaboration between the department and provider and district partnerships, Tennessee has an explicit focus on collaborative recruitment practices. Provider recruitment goals are co-developed with the provider's primary district partner, directly informing the provider's recruitment plan. The recruitment plan includes a documented set of strategies focused on the recruitment of candidates for preparation. The vision for recruitment plans includes, but is not limited to:

- Evidence of a needs assessment to inform recruitment efforts
- Data-driven formative and summative goals to increase the number of candidates for preparation within particular areas of need (e.g., high-needs endorsement or under-represented groups; see section *Annual Reports Data for 3.1 below*)
- Structures and systems to support efforts to target recruitment (e.g., timelines, milestones, and staffing structures)
- A reflective approach that emphasizes continuous improvement when evaluating the effectiveness of the plan

While there is no standard template or guidance for the structure or format of the recruitment plan and corresponding documentation, the expectation is that providers and district partners will generate and agree upon the most appropriate structure to formally address the criteria above.

Annual Reports Data for 3.1

The metrics included below use data obtained for completers and educators enrolled in job-embedded preparation programs. As a result, these metrics do not reflect the admitted cohort of candidates for each provider. For example, this process did not collect GPA data for individuals who were admitted to the preparation program but did not complete the program. Assessing this information could further illuminate the relationship between selection characteristics and successful program completion. The department is developing a system for collecting data on individuals who have been admitted to an educator preparation program.

Domain 1: Candidate Recruitment and Selection		
Metric	**Annual Reports Expectation**	**Metric Detail**
Percentage of completers from under-represented racial/ethnic groups	Positive growth over time or 22 percent of completers come from under-represented racial/ethnic groups	Percentage of completers in under-represented racial and ethnic categories is calculated by dividing the total number of individuals with a race and ethnicity reported other than *White* by the total number of individuals with a reported race or ethnicity.
Percentage of completers who are male	Positive growth over time or 22 percent of completers are male	Percentage of male completers is calculated by dividing the number of male completers by the total number of individuals with a reported gender.
Percentage of completers who receive a high-needs endorsement	Positive growth over time or the provider is in the 75th percentile[9] (or higher) for production of	Percentage of completers is calculated by dividing the number of individuals with a high-

[9] This data represents all educators included in Annual Reports cohorts across providers.

	educators who receive a high-needs endorsement	needs endorsement reported by the total number of individuals with an endorsement reported. The following endorsement codes are identified as high-needs subject areas: • English as a Second Language (490); • Secondary Math (125, 413); • Secondary Science: Biology (126, 415), Chemistry (127, 416), and Physics (129, 417); • Spanish (169, 409, 495); and • Special Education: Modified (460), Comprehensive (461), and Interventionist (144,145).

Additional information on Annual Reports is available in the Annual Reports Technical Guide.

Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement

3.2 Providers ensure that candidates for admission to educator preparation programs meet admission requirements. Candidates for admission to a baccalaureate-level educator preparation program shall, at a minimum, have achieved a postsecondary grade point average (GPA) of 2.75 at the time of admission (per state board rule 0520-02-04-.08). Candidates for admission to a post-baccalaureate educator preparation program shall, at a minimum, achieve an overall GPA of 2.75 from a completed baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate degree program or a GPA of 3.00 in the most recent sixty (60) credit hours earned at a regionally accredited higher education institution. Candidates for admission to preparation programs must have obtained a 21 ACT, 1080 SAT, or passed all Praxis Core exams.

Providers ensure that candidates for admission to educator preparation programs meet admission requirements.

Providers must report GPA data for the three most recent cohorts of admitted candidates prior to beginning the self-study. To meet expectations, 95 percent of candidates for admission to a post-baccalaureate educator preparation program shall, at a minimum, achieve an overall GPA of 2.75 from a completed baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate degree program or a GPA of 3.00 in the most recent sixty (60) credit hours earned at a regionally accredited higher education institution.

Annual Reports Data for 3.2

Metrics in Domain 1 use data obtained for completers and educators enrolled in job-embedded preparation programs. Data that reflect provider performance on indicators 3.2.2, 3.2.3, and 3.2.4 are collected and reported in the Annual Reports on Educator Preparation utilizing self-reported data from the provider. Aligned to state board policy, Annual Reports thresholds allow for a percentage of candidates to be admitted on appeal if they do not meet the minimum admissions assessment requirements. Providers are required to respond to a narrative prompt only if the provider does not meet expectations on any indicators for 3.2.

Domain 1: Candidate Recruitment and Selection

Metric	Annual Reports Expectation	Metric Detail
Percentage of undergraduate candidates meeting an admissions assessment expectation (ACT, SAT, or Praxis Core)	95 percent of candidates obtained a 21 ACT, 1080 SAT,[10] or qualifying scores all Praxis Core (reading, writing, and math) assessments	N/A
Percentage of candidates meeting the minimum undergraduate GPA expectation	95 percent of candidates were admitted with an undergraduate GPA of 2.75 or higher	Percentage of candidates with 2.75 or higher is calculated by dividing the total number of individuals with a 2.75 or higher undergraduate GPA at the time of admission by the total number of individuals with any undergraduate GPA used for admission.
Average undergraduate GPA	Average undergraduate GPA is 3.00 or higher	Average undergraduate GPA is calculated by dividing the sum total of average undergraduate GPAs by the total number of undergraduate GPAs reported.

Additional information on Annual Reports is available in the Annual Reports Technical Guide.

Additional Selectivity Factors

3.3 Educator preparation providers establish and monitor attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability that candidates must demonstrate at admissions and during the program. The provider selects criteria, describes the measures used and evidence of the reliability and validity of those measures, and reports data that show how the academic and non-academic attributes and dispositions predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching.

At admission and throughout the program, the provider monitors candidate progress and demonstration of non-academic/dispositional ability, which in addition to academic factors, are indicators of candidate success and educator effectiveness post-completion. There is no required instrument for measuring candidate dispositions; rather, providers have the autonomy to develop and implement instruments that address non-academic/dispositional ability. Examples of instruments that may be used as part of the EPP's assessment of non-academic/dispositional ability could include the TEAM evaluation rubric, edTPA, and/or EPP-created observational tools.

[10] Changes to SAT score requirements will be updated as state board rule and/or policy changes are implemented.

Selectivity During Preparation

3.4 The provider sets high standards, clearly defines program progression, and monitors candidate advancement from admissions through completion. All candidates demonstrate the ability to teach to college- and career-ready standards. Providers present multiple forms of evidence to indicate candidate development of content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology in all of these domains.

Selectivity during preparation refers to the provider's system, component processes, and data collected and utilized for assessing and monitoring candidate performance which informs provider decisions about candidate readiness for advancement through program progression. The provider should utilize multiple forms of assessment, representing all of the following areas:

- **Content knowledge—**the acquisition and understanding of facts, truths, or principles associated with the academic disciplines that are taught at the elementary, middle, and/or secondary levels, or a professional field of study such as special education, early childhood education, school psychology, reading, or school administration;
- **Pedagogical content knowledge**—a core part of content knowledge for teaching that includes: core activities of teaching, such as figuring out what students know; choosing and managing representations of ideas; appraising, selecting and modifying textbooks; deciding among alternative courses of action and analyzing the subject matter knowledge and insight entailed in these activities;
- **Pedagogical knowledge**—the broad principles and strategies of classroom instruction, management, and organization that transcend subject matter knowledge;
- **Pedagogical skill**—an educator's abilities or expertise to impart the specialized knowledge/content of their subject area(s);[11] **and**
- **Integration of technology** in all of these domains to support student learning.[12]

Selection at Completion

3.5 Before it recommends any completing candidate for licensure, the provider presents multiple forms of evidence that the candidate has reached a high standard for content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology in all of these domains in the fields where licensure is sought and can teach effectively with positive impacts on pre-K–12 student learning and development.

Selectivity at completion refers to the culmination of the provider's system for assessing and monitoring candidate performance and the ultimate process by which the provider determines that candidates are adequately prepared to be recommended for licensure and/or designated as having successfully completed the preparation program. For candidates completing job-embedded clinical practice, providers also ensure that candidates meet minimum requirements prior to recommendation for licensure, as these candidates serve as teachers of record while enrolled in and prior to completing a preparation program.

[11] Definitions from CAEP 2018 Initial-Level Handbook (2018, pp. 41-116).

[12] Though integration of technology should be evident in the provider's response to 3.4, explicit guidance and sharper focus for reviewers on the cross-cutting theme of technology is located in Standard 1.

There must be multiple forms of evidence that candidates have reached a high standard for content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology in all of these domains and can teach effectively with positive impacts on pre-K–12 student learning and development.

Selection at Completion

3.6 Before it recommends any completing candidate for licensure, the provider documents that the candidate understands the expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies.

Providers must ensure candidates understand expectations of the profession, including standards of practice, relevant laws and policies, and codes of ethics. New legislation (Tennessee Code §49-5-5615) requires educator preparation providers to train candidates on the teacher code of ethics (Tennessee Code §49-5.1001-1004). In addition, the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC)'s Model Code of Ethics for Educators (MCEE) builds on the concepts outlined in the Tennessee Teacher Code of Ethics. Providers are required to incorporate the MCEE and Tennessee Code of Ethics throughout preparation.

TN Department of Education

Rubrics

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 through admission, the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and through decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for licensure. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program.

Component 3.1 Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates

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 their mission. The admitted pool of candidates increasingly reflects the diversity of Tennessee's pre-K–12 students. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields, currently STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities.

Indicator 3.1.1 Plan for Recruitment

3.1.1 Narrative Prompts:

A. Describe the process by which the provider and primary LEA partner developed a recruitment plan that focuses on under-represented groups (i.e., racial and/or ethnic, males, and hard-to-staff/shortage fields).

- *How are roles and responsibilities identified and communicated?*
- *How were dedicated resources (human and fiscal) identified?*
- *How are strategies and accompanying goals for recruitment informed by data and aligned to local and/or state needs?*
- *How are timelines, including milestones and deliverables/outcomes, determined? How and by whom is progress monitored, measured, and communicated?*
- *What processes are in place to support, retain, and improve the proficiencies of under-represented at-risk candidates?*

B. Describe the ways in which the recruitment plan will result in the increased diversity of the candidate pool and target areas of teacher shortage.

- *What is the provider's theory of action to support the rationale for why the proposed activities outlined in the recruitment plan will have a positive impact on increasing the diversity of the candidate pool and target areas of teacher shortage?*
- *How is the data used to support additional efforts to increase the recruitment of candidates that meet these areas of need?*

C. How does the provider ensure that the plan includes a continuous improvement process for recruitment of candidates from all under-represented groups?

- *What is the current status of your recruitment efforts and where do you see your provider in relation to future milestones and benchmarks from your recruitment plan?*
- *Describe the process of reviewing the recruitment plan and making adjustments based on outcome data.*
- *What evidence demonstrates the allocation of resources toward identified targets and away from low-need employment area?*

3.1.1.D Required File Upload(s): Recruitment plan (see component and indicator section above for details)

3.1.1.E Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative responses to 3.1.1, if desired.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Below Expectations
• The provider meets all expectations for this indicator. **and** • The provider has a clearly articulated theory of action that provides the foundation for the plan. • The provider articulates an approach that is unique to its context, addresses specific partner-defined needs, and has preliminary outcome data to show the impact of recruitment targeting the three areas of focus.	• The plan focuses on the recruitment of candidates in all under-represented areas and addresses **all** of the following: o identifies dedicated resources (human and fiscal), o outlines strategies and accompanying goals that are informed by data and aligned to state and/or local needs, o provides timelines and deliverables, and o identifies roles and responsibilities. • The provider and its primary partner have a **formal** process for developing and reviewing the recruitment plan and making adjustments based on outcomes.	• The plan focuses on the recruitment of candidates of under-represented areas and addresses **some** of the following: o identifies dedicated resources (human and fiscal), and o outlines strategies and accompanying goals that are informed by data and aligned to state and/or local needs, o provides timelines and deliverables, and o identifies roles and responsibilities. • The provider and its primary partner have an **informal** process for developing and reviewing the recruitment plan and making adjustments based on outcomes.	• The plan does not focus on the recruitment of candidates of under-represented areas **and/or** addresses **none** of the following: o identifies dedicated resources (human and fiscal), o outlines strategies and accompanying goals that are informed by data and aligned to state and/or local needs, o provides timelines and deliverables, and o identifies roles and responsibilities. o The provider and its primary partner have **no process** for developing and reviewing and making adjustments to the recruitment plan.

Annual Reports Metrics

The rubrics below accompany quantitative metrics from the Annual Reports for components 3.1 and 3.2. Note that 3.2.1 requires providers to upload data not currently included on the Annual Reports. Providers are not required to provide responses to the indicators below, with the exception of 3.2.1, as data from the department-generated Annual Reports will be used.

If a provider is falling below expectations on any of the Annual Reports indicators, or on Indicator 3.2.1, the provider is required to provide a narrative response. The narrative purpose is two-fold. First, the narrative process is intended to engage the provider in preliminary analysis of issues related to metrics falling below expectations and the identification of potential solutions (i.e., root cause analysis). Second, narrative responses will provide additional context to reviewers and support a broader understanding of the whole provider, including how performance on these metrics may impact or be influenced by other programmatic areas.

Indicator 3.1.2 Percentage of completers from an under-represented racial/ethnic group **Domain 1** – Candidate Recruitment and Selection; **Metric** – Under-representation – racial and/or ethnic group **Expectation** – Candidates belonging to under-represented racial and/or ethnic groups represent at least 22 percent of the cohort OR the percentage of candidates from these groups increased.		
Exceeds Expectations	**Meets Expectations**	**Below Expectations**
The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 3 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on fewer than 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.

Indicator 3.1.3 Percentage of male completers **Domain 1** – Candidate Recruitment and Selection; **Metric** – Under-representation of gender **Expectation** – Male candidates represent at least 22 percent of the cohort OR the percentage of male candidates increased.		
Exceeds Expectations	**Meets Expectations**	**Below Expectations**
The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 3 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on fewer than 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.

Indicator 3.1.4 Percentage of completers who receive a high-needs endorsement **Domain 1** – Candidate Recruitment and Selection; **Metric** – High-needs endorsements **Expectation** – Production of candidates earning high-needs endorsements places the provider in the 75 percentile OR the percentage of candidates earning high-needs endorsements increased.		
Exceeds Expectations	**Meets Expectations**	**Below Expectations**
The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 3 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on fewer than 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.
Required Narrative Prompt only if the provider does not meet expectations on any Annual Reports indicators for 3.1. For each Annual Reports indicator that the provider did not meet expectations, provide a rationale why expectations were not met and potential action steps.		

Component 3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement – Providers ensure that candidates for admission to educator preparation programs meet admission requirements. Candidates for admission to a baccalaureate level educator preparation program shall, at a minimum, have achieved a postsecondary grade point average (GPA) of 2.75 at the time of admission (per state board rule 0520-02-04-.08). Candidates for admission to a post-baccalaureate educator preparation program shall, at a minimum, achieve an overall GPA of 2.75 from a completed baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate degree program or a GPA of 3.00 in the most recent sixty (60) credit hours earned at a regionally accredited higher education institution. Candidates for admission to preparation programs obtained a 21 ACT, 1080 SAT, or passed all Praxis Core exams.

Indicator 3.2.1 Percentage of candidates for admission to post-baccalaureate educator preparation programs meeting the **minimum overall GPA of 2.75** from a completed baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate degree program **or a GPA of 3.00 in the most recent sixty (60) credit hours** earned at a regionally accredited higher education institution *Data are not supplied by the department. Providers must submit data as part of completing the self-study to meet expectations.*		
3.2.1.A Required File Upload: Submit the last three cohorts of admissions GPA data for post-baccalaureate programs including GPA from a completed baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate degree program, and/or in the most recent sixty (60) credit hours earned at a regionally accredited higher education institution.		
Exceeds Expectations	**Meets Expectations**	**Below Expectations**
The provider demonstrates, through submission of at least three cohorts of admissions data for post-baccalaureate programs, that candidates meet the expectation more than 95 percent of the time.	The provider demonstrates, through submission of at least three cohorts of admissions data for post-baccalaureate programs, that candidates meet the expectation at least 95 percent of the time.	The provider demonstrates, through submission of at least three cohorts of admissions data for post-baccalaureate programs, that candidates meet the expectation less than 95 percent of the time.

Indicator 3.2.2: Percentage of undergraduate candidates meeting an admissions assessment expectation **Domain 1 –** Candidate Recruitment and Selection; **Metric** – Admission Assessment **Expectation** – 95 percent of undergraduate candidates obtained a qualifying score on an approved admissions assessment (ACT, SAT, or Praxis Core)		
Exceeds Expectations	**Meets Expectations**	**Below Expectations**
The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 3 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on fewer than 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.

Indicator 3.2.3: Percentage of candidates for admission to baccalaureate level educator preparation programs meeting minimum postsecondary GPA of 2.75 at the time of admission to a program **Domain 1 –** Candidate Recruitment and Selection; **Metric** – Minimum Undergraduate GPA **Expectation** – 95 percent of undergraduate candidates admitted with a minimum GPA of 2.75		
Exceeds Expectations	**Meets Expectations**	**Below Expectations**
The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 3 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on fewer than 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.

Indicator 3.2.4: Average undergraduate GPA **Domain 1 –** Candidate Recruitment; **Metric** – Minimum Undergraduate GPA **Expectation** – Average GPA is at or above 3.0		
Exceeds Expectations	**Meets Expectations**	**Below Expectations**
The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 3 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on fewer than 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.
Required Narrative Prompt only if the provider does not meet expectations on any indicators for 3.2 *For each indicator which the provider did not meet expectations, provide a rationale for why expectations were not met*		

Component 3.3: Additional Selectivity Factors – Educator preparation providers establish and monitor attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability that candidates must demonstrate at admissions and during the program. The provider selects criteria, describes the measures used and evidence of the reliability and validity of those measures, and reports data that show how the academic and non-academic/dispositional factors predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching.

Indicator 3.3.1 Non-Academic Attributes/Dispositions

3.3.1 Narrative Prompts:

A. How does the provider select the non-academic/dispositional attributes and monitor their contribution to program completion and candidate teaching effectiveness?

- *Identify and briefly describe each of the non-academic/dispositional attributes/dispositions that candidates must demonstrate at admission and during the program progression.*
- *How does the provider ensure that the measures used to assess candidates' non-academic/dispositional attributes are reliable and valid?*
- *How does the provider base non-academic/dispositional selection criteria on relevant research and/or investigations the provider has conducted?*

B. Describe how the provider analyzes the relationship between dispositional data and outcome/impact data.

C. Describe how the provider reviews the processes for monitoring candidates' dispositional characteristics and how changes are made based on the findings.

- *What evidence suggests that dispositional data use informed programmatic changes?*
- *What evidence suggests that these programmatic changes resulted in improved completer effectiveness?*

3.3.1.D Required File Upload: Dispositional assessment instruments used at admission and/or during the program (including throughout clinical practice)

3.3.1.E Required File Upload: Dispositional assessment data that are used at admission and/or during the program (including throughout clinical practice)

3.3.1.F Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 3.3.1, if desired.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Below Expectations
• The provider meets all expectations for this indicator. **and** • The provider has a clearly articulated theory of action that provides the foundation for the plan.	• The provider establishes and **consistently** monitors candidates' non-academic/dispositional attributes using defined processes and timelines for candidate selectivity at admission and during the program. • Processes for monitoring dispositional characteristics are	• The provider establishes but **inconsistently** monitors candidates' non-academic/dispositional attributes using defined processes and timelines for candidate selectivity at admission and during the program. • Processes for monitoring dispositional characteristics are	• The provider **has not established** and/or **does not monitor** candidates' non-academic/dispositional attributes using defined processes and timelines for candidate selectivity at admission and during the program. • Processes for monitoring dispositional characteristics are

	reviewed systematically, **routinely** and refined based on findings. • The provider routinely analyzes the relationship between non-academic/dispositional data and outcome/impact data such as, but not limited to, program completion rates, candidate and completer observation data; **and** • There is **clear** evidence that programmatic changes informed by dispositional data use resulted in improved completer effectiveness.	reviewed and may be refined, but this process is not systematic or routine. • The provider analyzes the relationship between non-academic/dispositional data and outcome/impact data such as program completion rates, candidate and completer observation data; **and** • There is **some** evidence that programmatic changes informed by dispositional data use resulted in improved completer effectiveness.	**rarely or never** reviewed and/or refined based on findings. • The provider rarely or never analyzes the relationship between non-academic/dispositional data and outcome/impact data such as program completion rates, candidate and completer observation data; **and/or** • There is **little or no** evidence that programmatic changes informed by dispositional data use resulted in improved completer effectiveness.

Component 3.4 Selectivity During Preparation – The provider sets high standards, clearly defines program progression, and monitors candidate advancement from admissions through completion. All candidates demonstrate the ability to teach to college- and career-ready standards. Providers present multiple forms of evidence to indicate candidate development of content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology in all of these domains.

Indicator 3.4.1 Criteria for Program Progression

3.4.1 Narrative Prompts:

A. Describe the provider's candidate assessment and monitoring system, and the processes that comprise the system.

B. Describe how the provider monitors, throughout preparation progression, the quality of candidates, especially in relation to the development of content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology needed to effectively teach all pre-K–12 students.

- *Describe the requirements of each of the transition points in detail, including when each transition point takes place and the assessments used at key points during the program.*
- *How does the monitoring of selected academic and non-academic/dispositional proficiencies inform decision making related to candidate support (e.g., interventions/remediation, referrals to student support services, counseling out of the program)?*
- *What measures are used that are specific to specialty area programs and which are applicable to all candidates?*
- *How does the provider ensure that all candidates demonstrate integration of technology in all of these domains, as part of its system of candidate assessment and monitoring?*

C. How does the provider ensure the candidate and completer information/data generated is of high quality and useful in continuous improvement as it relates to program progression?

- *How does the monitoring of selected academic and non-academic/dispositional proficiencies inform decision making related to program effectiveness?*
- *How does the provider summarize the information and data collected from the transition points and determine actionable next steps to make program improvements?*

3.4.1.D Required File Upload: Overview of candidate assessment and monitoring system and processes that support understanding of the narrative by providing a visual representation of how processes are related and when key actions are taken regarding candidate program progression (e.g., outline, flowchart, timelines).

3.4.1.E Required File Upload: Data collected and used as part of the candidate assessment system to demonstrate the provider's use of assessments in determining candidate progress and supporting decisions about candidate advancement through the program.

3.4.1.F Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 3.4.1, if desired.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Below Expectations
• The provider meets all expectations for this indicator. **and** • The provider demonstrates evidence that actions have been taken as a result of analyzing these data, such as: changes in program design or candidate support and intervention.	• The provider has **clearly** established a minimum of two transition points in addition to admission and completion points. • The provider sets high standards and transition points that include **clearly** defined expectations that demonstrate attainment of requisite knowledge and skills (see evidence submitted for Standard 1). • Multiple forms of assessment in content and pedagogy, are used to inform the selectivity during preparation. • Candidate demonstration of integration of technology is observed across the domains of content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and pedagogical skill. • Data are **consistently** collected, analyzed, and used to inform candidate progression throughout the program.	• The provider has established a minimum of two transition points in addition to admission and completion points. • Transition points include expectations that demonstrate attainment of requisite knowledge and skills (see evidence submitted for Standard 1). • Multiple forms of assessments in content and pedagogy are **not** used to inform the selectivity during preparation. • Candidate demonstration of integration of technology is inconsistently observed across the domains of content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and pedagogical skill. • Data are **inconsistently** collected, analyzed, or used to inform candidate selectivity throughout the program.	• The provider has not established transition points, with benchmarks, **or** the established points do not include clearly defined expectations that demonstrate attainment of requisite knowledge and skills (see evidence submitted for Standard 1).

Component 3.5: Selection at Completion – The provider sets high standards and clearly defines requirements for program completion. Completion requirements address candidate content knowledge and ability to provide effective instruction that positively impacts pre-K–12 student learning and development.

Indicator 3.5.1: Criteria for Program Completion
3.5.1 Narrative Prompts: **A.** How does the provider ensure a high standard for candidate content knowledge within endorsement area(s)? • *Describe the assessments used to ensure candidates demonstrate the applicable content knowledge within their endorsement area(s) upon program completion, including those other than required for state licensure.* **B.** How does the provider ensure a high standard for candidates' ability to positively impact pre-K–12 student learning? • *Describe the assessments used to ensure candidates demonstrate the ability to positively impact pre-K–12 student learning upon program completion.* **C.** How does the provider systematically use within program data (content assessments, observation data, edTPA preparation, dispositions, etc.) to inform decisions regarding licensure? What does this process entail? • *What structures are put in place to ensure a systematic review of all program data to inform decisions related to candidate licensure?*
3.5.1.D Required File Upload: Documentation demonstrating how the provider assesses, across and within programs, that candidates can teach effectively with positive impacts on pre-K–12 student learning and development (e.g., provider and/or program scope and sequence of supports, preparatory activities, and assessments of readiness for summative performance assessments such as the edTPA).
3.5.1.E Required File Upload: Clinical observation instruments to demonstrate how the provider assesses, across and within programs, that candidates can teach effectively with positive impacts on pre-K–12 student learning and development
3.5.1.F Required File Upload: Clinical observation data to demonstrate that the provider assesses, across and within programs, that candidates can teach effectively with positive impacts on pre-K–12 student learning and development
3.5.1.G Required File Upload: Pre-K–12 student pre- and post-assessment data gathered across and within programs to demonstrate that the provider assesses candidate ability to teach effectively with positive impacts on pre-K–12 student learning and development
3.5.1.H Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 3.5.1, if desired.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Below Expectations
• The provider meets all expectations for this indicator. **and** • The provider demonstrates evidence that, as a result of analyzing data, actions were taken to drive program improvement.	• The provider sets **high standards** for candidate content knowledge acquisition and candidates' ability to impact student learning upon completion of the program. • The provider demonstrates a **systematic** documentation process to ensure candidates meet or exceed the high	• The provider sets standards for candidate content knowledge acquisition and/or candidates' ability to impact student learning upon completion of the program. • The provider demonstrates a documentation process to ensure candidates meet the standards related to content	• There is little evidence to suggest the provider sets standards for candidate content knowledge and/or candidates' ability to impact student learning upon completion of the program. • The provider rarely or never demonstrates a documentation process to ensure candidates

	standards related to content knowledge acquisition and candidates' ability to impact student learning prior to making recommendations for licensure.	knowledge acquisition and candidates' ability to impact student learning prior to making recommendations for licensure.	meet the standards related to content knowledge acquisition and candidates' ability to impact student learning prior to making recommendations for licensure.

Component 3.6: Selection at Completion – Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure, it documents that the candidate understands the expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies.

Indicator 3.6.1: Demonstration of Candidate Professionalism
3.6.1.a Narrative Prompts: **A.** Describe how the provider integrates the expectations of the profession within programs. • *Which laws and policies are used across and within programs?* • *Which codes of ethics are used across and within programs? Are candidates exposed to professional codes of ethics in particular courses or is it embedded across curriculum?* • *How does the provider specifically integrate the Tennessee code of ethics within particular courses or across the curriculum?* • *What are some examples of specialty area programs for which more specific or specialized codes are incorporated in candidate preparation, in addition to general codes to which all candidates are exposed?* • *How are candidates provided with an understanding of appropriate professional conduct; including building rapport with colleagues, stakeholders, and families?* **B.** Describe how the provider ensures that all candidates, by program completion, understand the expectations of the profession. • *How are candidate understanding, modeling, and demonstration of professional conduct and codes of ethics assessed?* • *Describe the processes by which the need for remediation is identified, and subsequent outcomes of remediation.*
3.6.1.C Required File Upload: Program design documentation, such as syllabi, alignment matrices, scope and sequence demonstrating intentional focus on expectations of the profession, including the Tennessee code of ethics and the Model Code of Ethics for Educators (MCEE), across and within programs.
3.6.1.D Required File Upload: Candidate assessment instruments used to measure candidate understanding of expectations of the profession across and within programs.
3.6.1.E Required File Upload: Candidate assessment data demonstrating candidate understanding of expectations of the profession and modeling of professional conduct from candidates across programs.
3.6.1.F Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 3.6.1, if desired.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Below Expectations
• The provider meets all expectations for this indicator. **and** • The provider demonstrates evidence that, as a result of analyzing data, actions were taken to drive program improvement.	• The provider **clearly** integrates expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics (with a specific focus on the Tennessee Code of Ethics), professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies, within programs. • The provider **clearly** and **consistently** demonstrates	• The provider demonstrates candidates understand expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics (with a specific focus on the Tennessee Code of Ethics), professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies.	• The provider **does not** clearly demonstrate that candidates understand expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies.

	candidates understand expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics (with a specific focus on the Tennessee Code of Ethics), professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies.		

TN Department of Education

2020-21
Tennessee Comprehensive Review Handbook
for Educator Preparation Providers

Standard 4

Standard 4

Introduction to the Standard

Standard 4 addresses the results of preparation when candidates enrolled in job-embedded preparation programs and program completers are employed in positions for which they are prepared. Through EPP Annual Reports produced by the department, data are presented to support and, in some cases, fulfill the expectations of evidence presented for Standard 4. Data include impact data obtained through the Tennessee Value-added Assessment System (TVAAS) for program completers employed in Tennessee public schools in a tested grade and subject; observation data collected through Tennessee's state-wide evaluation system; and results from the Tennessee educator and district surveys. The standard emphasizes the impact on pre-K–12 student learning as measured by multiple metrics and, as noted by CAEP, draws from the principles of the Baldrige Education Criteria, which stipulate that any organization providing education services must know the results of those services.

The key concepts for Standard 4 are the same as the four components:

- Teacher impact on pre-K–12 student learning and development through multiple measures [component 4.1];
- Teacher effectiveness in the classroom through validated observation instruments [component 4.2];
- Satisfaction with preparation as viewed by employers, including employment milestones such as promotion and retention [component 4.3]; and
- Satisfaction with preparation as viewed by completers [component 4.4].

Fortunately, Tennessee is rich with data to support providers in documenting the outcomes and impact of program completers and educators enrolled in programs with a job-embedded clinical practice. While CAEP does not expect providers to present data demonstrating the positive impact of educators enrolled in a program while serving as the teacher of record, Tennessee includes these educators in all analyses as they generate evaluation and value-added growth data. Through the TNCompass licensure system, providers have the ability to flag an educator who is off-track in meeting program requirements. These educators are excluded from calculations for components 4.1 and 4.2.

CAEP expects providers to demonstrate familiarity with evidence to support data presented for components 4.1 and 4.2, such as:

1. Sources of pre-K–12 data and the psychometric soundness of assessments taken by students
2. Pre-K–12 student data characteristics, including the:
    a. Proportion of educators for which pre-K–12 student growth measures are available
    b. Degree of attrition
    c. Process by which student data are linked to individual teachers
3. Data reporting practices, including:
    a. Level of disaggregation of data
    b. Business rules for reporting
    c. Availability of disaggregated data to provide comparisons for educators teaching English learners and students in a special education program

For the purpose of the Tennessee Comprehensive Review Process, providers are not required to demonstrate familiarity with these concepts; however,

providers are encouraged to review resources provided by both SAS and the department regarding TVAAS, TEAM evaluation, and disaggregated data presented in the EPP Annual Reports Insights Tool and the TVAAS portal. More information about TVAAS and TEAM evaluation can be found here, here, and here.

The EPP Annual Reports Performance Report data provide all necessary evidence to determine if providers meet expectations for components 4.1 and 4.2. In addition, the EPP Annual Reports Insights Tool data provide some (though limited at this point in time) data to support components 4.3 and 4.4. As noted in the exhibits and rubric sections below, providers are required to supplement data provided by the department to meet expectations of components 4.3 and 4.4. The department continues to refine standardized tools to adequately measure and report on employer and completer satisfaction with the hopes of deploying and reporting results from a set of standardized surveys that will fully support providers as they document evidence toward meeting components 4.3 and 4.4.

Standard 4 measures include elements of a Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) (2015) study. The study found a strong correlation between these measures and pre-K–12 student learning. Teacher observation evaluations and student surveys can inform questions about the completer's teaching behaviors and interactions with students. The remaining two components, 4.3 and 4.4, examine satisfaction of completers and employers with preparation—again providing key information for providers to use in analyzing the results of their preparation courses and experiences.

Exhibits

Specific criteria for required exhibits are provided in the Component and Indicator Detail section below. Some indicators may allow providers to supply optional exhibits to support the preceding narrative response, though optional exhibits may be limited.

Standard 4 Component[13] and Indicator Detail

This information provides definitions of terms, highlights specific Tennessee considerations, and details the integration of state-recognized and primary partnership agreements. Providers should review this information carefully as they compile the evidence needed to adequately meet Standard 4 expectations.

Standard 4

The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on pre-K–12 student learning and development, classroom instruction and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

Impact on Pre-K–12 Student Learning and Development

4.1 The provider documents, using multiple measures that program completers contribute to an expected level of student learning growth. Multiple measures include all available growth measures (including value-added measures, student growth percentiles, and student learning and development objectives) required by the state for its teachers and available to educator preparation providers, other state-supported pre-K–12 impact measures, and any other measures employed by the providers.

For the purpose of achieving national accreditation, CAEP has extensively outlined the way in which providers can demonstrate completer impact 1-3 years following program completion. As a national accrediting body, CAEP must account for the various contexts that exist for states in terms of generation and application of student growth data. Many states do not have a statewide value-added measure, or they are limited in the grades and subjects that are tested and linked to student growth measures. As such, CAEP must maintain a level of flexibility in this area while also providing significant guidance to address this variation.

The TVAAS measures student growth year over year in Tennessee, regardless of whether the student is proficient on the state assessment. In calculating a TVAAS score, a student's performance is compared relative to the performance of his or her peers who have performed similarly on past assessments.

Tennessee has utilized the value-added assessment system since the early 1990s, providing data to district leaders, school leaders, and directly to educators. In 2010, through the First to the Top Act, TVAAS was incorporated into Tennessee's teacher evaluation system. That year, providers in Tennessee began receiving information about the performance of their completers on value-added assessments through the production of the Teacher Preparation Report Card. Originally produced by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), this report is now produced by the State Board of Education with support from the department. Since 2017, the department has produced Annual Reports. Data within Domain 5 on the Annual Reports Performance Reports investigate performance on TVAAS ratings.

Through the Insights Tool component of Annual Reports, data have been used by providers to better understand areas of strength and need for further investigation into specific aspects of program design (e.g., endorsement program areas, clinical pathways, and program types). Through the Annual

[13] Standard and component language is adapted from CAEP Standards (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, 2015) and has been edited to include Tennessee-specific expectations for educator preparation providers seeking state-only approval. Tennessee's standards are aligned to the CAEP standards to ensure fairness for providers who elect to complete the national accreditation process by CAEP, which can inform state approval.

Reports Performance Report component of the Annual Reports, specific metrics and corresponding thresholds are directly tied to the program approval process.

Domain 5: Completer Effectiveness and Impact

Metric	Annual Reports Expectation	Metric Detail
Percentage of TVAAS ratings at or above 3	Percentage of TVAAS ratings of 3 or higher meets or exceeds the state average	This metric is calculated by dividing the total number of individuals with a TVAAS rating of 3 or higher by the total number of individuals who held a license and had a TVAAS rating in the state evaluation database.

Annual Reports Data for 4.1

Metrics in Domain 5 include data obtained for completers and educators enrolled in job-embedded preparation programs who have taught a tested grade and subject and generated data in the TVAAS system during the applicable period. The Annual Reports Performance Report includes one metric that assesses the performance of educators on student growth indicators for tested grades and subjects, as reported by TVAAS. Data from the three most recent cohorts of provider program completers and educators enrolled in job-embedded preparation programs are matched with available TVAAS data to generate the metric. If the n count is lower than 10 and the annual report is unavailable, the EPP can access the SAS portal for specific completer data. Additional information regarding Annual Reports is available in the Annual Reports Technical Guide.

Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

4.2 The provider demonstrates, through structured and validated observation instruments and/or student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.

Similar to component 4.1, variability of state policy and other contextual factors contribute to CAEP's flexible approach to evidence presented by providers to support demonstration that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve. CAEP details the ways in which providers seeking national accreditation can present evidence to support meeting this component.

Teacher evaluation in Tennessee consists of constructive feedback for educators through multiple observations and pre- and post-conferences. Using the indicators of the TEAM rubric, educators work together to identify what is working well in the classroom (area of reinforcement), where there is room for improvement (area of refinement), and options for professional development to support continued growth. The General Educator Rubric is used for 85 percent of educators in Tennessee, with only a handful of districts using an alternative, approved model.

In addition to TVAAS and evaluation data, educators in Tennessee receive a level of overall effectiveness (LOE) rating, a measure that is inclusive of summative year-end observation data (50 percent), student growth data (35 percent), and a measure of student achievement (15 percent) selected by the educator in partnership with school leadership.

Through Annual Reports, providers receive detailed information assessing the performance of program completers and candidates enrolled in job-embedded programs on the TEAM evaluation rubric and LOE rating. These data are presented at the overall level, and they are disaggregated by rubric domain and indicator. Providers have the ability to disaggregate further by exploring performance on this rubric by endorsement areas, clinical types, and program types.

Annual Reports Data for 4.2

Metrics in Domain 5 include data obtained for completers and educators enrolled in job-embedded preparation programs who have been observed on the TEAM evaluation rubric, whose data have been recorded in the TNCompass database, and who have received an LOE rating. The Annual Reports Performance Report includes the LOE rating and a metric that assesses the overall performance on the observation rubric.

Domain 5: Completer Effectiveness and Impact		
Metric	**Annual Reports Expectation**	**Metric Detail**
Percentage of level of overall effectiveness (LOE) ratings at or above 3	85 percent of LOE ratings are 3 or higher	This metric is calculated by dividing the total number of LOE ratings of 3 or higher obtained by individuals in cohorts 1, 2, and 3 by the total number of LOE ratings obtained by individuals from cohorts 1, 2, and 3 who held a license and had an LOE in the state evaluation database.
Percentage of observation ratings at or above 3	90 percent of observation ratings are 3 or higher	This metric is calculated by dividing the total number of observation ratings of 3 or higher obtained by individuals in cohorts 1, 2, and 3 by the total number of observation ratings obtained by individuals from cohorts 1, 2, and 3 who held a license and had an observation rating in the state evaluation database.

Additional information on Annual Reports is available in the Annual Reports Technical Guide.

Satisfaction of Employers

4.3 The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data and including employment milestones such as promotion and retention, that employers are satisfied with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with pre-K–12 students.

The focus of component 4.3 is employer satisfaction with completers' preparation. Since 2016, the department has included an employer satisfaction module on the annual district survey, released in the fall to all districts in Tennessee. This module includes summative questions focused on perceptions

related to the quality of educators prepared by Tennessee providers as well as more detailed questions reflecting the quality of the partnership between the provider and district. Data obtained from this survey have been presented on the EPP Annual Reports Insights Tool since 2017. Challenges with response rates and ensuring the most appropriate district contact is completing the survey have resulted in limitations related to how these survey results can be used for accountability purposes; however, many providers have found these data to be useful.

Questions on the annual district survey are limited in their ability to gauge district satisfaction with completers' preparation and are primarily focused on measuring district engagement with the provider in activities that would constitute a strong partnership. While this information is highly useful, providers will need to supplement data obtained from the department to ensure the review team has a strong understanding of employer satisfaction with the quality of program completers. Examples of supplemental data may include information derived from provider-developed district or school surveys, focus groups, or interviews. In addition to evidence submitted by providers through the self-study, review teams may survey employers (district- and school-based staff) while on-site.

In addition to survey data, CAEP identifies educator retention data as a metric associated with employer satisfaction.

Domain 3: Employment and Retention

Metric	Expectation	Metric Detail
Percentage of completers employed for at least two years	85 percent of completers are employed for at least two years.	This metric is calculated by dividing individuals employed for two years by the number of individuals who were employed for one year, with the potential to be employed a second year.

Annual Reports Data for 4.3

The Annual Reports Performance Report includes one metric that measures the retention rate of program completers and job-embedded candidates following initial employment.

Satisfaction of Completers

4.4 The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data, that program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective.

Beginning in 2016, as a part of the annual Tennessee Educator Survey released each spring, the department included a series of questions aimed at measuring candidates' perceived satisfaction with early career educator preparation. Educators self-identified as early career teachers (with fewer than five years of experience) and responses were matched to the provider where each educator was prepared. Data obtained from this survey was included on the EPP Annual Reports Insights Tool beginning in 2017. It is not currently included as a measure on the Annual Reports Performance Report. Historically, providers independently survey candidates and program completers to gauge satisfaction and perceived preparedness for the classroom. To adequately meet the expectations of component 4.4, the information provided on the Insights Tool and any provider-developed and analyzed candidate satisfaction data should be included as evidence.

Rubrics

Standard 4 Program Impact

The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on pre-K–12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools; and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

Component 4.1: Impact on Pre-K–12 Student Learning and Development - The provider documents, using multiple measures that program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth. Multiple measures include all available growth measures (including value-added measures, student-growth percentiles, and student learning and development objectives) required by the state for its teachers and available to educator preparation providers, other state-supported pre-K–12 impact measures, and any other measures employed by the provider.

Annual Reports Metrics

The rubrics below accompany quantitative metrics from the Annual Reports for components 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3. If a provider is falling below expectations on any of the Annual Reports indicators, the provider is required to provide a narrative response for that indicator. The purpose for the narrative is two-fold. First, the narrative process is intended to engage the provider in preliminary root cause analysis; and second, narrative exhibits will provide additional context to reviewers and support a broader understanding of the whole provider, including how performance on these metrics may impact or be influenced by other programmatic areas.

Indicator 4.1.1 Percentage of TVAAS ratings at or above 3
Domain 5 – Effectiveness and Impact; **Metric** – TVAAS Ratings
Expectation – The percentage of program completers and candidates enrolled in job-embedded preparation programs who obtain TVAAS ratings of 3 or higher meets or exceeds the state average.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations
The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 3 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on fewer than 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.

Required Narrative Prompt only if the provider does not meet expectations on Annual Reports indicator for 4.1.
For each Annual Reports indicator which the provider did not meet expectations, provide a rationale why expectations were not met.

Component 4.2 Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness – The provider demonstrates, through structured and validated observation instruments and/or student surveys that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.

Indicator 4.2.1.A Percentage of level of overall effectiveness (LOE) ratings at or above 3 **Domain 5 –** Effectiveness and Impact; **Metric** – Level of Overall Effectiveness (LOE) Ratings **Expectation** – 85 percent of LOE ratings are level 3 or higher		
Exceeds Expectations	**Meets Expectations**	**Below Expectations**
The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 3 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on fewer than 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.
Indicator 4.2.1.B Percentage of observation ratings at or above 3 **Domain 5 –** Effectiveness and Impact; **Metric** – Observation Ratings **Expectation** – 90 percent of observation ratings are level 3 or higher		
Exceeds Expectations	**Meets Expectations**	**Below Expectations**
The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 3 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on fewer than 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.
Required Narrative Prompt only if the provider does not meet expectations on any Annual Reports indicators for 4.2. For each Annual Reports indicator which the provider did not meet expectations, provide a rationale why expectations were not met.		

Component 4.3. Satisfaction of Employers – The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data and including employment milestones such as promotion and retention, that employers are satisfied with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with pre-K–12 students.

Indicator 4.3.1: Evidence of Employer Satisfaction

4.3.1 Narrative Prompts:

A. Describe the design and methodology for implementation of all provider-developed employer satisfaction surveys, interviews, and/or focus groups.

B. Provide details on the response rate(s) and characteristics of respondents (e.g., participating districts, representativeness of districts compared to all employing districts).

C. Using available employer satisfaction data (no more than three years old), summarize the satisfaction of employers and/or partner districts in the following areas:

- Quality of completers hired from the provider
- Completer ability to:
  - deliver high-quality **instruction** (e.g., understanding subject matter, providing differentiated instruction, motivating students)
  - **plan** and assess effectively (e.g., create strong instructional plans and assess student understanding and application of content)
  - create a positive **environment** for learning (e.g., managing student behavior, promote a positive atmosphere, set clear expectations)

D. How do results from these tools demonstrate that employers are satisfied with program completers from the provider in the areas outlined above (instruction, planning, and environment)?

E. What are areas of strength and areas of opportunity identified by the data?

F. How do responses vary (e.g., by specialty area program, clinical type, or program type)?

G. How are data shared with provider faculty and staff and considered in decisions made regarding programmatic changes?

4.3.1.H Annual Reports Data: Partner survey data from Insights Tool, if available.

4.3.1.I Optional File Upload(s): Upload an additional exhibit (or exhibits) referenced in the narrative response to 4.3.1, if desired. This may include provider-deployed employer satisfaction surveys, employer interviews and focus groups, or employer case studies.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Below Expectations
• The provider meets all expectations for this indicator. **and** • The provider demonstrates evidence that actions have been taken as a result of analyzing these data.	• Survey data and information gathered through employer interviews and/or focus groups indicate employers are **mostly satisfied** with: o the quality of new teachers hired from the provider;	• Survey data and information gathered through employer interviews and/or focus groups indicate employers are **somewhat satisfied** with: o the quality of new teachers hired from the provider;	• Survey data and information gathered through employer interviews and/or focus groups indicate employers are **mostly unsatisfied** with: o the quality of new teachers hired from the provider;

	o completer ability to deliver high-quality instruction; o completer ability to plan and assess effectively; and o completer ability to create a positive environment. • The provider analyzes these data **annually** to determine areas of strength and opportunity and how responses may vary by specific program design characteristic. • Employer satisfaction data are **shared** with faculty and staff to make programmatic changes.	o completer ability to deliver high-quality instruction; o completer ability to plan and assess effectively; and o completer ability to create a positive environment. • The provider analyzes these data **occasionally** to determine areas of strength and opportunity and how responses may vary by specific program design characteristic. • Employer satisfaction data are **inconsistently** shared with faculty and staff to make programmatic changes.	o completer ability to deliver high-quality instruction; o completer ability to plan and assess effectively; and o completer ability to create a positive environment. • The provider **rarely** analyzes these data to determine areas of strength and opportunity **or** how responses may vary by specific program design characteristic. • Employer satisfaction data are **not** shared with faculty and staff to make programmatic changes.

Indicator 4.3.2: Percentage of completers and job-embedded candidates employed for at least two years **Domain 2 –** Employment and Retention; **Metric** – Retention Rate **Expectation** – 85 percent of program completers and candidates enrolled in job-embedded preparation programs are employed for at least two years.		
Exceeds Expectations	**Meets Expectations**	**Below Expectations**
The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 3 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.	The provider met expectations on the relevant Annual Reports metric on fewer than 2 of the last 3 Performance Reports.
Required Narrative Prompt only if the provider does not meet expectations on any Annual Reports indicators for 4.3. For each Annual Reports indicator which the provider did not meet expectations, provide a rationale why expectations were not met.		

Component 4.4. Satisfaction of Completers – The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data, that program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job and that their preparation was effective.

Indicator 4.4.1: Evidence of Completer Satisfaction

4.4.1 Narrative Prompts:

A. Using data available through the Annual Reports Insights Tool and/or any provider-developed completer surveys, summarize how program completers perceive coursework, clinical experiences, and coaching/mentoring have effectively prepared them for the classroom.

B. Describe the design and methodology for implementation of all provider-developed completer satisfaction surveys, interviews, and/or focus groups.

C. Provide details on the response rate(s) and characteristics of respondents (e.g., participating completers, representativeness of respondents compared to all program completers).

D. Using available completer satisfaction data (no more than three years old), summarize how well completers perceived the provider prepared them to:

- deliver high-quality **instruction** (e.g., understanding subject matter, providing differentiated instruction, motivating students)
- **plan** and assess effectively (e.g., create strong instructional plans and assess student understanding and application of content)
- create a positive **environment** for learning (e.g., managing student behavior, promote a positive atmosphere, set clear expectations)

E. How do results from these tools demonstrate that completers feel like the provider adequately prepared them in the areas outlined above (instruction, planning, and environment)?

F. What are areas of strength and areas of opportunity identified by the data?

G. How do responses vary (e.g., by specialty area program, clinical type, or program type)?

H. How are data shared with provider faculty and staff and considered in decisions made regarding programmatic changes?

4.4.1.I Required File Upload: Annual Reports Data: Completer Satisfaction data from Insights Tool, if available.

4.4.1.J Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 4.4.1, if desired.

Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Below Expectations
• The provider meets all expectations for this indicator. **and** • The provider demonstrates evidence that actions have been taken as a result of analyzing these data.	• Completers perceive that program coursework, clinical experiences, and coaching/mentoring **effectively** prepared them to succeed in the classroom. • Survey data and information gathered through focus groups and/or interviews indicate completers perceive the provider has **adequately** prepared them to:	• Completers perceive that program coursework, clinical experiences, and coaching/mentoring **somewhat** prepared them to succeed in the classroom. • Survey data and information gathered through focus groups and/or interviews indicate completers perceive the provider has **somewhat** prepared them to:	• Completers perceive that program coursework, clinical experiences, and/or coaching/mentoring **rarely** prepared them to succeed in the classroom. • Survey data and information gathered through focus groups and/or interviews indicate completers perceive the provider has **insufficiently** prepared them to:

	o deliver high-quality instruction; o plan and assess effectively; and o create a positive environment. • The provider analyzes these data **annually** to determine areas of strength and opportunity and how responses may vary by specific program design characteristic. • Completer satisfaction data **are shared** with faculty and staff to make programmatic changes.	o deliver high-quality instruction; o plan and assess effectively; and o create a positive environment. • The provider analyzes these data **occasionally** to determine areas of strength and opportunity and how responses may vary by specific program design characteristic. • Completer satisfaction data **are inconsistently** with faculty and staff to make programmatic changes.	o deliver high-quality instruction; o plan and assess effectively; and/or o create a positive environment. • The provider **rarely** analyzes these data to determine areas of strength and opportunity **or** how responses may vary by specific program design characteristic. • Completer satisfaction data **are not shared** with faculty and staff to make programmatic changes.

Appendix A

Some indicators may prompt providers to supply optional exhibits in support of the corresponding narrative prompt for the component. Note that optional exhibits may be limited.

A.5 Exhibits for Standard 5

5.1

5.1.1 **Required** Narrative Response (**prompts A-D**)

5.1.1.E **Required** File Upload: Upload 1-3 artifacts referenced in the 5.1.1 narrative that document QAS capabilities (what the QAS *can* do) that support provider quality and strategic evaluation, including multiple measures for provider monitoring and satisfaction of all standards.

5.1.1.F Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 5.1.1, if desired.

5.2

5.2.1 **Required** Narrative Response (**prompts A-B**)

5.2.1.C **Required** File Upload: Provide 1-2 exhibits referenced in the 5.2.1 narrative responses that support the provider's case that the QAS relies on measures that are relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable.

5.2.1.D **Required** File Upload: Provide 1-2 exhibits referenced in the 5.2.1 narrative responses that support the provider's case that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

5.2.1.F Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 5.2.1, if desired.

5.3

5.3.1 **Required** Narrative Response (**prompts A-C**)

5.3.1 **Required** File Upload: N/A

5.3.1.D Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 5.3.1, if desired.

5.4

5.4.1 **Required** Narrative Response (**prompts A-B**)

5.4.1 **Required** File Upload: N/A

5.4.1.C Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 5.4.1, if desired.

5.5

5.5.1 **Required** Narrative Response (**prompts A-B**)

5.5.1.C **Required** File Upload: Provide 1-2 additional exhibits referenced in the narrative response to 5.5.1, to support the examples of program improvement insights resulting from past collaboration with stakeholders.

5.5.1.D Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 5.5.1, if desired.

A.1 Exhibits for Standard 1

1.1

1.1.1 **Required** Narrative Response (**prompts A-C**)

1.1.1.D **Required** File Upload: Artifacts supporting narrative response such as key candidate assessments with results and subsequent analyses (e.g., candidate and/or pre-K–12 student pre- and post-assessments, candidate major content exams, pre-service exit measures, dispositional assessments, assessments of understanding of professional responsibilities).

1.1.1.E Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 1.1.1, if desired.

1.2

1.2.1 **Required** Narrative Response (**prompts A-D**)

1.2.1.E **Required** File Upload: Artifacts supporting narrative response such as key assessments, observational instruments, and resultant data are used to evaluate candidates' knowledge and proficiency of evidence-based instructional practices and measurement of student progress.

1.2.1.F Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 1.2.1, if desired.

1.3

1.3.1 State-Supplied Annual Reports

1.3.2 State-Supplied Annual Reports

1.3.3 State-Supplied Annual Reports

1.3.A **Required** Narrative Response **only if** the provider does not meet expectations on any indicators for 1.3.

1.4

1.4.1 **Required** Narrative Response (**prompts A-B**)

1.4.1.C **Required** File Upload: Artifacts supporting narrative response such as key assessments and data (e.g., observation instruments, edTPA, dispositional data) used to prepare candidates for instructional proficiencies and commitment that afford all students access to rigorous instruction.

1.4.1.D Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 1.4.1, if desired.

1.5

1.5.1 **Required** Narrative Response (**prompts A-B**)

1.5.1.C **Required** File Upload: Cite the technology standards referenced in the narrative prompts.

1.5.1.D Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 1.5.1, if desired.

A.2 Exhibits for Standard 2

2.1.1

2.1.1 **Required** Narrative Response (**prompts A-D**)

2.1.1.E **Required** File Upload: State-recognized partnership agreement(s) with at least one, but no more than three, district partners or at least one MOU/MOA that addresses the requirements of the state-recognized agreement

2.1.1.F Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 2.1.1, if desired.

2.1.2

2.1.2 **Required** Narrative Response (**prompts A-G**)

2.1.2.H **Required** File Upload: Primary-partnership agreement with at least one, but no more than three, district partners

2.1.2.I Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 2.1.2, if desired.

2.2.1

2.2.1. **Required** Narrative Response (**prompts A-F**)

2.2.1. **Required** File Upload: N/A

2.2.1.G Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 2.2.1, if desired.

2.2.2

2.2.2 **Required** Narrative Response (**prompts A-E**)

2.2.2 **Required** File Upload: N/A

2.2.2.F Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 2.2.2, if desired.

2.3.1

2.3.1 **Required** Narrative Response (**prompts A-E**)

2.3.1 **Required** File Upload: N/A

2.3.1.F Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 2.3.1, if desired.

2.3.2

2.3.2 **Required** Narrative Response (**prompts A-C**)

2.3.2 **Required** File Upload: N/A

2.3.2.D. Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 2.3.2, if desired.

A.3 Exhibits for Standard 3

3.1

3.1.1 **Required** Narrative Response (**prompts A-C**)

3.1.1.D **Required** File Upload: Recruitment Plan

3.1.1.E Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 3.1.1, if desired.

3.1.2 State-Supplied Annual Reports

3.1.3 State-Supplied Annual Reports

3.1.4 State-Supplied Annual Reports

3.1.A **Required** Narrative Response **only if** the provider does not meet expectations on any Annual Reports indicators for 3.1**.**

3.2

3.2.1.A **Required** File Upload: Post-baccalaureate GPA admissions data for 3 cohorts

3.2.2 State-Supplied Annual Reports

3.2.3 State-Supplied Annual Reports

3.2.4 State-Supplied Annual Reports

3.2.A **Required** Narrative Response **only if** the provider does not meet expectations on any indicators for 3.2.

3.3

3.3.1 **Required** Narrative Response (**prompts A-C**)

3.3.1.D **Required** File Upload: Dispositional assessment instruments used at admission and/or during the program (including throughout clinical practice)

3.3.1.E **Required** File Upload**:** Dispositional assessment data that are used at admission and/or during the program (including throughout clinical practice)

3.3.1.F Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 3.3.1, if desired.

3.4

3.4.1 **Required** Narrative Response (**prompts A-C**)

3.4.1.D **Required** File Upload: Overview of candidate assessment and monitoring system and processes that support understanding of the narrative by providing a visual representation of how processes are related and when key actions are taken regarding candidate program progression (e.g., outline, flowchart, timelines).

3.4.1.E **Required** File Upload: Data collected and used as part of the candidate assessment system to demonstrate the providers use of assessments in determining candidate progress and supporting decisions about candidate advancement through the program.

3.4.1.F Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 3.4.1, if desired.

3.5

3.5.1 **Required** Narrative Response (**prompts A-C**)

3.5.1.D **Required** File Upload: Documentation demonstrating how the provider assesses, across and within programs, that candidates can teach effectively with positive impacts on pre-K–12 student learning and development (e.g., provider and/or program scope and sequence of supports, preparatory activities, and assessments of readiness for summative performance assessments such as the edTPA).

3.5.1.E **Required** File Upload: Clinical observation instruments to demonstrate how the provider assesses, across and within programs, that candidates can teach effectively with positive impacts on pre-K–12 student learning and development

3.5.1.F **Required** File Upload: Clinical observation data to demonstrate that the provider assesses, across and within programs, that candidates can teach effectively with positive impacts on pre-K–12 student learning and development

3.5.1.G **Required** File Upload: Pre-K–12 student pre- and post-assessment data gathered across and within programs to demonstrate that the provider assesses candidate ability to teach effectively with positive impacts on pre-K–12 student learning and development

3.5.1.H Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 3.5.1, if desired.

3.6

3.6.1 **Required** Narrative Response (**prompts A-B**)

3.6.1.C **Required** File Upload: Program design documentation, such as syllabi, alignment matrices, scope and sequence demonstrating intentional focus on expectations of the profession, including the Tennessee code of ethics and the Model Code of Ethics for Educators (MCEE), across and within programs.

3.6.1.D **Required** File Upload: Candidate assessment instruments used to measure candidate understanding of expectations of the profession across and within programs.

3.6.1.E **Required** File Upload: Candidate assessment data demonstrating candidate understanding of expectations of the profession and modeling of professional conduct from candidates across programs.

3.6.1.F Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 3.6.1, if desired.A.4 Exhibits for Standard 4

A.4 Exhibits for Standard 4

4.1

4.1.1 State-supplied Annual Reports

4.1.1.A **Required** Narrative Prompt if (and only if) the provider does not meet expectations on any Annual Reports indicators for 4.1**.**

4.2

4.2.1.A State-supplied Annual Reports

4.2.1.B State-supplied Annual Reports

4.2.A **Required** Narrative Prompt only if the provider does not meet expectations on any Annual Reports indicators for 4.2**.**

4.3

4.3.1 **Required** Narrative Response (**prompts A-G**)

4.3.1.H **Required** Annual Reports (Partner survey data from Insights Tool, if available)

4.3.1.I Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit (or exhibits) referenced in the narrative response to 4.3.1, if desired.

4.3.2 State-supplied Annual Reports

4.3.A **Required** Narrative Prompt only if the provider does not meet expectations on any Annual Reports indicators for 4.3.

4.4

4.4.1 **Required** Narrative Response (**prompts A-H**)

4.4.1.I **Required** Annual Reports (Completer satisfaction data from Insights Tool, if available)

4.4.1.J Optional File Upload: Upload an additional exhibit referenced in the narrative response to 4.4.1, if desired.