

**TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
 EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROVIDER STATUS CHANGE RECOMMENDATION  
 RHODES COLLEGE  
 AUGUST 15, 2025**

Department Recommendation: EPP and specialty area program status change from Probationary Approval, Major Stipulations to Full Approval, Minor Stipulations

**EPP Status Change**

Educator Preparation Rule 0520-02-04 states EPPs with probationary approval, major stipulations status, may recommend candidates for licensure but shall submit to the Department an improvement plan for addressing the areas in need of improvement. The EPP shall also participate in a focused review within three (3) years of receiving probationary approval from the State Board. If the EPP has adequately addressed the stipulations during the focused review, the Department may recommend to the State Board removal of the major stipulations for the remainder of the EPP approval period.

**Context**

In July 2022, the State Board of Education (SBE) took action regarding the approval status of Rhodes College Educator Preparation Provider (EPP). The action was preceded by a state-managed comprehensive review process, which included a January 10-11, 2022, site visit conducted by a state review team and subsequent post-visit procedures.

The EPP outcome of board action was probationary approval, major stipulations. Rhodes College final report cited multiple minor and major stipulations across four (4) of the five (5) TNCR standards. Within three (3) months of the SBE vote, Rhodes College worked with the Department to develop and implement an action plan focused on the following stipulations:

**Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge**

The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.

Minor Stipulation	Rationale
1.1 and 1.4 The EPP did not ensure that all programs are accurately and meaningfully aligned to current standards for educator preparation, as outlined in component requirements and SBE policy (5.504 and 5.505) and the EPP did not provide a regular and systematic process for measuring candidates understanding of required standards.	No evidence was provided for alignment to all relevant and required standards for EPPs in Tennessee. Without a clear and accurate standards alignment, the EPP will be unable to ensure that standards are clearly addressed and measured.
1.5 The EPP did not provide clear evidence that candidates' integration of technology standards is modeled and applied across the domains of content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and pedagogical skill.	Within and across programs, the EPP should clearly demonstrate how candidates' model and apply technology standards as they design, implement, and assess learning experiences. In addition, the EPP should employ a clear process for collecting and analyzing data that indicates opportunities

	resulting in candidate knowledge and skills applicable to technology standards.
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity**

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

Minor Stipulation	Rationale
3.1 Evidence and interviews did not confirm that the EPP and Shelby County Schools have a formal process for developing and reviewing the recruitment plan or that they have made adjustments based on outcomes.	A process appears to be outlined in the primary partnership and reviewing this process together will ensure implementation and support the recruitment of high-quality candidates.
3.3 Evidence and interviews did not confirm an established process where dispositional characteristics are monitored and reviewed systematically and routinely nor that the relationship between dispositions and outcome/impact data are routinely analyzed. In addition, interviews did not confirm that programmatic changes are informed by dispositional data.	The current process involves monitoring dispositions whenever a candidate encounters a problem area rather than monitoring dispositions and collecting data for all candidates across the program, even those who are meeting or exceeding expectations. Dispositional data, and the reliability and validity of the measures, need to establish how dispositional factors predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching.

**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.

Major Stipulation	Rationale
4.1: The EPP does not currently document, using multiple measures, that program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth.	The EPP has a plan to implement this documentation and data collection; however, its past practice leading up to the site visit was unable to show that program completers contribute to student learning and growth.
4.2: The EPP cannot currently demonstrate, 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.	The EPP has a plan to implement data collection that will allow them to demonstrate this in the future; however, its past practice leading up to the site visit did not include data collection that would allow the EPP to show that program completers effectively apply the expected knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

<p>4.3: The EPP was unable to demonstrate, 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.</p>	<p>The EPP has a plan to implement data collection that will allow them to demonstrate employer satisfaction in the future; however, its past practice leading up to the site visit did not include employer satisfaction data.</p>
<p>4.4: The EPP did not demonstrate, 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</p>	<p>The EPP has a plan to implement data collection that will allow them to demonstrate completer satisfaction in the future; however, its past practice leading up to the site visit did not include completer satisfaction data.</p>

**Standard 5: Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement**

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on pre-K–12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on pre-K–12 student learning and development.

<p><b>Major Stipulation</b></p>	<p><b>Rationale</b></p>
<p>5.2 The QAS does not currently ensure that it relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, actionable measures and does not fully produce empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent</p>	<p>The EPP has a plan for quality assurance; however, its past practice leading up to the site visit has not included a process for ensuring analyses are conducted accurately nor that data align to measures of performance to inform program evaluation and continuous improvement. In addition, evidence does not indicate that interpretations of data are valid and consistent; that assessment instruments are aligned with the constructs being measured; that scoring mechanisms are clearly aligned to assessment requirements; those interpretations of assessment results are unambiguous; nor that data generated from assessments are complete and accurate</p>
<p>5.5 The EPP does not assure that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school, and community partners (or other stakeholders as defined by the EPP) are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence</p>	<p>The QAS is a work in progress, with some processes being planned but not yet enacted. A more refined QAS, which includes all aspects of component 5.5 will enable the EPP to better engage in continuous improvement that involves a wide range of stakeholders.</p>

## Specialty Area Programs

Minor Stipulation	Rationale
The elementary K-5 program is not aligned to the current literacy standards	Current literacy standards were not provided for the elementary program.
The English 6-12 program is not aligned to the current literacy standards.	Current literacy standards were not provided for the English 6-12 program.
The government 6-12 program is not aligned to the correct social studies content standards and the current literacy standards.	The correct social studies content standards as well as the current literacy standards were not provided for government 6-12 program.
The history 6-12 program is not aligned to the correct social studies content standards and the current literacy standards.	The correct social studies content standards as well as to the current literacy standards were not provided for the history program.
The mathematics 6-12 program is not aligned to the correct math content standards and the current literacy standards.	The correct math content standards as well as the current literacy standards were not provided for the mathematics program.
The biology 6-12 program is not aligned to the current literacy standards.	Current literacy standards were not provided for the biology 6-12 program.
The chemistry 6-12 program is not aligned to the current literacy standards.	Current literacy standards were not provided for the chemistry 6-12 program.
The physics program is not aligned to the current literacy standards.	Current literacy standards were not provided for the physics 6-12 program.
The Spanish 6-12 program is not aligned to the current literacy standards.	Current literacy standards were not provided for the Spanish 6-12 program.
The Russian 6-12 program is not aligned to the current literacy standards.	Current literacy standards were not provided for the Russian 6-12 program.
The German 6-12 program is not aligned to the current literacy standards.	Current literacy standards were not provided for the German 6-12 program.
The Latin 6-12 program is not aligned to the current literacy standards.	Current literacy standards were not provided for the Latin 6-12 program.
The Chinese 6-12 program is not aligned to the current literacy standards.	Current literacy standards were not provided for the Chinese 6-12 program.
The French 6-12 program is not aligned to the current literacy standards.	Current literacy standards were not provided for the French 6-12 program.

### Action Plan and Progress Monitoring

In response to the SBE Educator Preparation Rule 0520-02-04 requirement, the EPP developed the content of the action plan, which included goals, strategies, timelines, and performance measures. The plan was reviewed and approved by the Department and the EPP began implementation of the action plan immediately.

From January 2023 – January 2024, the Department conducted a series of two (2) progress monitoring reviews to gauge the implementation of the action plan. Over the course of these reviews, the EPP provided descriptions and supporting evidence that insufficient progress was achieved in addressing each of the stipulations cited in the final report. The EPP continued implementing the action plan to

address each stipulation. The final progress review was integrated into the fall 2024 state-managed focused review. The fall 2024 state-managed focused review enabled the EPP to provide evidence through a site visit and post-visit review of evidence of progress made in addressing stipulations across three (3) of the four (4) TNCR standards. One (1) minor stipulation was not met in component 5.2.

Minor Stipulation	Rationale
Rhodes College’s quality assurance system did not consistently rely on measures that were reliable and valid. (5.2)	Evidence was not provided to demonstrate how the quality assurance system relied only on measures that were verifiable. Evidence was not provided to demonstrate how the quality assurance system included processes for 14 ensuring that convergent and consistent analyses were conducted accurately.

**Conclusions**

Based on the outcomes of the aforementioned progress monitoring reviews and state-managed focused review, the Department concluded that the EPP meets expectations on all standards but falls below expectations on one (1) component. The EPP must submit to the Department a plan for addressing the area in need of improvement within three (3) months of receiving full approval, minor stipulations. The Department shall annually review the EPP’s progress on the submitted plan for improvement. If the EPP has adequately addressed the areas in need of improvement, the Department may recommend to the State Board removal of the minor stipulations for the remainder of the approval period of the EPP. If within a three-year period the Department determines the areas in need of improvement are not adequately addressed, then the EPP may be required to participate in an interim review.