

**Rutherford County Schools
Revised New EPP Proposal for Initial Approval
Reviewers' Feedback**

The first review of the Rutherford County Schools *Called to Educate* proposal for a recommendation of initial approval as a new Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) and associated Specialty Area Program (SAP) for occupational educator preparation was conducted by the Office of Educator Licensure and Preparation. The review considered key components of the State Board of Education Educator Preparation Rule 0520-02-04 and Educator Preparation Policy 5.504 related to initial EPP and SAP approval. The first review resulted in the identification of action steps and information for proposal revisions necessary for the review process to continue.

The current review identifies whether there is sufficient evidence to suggest the revised proposal has addressed the action steps identified during the first review. Any items identified as missing or insufficient in the action steps below must be addressed in a formal revision process. This process must be completed prior to the department determining an approval recommendation for State Board of Education action. Questions, comments and requests revision submission instructions should be directed to Martin Nash (Martin.Nash@tn.gov or 615-714-3165).

Overview of Department Review Findings

Cover Letter	Sufficient Evidence	Revisions Sufficient
Cover letter is present, provides a request that the TDOE review the proposed program for conditional approval, and is submitted by the Director of Schools, Bill Spurlock.	Yes	
Review Comments: Contact person is identified as Rebecca Murphy.		
Action Steps: None cited		

Type of EPP Proposed

- Institution of Higher Education
 Education Related Organization
 Tennessee Local Education Agency/School District

PART I: New EPP Eligibility Requirements

Section 1: EPP Eligibility Requirements	Sufficient Evidence	Revisions Sufficient
To be eligible for conditional approval to provide educator preparation in Tennessee, a prospective EPP must meet the eligibility requirements below.		
1. Evidence that it has the capacity to prepare educators: a. If its candidates receive Title IV funds, it must show evidence of regional accreditation by an accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Department	N/A	

of Education or its equivalent. A copy of the official letter from the accreditor must be provided. b. If its candidates do not receive Title IV funds, it must provide evidence that it meets the requirements outlined below in the Non-IHE provider section.		
2. Applicable demographic characteristics, such as governance (non-profit or for-profit), control (private or public), regional accreditation agency (e.g., WASC or Middle States), and THEC authorization.	Yes	
3. Identification of all SAPs proposed for the preparation of PreK-12 educators.	Yes	
Review Comments: As a public local education agency (LEA), Rutherford County Schools through the Department of Curriculum and Instruction proposes to offer an occupational educator preparation program only. It intends to offer an 18 month program, cohort-based, program		
Action Steps: None cited		
Non-IHE providers must provide the following:	Sufficient Evidence	Revisions Sufficient
Clean independent audits of a full set of financial statements of the legal entity offering educator preparation programs for the three years prior to applying for state approval. The audits should meet the standards of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants or other appropriate accounting standards generally accepted in the United States.		
The legal entity's 990 Form (for nonprofits) or corporate income tax returns (for for-profits) or comparable information for the past year for EPPs.	N/A	
A business plan that focuses on the EPP being approved. The business plan should include:		
a. A business model that briefly describes the services to be delivered, the area to be served, the current and projected number of candidates, recruitment activities, a description of faculty/instructors, tuition costs, a budget narrative, etc.;	Yes	
b. The most current approved budget;	Yes	
c. Revenue and expense projections for the next two years, including funding streams, the length and percentage of funding from foundation grants, appropriated governmental funds, tuition, funds from elsewhere in the legal entity or its affiliates and costs of facility, payroll, maintenance, etc.;	Yes	
d. A one- to two-page narrative describing revenue and expenditure projections for the next 4 years;	Yes	
e. A one- to two-page narrative describing the relationship between the provider and the legal entity offering the educator preparation programs; and	No	Yes
f. If tuition-based, the tuition refund policy, should the educator preparation programs be discontinued.	N/A	
Reviewer Comments: All relevant fiscal-related items are provided and appear to be in order. A business model indicates the applicant intends to offer an 18 month program, cohort-based program while candidates are employed by the district as teachers of record.		

Candidates admitted to the program will commit to three years of teaching in the district.

The projected number of candidates for the first cohort is 10-15 candidates each school year.

A four-year revenue and expense projections spreadsheet is provided. Personnel cost is the primary cost as a start-up EPP.

A one-page description and an accompanying partnership agreement indicates the EPP as the Department of Curriculum and Instruction within the district and the primary partner as the district; however, the governance structure and authority between the EPP and the district remains unclear (for example, the narrative implies the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum is the EPP head administrator; however, the partnership agreement indicates the CTE Coordinator is the EPP head administrator).

Reviewer Comments Related to Revisions:

The revised narrative clarifies the respective roles of the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction, Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources, CTE Director and the EPP Specialist in the governance structure and authority between the proposed EPP and RCS.

Action Steps:

Although the RCS Department of Curriculum and Instruction is identified as the EPP within the district, a clear, more precise description of the specific governance structure and authority between the proposed EPP and RCS must be provided for state review, approval, and on-going accountability purposes.

Action Steps Related to Revisions:

None cited

NOTE: Because CAEP Standard 4: Program Impact relies on evidence that is primarily related to program completers, a proposal for a new EPP is not expected to address the standard or its components. Reviewer feedback for Standard 4 is not provided.

Section 2: EPP Framework Overall Comments

Reviewer Comments:

The proposal responses to each CAEP Standard and component are in the form of very brief statements accompanied by a list of items identified as evidence. The responses do not provide sufficient descriptive/narrative information that conveys that the applicant has a thorough understanding of the standards and components. The limited responses do not clearly state a case for the development of a comprehensive, integrated approach for candidate preparation and the start-up and on-going operation of a new EPP. The limited structure of the proposal responses does not provide the context for how each item listed as evidence is connected to the respective standard and components. To provide better context, it should be considered that references to the evidence be included in the descriptive/narrative responses. Below is an example of how an item of evidence cited in a narrative is connected with a component of CAEP Standard 1.

A primary assessment of Instructional Practice is the Methods Lab Evaluation, MLE evidence item 7, for candidates. The MLE is utilized during the Clinical I methods experience. Clinical I candidates teach one lesson per week in a local school. As a formative assessment, the clinical mentor completes an MLE each

week on the assigned lesson which is shared with the candidate. The candidate is then responsible to share the weekly MLE with the clinical supervisor at a weekly debriefing session. The clinical supervisor uses the weekly MLE to inform him/her of the need to make focused visits in the classroom and/or arrange individual meetings with the candidate as deemed necessary. A final MLE is used as a summative assessment and is completed by both the clinical mentor and clinical supervisor.

Reviewer Comments Related to Revisions:

For the revised proposal each CAEP standard component has been responded to as a rewritten narrative format and referenced documents.

All titled items of evidence/documents referenced in the initial proposal have been reviewed and where appropriate have been either provided, indicated as in development, or deleted from the revised proposal.

Action Steps:

All responses in section two must be revised to include expanded descriptive/narrative responses to the standards and components. Descriptive/narrative responses to each component should be clear, succinct, and limited to approximately 300 words.

The evidence must be more clearly and directly connected to the content of the respective standards and components.

Action Steps Related to Revisions:

None cited

Section 2: EPP Framework	Sufficient Evidence	Revisions Sufficient
Proposal identifies how the EPP will address each component of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Standards		
CAEP Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	No	Yes
<p>Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Component 1.1: InTASC standards understanding will be delivered primarily through the SREB <i>Teach to Lead</i> (T2L) modular curriculum; however, the proposal does not explicitly indicate how candidates will be assessed against the standards.</p> <p>Component 1.2: The proposal lists a set of items that are sources of data and evidence for candidates to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and to measure their P-12 students' progress and their own professional practice; however the proposal does not describe how the EPP will ensure that candidates know how to appropriately use research and evidence.</p> <p>Component 1.3 & 1.4: The proposal provides a list of items that indicate how the EPP will verify candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge as well as skills that all P-12 students exposed to rigorous college- and career-ready standards. Most notably listed are SREB modules, field observations, one-on-one coaching sessions and RCS PD requirements.</p>		

Component 1.5: The proposal provides a list of items that indicate how the EPP will verify candidates' ability to model and apply technology standards, most notably the use of instructional technology coaches in each school.

Reviewer Comments Related to Revisions:

The following are the primary assessment methods used to verify candidate mastery of each InTASC standard:

- candidates will be required to complete a portfolio of assignments to demonstrate their deep understanding of the concepts and principles of education as articulated in the InTASC Standards;
- numerous “Authentic Tasks” are embedded within the SREB T2L curriculum lessons in which candidates must apply the pedagogy learned to their own classroom; and
- candidates will be observed by administrators, the RTI coach in their school, and the CTE OLP Specialist.

The EPP will use the following to ensure that candidates know how to appropriately use research and evidence.

- several research-based learning opportunities through review and discussion of current research findings, reading relevant articles are embedded in the SREB T2L curriculum;
- as part of their portfolio assignment, teacher candidates will be expected to complete an observation-based research project; and
- candidates will have access to student TVAAS and benchmark assessment data and will receive guidance on how best to use those data to inform their instruction.

Action Steps:

Descriptions of assessments used or assessments being planned/developed to be used by the EPP to verify candidate mastery of each InTASC standard must be provided.

A description must be provided as to how the EPP will ensure that candidates know how to use research and evidence appropriately.

Action Steps Related to Revisions:

None cited

CAEP Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	Sufficient Evidence	Revisions Sufficient
	No	Yes

Reviewer Comments:

Component 2.1: For this component, the proposal lists various items as evidence across three indicators. Items listed as evidence take many forms. For many of the items, the origin and use of are self-evident (e.g., Primary Partnership outcomes, Annual Reports data, Reflective Portfolio Project); however, several titled items and their descriptions, particularly assessment instruments which may serve as key evidence are listed but do not accompany the proposal.

Component 2.2 and 2.3: Although these components are well developed, as is the case with 2.1 above, several titled items of evidence are listed but do not accompany the proposal.

Reviewer Comments Related to Revisions:

All titled items of evidence/documents referenced in the initial proposal have been reviewed and where appropriate have been either provided, indicated as in development, or deleted from the revised proposal.

Action Steps

Where the proposal includes titled items of evidence, the items and their descriptions must accompany the proposal or if they are to be developed, that should be stated. The following items of evidence listed in the proposal must be provided and described or identified as under development:

Related to 2.1

- Annual review
- Pre- & post- self-efficacy scale assessment
- Exit surveys for teacher candidates at end of each cohort

Related to 2.2

- End of year effectiveness surveys
- Surveys
- On-site interviews

Related to 2.3

- Candidate Assessment Tools (Formative & Summative)
- Surveys (Clinical educators and teacher candidates)

Peer colleague observations

Action Steps Related to Revisions:

None cited

CAEP Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment and Selectivity	Sufficient Evidence	Revisions Sufficient
	No	Yes

Reviewer Comments:

Component 3.1: This component addresses six indicators by providing the same narrative with a few, slightly varying items of evidence. The narrative provided and the items of evidence do not constitute an EPP recruitment plan that includes specific elements that represent goals to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations. The information presented seems more oriented to general district recruitment plan, with slight modifications for an occupational educator preparation program.

Components 3.2, 3.4, 3.5, and 3.6: Given the context of the proposed EPP as a provider focused solely on occupational educator preparation and employment of candidates through job-embedded clinical practice, items that address these components are adequate.

Component 3.3: The use of the Professionalism portion of the TEAM rubric for the purposes of candidate demonstration of attributes and dispositions at admission and during preparation is inappropriate. The expectation this that the EPP delineate a specific set of attributes and dispositions that it assesses as criteria for admission and program progression.

Reviewer Comments Related to Revisions:

In addition to participation in general RCS recruitment activities, the EPP revised recruitment plan specific for occupational educator preparation include the following strategies:

- recruitment efforts specifically targeting employees in industries aligned with occupational cluster offerings;
- recruit among graduates from the area Tennessee College of Applied Technology;
- use of online search engine sites, such as Indeed.com

The revised proposal narrative identifies the following attributes and dispositions for program admission:

- strong organizational skills;
- written and oral communication skills;
- strong content knowledge;
- ability to be flexible;
- effective collaborators;
- ability to analyze and interpret data; and
- eager to serve as leaders and role models in the school community.

The EPP will use applicant work history and employer references to determine the likelihood that the candidates meet the above attributes and dispositions for admission.

As the EPP moves from initial start-up to on-going implementation, recruitment activities and strategies for identified underrepresented groups should be a focus.

Action Steps:

Provide a more detailed recruitment plan with specific goals related to recruiting and supporting completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations.

The proposal must include an EPP delineated set of attributes and dispositions with accompanying assessments for candidate admission and program progression purposes.

Please see note in Section III (Primary Partnerships) regarding admissions criteria and requirements for program completion.

Action Steps Related to Revisions:

None cited

CAEP Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement	Sufficient Evidence	Revisions Sufficient
	No	Yes

Reviewer Comments:

Components 5.1 -5.4: These components are addressed by very brief declarative statements of what the EPP will do regarding the implementation of a quality assurance system across the various elements of the respective components. The statements are accompanied by lists of sources of information, assessment, and data. As presented, the combination of statements and items of evidence for Standard 5 and elsewhere in the proposal, (e.g. standard 3 item *Candidate Assessment System Framework* and Part II, Section 6 *Candidate Assessment Process/Structure*), do not constitute a cohesive EPP quality assurance system or a plan for a cohesive system.

As is the case in 2.1 above, items listed as evidence take many forms. For many of the items, the origin and use of are self-evident; however, several titled items, particularly assessment instruments (which may serve as key evidence), are listed but do not accompany the proposal.

Component 5.5: The EPP has identified a set of stakeholders that it engages on a regular basis for program improvement.

Reviewer Comments Related to Revisions:

The quality assurance system (QAS) described is based on four primary categories of candidate performance:

- observation scores each year;
- reflective portfolio scores;
- administrator, RTI coach, and clinical mentor survey feedback; and
- attendance records, and completion of required T2L and all program-related tasks.

EPP effectiveness and indicators for improvement include:

- candidate completer rates;
- completer retention rates within RCS after candidates' 3-year commitment;
- observation score averages;
- percentage of CTE concentrators,
- students' industry certification pass rates;
- survey feedback from administrators, RTI coaches, clinical mentors; and
- exit surveys from program completers.

All titled items of evidence referenced in the initial proposal have been reviewed and where appropriate have been either provided, indicated as in development, or deleted from the revised proposal as not relevant to the QAS.

Action Steps:

To address components 5.1 -5.4, the proposal must include a cohesive EPP quality assurance system or a plan for a cohesive system that includes data gathering; the capacity to disaggregate, combine, and analyze data; can provide context for interpreting data by showing relationships with other data, and can describe any aspect of EPP operations, courses, experiences, candidates, and outcomes that multiple measures cover.

Where the proposal includes titled items of evidence, the items and their descriptions must accompany the proposal or if they are to be developed, that should be stated. The following items of evidence listed in the proposal must be described and provided or identified as under development:

- Surveys – completers & administrators attitudes towards effectiveness
- Outcome data
- Annual review

Interviews

Action Steps Related to Revisions:

None cited

Section 3: Primary Partnership	Sufficient Evidence	Revisions Sufficient
Each EPP must establish a primary partnership with at least one Tennessee LEA and include the following:		
Established the roles and responsibilities of EPP faculty and LEA staff, including clinical mentors and supervisors	Yes	
Established clear expectations regarding the delivery of candidate support and evaluation	Yes	
Established and explicit processes for identifying and responding to LEA-identified areas of need (e.g., ESL or Special Education teachers).	Yes	
Collaborative development of candidate selection criteria	Yes	
Collaborative design of high-quality, needs-based clinical experiences	Yes	
Collaborative implementation of high-quality clinical experiences with engagement of both partners throughout	Yes	
<p>Reviewer Comments: The EPP-LEA partnership agreement submitted is completed on the OELP <i>Primary Partnership Agreement</i> template.</p> <p>The partnership agreements includes the statement: “Before being approved for licensure, all teacher candidates will be required to complete and pass the Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT 7-12 Praxis exam”).</p> <p>The PLT is an assessment associated with the professional education content of the preparation program. In that all candidates who participate in job-embedded clinical practice must be licensed, it is unclear why passing the PLT appears to be a candidate admission criterion when it is the program content that should prepare candidates to pass the PLT.</p> <p>Reviewer Comments Related to Revisions: The statement related to the implication that passing the PLT for program admission has been revised. It has been clarified the PLT is an advancement requirement, not an initial licensing requirement.</p>		
<p>Action Steps: Provide a rationale/explanation regarding the apparent admission requirement of a passing score on the PLT. In Part II, Standard 3, provide clarity regarding admissions criteria and requirements for program completion.</p> <p>Action Steps Related to Revisions: None cited</p>		

PART II: SAP Proposal Review

List all specialty area endorsements:

The proposal includes an extensive list of the specific occupational endorsements available through the specialty area program. The occupational endorsements include:

Aircraft Maintenance	Distribution and Logistics	Leisure Craft Tech
Automotive Technology	Drafting/CAD	Logistics & Warehouse
Aviation Ground School	Electrical	Distribution
Barbering	Electronic Media	Manufacturing Technology
Broadcasting	Fire Safety	Plumbing
Carpentry	Graphic Communications	Programming
Collision Repair Technology	Graphic Design	Public Health
Concrete/Masonry	Health Informatics	Radio/TV Broadcasting
Cosmetology	Health Science	Technology Infrastructure
Culinary Arts	HVAC	Trade and Industrial
Diesel Equipment	Information Technology	Education
Technology	Legal and Protective Services	Welding

Program Pathway (check all that apply)

Traditional IHE:

- Undergraduate
- Post-Baccalaureate - undergraduate level
- Post-Baccalaureate - graduate level, non-degree
- Post-Baccalaureate - advanced degree

Other: (Describe)

Non-degree and non-credit: The EPP is a school district.

Clinical Practice (check all that apply)

- Student Teaching Semester
- Year-Long Internship (Residency)
- Job-embedded

Section I: Program Synopsis	Sufficient Evidence	Revisions Sufficient
The proposal describes the goals and structure of the SAP(s) and how the program focuses on preparing candidates to instruct students across the developmental spectrum and grade span associated with the endorsement(s).	Yes	
<p>Reviewer Comments: The basic goal is to ensure students enrolled in occupational education courses have well-trained, qualified teachers who will be able to help students develop the foundational skills needed for success in post-secondary programs and the workforce. The SAP is designed as an 18-month, cohort-based educator preparation program while candidates simultaneously serve as full time teachers in occupation endorsement areas, with particular attention given to hard-to-staff areas. Candidates are required make a three-year commitment to teach in the district.</p>		
<p>Action Steps: None cited</p>		

SAP Section 2: Program Curriculum	Sufficient Evidence	Revisions Sufficient
Program(s) of study/requirements for program completion associated with each program pathway is provided.	Yes	
<p>Reviewer Comments: The proposed EPP intends to use the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) Teaching to Lead (T2L) curriculum to prepare candidates for their work in the classroom. This professional development series was designed for new educators seeking licensure to teach occupational courses. The series includes four modules:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom Assessment • Classroom Management • Instructional Planning • Instructional Strategies <p>The proposal includes the following overall sequence: Training hours:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TDOE Occupational New Teacher Training – 1 week (40 hours) • Summer Induction Part 1– 1 week in July before 1st year (40 hours) • Summer Induction Part 2 – 1 full week in following July (40 hours) • 1 full day Fall, Spring, & following Fall semester (8 hours each) • Evening PD’s 1/month Aug – May 2019-2020 (3 hours each; 2X in Aug.) • Evening PD’s 1/month Aug – Dec 2020 (3 hours each) <p>Total 18 month = 192 contact hours</p> <p>A curriculum scope and sequence chart is provided.</p> <p>Also included are the excerpts from the first few pages of the SREB manuals for each of the four Teaching to Lead modules that provide limited information regarding the actual content delivered. The excerpts include:</p>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table of Contents • Module Set Up <p>Module Organization (unit and lesson charts)</p>
<p>Action Steps: None cited</p>

SAP Section 3: Standards Used for Program Design	Sufficient Evidence	Revisions Sufficient
Identify/list the source(s) and set(s) of specialty area standards (e.g., AMLE Standards for Middle Level Teacher Preparation, ACTFL, CEC, NCTE, NCTM, NCSS, etc.) used for program design. (NOTE: All SAPs that lead to initial licensure must address the InTASC Standards.	Yes	
<p>Reviewer Comments: The proposal identifies the following standards for program design: InTASC Standards Literacy Standards</p> <p>Per TDOE communication with the coordinator, the literacy proposals (including standards alignment), which demonstrate alignment to the literacy standards, will be submitted by the end of February and reviewed subsequently.</p>		
<p>Action Steps: None cited</p>		

SAP Section 4: Program Alignment to Standards	Sufficient Evidence	Revisions Sufficient
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matrices clearly align the program(s) of study to each of the standards identified. 	No	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard alignments for various pathways (e.g. undergraduate, graduate, etc.,) must be clearly identifiable. 	Yes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responses to all relevant Implementation Standards are provided. 	Yes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Descriptions of courses/program content that address the standards are provided. 	No	Yes
<p>Reviewer Comments: A table is provided that aligns each of the ten InTASC standards to a list of bulleted topics included in the Teaching to Lead lessons; however, the lesson topics are not connected to the any of the four respective Teaching to Lead module manuals (see Part II Section 2).</p> <p>The link to the Teaching to Lead website (https://www.sreb.org/teaching-lead) does not provide access to items of adequate depth to determine whether each of the InTASC standards is adequately addressed.</p> <p>In addition to the early alignment to the Literacy Standards included with this proposal, a supplemental alignment will be submitted that is within the submission guidance subsequently developed.</p>		

Reviewer Comments Related to Revisions:

The table of the alignment of the T2L preparation modules and embedded topics has been thoroughly revised and now identifies the connection among the respective modules, embedded topics, and the ten InTASC standards. The revised alignment table more clearly illustrates the how the 152 hours of preparation content is sequenced within the module structure.

The four SREB T2L module overviews are provided. Each module overview includes a straight forward organizational structure as follows:

- preparation “unit” title
- unit set up
- unit overview narrative
- content preparation “lessons”
- suggested readings and references

Action Steps:

The list of topics of the Teaching to Lead lessons must be connected to the respective modules.

Access to Teaching to Lead items that provide more in-depth information (perhaps complete module manuals see Part II Section 2) about the content of the modules must be provided.

Action Steps Related to Revisions:

None cited

SAP Section 5: Clinical Experiences	Sufficient Evidence	
The sequence and structure of clinical experiences is described. This includes field experiences prior to clinical practice and the clinical practice. The evidence clearly indicates the program offers well-integrated clinical experiences involving candidates in a variety of settings and opportunities to collaborate with other educational professionals.	Yes	
A description of the supervision and evaluation of candidates during clinical experiences is provided.	Yes	
<p>Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal clearly identifies Job-embedded as the clinical practice requirement.</p> <p>The proposal indicates the EPP will include clinical experiences/settings that are beyond those assigned as teacher of record as required by the Educator Preparation Policy.</p> <p>Clear descriptions of candidate support, supervision, and evaluation are provided.</p>		
<p>Action Steps:</p> <p>None cited</p>		

SAP Section 6: Candidate Assessment Process/Structure	Sufficient Evidence	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate assessment transition points and key assessments embedded within each transition are identified. 	No	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three-five samples of key formative and/or summative, standards-based evaluation tools and associated rubrics/ scoring guides that are used to evaluate candidates' performance throughout the preparation program are provided. 	Yes	

Reviewer Comments:

The proposal provides a brief narrative titled “Key Assessments” that references the general qualifying assessment, industry certification, for respective occupational content knowledge and a high school diploma as the education attainment level requirement.

The “Key Assessments” narrative includes the statement, “Before being approved for licensure, all teacher candidates will be required to complete and pass the Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) 7-12 Praxis exam.” See Part I, Section 3 regarding the same matter.

A list eight transition points is accompanied by the table “Candidate Assessment Transition Points and Key Assessments” that bullets the key assessments embedded; however, some of the transition points listed do not correspond to the transition identified on the table. For example transition point 8 on the list is “Remediation for teachers with LOE 1 or 2” while transition 8 on the table is “Program completion” with the embedded key assessment “Pass the PLT Praxis.” Although not rising to the level of an Action Step, all such proposal items should be consistent and accurate.

In addition to external assessment items (e.g. TEAM Observation Rubrics, CTE Competency Attainment) the proposal includes EPP developed assessment items related to Teacher Candidate Reflective Portfolio Project and Formal Walk Through.

As cited in Part I, Section 2, CAEP Component 1.1., the proposal does not include any explicit information regarding how candidates will be assessed regarding their knowledge of and ability to demonstrate performance skills associated with the InTASC standards, which is a central focus of preparation and assessment.

Reviewer Comments Related to Revisions:

The key assessments narrative and the QAS transition points list and table have been aligned for consistency.

All titled items of evidence referenced in the initial proposal have been reviewed and where appropriate have been either provided, indicated as in development, or deleted from the revised proposal as not relevant to the QAS.

Action Steps:

Descriptions of the assessments used or being planned/developed to be used by the EPP to verify candidate mastery of each InTASC standard must be provided.

Action Steps Related to Revisions:

None cited