

Standard 3 Components⁶ 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)

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 which 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 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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provider meets all expectations for this indicator. <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provider has a clearly articulated theory of action that provides the foundation for the plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • **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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

	<p>reviewed systematically and routinely and refined based on findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • **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. 	<p>reviewed and may be refined but this process is not systematic or routine.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>rarely or never reviewed and/or refined based on findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
--	--	---	---

****plans and progress steps accepted for rubric criteria**

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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provider meets all expectations for this indicator. <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provider has either not established transition points, with benchmarks, or the points that are established do not include clearly defined expectations that demonstrate attainment of requisite knowledge and skills (see evidence submitted for Standard 1).

****plans and progress steps accepted for rubric criteria**

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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provider meets all expectations for this indicator. <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provider demonstrates evidence that, as a result of analyzing data, actions were taken to drive program improvement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 is 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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provider meets all expectations for this indicator. <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provider demonstrates evidence that, as a result of analyzing data, actions were taken to drive program improvement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • **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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.		
--	--	--	--

****plans and progress steps accepted for rubric criteria**

2019-20
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 positive impact of educators enrolled in a program while serving as 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 Component¹³ 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.

Additional information on 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 has 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.

<p>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.</p>		
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.
<p>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.</p>		

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:
 - The 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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • **Survey data and information gathered through employer interviews and/or focus groups indicate employers are mostly satisfied with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the quality of new teachers hired from the provider; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey data and information gathered through employer interviews and/or focus groups indicate employers are somewhat satisfied with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the quality of new teachers hired from the provider; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey data and information gathered through employer interviews and/or focus groups indicate employers are mostly unsatisfied with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the quality of new teachers hired from the provider;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ completer ability to deliver high-quality instruction; ○ completer ability to plan and assess effectively; and ○ 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ completer ability to deliver high-quality instruction; ○ completer ability to plan and assess effectively; and ○ 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ completer ability to deliver high-quality instruction; ○ completer ability to plan and assess effectively; and ○ 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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ deliver high-quality instruction; ○ plan and assess effectively; and ○ 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ deliver high-quality instruction; ○ plan and assess effectively; and ○ 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ deliver high-quality instruction; ○ plan and assess effectively; and/or ○ 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

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.