

2026-2027 Continuing Approval Rubric – Redesign Pilot

The rubric in this document is currently being utilized for the 2026-2027 Continuing Approval Review pilot only. The rubric is in draft form and is shared for informational purposes only.

Review Area 1: Quality of Candidate Training

Indicator	1.1 Preparation for Effective Instruction and Delivery	1.2 Content Pedagogy Knowledge and Related Pedagogy in Reading	1.3 Content Knowledge and Related Pedagogy in Math	1.4 Pedagogical Preparation for Reaching All Learners	1.5 Evaluation of Quality and Delivery of Content
Essential Questions	To what extent does EPP coursework strategically incorporate key components that foster strong preparation and delivery?	To what extent does the EPP provide comprehensive, research-aligned training in literacy content pedagogy , the Science of Teaching Reading (STR) , and the application of grade-level TEKS and Bluebonnet Learning materials ?	To what extent does the EPP provide comprehensive training in math content pedagogy grounded in the science of learning , and the application of grade-level TEKS and Bluebonnet Learning materials ?	To what extent does EPP coursework and training equip candidates with the knowledge and skills to prepare for HQIM-based instruction that maintains grade-level rigor and implements scaffolds to provide access to content, meeting the diverse needs of all learners?	To what extent does the EPP systematically evaluate the design, rigor, and delivery of content across all coursework and clinical practice?

Overarching Question: To what extent does the EPP ensure that coursework and training are intentionally designed, content-rich, and regularly evaluated to effectively prepare candidates to teach all learners?

Data Sources - Materials will be collected prior to the review:

- Curriculum guides, course syllabi, and degree plans.
- Instructional materials (lesson plans, modules, slide decks, resources, etc.).
- Observation of program courses (including multiple sections of the same course when these are offered)
- Candidate application of lesson plan preparation.
- Course quality reports (evaluations, surveys, summary reports).

Prioritized compliance items for Review Area 1 are in Appendix A.

Indicator	4 – Distinguished	3 – Proficient	2 – Developing	1 – Improvement Needed
1.1 Preparation for Effective Instruction and Delivery (Chapter 235 Standards)¹ <u>Criteria:</u> a) Preparation of candidates to evaluate and use HQIM b) Preparation for lesson internalization c) Preparation for student assessment d) Integration of research-based practices grounded in SoL e) Preparation for learning environment f) Practice-based learning	a) EPP coursework systematically and coherently equips candidates to evaluate and analyze HQIM, enabling them to identify the components of HQIM and apply knowledge of HQIM to select or customize instructional materials when appropriate. b) EPP coursework systematically and coherently equips candidates to effectively internalize and prepare well-organized, sequential instruction using HQIM, including Bluebonnet Learning, that builds on students' prior knowledge. c) EPP coursework systematically and coherently equips candidates to monitor and assess student learning, including within HQIM/Bluebonnet Learning materials, through questioning, student work analysis, data review, and formative and summative assessments. d) EPP coursework systematically and coherently equips teacher candidates with evidence-based strategies aligned with the science of learning, such as reduction of extraneous cognitive load, retrieval practices, clear and specific use of worked examples, interleaving, metacognition, clear and specific feedback to students, and deep integration of new experiences with prior knowledge². e) EPP coursework systematically and coherently prepares candidates to effectively manage classrooms, enhancing student learning and engagement through routines that maximize instructional time and the enforcement of grade-level appropriate expectations for student behavior. f) Candidates systematically and intentionally practice skills outlined in	a) EPP coursework consistently equips candidates to evaluate and analyze HQIM, enabling them to identify most components of HQIM and apply knowledge of HQIM to select or customize instructional materials when appropriate. b) EPP coursework consistently equips candidates to internalize and prepare organized, sequential instruction using HQIM, including Bluebonnet Learning, that builds on students' prior knowledge. c) EPP coursework consistently equips candidates to monitor and assess student learning, including within HQIM/Bluebonnet Learning materials, through questioning, student work analysis, data review, and formative and summative assessments. d) EPP coursework consistently equips teacher candidates with evidence-based strategies aligned with the science of learning, such as reduction of extraneous cognitive load, retrieval practices, use of worked examples, interleaving, metacognition, student feedback, and integration of new experiences with prior knowledge. e) EPP coursework consistently prepares candidates to effectively manage classrooms, enhancing student learning and engagement through routines that maximize instructional time and enforcement of grade-level appropriate expectations for student behavior. f) Candidates consistently practice skills outlined in coursework criteria with increasing depth in authentic and	a) EPP coursework inconsistently equips candidates to evaluate and analyze HQIM, enabling them to identify some components of HQIM but inconsistently apply knowledge of HQIM to select or customize instructional materials when appropriate. b) EPP coursework inconsistently equips candidates to internalize and prepare instruction using HQIM, including Bluebonnet Learning, with some evidence of organization, sequencing, and connection to students' prior knowledge. c) EPP coursework inconsistently equips candidates to monitor and assess student learning, including within HQIM/Bluebonnet Learning materials, with some use of questioning, student work analysis, data review, and formative and summative assessments. d) EPP coursework inconsistently equips teacher candidates with some evidence-based strategies aligned with the science of learning, such as reduction of extraneous cognitive load, retrieval practices, use of worked examples, interleaving, metacognition, student feedback, and connection of new experiences with prior knowledge. e) EPP coursework inconsistently prepares candidates to manage classrooms, with some evidence of routines that support instructional time and implementation of grade-level appropriate expectations for student behavior.	a) EPP coursework rarely or does not equip candidates to evaluate and analyze HQIM, resulting in limited or no ability to identify components of HQIM or apply knowledge of HQIM to select or customize instructional materials when appropriate. b) EPP coursework rarely or does not equip candidates to internalize and prepare instruction using HQIM, including Bluebonnet Learning, resulting in limited or no evidence of organized, sequential instruction that builds on students' prior knowledge. c) EPP coursework rarely or does not equip candidates to monitor and assess student learning, including within HQIM/Bluebonnet Learning materials, resulting in limited or no use of questioning, student work analysis, data review, or formative and summative assessments. d) EPP coursework rarely or does not equip teacher candidates with evidence-based strategies aligned with the science of learning, resulting in limited or no use of science-of learning aligned strategies, and may include instruction in contrary practices such as learning styles, hemispheric dominance or approaches that lack explicit instruction. e) EPP coursework rarely or does not prepare candidates to effectively manage classrooms, resulting in limited or no evidence of routines that maximize instructional time or enforcement of grade-level appropriate expectations for student behavior.

¹: Reviewers Note should reference Texas Administrative Code (TAC) Chapter 235 Texas Educator Standards [Definitions](#), [Classroom Teacher Pedagogy Standards](#), and [STR Standards](#).

² Definitions, knowledge and skills related to the Science of Learning are included in [Chapter 235 Definitions and Classroom Teacher Pedagogy Standards](#).

Indicator	4 – Distinguished	3 – Proficient	2 – Developing	1 – Improvement Needed
	coursework criteria with increasing depth in increasingly more authentic and developmentally rigorous ways, including analysis, representation, and enactments of instructional skills, actively applying high-quality feedback to refine implementation.	developmentally rigorous ways, including analysis, representation, and enactments of instructional skills, applying feedback to improve implementation.	f) Candidates inconsistently practice skills outlined in coursework criteria, with some opportunities for analysis, representation, and enactments of instructional skills, and limited application of feedback to improve implementation.	f) Candidates rarely or do not practice skills outlined in coursework criteria in authentic or developmentally rigorous ways, resulting in limited or no opportunities for analysis, representation, enactments of instructional skills, or application of feedback to refine implementation.
1.2 Content Pedagogy Knowledge and Related Pedagogy in Reading (Chapter 235 Standards)³ Criteria: a) Comprehensive training and integration of practice on the STR. b) Research and evidence-based training content. c) Training that builds content knowledge, including knowledge of Bluebonnet Learning	a) EPP coursework and training systematically and coherently provide sequential instruction and practice opportunities in the STR, enabling candidates to effectively teach all students to read using complex texts, knowledge coherence, and text-based responses. All foundational skills are fully present, explicitly taught, practiced, and assessed across the sequence: ● Oral language development. ● Print awareness and alphabet knowledge. ● Phonological and phonemic awareness. ● Phonics (decoding and encoding). ● Reading fluency. ● Vocabulary development. ● Syllabication and morphemic analysis. ● Comprehension of literary text. ● Comprehension of informational text. ● Beginning strategies and reading comprehension skills. ● Writing. b) EPP coursework and training deliberately and comprehensively equip candidates to apply reading and language arts practices grounded in research-based instructional strategies (RBIS) and aligned to the science of learning. All materials and instructional	a) EPP coursework and training consistently provide sequential instruction and practice opportunities in the STR, enabling candidates to effectively teach all students to read using complex texts, knowledge coherence, and text-based responses. All foundational skills are present, taught, practiced, and assessed, though instruction may not always be explicit or spiraled across the sequence: ● Oral language development. ● Print awareness and alphabet knowledge. ● Phonological and phonemic awareness. ● Phonics (decoding and encoding). ● Reading fluency. ● Vocabulary development. ● Syllabication and morphemic analysis. ● Comprehension of literary text. ● Comprehension of informational text. ● Beginning strategies and reading comprehension skills. ● Writing. b) EPP coursework and training consistently equip candidates to apply reading and language arts practices grounded in research-based instructional strategies (RBIS) and aligned to the science of learning. Most	a) EPP coursework and training inconsistently provide sequential instruction and practice opportunities in the STR, partially enabling candidates to teach students to read using complex texts, knowledge coherence, and text-based responses. Some foundational skills are present and taught, but practice and assessment are inconsistent or missing across the sequence: ● Oral language development. ● Print awareness and alphabet knowledge. ● Phonological and phonemic awareness. ● Phonics (decoding and encoding). ● Reading fluency. ● Vocabulary development. ● Syllabication and morphemic analysis. ● Comprehension of literary text. ● Comprehension of informational text. ● Beginning strategies and reading comprehension skills. ● Writing. b) EPP coursework and training inconsistently equip candidates to apply reading and language arts practices grounded in research-based instructional strategies (RBIS) and aligned to the science of learning. Some	a) EPP coursework and training do not consistently provide sequential instruction and practice opportunities in the STR, significantly limiting candidates' ability to effectively teach students to read using complex texts, knowledge coherence, and text-based responses. Few to no foundational skills are present, and explicit teaching, practice, and assessment are absent from the sequence: ● Oral language development. ● Print awareness and alphabet knowledge. ● Phonological and phonemic awareness. ● Phonics (decoding and encoding). ● Reading fluency. ● Vocabulary development. ● Syllabication and morphemic analysis. ● Comprehension of literary text. ● Comprehension of informational text. ● Beginning strategies and reading comprehension skills. ● Writing. b) EPP coursework and training rarely or do not equip candidates to apply reading and language arts practices grounded in research-based instructional strategies (RBIS) or aligned to the science of learning. Few to no materials or

³ Note: Reviewers should reference Texas Administrative Code (TAC) Chapter 235 Texas Educator Standards [Definitions](#), [Classroom Teacher Pedagogy Standards](#), and [STR Standards](#).

⁴ The qualifier "All" is intentional, as STR. requires every bulleted item

Indicator	4 – Distinguished	3 – Proficient	2 – Developing	1 – Improvement Needed
	practices are implemented with integrity and fidelity, explicitly addressing all the following: • Systematic practice with foundational skills • Regular practice with complex grade-level texts • Building knowledge and vocabulary through text in all content areas • Utilizing text evidence c) EPP coursework systematically and coherently ensures alignment among standards, instruction, and curriculum across the program by equipping candidates with a thorough understanding of Texas reading and language arts standards and Bluebonnet Learning, including how the curriculum aligns to standards and builds knowledge across content areas. Candidates interpret and apply grade-level TEKS with precision; demonstrate a strong understanding of the role of cumulative, content-rich knowledge in reading comprehension; and competently prepare and implement instruction that reflects effective use of Bluebonnet Learning.	materials and instructional practices are implemented with integrity and fidelity, addressing the following: • Practice with foundational skills • Practice with complex grade-level texts • Building knowledge and vocabulary through text in multiple content areas • Utilizing text evidence c) EPP coursework consistently ensures alignment among standards, instruction, and curriculum across the program by equipping candidates with an understanding of Texas reading and language arts standards and Bluebonnet Learning, including how the curriculum aligns to standards and supports knowledge building across content areas. Candidates interpret and apply grade-level TEKS accurately; demonstrate understanding of the role of cumulative, content-rich knowledge in reading comprehension; and effectively prepare and implement instruction using Bluebonnet Learning.	materials and instructional practices are implemented with partial integrity and fidelity, with limited attention to the following: • Foundational skills practice • Complex grade-level texts • Building knowledge and vocabulary through text • Utilizing text evidence c) EPP coursework inconsistently ensures alignment among standards, instruction, and curriculum across the program by equipping candidates with some understanding of Texas reading and language arts standards and Bluebonnet Learning, including limited understanding of how the curriculum aligns to standards and supports knowledge building across content areas. Candidates inconsistently interpret and apply grade-level TEKS; demonstrate partial understanding of the role of cumulative, content-rich knowledge in reading comprehension; and inconsistently prepare and implement instruction using Bluebonnet Learning.	instructional practices are implemented with integrity and fidelity, resulting in limited or no evidence of attention to research-based instruction strategies, and may include practices contrary to the research on how students learn to read. c) EPP coursework rarely or does not ensure alignment among standards, instruction, and curriculum across the program, resulting in limited or no understanding of Texas reading and language arts standards or Bluebonnet Learning. Candidates demonstrate limited ability to interpret and apply grade-level TEKS, limited understanding of the role of content knowledge in reading comprehension and may demonstrate misconceptions such as teaching comprehension through isolated skills, with limited or no ability to prepare and implement instruction using Bluebonnet Learning effectively.
1.3 Content Knowledge and Related Pedagogy in Math: (Chapter 235 Standards)⁵ <u>Criteria:</u> a) Comprehensive training in math pedagogy. b) Research and evidence-based training content. c) Training that builds content knowledge, including knowledge of OER.	a) EPP coursework and training systematically and coherently provide sequential instruction and practice opportunities in mathematics, enabling candidates to effectively teach all students mathematics grounded in the science of learning. All major mathematics domains—Numbers & Operations, Algebra & Functions, Geometry & Measurement, Data Analysis & Probability, Financial Literacy, and Fluency—and key aspects of math pedagogy are explicitly taught, practiced, and assessed.	a) EPP coursework and training consistently provide sequential instruction and practice opportunities in mathematics, enabling candidates to effectively teach most students mathematics grounded in the science of learning. Most major mathematics domains—Numbers & Operations, Algebra & Functions, Geometry & Measurement, Data Analysis & Probability, Financial Literacy, and Fluency—and key aspects of math pedagogy are explicitly taught, practiced, and assessed.	a) EPP coursework and training inconsistently provide sequential instruction and practice opportunities in mathematics, enabling candidates to teach some mathematics concepts grounded in the science of learning. Some major mathematics domains—Numbers & Operations, Algebra & Functions, Geometry & Measurement, Data Analysis & Probability, Financial Literacy, and Fluency—and key aspects of math pedagogy are taught, practiced, or assessed, with limited depth, coherence, or consistency.	a) EPP coursework and training rarely or do not provide sequential instruction or practice opportunities in mathematics grounded in the science of learning. Few to no major mathematics domains—Numbers & Operations, Algebra & Functions, Geometry & Measurement, Data Analysis & Probability, Financial Literacy, and Fluency—or key aspects of math pedagogy are explicitly taught, practiced, or assessed. b) Candidates rarely or do not apply

⁵

Note: Reviewers should reference Texas Administrative Code (TAC) Chapter 235 Texas Educator Standards [Definitions](#), [Classroom Teacher Pedagogy Standards](#), and [STR Standards](#)

Indicator	4 – Distinguished	3 – Proficient	2 – Developing	1 – Improvement Needed
	b) Candidates systematically and coherently apply research-based instructional strategies (RBIS) aligned to the science of learning. All materials and instructional practices are implemented with integrity and fidelity, explicitly addressing all the following: ● Teaching math as a connected, coherent story with appropriate depth and coherence of key concepts and procedures ● Developing conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and automaticity ● Providing effective explicit instruction for novice learners ● Facilitating effective student practice to develop mathematical independence c) EPP coursework systematically and coherently equips candidates with a thorough understanding of Texas mathematics standards, aligned content pedagogy and assessment, through training to effectively use Bluebonnet Learning. Candidates consistently and independently interpret and apply grade-level TEKS with precision, teach content knowledge accurately and demonstrate thorough understanding and competence in the use of Bluebonnet Learning materials.	b) Candidates consistently apply research-based instructional strategies (RBIS) aligned to the science of learning. Most materials and instructional practices are implemented with integrity and fidelity, addressing all the following: ● Teaching math as a connected, coherent progression with appropriate depth of key concepts and procedures ● Developing conceptual understanding and procedural fluency ● Providing explicit instruction for novice learners ● Facilitating student practice to support mathematical independence c) EPP coursework consistently equips candidates with an understanding of Texas mathematics standards, aligned content pedagogy, and assessment through training to effectively use Bluebonnet Learning. Candidates accurately interpret and apply grade-level TEKS, teach content knowledge appropriately, and demonstrate competence in the use of Bluebonnet Learning materials.	b) Candidates inconsistently apply research-based instructional strategies (RBIS) aligned to the science of learning. Some materials and instructional practices are implemented with partial integrity and fidelity, with limited attention to the following: ● Teaching math as a connected and coherent progression ● Developing conceptual understanding and procedural fluency ● Providing explicit instruction for novice learners ● Facilitating student practice to build mathematical independence c) EPP coursework inconsistently equips candidates with understanding of Texas mathematics standards, aligned content pedagogy, and assessment through limited training in the use of Bluebonnet Learning. Candidates inconsistently interpret and apply grade-level TEKS, demonstrate partial accuracy in teaching content knowledge, and show developing competence in the use of Bluebonnet Learning materials.	research-based instructional strategies (RBIS) aligned to the science of learning. Few to no materials or instructional practices are implemented with integrity and fidelity, resulting in limited or no evidence of: ● Teaching math as a connected, coherent progression of concepts and procedures ● Developing conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, or automaticity ● Providing effective explicit instruction for novice learners ● Facilitating student practice to develop mathematical independence c) EPP coursework rarely or does not equip candidates with understanding of Texas mathematics standards, aligned content pedagogy, or assessment through training in the use of Bluebonnet Learning. Candidates demonstrate limited or no ability to interpret and apply grade-level TEKS, limited accuracy in teaching content knowledge, and limited or no competence in the use of Bluebonnet Learning materials.

Indicator	4 – Distinguished	3 – Proficient	2 – Developing	1 – Improvement Needed
1.4 Pedagogical Preparation for Reaching All Learners (Chapter 235 Standards)⁶ <u>Criteria:</u> a) Preparing and implementing instruction for all learners b) Adjustments that maintain rigor	a) EPP coursework and training systematically and coherently equips candidates to prepare and implement instruction that meets all learners' needs. Candidates are prepared to effectively use acceleration, just-in-time supports, technology, intervention, linguistic supports, appropriate scaffolding, and implementation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). b) Candidates are prepared to intentionally and appropriately use HQIM-based instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners while maintaining grade-level rigor for all learners, including: ● Using evidence-based supports, including multiple means of engagement, representation, and expression, to meet the diverse needs of all learners ● Monitoring student progress through data to inform instructional decisions and purposeful groupings ● When necessary, thoughtfully adapting materials to meet diverse instructional needs	a) EPP coursework and training consistently equip candidates to prepare and implement instruction that meets most learners' needs. Candidates are prepared to use acceleration, just-in-time supports, technology, intervention, linguistic supports, appropriate scaffolding, and implementation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). b) Candidates are prepared to appropriately use HQIM-based instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners while maintaining grade-level rigor for most learners, including: ● Using evidence-based supports, including multiple means of engagement, representation, and expression, to meet the needs of diverse learners ● Monitoring student progress through data to inform instructional decisions and purposeful groupings ● When necessary, adapting materials to meet diverse instructional needs	a) EPP coursework and training inconsistently equip candidates to prepare and implement instruction that meets some learners' needs. Candidates demonstrate developing ability to use acceleration, just-in-time supports, technology, intervention, linguistic supports, appropriate scaffolding, and implementation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). b) Candidates are inconsistently prepared to use HQIM-based instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners while maintaining grade-level rigor for some learners, including limited use of: ● Evidence-based supports, including multiple means of engagement, representation, and expression ● Monitoring student progress through data to inform instructional decisions and groupings ● Appropriate adaptation of materials to meet diverse instructional needs	a) EPP coursework and training rarely or do not equip candidates to prepare and implement instruction that meets learners' needs. Candidates demonstrate limited or no ability to use acceleration, just-in-time supports, technology, intervention, linguistic supports, appropriate scaffolding, or implementation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). b) Candidates are rarely or not prepared to use HQIM-based instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners while maintaining grade-level rigor. There is limited or no evidence of: ● Use of evidence-based supports, including multiple means of engagement, representation, and expression ● Monitoring student progress through data to inform instructional decisions or purposeful groupings ● Appropriate adaptation of materials to meet diverse instructional needs
1.5 Evaluation of Quality and Delivery of Content <u>Criteria:</u> a) Formal monitoring system. b) Response to data. c) Support and development of instructors	a) EPP leadership and staff systematically and coherently use a formal, comprehensive system to monitor and enhance the quality of all the following components: ● Standards-based curriculum ● Integration of practice-based experiences and assignments ● Instructor preparation and delivery of content ● Candidate performance Data is systematically and continuously gathered, analyzed, and shared with staff and stakeholders to drive continuous quality improvement,	a) EPP leadership and staff consistently use a formal system to monitor and enhance the quality of all the following components: ● Standards-based curriculum ● Integration of practice-based experiences and assignments ● Instructor preparation and delivery of content ● Candidate performance Data is regularly gathered, analyzed, and shared with staff and stakeholders to inform decision-making, create action plans with measurable goals, and track progress toward improvement.	a) EPP leadership and staff use an informal system and inconsistently monitor and enhance the quality of some of the following components: ● Standards-based curriculum ● Integration of practice-based experiences and assignments ● Instructor preparation and delivery of content ● Candidate performance Data is inconsistently gathered and shared with staff and stakeholders to inform some decision-making. Action plans may be present but lack measurable goals, defined steps, or consistent	a) EPP leadership and staff lack a system to monitor and enhance the quality of the following components: ● Standards-based curriculum ● Integration of practice-based experiences and assignments ● Instructor preparation and delivery of content ● Candidate performance Data is rarely gathered or shared with staff and stakeholders and is not consistently used to inform decision-making. Action plans are absent or lack measurable goals, defined steps, and progress tracking.

Indicator	4 – Distinguished	3 – Proficient	2 – Developing	1 – Improvement Needed
	inform decision-making, and create action plans with measurable goals, explicit action steps, and tracked progress. b) Data and action planning for continuous improvement of coursework and instruction is systematically and continuously driven by a commitment to program quality, remaining responsive to P-12 partners' needs and feedback through a sustained cycle of monitoring, acting on results, and assessing impact on program outcomes. c) The EPP systematically invests in coursework instructors through ongoing, responsive feedback, support and training focused on research-based practices — including co-teaching, instructional strategies, high-quality curriculum, and practice-based preparation — to continuously improve instructional quality and program outcomes.	b) Data and action planning for continuous improvement of coursework and instruction is consistently driven by a commitment to program quality and responsiveness to P-12 partners' needs and feedback through ongoing monitoring, action planning, and review of program outcomes. c) The EPP consistently invests in coursework instructors through ongoing feedback, support, and training focused on research-based practices — including co-teaching, instructional strategies, high-quality curriculum, and practice-based preparation — to improve instructional quality and program outcomes.	progress tracking. b) Data and action planning for continuous improvement of coursework and instruction is inconsistently driven by program quality and responsiveness to P-12 partners' needs and feedback, with some evidence of monitoring, action planning, and review of program outcomes. c) The EPP inconsistently invests in coursework instructors through limited feedback, support, or training focused on research-based practices — including co-teaching, instructional strategies, high-quality curriculum, and practice-based preparation — with some evidence of efforts to improve instructional quality and program outcomes.	b) Data and action planning for continuous improvement of coursework and instruction is rarely or not driven by program quality or responsiveness to P-12 partners' needs and feedback, resulting in limited or no evidence of monitoring, action planning, or assessment of impact on program outcomes. c) The EPP rarely or does not invest in coursework instructors through feedback, support, or training focused on research-based practices — including co-teaching, instructional strategies, high-quality curriculum, or practice-based preparation — resulting in limited or no evidence of continuous improvement in instructional quality or program outcomes.

Review Area 2: Quality of Practice

Criteria	2.1 Quality of Placement	2.2 Quality of Pre-Clinical and Clinical Practice	2.3 Data-Driven Decision-Making With P–12 Partners
Essential Questions	To what extent does the EPP uphold high standards of quality by implementing a rigorous, collaborative selection and strategic matching process for field supervisors and mentoring educators?	To what extent does the EPP ensure high-quality clinical placements and practice-based experiences that are collaboratively designed, pathway-appropriate , and supported by structured feedback and proactive candidate support?	To what extent does the EPP systematically collaborate with P–12 partners through formal governance structures to ensure high-quality clinical placements and data-driven recruitment planning?

Overarching Question: To what extent does the EPP ensure high-quality clinical preparation through intentional collaboration, rigorous personnel selection, strategically designed and pathway-appropriate field experiences, and formal data-driven partnership structures that support candidate development and meet P–12 needs?

Data Sources - Materials will be collected prior to the review:

- Memorandum of understanding/agreements.
- Meeting minutes/notes (governance, advisory board, internal EPP).
- Selection criteria and documentation of placement schools.
- Demographic and school performance data (three years data of school and district demographics and school performance).
- Selection criteria and documentation of the field supervisor and cooperating/host/mentor teacher selection.
- Survey summary reports of principals and program graduates.
- Conversations with principals, district personnel, and recent program graduates.

Prioritized compliance items for Review Area 2 are in Appendix A.

Indicator	4 – Distinguished	3 – Proficient	2 – Developing	1 – Improvement Needed
2.1: Quality of Placement <u>Criteria:</u> a) Rigorous and consistent selection of supervisors / mentoring educators b) P-12 collaboration in FS/ME selection and matching c) P-12 collaborative candidate placement	a) EPP leadership and staff systematically and intentionally use comprehensive criteria to select field supervisors and mentoring educators who demonstrate instructional effectiveness, HQIM knowledge and skills, and full alignment with program expectations. All selected supervisors and mentoring educators are thoroughly prepared and consistently supported to advance candidate development through evidence-based practices. b) EPP leadership and staff systematically and intentionally collaborate with P-12 partners to analyze data and make strategic decisions regarding the selection and matching of mentoring educators. Strategic matching consistently addresses candidate development needs, partner staffing, and pipeline needs. c) EPP strategically and systematically ensures high-quality clinical placements through collaborative procedures with P-12 partners, placing candidates in settings that align to program goals, ensure access to effective mentoring educators who model strong instructional practices and HQIM use, and provide meaningful practice with diverse student populations.	a) EPP leadership and staff consistently use clear criteria to select field supervisors and mentoring educators who demonstrate instructional effectiveness, HQIM knowledge and skills, and alignment with program expectations. Most selected supervisors and mentoring educators are prepared and supported to advance candidate development through evidence-based practices. b) EPP leadership and staff consistently collaborate with P-12 partners to analyze data and make strategic decisions regarding the selection and matching of mentoring educators. Strategic matching consistently addresses candidate development needs, partner staffing, and pipeline needs. c) EPP consistently ensures high-quality clinical placements through collaborative procedures with P-12 partners, placing candidates in settings that align to program goals, provide access to effective mentoring educators who model strong instructional practices and HQIM use, and offer practice with diverse student populations.	a) EPP leadership and staff inconsistently use criteria to select field supervisors and mentoring educators with some evidence of instructional effectiveness, HQIM knowledge and skills, and alignment with program expectations. Some selected supervisors and mentoring educators receive preparation and support to advance candidate development through evidence-based practices. b) EPP leadership and staff inconsistently collaborate with P-12 partners to make decisions regarding the selection and matching of mentoring educators. Strategic matching inconsistently addresses candidate development needs, partner staffing, and pipeline needs. c) EPP inconsistently ensures high-quality clinical placements through limited collaboration with P-12 partners, placing some candidates in settings aligned to program goals with varying access to effective mentoring educators, HQIM use, and diverse student populations.	a) EPP leadership and staff rarely or do not use clear criteria to select field supervisors and mentoring educators with instructional effectiveness, HQIM knowledge and skills, or alignment with program expectations. Selected supervisors and mentoring educators receive limited or no preparation or support to advance candidate development through evidence-based practices. b) EPP leadership and staff rarely collaborate with P-12 partners to make decisions regarding the selection and matching of mentoring educators. Strategic matching is absent , with little to no consideration of candidate development needs, partner staffing, and pipeline needs. c) EPP rarely or does not ensure high-quality clinical placements through collaboration with P-12 partners, resulting in limited or no alignment to program goals, limited access to effective mentoring educators who model strong instructional practices and HQIM use, and limited or no opportunities to work with diverse student populations.
2.2: Quality of Pre-Clinical and Clinical Practice <u>Criteria:</u> a) Early practice-based experiences b) Quality of co-teaching ⁷ c) Placement timing and length (TRAD/RSD ONLY) ⁸	a) Field-based experiences or pre-internship clinical teaching experiences strategically and systematically align to coursework and provide opportunities for candidates to apply practices in authentic P-12 settings, with structured feedback from the program and P-12 partners. b) EPP consistently scaffolds pre-clinical and clinical practice through	a) Field-based experiences or pre-internship clinical teaching experiences consistently align to coursework and provide opportunities for candidates to apply practices in authentic P-12 settings, with structured feedback from the program and P-12 partners. b) EPP consistently scaffolds pre-clinical and clinical practice through	a) Field-based experiences or pre-internship clinical teaching experiences inconsistently aligned to coursework and provide opportunities for candidates to apply practices in authentic P-12 settings, with structured feedback from the program and P-12 partners. b) EPP inconsistently scaffolds pre-clinical and clinical practice to include	a) Field-based experiences or pre-internship clinical teaching experiences rarely or do not intentionally align to coursework and provide opportunities for candidates to apply practices in authentic P-12 settings, with structured feedback from the program and P-12 partners. b) EPP rarely or does not scaffold pre-clinical and clinical practice to include

⁷ For 26-27 only, programs that place most/all candidates in INT will not be rated on the Quality of Co-teaching criteria.

⁸ Programs that place most/all candidates in TRAD/RSD, or most/all candidates in INT, will be evaluated only on the appropriate criteria. Programs that place a combination of both TRAD/RSD and INT may be evaluated on all criteria.

Indicator	4 – Distinguished	3 – Proficient	2 – Developing	1 – Improvement Needed
d) Internship placement supports (INT ONLY)	b) EPP intentionally scaffolds pre-clinical and clinical practice to include co-teaching alongside qualified mentoring educators, providing a gradual release in instructional responsibility over time. Expectations for co-teaching are collaboratively set with P-12 partners and include a variety of models designed to ensure increased candidate proficiency over time. c) (TRAD/RSD ONLY)- EPP leadership has intentionally scaled and institutionalized a full-year clinical residency model, such that all candidates are placed in yearlong experiences that span the full academic year (both the first and last day of school). d) (INT ONLY) Programs deliberately demonstrate multiple proactive supports in place for candidates who are teachers of record, including supports for hiring and placement, frequent visits to provide timely oral and written feedback that focuses on how well students are learning, and evidence that strategic intervention routinely takes place to address weaknesses in candidate performance if/when they arise.	co-teaching experiences alongside qualified mentoring educators. Expectations for co-teaching are established with P–12 partners and include co-teaching models that support candidate development. Candidates are provided opportunities for increased instructional responsibility over time as they develop instructional skills during clinical practice. c) (TRAD/RSD ONLY) EPP leadership has established a full-year clinical residency model, such that all candidates are placed in yearlong experiences that span the full academic year. All other candidates, including those in non-residency pathways, are placed in well-designed semester-long placements that exceed minimum length requirements, including structured co-teaching, multiple feedback cycles, and opportunities for scaffolded practice and growth. d) (INT ONLY) Programs consistently demonstrate multiple proactive supports in place for candidates who are teachers of record, including supports for hiring and placement, frequent visits to provide timely oral and written feedback that focuses on how well students are learning, and evidence that strategic intervention takes place to address weaknesses in candidate performance if/when they arise.	co-teaching alongside mentoring educators, with limited opportunities for increased instructional responsibility over time. Expectations for co-teaching are partially established with P–12 partners and include limited use of co-teaching models to support candidate growth. c) (TRAD/RSD ONLY) EPP leadership has begun to implement a full-year clinical residency model, but some candidates are placed in yearlong experiences that span the full academic year. Candidates in non-residency pathways are placed in semester-long placements that meet but do not exceed minimum length requirements, and structured co-teaching, feedback cycles, and scaffolded practice opportunities are present but uneven. d) (INT ONLY) Programs inconsistently demonstrate proactive supports for candidates who are teachers of record. Supports for hiring and placement are present but not comprehensive, visits and feedback are provided but not always timely or focused on student learning, and evidence of strategic intervention to address weaknesses in candidate performance is limited or reactive rather than proactive.	co-teaching alongside mentoring educators, resulting in limited or no opportunities for gradual instructional responsibility. Expectations for co-teaching are unclear or not established with P–12 partners, with limited or no use of co-teaching models to support candidate development. c) (TRAD/RSD ONLY) EPP leadership has not yet established a full-year clinical residency model, and few or no candidates are placed in yearlong experiences that span the full academic year. Candidates in non-residency pathways are placed in semester-long experiences that meet only minimum length requirements, with limited or no structured co-teaching, feedback cycles, or scaffolded practice opportunities. d) (INT ONLY) Programs rarely demonstrate proactive supports for candidates who are teachers of record. Supports for hiring and placement are minimal or absent, visits and feedback are infrequent and lack focus on student learning, and there is little to no evidence that strategic intervention is in place to address weaknesses in candidate performance when they arise.
2.3: Data-Driven Decision-Making with P-12 Partners <u>Criteria:</u> a) Structured system for shared governance. b) Collaboration on the recruitment needs of P-12 partners.	a) EPP leadership strategically and systematically uses a formal, comprehensive system shared with P-12 partners to continuously gather, analyze, and monitor the quality of clinical placements and drive improvement. The partnership continuously operates under a formal agreement with a <u>governance structure</u> that advances candidate development and program goals, with clearly defined	a) EPP leadership consistently uses a formal system shared with P-12 partners to regularly gather, share, and monitor the quality of clinical placements. The partnership consistently operates under a formal agreement with a <u>governance structure</u> that oversees candidate development and program goals, with clearly defined roles and responsibilities. Formal meetings between P-12 and EPP	a) EPP leadership inconsistently uses a formal/informal system shared with some P-12 partners to gather, share, and monitor the quality of clinical placements. The partnership inconsistently operates under a formal agreement with a governance structure that oversees candidate development and program goals, with roles and responsibilities that are not yet clearly defined. Formal meetings between P-12	a) EPP leadership rarely or does not use a system that is shared with P-12 partners to gather, share, and monitor the quality of clinical placements. A formal agreement with a <u>governance structure</u> is absent or not meaningfully implemented, with little to no clarity around roles and responsibilities. Formal meetings between P-12 and EPP leaders, faculty, and staff are absent, resulting in little to no ongoing

Indicator	4 – Distinguished	3 – Proficient	2 – Developing	1 – Improvement Needed
	roles and responsibilities. Formal meetings between P-12 and EPP leaders, faculty, and staff advance partnership goals, drive program decisions, and ensure ongoing coordination. b) EPP leaders, staff, and P-12 partners systematically and intentionally collaborate to analyze data, identify recruitment needs and challenges, and develop a comprehensive recruitment and support plan. The plan includes clear goals, benchmarks, responsibilities, and progress monitoring, and is continuously used to adapt program design to meet P-12 partners' requirements and advance candidate pipeline development.	leaders, faculty, and staff ensure ongoing coordination and inform program decisions. b) EPP leaders, staff, and P-12 partners consistently collaborate to analyze data, identify recruitment needs and challenges, and develop a recruitment and support plan with clear goals, benchmarks, responsibilities, and progress monitoring that is consistently used to adapt program design to meet P-12 partners' requirements.	and EPP leaders, faculty, and staff are inconsistent and do not yet reliably ensure ongoing coordination or inform program decisions. b) EPP leaders, staff, and P-12 partners inconsistently collaborate to analyze data and identify recruitment needs and challenges. A recruitment and support plan is emerging but lacks clear goals, benchmarks, responsibilities, or consistent progress monitoring, and is not yet reliably used to adapt program design to meet P-12 partners' requirements.	coordination or informed program decisions. b) EPP leaders, staff, and P-12 partners rarely collaborate to analyze data and identify recruitment needs and challenges. A recruitment and support plan is absent or too underdeveloped to include clear goals, benchmarks, responsibilities, or progress monitoring, and is not used to adapt program design to meet P-12 partners' requirements.

Review Area 3: Quality of Candidate Support

Criteria	3.1 Training, Support, and Calibration for Coaching	3.2 Quality of Coaching Supports	3.3 Candidate Proficiency and Readiness Over Time
Essential Questions	To what extent does the EPP ensure that field supervisors, and mentoring educators receive consistent preparation, ongoing calibration, and targeted professional development to support candidate growth?	To what extent does the EPP ensure that observation and feedback systems use common, aligned tools focused on key instructional practices and provide evidence-based, actionable coaching that strengthens candidate effectiveness and student learning?	To what extent does the EPP ensure, through data usage, that it proactively supports teacher candidates to meet clearly defined performance standards through ongoing assessment, targeted feedback, and structured interventions — including co-teaching opportunities and coursework refinement— that strengthen instructional practice and advance student learning?

Overarching Question: To what extent does the EPP implement a coherent system of training, observation, feedback, and data use to ensure that all stakeholders are equipped to support candidate development and improve student learning outcomes?

Data Sources - Materials will be collected prior to the review:

- Training materials and documents.
- Handbooks.
- Current and complete written feedback.
- Observations of teacher candidates teaching.
- Observations of post-conference feedback.
- Observation forms and rubrics.
- Field and clinical assignments.
- Survey summary reports of teacher candidates, mentoring educators, and supervisors.
- Conversations with teacher candidates, mentoring educators, and supervisors.

Prioritized compliance items for Review Area 3 are in Appendix A.

Indicator	4 – Distinguished	3 -Proficient	2 – Developing	1 – Improvement Needed
3.1: Training, Support and Calibration for Coaching <u>Criteria:</u> a) Quality and alignment of observation tools b) Training on coaching and feedback for field supervisors and mentoring educators c) Inter-rater reliability and collaboration d) Monitoring, support and collaboration for field supervisors and mentoring educators.	a) All observers utilize common tools such as observation instruments, action step guides, and terminology aligned to state and local frameworks. Tools are utilized for both formal and informal observations and include an explicit focus on <u>all</u> the following: ● Candidate content knowledge and use of academic language. ● Appropriate pacing aligned to the purpose of the lesson ● Routines and classroom management strategies that include positive teacher reinforcements and redirections with minimal disruption to instruction ● Frequency, breadth, and depth of student practice. ● Monitoring and adjusting in response to student learning, including implementing scaffolds and supports for students with diverse needs. ● Impact of candidate instruction on learning during the observed lesson. b) The EPP systematically and coherently ensures comprehensive training with fidelity to field supervisors and mentoring educators on methods and practices for observing, coaching, and providing high-quality oral and written feedback to teacher candidates. All field supervisors and mentoring educators who oversee teacher candidates receive in-depth training at least quarterly to ensure strong and aligned feedback and coaching practices. c) The EPP systematically ensures measurable reliability and rater	a) Most observers utilize common tools — including observation instruments, action step guides, and terminology — aligned to state and local frameworks. Tools are used for both formal and informal observations and include a focus on most of the following as: ● Candidate content knowledge and use of academic language. ● Appropriate pacing aligned to the purpose of the lesson ● Routines and classroom management strategies that include positive teacher reinforcements and redirections with minimal disruption to instruction ● Frequency, breadth, and depth of student practice. ● Monitoring and adjusting in response to student learning, including implementing scaffolds and supports for students with diverse needs. ● Impact of candidate instruction on learning during the observed lesson. b) The EPP consistently ensures training to field supervisors and mentoring educators on methods and practices for observing, coaching, and providing high-quality oral and written feedback to teacher candidates. Most field supervisors and mentoring educators who oversee teacher candidates receive training at least quarterly to ensure aligned feedback and coaching practices. c) The EPP consistently ensures reliability and rater agreement for field supervisors and fosters regular collaboration between field supervisors	a) Observers inconsistently utilize common tools aligned to state and local frameworks. Tools are inconsistently used across formal and informal observations; however, implementation is inconsistent, limited to certain observation types, and/or the tools only partially address the following areas: ● Candidate content knowledge and use of academic language. ● Appropriate pacing aligned to the purpose of the lesson ● Routines and classroom management strategies that include positive teacher reinforcements and redirections with minimal disruption to instruction ● Frequency, breadth, and depth of student practice. ● Monitoring and adjusting in response to student learning, including implementing scaffolds and supports for students with diverse needs. ● Impact of candidate instruction on learning during the observed lesson. b) The EPP inconsistently ensures training to field supervisors and mentoring educators on methods and practices for observing, coaching, and providing oral and written feedback to teacher candidates. Training is provided but not consistently comprehensive or quarterly, resulting in uneven feedback and coaching practices across field supervisors and mentoring educators. c) The EPP inconsistently ensures reliability and rater agreement for field supervisors and fosters some	a) Observers rarely utilize common tools aligned to state and local frameworks. Observation instruments, action step guides, and shared terminology are absent or misaligned, and few or none of the following areas: ● Candidate content knowledge and use of academic language. ● Appropriate pacing aligned to the purpose of the lesson ● Routines and classroom management strategies that include positive teacher reinforcements and redirections with minimal disruption to instruction ● Frequency, breadth, and depth of student practice. ● Monitoring and adjusting in response to student learning, including implementing scaffolds and supports for students with diverse needs. ● Impact of candidate instruction on learning during the observed lesson. b) The EPP rarely ensures training to field supervisors and mentoring educators on methods and practices for observing, coaching, and providing oral and written feedback to teacher candidates. Training is infrequent, limited in scope, or absent, and field supervisors and mentoring educators lack the consistent preparation needed to deliver aligned, high-quality feedback and coaching to teacher candidates. c) The EPP rarely or never ensures reliability or rater agreement for field supervisors and fosters few to no

Indicator	4 – Distinguished	3 -Proficient	2 – Developing	1 – Improvement Needed
	agreement for field supervisors and fosters frequent collaboration between field supervisors and mentoring educators to share feedback, calibrate and align on candidate strengths and areas for growth. d) The EPP consistently monitors the effectiveness of field supervisor and mentoring educator training and provides ongoing support for all participants, (i.e., monthly check-ins, review of training and materials, co-observations, performance feedback, and a counseling out process if needed).	and mentoring educators to share feedback and align on candidate strengths and areas for growth. d) The EPP regularly monitors the effectiveness of field supervisor and mentoring educator training and provides ongoing support for all participants, including semi-annual check-ins, review of training materials, co-observations, and general performance feedback.	collaboration between field supervisors and mentoring educators to share feedback and discuss candidate strengths and areas for growth. d) The EPP inconsistently monitors the effectiveness of field supervisor and mentoring educator training and provides limited support for participants, such as occasional check-ins, informal review of materials, or general feedback without follow-up.	opportunities for collaboration between field supervisors and mentoring educators to share feedback or align on candidate strengths and areas for growth. d) The EPP rarely or does not monitor the effectiveness of field supervisor and mentoring educator training, nor provide ongoing support, or maintain check-ins, co-observations, or performance feedback systems.
3.2: Quality of Coaching Supports <u>Criteria:</u> a) Actionable and highest-leverage feedback b) Quality of coaching c) Quality of evaluation	a) Oral and written feedback provided to candidates is precise, accurate, and is always focused on instructional impact. Candidates continuously receive observable, high-leverage, manageable action steps that are explicitly connected to evidence from the observation and are implementable within a short timeframe, accelerating candidate growth and improving student learning. b) The program proactively follows up on all observation opportunities with a structured, high-quality coaching approach in which candidates see an exemplar, connect it to the targeted skill, and practice it as they would in instruction. Follow-up is timely, calibrated across supervisors and faculty, and designed to close the gap between current practice and mastery — with prior action steps revisited to reinforce growth and track progress over time. c) All formal observations result in accurate, evidence-based evaluations that clearly distinguish levels of instructional performance and priority growth areas, so that all candidates understand how evaluation outcomes	a) Oral and written feedback provided to candidates is accurate and consistently focused on instructional impact. Candidates regularly receive observable, high-leverage, manageable action steps connected to evidence from the observation and implementable within a short timeframe to support candidate growth and improve student learning. b) The program follows up on all observation opportunities with a consistent coaching approach which includes opportunities for candidates to see exemplars of a targeted skill, connect exemplars to the targeted instructional skill or strategy, and practice the action step in the same way they would utilize it in instructional preparation or in front of students. c) Most formal observations result in accurate, evidence-based evaluations that distinguish levels of instructional performance and identify priority growth areas, so that most candidates understand how evaluation outcomes were determined and how results connect to their growth over time. Evaluation data is consistently used to inform coaching,	a) Oral and written feedback provided to candidates is inconsistently accurate and not always focused on instructional impact. Candidates inconsistently receive observable, manageable action steps that may not always be connected to evidence from the observation or implementable within a short timeframe, limiting candidate growth and impact on student learning. b) The program inconsistently follows up on observations with a coaching approach. Exemplars are sometimes provided but may lack alignment or clarity in relation to the targeted instructional skill. Connections between exemplars and instructional practice are uneven or superficial. Opportunities for candidate practice are present but may not fully reflect authentic instructional contexts or may lack sufficient guidance for effective implementation. Lesson c) Some formal observations result in evidence-based evaluations that inconsistently distinguish levels of instructional performance or identify priority growth areas, so that some candidates understand how evaluation	a) Oral and written feedback provided to candidates is rarely accurate or focused on instructional impact. Candidates rarely receive observable, high-leverage, manageable action steps connected to evidence from the observation or implementable within a short timeframe, significantly hindering candidate growth and having little to no impact on student learning. b) The program rarely follows up on observations with a coherent coaching approach. Exemplars are limited, absent, or not aligned to targeted instructional skills. Coaching does not clearly connect exemplars to instructional strategies. Candidates have few or no meaningful opportunities to practice the action step in ways that prepare them for real instructional planning or teaching. c) Few to no formal observations result in accurate, evidence-based evaluations that distinguish levels of instructional performance or identify priority growth areas, so that candidates rarely or never understand how evaluation outcomes were determined or how results connect to their growth over time.

Indicator	4 – Distinguished	3 -Proficient	2 – Developing	1 – Improvement Needed
	were determined and how results connect to their growth over time. Evaluation data is used deliberately to inform coaching, monitor progress, and strengthen instructional effectiveness throughout the clinical experience.	monitor progress, and support instructional effectiveness throughout the clinical experience.	outcomes were determined and how results connect to their growth over time. Evaluation data is inconsistently used to inform coaching, monitor progress, or support instructional effectiveness throughout the clinical experience.	Evaluation data is rarely or never used to inform coaching, monitor progress, or strengthen instructional effectiveness throughout the clinical experience.
3.3: Candidate Proficiency and Readiness Over Time <u>Criteria:</u> a) Candidate effectiveness and growth. b) Transfer of skills to practice c) Performance standards and monitoring. d) Proactive supports and intervention.	a) Through high-quality, structured practice opportunities — including co-teaching in diverse settings — teacher candidates deliberately and consistently refine and deepen their ability to engage all students in meaningful learning using research-based strategies and strong content knowledge. Observations confirm all candidates apply these skills with increasing independence and intentionality, supported by timely, specific, and actionable feedback from faculty, clinical support teachers, and supervisors that fosters deep reflection and continuous improvement to advance student learning. b) All candidates systematically and consistently demonstrate effective application of content knowledge, behavior management, formative assessment, differentiated instruction, academic feedback, and questioning — not in isolation, but in service of student learning. Observers consistently see clear evidence across all candidates that students are mastering the lesson objective and are meaningfully engaged as a direct result of the candidate's instruction. c) EPP leadership systematically and proactively sets clear, rigorous performance standards across coursework, field experiences, and clinical practice, with multiple checkpoints throughout the program. A formal monitoring system uses ongoing formative and summative data to track progress, identify	a) Through high-quality, structured practice opportunities — including co-teaching in diverse settings — teacher candidates independently refine and deepen their ability to engage all students in meaningful learning using research-based strategies and strong content knowledge. Observations confirm all candidates apply these skills with increasing independence, supported by timely, specific, and actionable feedback from faculty, clinical support teachers, and supervisors that fosters reflection and continuous improvement to advance student learning. b) Most candidates consistently demonstrate effective application of content knowledge, behavior management, formative assessment, differentiated instruction, academic feedback, and questioning in service of student learning. Observers regularly see evidence across most candidates that students are mastering the lesson objective and are meaningfully engaged as a direct result of the candidate's instruction. c) EPP leadership consistently sets clear performance standards across coursework, field experiences, and clinical practice, with checkpoints throughout the program. A monitoring system uses formative and summative data to track candidate progress, identify learning gaps, and inform instructional adjustments in collaboration with P–12 partners.	a) Through structured practice opportunities — including some co-teaching experiences — teacher candidates inconsistently refine their ability to engage all students in meaningful learning using research-based strategies and content knowledge. Observations confirm most candidates apply these skills with some support, and feedback from faculty, clinical support teachers, and supervisors is sometimes timely and actionable, partially fostering reflection and improvement to advance student learning. b) Some candidates inconsistently demonstrate effective application of content knowledge, behavior management, formative assessment, differentiated instruction, academic feedback, and questioning in service of student learning. Observers sometimes see evidence across some candidates that students are mastering the lesson objective and are meaningfully engaged because of the candidate's instruction, but application is uneven and the connection to student learning is not yet reliably sustained. c) EPP leadership inconsistently sets performance standards across coursework, field experiences, and clinical practice, with some checkpoints throughout the program. Monitoring systems use limited formative and summative data to track candidate progress and identify learning gaps, resulting in some instructional	a) Practice opportunities are limited or inconsistently structured, and teacher candidates rarely demonstrate growth in their ability to engage all students in meaningful learning using research-based strategies and content knowledge. Observations reveal that few candidates apply these skills independently, and feedback from faculty, clinical support teachers, and supervisors is infrequent, general, or lacking the specificity needed to foster meaningful reflection or improvement to advance student learning. b) Few to no candidates rarely or do not demonstrate effective application of content knowledge, behavior management, formative assessment, differentiated instruction, academic feedback, and questioning in service of student learning. Observers see little to no evidence that students are mastering the lesson objective or are meaningfully engaged because of the candidate's instruction across few to no candidates. c) EPP leadership rarely or never sets clear performance standards across coursework, field experiences, and clinical practice, with few to no checkpoints throughout the program. Monitoring systems rarely or never use formative or summative data to track candidate progress, identify learning gaps, or inform instructional adjustments in collaboration with P–12 partners. Adjustments to coursework, practice opportunities, coaching, and

Indicator	4 – Distinguished	3 -Proficient	2 – Developing	1 – Improvement Needed
	learning gaps, and inform real-time instructional adjustments in collaboration with P-12 partners. Systems ensure that adjustments to coursework, practice opportunities, coaching, and feedback are timely, specific, and actionable and are proactively used to strengthen candidate performance and close skill gaps. d) When standards are not met, the EPP deliberately and without exception implements structured, proactive intervention plans — including individualized coaching, additional observations, targeted support, and when necessary, counseling — developed in collaboration with stakeholders to ensure candidates receive the support they need to meet expectations.	Adjustments to coursework, practice opportunities, coaching, and feedback are regularly used to support candidate performance and address skill gaps. d) When standards are not met, the EPP consistently implements structured intervention plans — including individualized coaching, additional observations, targeted support, and when necessary, counseling — developed in collaboration with stakeholders to ensure candidates receive the support they need to meet expectations.	adjustments in collaboration with P–12 partners. Adjustments to coursework, practice opportunities, coaching, and feedback inconsistently support candidate performance or address skill gaps. d) When standards are not met, the EPP inconsistently implements intervention plans — including some coaching, additional observations, and targeted support — sometimes developed in collaboration with stakeholders. Interventions are not always structured or proactive, and candidates may not consistently receive the support needed to meet expectations.	feedback are limited or not used to strengthen candidate performance or close skill gaps. d) When standards are not met, the EPP rarely implements structured intervention plans. Support efforts are limited, reactive, or informal, with little to no collaboration with stakeholders, and candidates frequently lack access to the individualized coaching, observations, or targeted support needed to meet expectations.

Appendix A: Prioritized Compliance Items

Review Area 1 Prioritized Compliance Items

TAC Rule Requirement	Criteria Summary	Acceptable Evidence
1A: Coursework Hours <u>§228.37(a)</u> <u>§228.41(a)</u>	- Program includes the minimum amount of coursework hours for candidates (300 clock hours / 20 credit hours for accredited IHE) - Program addresses the listed topics in the first 150 clock-hours (10 credit hours for accredited IHE) of coursework - Program provides the minimum field-based experience hours (50 clock-hours) within their coursework	EC-6 Scope & Sequence (may use TEA provided template or any document that demonstrates the required hours)
1B: Standards-Based Curriculum—Classroom Teacher Pedagogy Standards <u>§228.57(a)</u>	- Coursework material shows that the Educator Standards form the basis for the curricular material. - No material is in misalignment with the Classroom Teacher Pedagogy Standards.* * Examples of misaligned practices include: - Instruction on learning myths such as hemispheric dominance, personality traits, and learning styles, as named in TAC §235.21(b)(1)(D) - Instructional approaches that omit or fail to incorporate explicit, evidence-based teaching practices (modeling, clear expectation, guided practice, etc.) and instead focus on unguided or minimally guided learning approaches, contrary to TAC §235.21(b)(2)(A), §235.21(c)1(C), §235.21(e)(3), §235.21(d)(3)(E) - Instruction that trains candidates to prioritize independent lesson design over the use of district-approved high-quality instructional materials, contrary to TAC §235.21(b)(3) expectations that candidates utilize lesson design only when such materials are unavailable.	EC-6 Course/Module Syllabi, Lesson Plans, Coursework Materials, and/or Performance Assessments <i>OPTIONAL: Standards Alignment Charts</i>
1C: Standards-Based Curriculum—Science of Teaching Reading <u>§228.57(a), (d)(2)</u>	- Coursework material shows that candidates receive training in all of the Science of Teaching Reading standards. - No material is in misalignment with the Science of Teaching Reading Standards. * Examples of <i>misaligned</i> practices include: - Practices based in or containing cueing strategies (228.57(c)(10) such as: - Three-cueing - Balanced literacy - Miscue analysis	EC-6 Course/Module Syllabi, Lesson Plans, Coursework Materials, and/or Performance Assessments <i>OPTIONAL: STR Standards Alignment Chart</i>

TAC Rule Requirement	Criteria Summary	Acceptable Evidence
	○ Assessments such as DRA, QRI and IRI ○ Running records ● Practices that do not provide access to grade-level texts (235.21(d)4), such as: ○ Guided reading ○ Leveled texts ○ Reader's workshop ● Practices that contain "embedded" or implicit phonics instruction	

TAC Rule Requirement	Criteria Summary	Acceptable Evidence
1D: Instruction in the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills <u>§228.57(a), (d)(1)</u>	Coursework material shows that candidates receive training in the TEKS relevant to their certification area.	EC-6 Course/Module Syllabi, Lesson Plans, Coursework Materials, and/or Performance Assessments
1E: Performance Based <u>§228.33(c)</u> <u>§228.57(b)</u>	- Coursework material shows that candidates are provided, at minimum, opportunities to practice and receive feedback throughout coursework. - Performance assessments are aligned to standards and allow candidates to demonstrate competency	EC-6 Course/Module Syllabi, Lesson Plans, Coursework Materials, and/or Performance Assessments At least 2 sample performance assessments for areas aligned to educator standards and/or skills in 228.41
1F: Required Topics in Coursework – Code of Ethics; Appropriate Boundaries <u>§228.57(c)(1) & (7)</u>	Program provides instruction on the required topics.	Syllabus or lesson plan or performance task or assessment reflecting the integration of this instruction into the coursework
1G: Required Topics in Coursework – Dyslexia <u>§228.57(c)(2)</u>	Program provides instruction on the required topics.	Certificates of completion OR syllabus reflecting the integration of this training into coursework, including the approved provider
1H: Required Topics in Coursework – Mental Health <u>§228.57(c)(3)</u>	Program provides instruction on the required topics.	Certificates of completion OR syllabus reflecting the integration of this training into coursework
1H (I): Required Topics in Coursework – Open Education Resources (Bluebonnet Learning) <u>§228.57(c)(3)</u> <u>TEC, §21.044(a-1) (4)</u>	Training is sufficient to provide candidates with “thorough understanding of and competence in the use of open education resources [Bluebonnet Learning] in accordance with TEC 21.044(a-1)(4). * This should include direct training on the applicable Bluebonnet Learning materials and not <u>solely</u> the incorporation of Bluebonnet examples into coursework.	Syllabus reflecting the integration of this training into coursework AND Sample coursework materials showing that candidates receive instruction in the use of OER materials (K-5 Bluebonnet Learning ELAR and K-5 Bluebonnet Mathematics and/or Secondary Mathematics)
1J: Required Topics in Coursework – Proactive Instructional Practices <u>§228.57(c)</u> <u>TEC, §21.044(a-1) (1)-(3)</u>	Program provides instruction on the required topics.	Syllabus or lesson plan or performance task or assessment reflecting the integration of this instruction into the coursework
1K: Instructional Prohibitions (Forced Political Activity) <u>TEC, §21.0443(b)(3)</u>	Coursework and training complies with prohibitions listed in TEC 28.0022(a)(1-3) (linked here)	N/A – Reviewed in all submitted coursework materials
1L: Instructional Prohibitions (Alignment with Public Education’s Constitutional Goal) <u>TEC, §21.0443(b)(3)</u>	Coursework and training complies with prohibitions listed in TEC 28.0022(a)(4) (linked here).	N/A – Reviewed in all materials

Review Area 2 Prioritized Compliance Items

TAC Rule Requirement	Criteria Summary	Acceptable Evidence
2A: Preservice Field-Based Experience <u>§228.43(a)</u>	- Program includes the minimum number of field-based experiences for candidates before their clinical assignment. - At least 25 hours of field-based experiences include the instructional engagement requirements listed in rule.	EPP Handbook AND/OR Description of field-based experiences AND/OR Sample FBE logs
2B.1: Clinical Teaching Structure <u>§228.67(b) (1-2), (d)</u>	The structure of the clinical teaching experience meets the minimum requirements for hours, placement in subject/grade level matching certification area, and required co-teaching.	EPP Handbook AND/OR Clinical experience logs
2B.2: Residency Structure <u>§228.65(a) (1-3), (b) (1-3)</u>	- The structure of the residency experience meets the minimum requirements for length and placement in subject/grade level matching certification. - The structure of the residency experience meets the minimum requirements for engaging in increased responsibility for student instruction.	EPP Handbook AND/OR clinical experience logs
2B.3: Internship Structure <u>§228.73(a)-(e)</u>	- The structure of the internship meets minimum requirements for length and placement. - The structure of the internship ensures the candidate's certificate is valid during the internship.	EPP Handbook AND/OR process description
2C: Advisory Committee (and/or Shared Governance) <u>§228.25(a)-(c)</u>	- The structure for the advisory committee and/or shared governance includes at least 3 of the 5 required participants. - Committee meets at least once a year. - Committee has clear roles and responsibilities.	Description of process AND/OR meeting agendas or minutes
2C.1: Shared Governance (Residency Programs Only) <u>§228.25(d)</u>	- Governance meetings occur at least quarterly. - Governance includes district/campus administrators from the partner district. - Governance meetings include a review of data.	Description of process AND/OR meeting agendas or minutes
2D: Proactive Instructional Planning and Inclusive Practices for All Students <u>§228.25(a)(1)(J)</u> <u>(TEC), §21.0443(b)(1) and (2)</u>	The ability of the candidate to proactively plan and implement inclusive practices for all students, including students with disabilities, is assessed in the clinical experience.	Formal observation instrument that includes these proficiencies OR clinical experience project (e.g., portfolio) with aligned rubric

Review Area 3 Prioritized Compliance Items

TAC Rule Requirement	Criteria Summary	Acceptable Evidence
Requirement 3A: Required Support During Clinical Experiences <u>§228.91, §228.93, §228.97, §228.101, §228.105</u>	• Candidates received the support of a qualified field supervisor AND a mentoring educator (host, mentor, or cooperating teacher) throughout their clinical experience.	Description of process AND field supervisor and mentoring educator job description or description of roles and responsibilities
Requirement 3B: Mentoring Educator Training <u>§228.91(f)</u> <u>§228.93(a)(3)</u> <u>§228.95(a)(3)</u> <u>§228.97(a)(4)</u>	• Program provides training to mentoring educators according to the minimum requirements for the clinical experience. • Training is research-based.	Training materials OR training scope and sequence* * If the EPP's partner districts are participating in the Texas Mentorship Training (TMT) or TMT pilot, the EPP may provide evidence or documentation of this participation.
Requirement 3C: Field Supervisor Training <u>§228.101(b)(1)</u>	• Program provides the minimum required training to field supervisors.	Evidence that field supervisors complete the TEA approved training (certificates of completion, training transcripts, attendance sign-in sheet) AND Evidence that the field supervisor is trained annually by the EPP (training materials, description of process)
Requirement 3D: Informal Observations for Candidates <u>§228.101(b)(5)</u>	• Program provides the minimum number of required informal observations. ○ Residency: 4 per semester (8 total) ○ Clinical Teaching and Internship: 3 total • Informal observations meet requirements for timing, length, and feedback on targeted skills.	EPP Handbook and/or description of process AND Informal observation protocols or tools OR Informal observation records from submitted completers
Requirement 3E: Formal Observations <u>§228.105(a)-(d)</u>	• Program provides the minimum number of required formal observations (4 total; 2 in first half and 2 in second half of clinical experience) • Formal observations meet the timing (45 mins min) and length requirements. ○ Residency Timing: First within the first 6 weeks ○ Clinical Teaching Timing: First within the first third of assignment ○ Internship Timing: First within the first 4 weeks • Formal observations include pre- and post-observations.	Observation records from submitted completers AND EPP Handbook and/or description of process (including pre- and post-observation processes) AND Formal observation instrument