College of Education Program Approval Process

States are moving from a standard teacher preparation program approval process designed to ensure compliance with state and national standards to an evaluation process focused on holding teacher preparation programs accountable, producing effective teachers, and improving student achievement outcomes. The Public Education Department (PED) is in the midst of revising New Mexico's teacher preparation program approval process. The success and the usefulness of accountability efforts are dependent on the quality of the measures used and how the state, teacher preparation programs, and individuals use the data gathered from these measures to ensure continuous improvement. (The revised evaluation system may be an improvement from the previous approval system; however, it remains unclear how successful the revised system will be in meeting the needs of teacher candidates, practicing teachers, and their students.) Therefore, as New Mexico revises its existing accountability system for teacher preparation programs, it is imperative all entities collaborate for the successful implementation and management of the system.

This brief will provide an overview of New Mexico's teacher preparation process, detail the state's pilot of its revised approval process, and provide examples of state teacher preparation approval processes across the country.

National Teacher Preparation Program Approval

Several national efforts promote reforming how teacher preparation programs are evaluated. In 2011, the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) released the Plan for Teacher Education Reform and Improvement, which emphasized better reporting of program outcomes for accountability purposes, including information on student achievement growth, teacher job placements, retention rates, and surveys of graduates and their principals. These efforts are leading states to rethink how they evaluate teacher preparation programs to better understand how graduates of different programs perform as teachers, impact student achievement as new teachers, and improve program curricula, teacher recruitment efforts, and clinical experiences.

In October 2016, USDE released final regulations for teacher preparation programs that would have required states to rate the effectiveness of the programs, including the reporting of program-level data on graduates' placement and retention, feedback from graduates and their employers, and learning outcomes of students taught by graduates of teacher preparation programs, and tying access to federal grants to student success. However, the U.S. president signed a bill rescinding the USDE's final regulations under the Congressional Review Act, which allows Congress to disapprove of regulations enacted at the end of a prior administration.

In 2016, the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) released *No Time to Lose: How to Build a World-Class Education System State by State*, a report that acknowledges the recent struggles of state education systems in the United States, highlights the policies and practices of high-performing countries, and offers recommendations states can implement to build comprehensive education systems that are successful. In particular, the report describes how a world-class teaching profession supports a world-class instructional system, and this enables every student to have access to highly effective teachers who expect students to succeed academically. According to the report, most teacher preparation programs in top-performing countries are based in prestigious research universities that are more selective and rigorous than U.S. programs. Teaching programs in top-performing countries know and produce the number and types of teachers needed to fill vacancies each year, have significantly longer clinical practices, and do not allow alternative routes to licensure. On the other hand, U.S. programs typically have lower standards for entrance and exit, overproduce elementary education teachers, and struggle to produce teachers in high demand fields.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).
The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) joined together to create one entity – CAEP – and on July 1, 2013, CAEP became fully operational as the sole national accrediting body for teacher preparation program providers. On August 29, 2013, the CAEP board of directors approved new accreditation standards, which were fully implemented in 2016 (NCATE and TEAC legacy standards are no longer used for accreditation). CAEP's mission is to advance excellent educator preparation through evidence-based accreditation that assures quality and supports continuous improvement to strengthen prekindergarten to 12th-grade student learning.

CAEP works with more than 900 teacher preparation program providers currently participating in its accreditation system. CAEP serves all providers previously accredited by NCATE and TEAC. The scope of CAEP's work is the accreditation of U.S. and international teacher preparation programs at the certification, licensure, bachelor's, master's, post-baccalaureate, and doctoral levels. All teacher preparation program providers seeking CAEP accreditation are required to complete the program review process, which is part of the overall accreditation process and occurs prior to the self-study and on-site accreditation visit. Teacher preparation program providers then use the results of the program review as evidence to meet applicable CAEP standards. States define the program review options available to teacher preparation program providers as part of the CAEP state partnership agreement. States may choose from the following three options: CAEP program review with national recognition, CAEP program review with feedback, and state program review. **See Attachment 1 for an overview of each option.**

Standards. CAEP's standards and their components flow from two principals: solid evidence that the provider's graduates are competent and caring educators, and

solid evidence that the provider's educator staff have the capacity to create a culture of evidence and use it to maintain and enhance the quality of the professional programs they offer. The five standards define quality in terms of organizational performance and serve as the basis for accreditation reviews and judgments. The CAEP standards include the following: Standard 1 – content and pedagogical knowledge; Standard 2 – clinical partnerships and practice; Standard 3 – candidate quality, recruitment, and selectivity; Standard 4 – program impact; and Standard 5 – provider quality, continuous improvement, and capacity.

Costs. There are two mains costs for teacher preparation program providers associated with the CAEP peer review accreditation process: annual program provider fees, and accreditation visit fees and expenses. Annual fees are based on the number of program completers and cover the costs of maintaining accreditation status and support administrative operations. Accreditation fees cover CAEP administrative support for the visit, while visit expenses cover travel costs of the visit team. For the 2017-2018 school year, the cost to host a CAEP accreditation site visit is as follows: site visit fees include $1,980 per site visitor, site visit expenses include $825 per site visitor, and on-site expenditures vary by location. CAEP will assign five site visitors to each site team. The number of site team members is based on the size of the teacher preparation program, number of programs to be reviewed, and complexity of the visit.

2017-2018 CAEP Teacher Preparation Program Provider Annual Fees	
Completers	Annual Fees
0-50	$2,560
51-150	$2,840
151-300	$3,240
301-500	$3,750
501-1000	$4,940
1000+	$5,740
International	$11,500

Source: CAEP

Decision Process. Twice a year, the CAEP accreditation council convenes to review and make accreditation decisions through a three-step process, including: Step one – initial review panel; Step two – joint review panel; and Step three – CAEP accreditation council decision. There are three to four council members assigned to each initial review panel that review self-study reports (as amended in response to formative response, if applicable), site team reports (including possible provider corrections and response), and the lead site visitor's comments on the provider's response. A teacher preparation program provider representative, a representative from the program's state, and the lead site visitor may observe the panel's discussion. Clarifying questions may be directed to either the program representatives or lead site visitor during the initial panel. After a thorough review, the panel prepares a written recommendation on the program provider's accreditation status.

During the joint review panel, six to eight members of two initial panels cross present to ensure rigor, clarity, and consistency in accreditation recommendations in one joint panel. The joint panel may make changes to the initial panel's recommendations, and the recommendations are submitted to the full accreditation council. Finally, the CAEP accreditation council makes the final decision based on evidence submitted by the provider, findings from the visitor team together with their identification of the evidence, and the joint panel's recommendations relevant to the CAEP standards. The levels of CAEP accreditation decisions include: (1) Full accreditation, which is awarded to providers that meet CAEP guidelines for all five standards; (2) Probationary accreditation, which is awarded to providers seeking continuing accreditation that meet or surpass CAEP guidelines in four of five standards; (3) Denial of accreditation, which is for providers seeking initial accreditation that fall below CAEP guidelines in any standard; and (4) Revocation of accreditation, which is for providers seeking continuing accreditation that fall below CAEP guidelines in two or more standards.

Currently, New Mexico is not a state partner with CAEP. However, the following postsecondary institutions are NCATE-accredited and will be seeking CAEP accreditation: Eastern New Mexico University (ENMU), New Mexico Highlands University (Highlands), New Mexico State University (NMSU), Northern New Mexico College (NNMC), University of New Mexico (UNM), and Western New Mexico University (WNMU). In addition to seeking CAEP approval, which used to serve as the only official review of these programs, these programs will now also go through the new PED-led process.

State Evaluations of Teacher Preparation Programs

For a detailed description of New Mexico's teacher preparation program report card initiative, see the following LESC hearing brief: College of Education Report Card Development from September 1, 2017, which can be found under Tab 10.

Evaluation of teacher preparation programs involves primarily state program approval processes, which vary substantially across states. There is no systematically collected information about these processes. However, many states across the country focus their evaluation of teacher preparation programs on program design and implementation. Evaluation teams typically include state education agency staff and practicing or retired prekindergarten to secondary teachers; and a review of documents on program curricula, field experiences, and candidate performance submitted by each teacher preparation program. The teams conduct on-site visits to supplement and validate the documentation and then make a determination about the quality of the program.

As required by state statute, PED is required to report annually using the Educator Accountability Reporting System (EARS), which measures how well public postsecondary teacher and administrator preparation programs are performing their duties to develop effective educators (teachers, counselors, and administrators). Additionally, the EARS report aims to help teacher preparation programs improve their practices in regards to the following: preparing highly effective educators, connecting curriculum and learning experiences to the needs of schools, hiring terminally degreed faculty who have public school experience, and remaining active in service and research in the prekindergarten through postsecondary culture.

New Mexico. PED has the statutory authority to approve teacher preparation programs offered at the state's public and private postsecondary institutions. According to the 2015 Educator Accountability Reporting System (EARS) report, there were 13 postsecondary institutions that offered traditional and alternative teacher preparation programs in the state, including: research universities – NMSU and UNM; comprehensive universities and colleges – ENMU, Highlands, NNMC, and WNMU; community colleges – Central New Mexico Community College (CNM), New Mexico Junior College, San Juan College, and Santa Fe Community College; and private universities and colleges – University of Phoenix New Mexico, University of the Southwest, and Wayland Baptist.

NCATE. In 1991, the New Mexico Department of Education (predecessor to PED) entered into a partnership agreement with NCATE for state-based program reviews for granting accreditation to teacher preparation programs. This process consisted of meeting NCATE standards; a review team that included NCATE members, state education agency staff, faculty of higher education, teachers, and other school personnel to determine whether NCATE standards had been met; a pre-visit; an on-site accreditation visit; an exit report; and a teacher preparation program decision, which included NCATE accreditation and state department of education program approval. The department secretary determined the accreditation status of professional education programs going through the state process. Accreditation recommendations to the secretary were rendered at the professional practices and standards council (PPSC) meetings.

PPSC. PED created PPSC through regulation in 2005. PPSC is charged with ensuring high standards are maintained in the preparation and practice of professional educators and support providers licensed by PED. PPSC is required to advise the PED secretary on matters related to the approval of teacher preparation programs, licensure, professional development, and ethics of licensed school personnel. Specifically, PPSC is charged with recommending standards to govern the approval of teacher preparation programs and establishing procedures for assessing teacher preparation programs in compliance with standards approved by PED. These procedures are required to include provisions for a comprehensive evaluation of course content, an on-site visit, and recommending the approval or disapproval of programs designed to prepare professional education personnel. According to college of education staff, PED will review approved programs if a postsecondary institution submits program changes to PED, which will call a meeting of the PPSC to approve the program changes submitted. For instance, UNM presented before the PPSC in the spring of 2016 to obtain approval for an administrator preparation program. In April 2017, UNM's College of Education (COE) was scheduled to present before the PPSC regarding curriculum revisions; however, COE staff who attended the meeting reported PED staff were present at the scheduled meeting as opposed to a presentation before the PPSC.

Prior Teacher Preparation Program Approval Process. According to PED staff, the department previously utilized a state teacher preparation program approval process in collaboration with an NCATE accreditation visit to each teacher preparation program, which is detailed above. Additionally, each teacher preparation program was required to submit an institutional report to PED, which described the program's conceptual framework and the evidence demonstrating the NCATE standards were met. Finally, each program was approved by PED for a seven-year period, after which the process would repeat.

NCATE Standards:
Standard 1: Candidate knowledge, skills, and professional disposition;
Standard 2: Assessment system and unit evaluation;
Standard 3: Field experiences and clinical practices;
Standard 4: Diversity;
Standard 5: Faculty qualifications, performance, and development; and
Standard 6: Unit governance and resources.

Revised Teacher Preparation Program Approval. In 2014, PED began considering revising its teacher preparation program approval process and discussing potential changes with the New Mexico Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, commonly referred to as the Deans and Directors. Originally, PED proposed using the inspectorate model, with a New Mexico focused program, to approve teacher preparation programs in the state. PED staff noted the inspectorate program was chosen because it would reduce the costs and preparation associated with the evaluation process. Additionally, the inspectorate model promoted improvement and feedback from the people who were hiring teachers so it would prove to be more useful. In the end, it is unclear why PED decided against using the inspectorate model, but the department proceeded to develop a new revised teacher preparation program approval method.

The inspectorate model has been used in Great Britain to approve teacher preparation programs for over the past decade.

In the fall of 2016, PED contracted with Columbia University's Center for Public Research and Leadership (CPRL) to create and develop a revised teacher preparation program approval process. CPRL staff created a revised process based on analysis, including a comprehensive review of academic and policy research across the country; interviews with PED leaders and key stakeholders, including teacher

preparation program staff in New Mexico; and interviews with practitioners across the country, including other teacher preparation programs, state departments of education, and local education agencies. Based on research and feedback collected, the framework was designed to create day-one ready teachers for which teacher preparation programs would be assessed on. CPRL developed a teacher preparation program review manual, which includes timelines for program review and on-site visits, quality review rubrics and components, review indicators, NMTEACH rubrics, and the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards. Official reviews of teacher preparation programs will begin in the 2018-2019 school year.

According to UNM college of education staff, the InTASC standards and NMTEACH rubric domains are aligned. **For a crosswalk, see Attachment 2.**

The four key components of the revised program approval process are intended to provide the framework for the review and focus on curriculum design and delivery, clinical practice, candidate and completer quality, and continuous improvement. All activities, including preparation, the on-site visit, and the summary report, will be organized around the key components. Additionally, data and artifacts will be collected to support each of the four areas. Effective curriculum design and delivery will ensure candidates' content, pedagogical, technological, and developmental knowledge and ensure candidates deliver content effectively and as designed. Efficient clinical practice will ensure candidates can apply learning in context, planning, and instructional delivery, assess student learning to nurture student growth, and foster strong relationships with school districts. Successful candidate and completer quality will ensure quality of candidates in a continuing and purposeful way from the initial program selection of candidates to the recommendations for licensure at the time of graduation. Finally, continuous improvement will allow teacher preparation programs to routinely engage in a continuous improvement cycle and prepare to meet the evolving needs of local partners and shifts in research and best practices. PED released a set of rubrics it will use to evaluate each of the four components of the revised program approval process. **See Attachment 3.**

The overarching goal of the revised teacher preparation program approval review is to improve the educational outcomes for students in New Mexico. To accomplish this, the review process aims to: establish meaningful links between and ways of measuring the impact of teacher preparation program inputs on public school student performance, create feedback mechanisms to spur ongoing internal improvement, and streamline the process to minimize burden on teacher preparation programs and review teams while maximizing results.

The program approval process will include six phases, including self-review, site visit notification, pre-visit review, on-site review, post-visit review, and report of the results. The on-site review will consist of three days, including orientation of the visiting team and site presentation of current standing. The visiting team will review data and get assignments for interviews and classroom observations. During the second day, interviews and observations of postsecondary and teacher candidates will be conducted, and the day will end with a team debriefing with data on the four key components. During the last day, the review team will finalize the data review and summaries for each of the four key components and end with a debriefing on initial findings with teacher preparation program leaders.

PED's proposing to review each teacher preparation program through this process every three years, depending on the size of the program. PED has released a proposed timeline for upcoming visits. **See Attachment 4.**

Teacher Preparation Program Approval Pilot. PED conducted a pilot for the revised teacher preparation program approval process in March 2017 with NMSU and CNM. According to review team members, teacher preparation programs were given little time to prepare for the actual on-site visit and to gather their evidence and artifacts. Reviewer feedback was based on the evidence from the programs as well as anecdotal information obtained through interviews with faculty and teacher candidates. On the third day of each on-site visit, the review team provided verbal feedback to teacher preparation program staff. PED provided written feedback to NMSU and UNM on pilot results several month after the pilot.

The pilot offered insight into what teacher preparation programs would experience with the revised program approval process. Concerns have been raised about the revised teacher preparation program approval process, including PED's capacity to implement and manage the revised process. Additionally, review team members and teacher preparation program staff noted challenges regarding the pilot, including: (1) lack of time to gather evidence and artifacts on the four key components; (2) no guidelines regarding data collection; (3) ambiguity if PED will focus solely on the NMTEACH rubric or InTASC standards, or a combination of both elements; (4) the pilot review focused on the quality of candidates, and did not focus on content knowledge of the candidates; (5) limited time was spent observing classrooms; (6) the need for a feedback process that is evidence-based as opposed to anecdotal experiences; (7) clarification on who should be present at the interviews; (8) program review questions were not aligned to the particular teacher preparation program; (9) the overall frequency of the review process; and (10) no opportunity for the pilot programs to offer feedback on the revised process. These challenges underlie the need for further collaboration and engagement with stakeholders.

Key differences between the current and revised teacher preparation program approval processes, include:

- The revised process contains a proposed timeline to ensure teacher preparation programs are visited and reapproved every three years;
- The revised process is focused on equity, which includes promoting diversity and increasing access by the state's highest need students to its highest-quality teachers;
- The revised process is easily implemented, which includes a process that should not overburden or require excessive commitment of resources by teacher preparation programs or the state; and
- The revised system is aligned with and supports related processes and policies, such as the NMTEACH teacher evaluation system, InTASC standards, and the college of education report card.

Other State Examples. Tennessee and Louisiana are among the best nationally when it comes to evaluating effective teacher preparation programs. Their approval processes are described below.

Tennessee. Tennessee requires all teacher preparation programs and specialty area programs that lead to teacher licensure to be approved by the state board of education, which is a multistep process to ensure candidates have access to training and support that provide opportunities for completers to become effective educators. To maintain approval to prepare educators, all teacher preparation programs in Tennessee are required to engage in a comprehensive review. Conditionally approved teacher preparation programs are required to participate in a comprehensive review within five years of receiving conditional approval. Fully approved teacher preparation programs are required to participate in a comprehensive review every seven years. Interim reviews may be required at any point if annual reports reflect performance persistently below expectations. During the review process, the following are required: (1) a trained review team that will conduct the approval review; (2) a pre-visit, which requires teacher preparation

programs to submit evidence for review, and each program will be evaluated against the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) standards and state-specific rubrics; (3) an on-site visit by the review team that focuses on specific evidence and metrics; (4) a post-visit by the advisory committee on educator preparation to review the materials and reports generated by the comprehensive review process; and (5) recommendations are submitted to the state board of education, which includes full approval, full approval with stipulations, probationary approval with stipulations, or denial of approval.

The federal Higher Education Act requires accountability for teacher preparation programs. Under Title II, traditional teacher preparation programs and alternative routes to state licensure are required to report to the USDE on the quality of their programs. The law also requires the USDE secretary to compile all teacher preparation reports and report to Congress annually.

Louisiana. Louisiana created a teacher preparation accountability system to assess the performance of teacher preparation programs at public and private universities within the state. From 2005 to 2013, data was released to the public about teacher preparation programs through Title II reporting and the dissemination of value-added scores that examined the growth of learning of children taught by new teachers. During 2013, the Louisiana board of regents adopted a revised accountability system for public universities to be in compliance with the federal Higher Education Act. The primary purpose of the state's current accountability system is to demonstrate teacher preparation programs at public universities are addressing workforce needs as they prepare and support teacher candidates and new teachers demonstrate knowledge and skills to successfully teach prekindergarten to 12th-grade students to ensure they are college- and career-ready.

In Louisiana, all teacher preparation programs are required to provide evidence for the following nine areas to operate approved programs: (1) regional institution accreditation; (2) university system and board of regent approval to offer degrees and programs; (3) board of elementary and secondary education initial and ongoing approval for program completers to receive a license to teach in the state; (4) national program accreditation; (5) documentation of teacher preparation program alignment to board of elementary and secondary education policy; (6) documentation of integration of current state and national student teacher standards into the teacher preparation curriculum; (7) attainment of board of regents completer requirements; (8) compliance with Title II of the federal Higher Education Act; and (9) attainment of effectiveness measures.

Teacher preparation programs select program review options as determined by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)-state agreement. In the absence of a CAEP-state agreement, programs choose among the three program review options listed in the table below.

CAEP Program Review Options			
	CAEP Program Review with National Recognition*	**CAEP Program Review with Feedback**	**State Program Review**
Format	Program report forms completed for each content area and level describing evidence of candidates' performance on a set of key assessments that demonstrates meeting standards	Submitted as an addendum to the self-study report (inquiry brief or institutional report)	State-defined process
Standards	Specialized Professional Association (SPA) standards	State-selected standards	State-selected standards
Timing of Submission	Mid-cycle of the overall accreditation cycle (three years in advance of the accreditation visit for most states)	At the same time as the Inquiry Brief or Institutional Report documents (roughly 8-12 months in advance of the visit)	State-defined timing.
Review Team	SPA review teams trained by both the SPAs and CAEP	Reviewed by site visitors	State review team
Results	Recognition Report with a decision of "Nationally Recognized," "Recognized with Conditions," or "Further Development Required/Recognized with Probation/Not Nationally Recognized"	Feedback is provided to EPPs and the state on specialty licensure areas aligned to CAEP and state standards based on disaggregated data presented in the self-study	State decision regarding program approval

Source: CAEP

* This is the only program review option that can lead to national recognition by CAEP.

NMTEACH Domains
Domain 1: Planning and Preparation
A. Content Knowledge
B. Designing Instruction
C. Setting Insructional Outcomes
D. Knowledge of Resources
E. Knowledge of Students
F. Student Assessment
Domain 2: Learning Environment
A. Environment Respect/Rapport
B. Organization of Physical Space
C. Established Learning Culture
D. Management of Classroom Procedures
E. Management of Student Behavior
Domain 3: Teaching/Learning
A. Communication with Students
B. Using Questioning
C. Student Engagement
D. Instructional Assessment
E. Flexibility/Responsiveness
Domain 4: Professionalism
A. Community/Families
B. Professor/Community
C. Reflecting on Teaching
D. Professionalism
E. Growth/Development Professionally
F. Maintenance of Records

InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards	
1. Learner Development	1E, 2A, 2C, 2E
2. Learning Differences	1B, 1E, 2D, 3B
3. Learning Environments	1D, 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D
4. Content Knowledge	1A, 1D
5. Application of Content	1B, 1C, 3A,3C
6. Assessment	1F, 3D, 4F
7. Instructional Planning	1D, 1E, 1F, 2C, 2D, 3B, 3C
8. Instructional Strategies	1F,3B,3C,3F
9. Professional Learning and Ethical Practice	1D,4A,4B,4D,4E,4F
10. Leadership and Collaboration	1D, 4C,4D,4E,4F

Source: UNM

Quality Review Rubrics

The Quality Review components are assessed with the following four rubrics. These rubrics are tools intended to inform an effective Quality Review by (1) providing clear expectations for EPPs to describe which behaviors, actions, and outcomes meet standards and (2) instructing the scoring of Quality Reviews. Each rubric aligns indicators to subcomponents and measures each indicator on a scale of five performance levels: Undeveloped, Developing, Proficient, Well Developed, and Industry Leader.

Questions should be directed to the Educator Quality Division at the PED: and submissions should be timestamped by 11:59pm on the deadline provided by the PED.

Rubric for Curriculum Design and Delivery Component

Indicators	Undeveloped	Developing	Proficient	Well Developed	Industry Leader
1.1 Curriculum Design					
Curriculum Design	EPPs do not demonstrate alignment of curriculum and assessments to the 10 InTASC standards and 6 priority areas.	EPPs demonstrate alignment of curriculum and assessments to the 10 InTASC standards and 6 priority areas. However, many standards and priority areas are not covered comprehensively or rigorously.	EPPs demonstrate alignment of curriculum and assessments to the 10 InTASC standards and 6 priority areas. However, several standards and priority areas are not covered comprehensively or rigorously.	EPPs demonstrate alignment of curriculum and assessments to the 10 InTASC standards and 6 priority areas. Almost all standards and priority areas are comprehensively and rigorously covered.	EPPs demonstrate alignment of curriculum and assessments to the 10 InTASC standards and 6 priority areas. All standards and priority areas are comprehensively and rigorously covered.
1.2 Instructional Delivery					
Delivery alignment with curriculum design	Observed instructional delivery is not aligned to the 10 InTASC standards and 6 priority areas.	Observed instructional delivery is aligned to the 10 InTASC standards and 6 priority areas but is of an inadequate quality. Observed instruction will not enable candidates to master the presented standards.	Observed instructional delivery is aligned to 10 InTASC standards and 6 priority areas and is of an adequate quality. Observed instruction will enable candidates to mostly master the presented standards.	Observed instructional delivery is aligned to 10 InTASC standards and 6 priority areas and is high quality. Observed instruction will enable candidates to fully master the presented standards.	Observed instructional delivery is aligned to 10 InTASC standards and 6 priority areas and is high quality. Instruction enables candidates to fully master the presented standards. In addition, EPPs make clear to candidates how coursework aligns to key standards (e.g. InTASC, CCSS) and how they can use those standards in their own teaching.
Active learning	Instructors do not employ active learning strategies (such as activities that encourage candidates to talk with each other, work in small groups on an activity, or respond to a question through discussion, in-class writing or polling) or employ such strategies without achieving active student engagement.	Instructors occasionally employ active learning strategies (such as activities that encourage candidates to talk with each other, work in small groups on an activity, or respond to a question through discussion, in-class writing or polling) or employ such strategies while achieving only occasional student engagement.	Instructors frequently employ active learning strategies (such as strategies that encourage candidates to talk with each other, work in small groups on an activity, or respond to a question through discussion, in-class writing or polling) resulting in student engagement.	Instructors consistently employ a variety of active learning strategies (such as activities that encourage candidates to talk with each other, work in small groups on an activity, or respond to a question through discussion, in-class writing or polling) resulting in a high level of student engagement.	Instructors consistently employ a variety of active learning strategies (such as activities that encourage candidates to talk with each other, work in small groups on an activity, or respond to a question through discussion, in-class writing or polling) resulting in a high level of student engagement; instructors use metacognitive narration to explain their use of instructional strategies to candidates.

Rubric for Curriculum Design and Delivery Component

Indicators	Undeveloped	Developing	Proficient	Well Developed	Industry Leader
Classroom dynamics and diversity	Classroom environments are not conducive to the learning of the majority candidates. Instructors do not make explicit efforts to embrace the diverse perspectives of their candidates.	Classroom environments are conducive to the learning of the majority candidates. Instructors attempt to, but may not successfully, embrace the diverse perspectives of their candidates and employ these to enrich everyone's understanding of the subject at hand.	Classroom environments are conducive to the learning of all candidates. Instructors embrace the diverse perspectives of their candidates and employ these to enrich everyone's understanding of the subject at hand.	Classroom environments are highly conducive to the learning of all candidates. Instructors embrace the diverse perspectives of their candidates and the state's PK-12 students and employ these to enrich everyone's understanding of the subject at hand.	Classroom environments are highly conducive to the learning of all candidates. Instructors embrace the diverse perspectives of their candidates and the state's PK-12 students and employ these to enrich everyone's understanding of the subject at hand. Instructors use metacognitive narration to explain their approach to and use of diversity to improve their instruction.

Additional Measures for Curriculum Design and Delivery Component

1.1 Curriculum Design and 1.2 Instructional Delivery:
- Summative and capstone assessment scores to measure candidate mastery of the 10 InTASC standards and 6 priority areas
- Graduate Survey to measure graduate satisfaction with effectiveness and relevance of EPP coursework
- NES exams assessing graduate mastery

Rubric for Clinical Practice Component

Indicators	Undeveloped	Developing	Proficient	Well Developed	Industry Leader
2.1 Selection of Observation and Placement Sites and Cooperating Teachers/Mentors					
Selection of placement sites	EPPs select placements without attention to providing candidates with opportunities to learn about teaching students from different backgrounds, with different learning needs, and in different geographic settings.	EPPs attempt to select placement sites that will provide candidates with opportunities to learn about teaching students from different backgrounds, with different learning needs, and in different geographic settings.	EPPs mostly select sites which provide candidates with opportunities to learn about teaching students from different backgrounds, with different learning needs, and in different geographic settings.	EPPs only select sites which provide candidates with opportunities to learn about teaching students from different backgrounds, with different learning needs, and in different geographic settings.	EPPs only select sites which provide candidates with opportunities to learn about teaching students from different backgrounds, with different learning needs, in different geographic settings, and in high-quality schools (with School Grades of A or B).
2.2 Preparation of Program-Based Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher/Mentor					
Training for program-based supervisor and cooperating teachers/mentors	EPPs provide no training to program-based supervisors (PBSs) and cooperating teachers (CTs)/mentors.	EPPs provide some training to program-based supervisors (PBSs) and cooperating teachers (CTs)/mentors.	EPPs provide meaningful training in coaching strategies to program-based supervisors (PBSs) and cooperating teachers (CTs)/mentors.	EPPs provide meaningful training in coaching strategies, content standards, professional teaching standards, and the NMTEACH Teacher Observation Rubric to program-based supervisors (PBSs) and cooperating teachers (CTs)/mentors.	EPPs provide meaningful training in coaching strategies, content standards, professional teaching standards, and the NMTEACH Teacher Observation Rubric to program-based supervisors (PBSs) and cooperating teachers (CTs)/mentors. EPPs ensure that PBSs and CTs/mentors are trained in the same coaching methodology as each other to provide consistency for candidates.
2.3 Preclinical and Clinical Experience					
Application of coursework to practice	Unclear if and when candidates apply coursework to practice.	Candidates sometimes apply coursework to practice, but on delayed timeframe and without fidelity.	Candidates usually apply coursework to practice immediately, but only sometimes with fidelity.	Candidates apply coursework to practice immediately, and with fidelity.	Candidates embed coursework into practice consistently.
Coaching time	There is no dedicated time for coaching to occur.	EPPs and placement sites allocate PBSs and CTs/Mentors time to meet with candidates, but not enough time to always meet after observations.	EPPs and placement sites allocate PBSs and CTs/Mentors time to meet with candidates after every observation.	EPPs and placement sites allocate PBSs and CTs/Mentors time to meet with candidates immediately after every observation.	EPPs and placement sites allocate PBSs and CTs/Mentors ample time to meet with candidates immediately after every observation.

Rubric for Clinical Practice Component

Indicators	Undeveloped	Developing	Proficient	Well Developed	Industry Leader
Communication between PBS and CT/Mentor	PBSs and CTs/Mentors coaching the same candidate do not communicate with one another about their candidate.	PBSs and CTs/Mentors with the same candidate engage in some, but little communication with one another about their candidate.	PBSs and CTs/Mentors with the same candidate engage in moderate communication with one another about their candidate.	PBSs and CTs/Mentors with the same candidate often communicate with one another about their candidate and coordinate their support of and to the candidate.	PBSs and CTs/Mentors with the same candidate frequently communicate with one another about their candidate and carefully coordinate their support of and to the candidate.
High Quality Coaching	During coaching conversations, candidates receive irrelevant or unhelpful feedback. Candidates are not provided concrete instructional strategies for how to improve.	During coaching conversations, candidates rarely receive evidence-based, targeted, and specific feedback. Candidates are provided concrete instructional strategies for how to improve, but strategies are not based on professional teaching or appropriate content area standards.	During coaching conversations, candidates usually receive evidence-based, targeted, and specific feedback. Candidates are usually provided concrete instructional strategies for how to improve based on professional teaching and appropriate content area standards.	During coaching conversations, candidates always receive evidence-based, targeted, and specific feedback. Candidates are always provided concrete instructional strategies for how to improve based on professional teaching and appropriate content area standards.	During lessons, coaches conduct active observations.[1] During coaching conversations, candidates always receive evidence-based, targeted, and specific feedback that is tied to coursework. Candidates are always provided concrete instructional strategies for how to improve based on professional teaching and appropriate content area standards. Coaches use active observation when observations are in-person.
Candidates practice of new techniques	Candidates do not practice new techniques.	Candidates sometimes practice new techniques, but on delayed timeframe or without fidelity.	Candidates usually practice new techniques immediately, but only sometimes with fidelity.	Candidates practice new techniques immediately and with fidelity.	Candidates embed new techniques into practice consistently.
2.4 Collaboration of Partners					
Partner engagement	EPPs rarely or never meet with partner district(s). EPPs do not evaluate the quality of partnership(s).	EPPs meet on "as needed" basis with partner district(s). EPPs irregularly evaluate the quality of partnership(s).	EPPs meet regularly with partner district(s) to discuss each partner's goals. EPPs irregularly evaluate the quality of partnership(s).	EPPs meet regularly and strategically with partner district(s) to discuss each partner's goals. EPPs regularly evaluate the quality of partnership(s).	EPPs meet regularly and strategically with partner district(s) to discuss each partner's goals. EPPs regularly evaluate the quality of partnership(s) and, based on results, make strategic improvements.

[1] TNTP (2014). Fast Start: Training Better Teachers Faster, with Focus, Practice and Feedback. Retrieved December 5, 2016, from http://tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP_FastStart_2014.pdf.

Rubric for Clinical Practice Component				
Indicators	Undeveloped	Developing	Proficient	Well Developed	Industry Leader
Additional Measures of Clinical Practice Component					

2.1 Selection of Observation and Placement Sites and Cooperating Teachers/Mentors:
- Interviews or focus groups to determine usefulness of experience and quality of guided support
- NMTEACH summative score of cooperating teacher/mentor
- Candidate surveys to assess satisfaction with student teaching or job-embedded clinical practice experience

2.2 Preparation of Program-Based Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher/Mentor:
- Supervisor and cooperating teacher/mentor survey to assess satisfaction
- Candidate survey to assess satisfaction

2.3 Preclinical and Clinical Experience
- Candidate survey to gauge candidate learning and alignment of experience with candidate expectations and needs
- Program-based supervisor and cooperating teacher/mentor survey to assess candidates' experiences and progress
- NMTEACH Teacher Observation Rubric scores of candidates over time
- Formative or, where applicable, summative assessments of the candidates' students to assess candidate impact on student learning

2.4 Collaboration of Partners:
- Candidate and cooperating teacher/mentor surveys to assess quality and impact of partnerships

Rubric for Candidate Quality Component

Indicators	Undeveloped	Developing	Proficient	Well Developed	Industry Leader
3.1 Recruitment and Admissions					
Effective Recruitment and Selection goals	EPPs do not operate with recruitment and selection goals for incoming cohorts' academic achievement, candidate dispositions, and diversity.	EPPs operate with implicit recruitment and selection goals for incoming cohorts' academic achievement, candidate dispositions, and diversity.	EPPs set explicit, high recruitment and selection goals for incoming cohorts' academic achievement, candidate dispositions, and diversity.	EPPs set explicit, high recruitment and selection goals for incoming cohorts' academic achievement, candidate dispositions, and diversity. EPPs raise goals upon meeting them.	EPPs set explicit, high recruitment and selection goals for incoming cohorts' academic achievement, candidate dispositions, and diversity. EPPs raise goals annually.
Alignment and Quality of Selection Model	The selection model is not aligned with selection goals. The selection model minimally takes into account academic achievement, candidate dispositions or diversity.	The selection model is somewhat aligned with selection goals. It takes into account academic achievement, candidate dispositions, and diversity, but does not clearly describe selection criterion for one or more of the elements.	The selection model is mostly aligned with selection goals; takes into account academic achievement, candidate dispositions, and diversity; and adequately describes selection criterion for each of the elements.	The selection model is well-aligned with selection goals; takes into account academic achievement, candidate dispositions and diversity; and clearly describes selection criterion for each of the elements. Standards for each of these criteria are high and ensure high-quality incoming cohorts.	The selection model is completely aligned with selection goals; takes into account academic achievement, candidate dispositions, and diversity; and clearly describes selection criterion for each of the elements. Standards for each of these criteria are high and ensure top-quality incoming cohorts.
Quality of incoming cohort	EPPs do not have evidence of quality of incoming cohorts on teacher-related dispositions. The quality of incoming cohorts does not meet any selection goals.	EPPs have evidence of moderate quality of incoming cohorts on teacher-related dispositions. The quality of incoming cohorts only meets some selection goals.	EPPs have evidence of high quality of incoming cohorts on teacher-related dispositions. The quality of incoming cohorts meets the most important selection goals.	EPPs have clear evidence of high quality of incoming cohorts on teacher-related dispositions. Incoming cohort quality increases over time. The quality of incoming cohorts meets or exceeds most selection goals.	EPPs have clear evidence of top quality of incoming cohorts on teacher-related dispositions. Incoming cohort quality increases over time. The quality of the incoming cohorts meets or exceeds all selection goals.
3.2 Continuous Assessment and Support for Candidate Progress					
Quality of Evaluation System	EPPs do not have an ongoing evaluation system to assess candidates. EPPs assess candidates in ad hoc manner or not at all.	EPPs design an ongoing evaluation system which partly on candidates' continuous improvement. EPPs use system to assess candidates irregularly.	EPPs design an ongoing evaluation system which focuses on candidates' continuous improvement. EPPs use system to assess candidates frequently.	EPPs design an ongoing evaluation system which focuses on candidates' continuous improvement. EPPs use system to assess candidates frequently and rigorously and differentiate among candidates.	EPPs design an ongoing evaluation system which focuses on candidates' continuous improvement. EPPs use system to assess candidates frequently and rigorously, differentiates among candidates, and shares progress with students.

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Quality of Support Systems	No clear support systems or feedback mechanisms are in place.	Support systems and feedback mechanisms are in place, but are not effective in supporting candidate growth.	Support systems and feedback mechanisms are in place and are effective in supporting most candidates' growth.	Support systems and feedback mechanisms are in place and are effective in supporting all candidates' growth.	Support systems and feedback mechanisms are in place and are effective in supporting all candidates' growth, with equal success supporting struggling students as high achieving students.
Candidate and Cohort performance	Performance of the cohort is either not measured or is stagnant.	Performance of the cohort is generally increasing during the program.	Performance of the cohort increases consistently during the program.	Performance of the cohort consistently increases during the program. Nearly all students, including candidates identified 'at risk' of not meeting standards across key learning areas, grow.	Performance of the cohort consistently increases during the program. Nearly all students grow, and candidates identified 'at risk' of not meeting standards across key learning areas grow sufficiently quickly to catch up to their peers.

3.3 Selectivity During Graduation

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Quality of Selection criteria during program completion	EPP recommends program graduates for licensure without assessment of their preparedness.	EPPs recommend program graduates for licensure with moderate assessment of candidate preparedness.	EPPs recommend program graduates for licensure based on assessment of candidate preparedness. Selection criteria are based on more than satisfactory GPA in coursework.	EPPs recommend program graduates for licensure based on rigorous assessment of candidate preparedness, potentially resulting in candidates graduating who are not recommended for licensure. Selection criteria are based on substantial evidence collected through the program.	EPPs recommend program graduates for licensure based on rigorous assessment of candidate preparedness, potentially resulting in candidates graduating who are not recommended for licensure and are supported further by their program. Selection criteria are based on substantial evidence collected through the program.
Quality of the Graduating Cohort	EPPs do not have evidence of quality of graduating cohorts on teacher-related dispositions.	EPPs have evidence of moderate quality of graduating cohorts on teacher-related dispositions.	EPPs have evidence of high quality of graduating cohorts on teacher-related dispositions.	EPPs have clear evidence of high quality of graduating cohorts on teacher-related dispositions. Graduating cohort quality increases over time.	EPPs have clear evidence of top quality of entire graduating cohorts on teacher-related dispositions. Graduating cohort quality increases over time.

Additional Measures of Clinical Practice Component

3.1 Recruitment and Admissions and
- Average GPA, nationally-normed test scores, or other data similar metric
- Incoming cohort reflects the diversity of the student body of New Mexico's population

3.2 Continuous Assessment and Support for Candidate Progress
- Interviews to assess the growth of individual candidate and cohort performance at each stage of evaluation
- EPP faculty and candidate surveys and interviews to gauge the quality and effectiveness of the evaluation and support systems

3.3 Selectivity During Graduation
- Interviews of candidates to gauge the rigor of the selectivity criteria and model during completion
- Average GPA, nationally-normed test scores, or other data similar metric
- Graduating cohort reflects the diversity of the student body of New Mexico's population
- Cohort graduation rate
- NES exams assessing graduate mastery
- Feedback and graduate surveys to determine candidate satisfaction with preparation and support throughout program

Rubric for Continuous Improvement Component

Indicators	Undeveloped	Developing	Proficient	Well Developed	Industry Leader
4.1 Theory of Action					
Articulated theory of action	EPPs ineffectively or do not articulate a theory of action.	EPPs articulate a theory of action but it is not aligned with preparing Day-One Ready candidates.	EPPs articulate a theory of action that is implicitly aligned with preparing Day-One Ready candidates.	EPPs explicitly articulate a theory of action that is aligned with preparing Day-One Ready candidates.	EPPs explicitly articulate a theory of action that is aligned with preparing Day-One Ready candidates. The theory of action evolves over time in response to changes in local needs and national trends.
4.2 Goal-Setting and Implementation					
Strategic Goals	Goals are not informed by data analysis or do not exist.	Goals are informed by data analysis.	Goals are driven by data analysis and use some SMART criteria.	Goals are driven by data analysis and use SMART criteria.	Goals are driven by data analysis and consistently use SMART criteria.
Planning	EPPs do not develop plans for program changes.	EPPs develop plans for program changes and iterations, but do not have a timetable or key actions and owners.	EPPs develop plans for program changes and iterations, including a timetable and key actions and owners.	EPPs develop detailed plans for program changes and iterations, including a timetable, key actions and owners, and monitoring processes.	EPPs develop detailed plans for program changes and iterations, including a timetable, key actions and owners, and monitoring processes which include reflection on quality of planning.
Measures	EPPs do not identify appropriate measures or tools for investigating or evaluating improvement outcomes.	EPPs identify some measures for investigating and evaluating improvement outcomes. EPPs select or develop effective tools to collect and analyze data in support of these measures., but these tools have limited effectiveness.	EPPs identify some measures for investigating and evaluating improvement outcomes. EPPs select or develop effective tools to collect and analyze data in support of these measures.	EPPs identify appropriate and complementary measures for investigating and evaluating improvement outcomes. EPPs select or develop effective tools to collect and analyze data in support of these measures.	EPPs identify multiple appropriate and complementary measures for investigating and evaluating improvement outcomes. EPPs select or develop effective tools to collect and analyze data in support of these measures and share them with peer institutions.
Implementation	EPPs do not demonstrate capacity to implement, test, and evaluate program improvements.	EPPs demonstrate mixed capacity to implement, test, and evaluate program improvements.	EPPs demonstrate capacity to implement, test, and evaluate program improvements.	EPPs demonstrate capacity to implement, test, evaluate program improvements and execute iterations.	EPPs demonstrate capacity to implement, test, evaluate program improvements and execute iterations. EPPs solicit and incorporate feedback from local partners.

ATTACHMENT 3

		Rubric for Continuous Improvement Component			
Indicators	Undeveloped	Developing	Proficient	Well Developed	Industry Leader
4.3 Reflection and Adjustment					
Evidence-based decision making	EPPs do not revise plans or only do so in ad hoc manner not driven by data collection and analysis.	EPPs revise plans loosely based on data collection and analysis and implement new plans with moderate effectiveness.	EPPs revise plans based on data collection and analysis and implement new plans with moderate effectiveness.	EPPs revise plans based on data collection and analysis and implement new plans effectively.	EPPs revise plans based on data collection and analysis and implement new plans effectively. EPPs share key learnings within the organization and with local partners.
Outcomes	EPPs make no growth towards strategic goals and targets.	EPPs make incremental growth towards strategic goals and targets and begin cycle again.	EPPs make moderate growth towards strategic goals and targets and begin cycle again.	EPPs make significant growth towards strategic goals and targets and begin cycle again.	EPPs make significant growth towards strategic goals and targets and begin cycle again. EPPs share key learnings within the organization and with local partners.

21

Proposed Seven-Year Teacher Preparation Program Schedule						
Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four	Year Five	Year Six	Year Seven
UNM – SEC*	CNM – All	ENMU – All	SFCC – All	CNM – All	ENMU – All	Repeat
SFCC – All	NMSU – ECE	WNMU – All	Highlands – ECE	NMSU – SEC	WNMU – All	
Highlands – SEC	NNMC – All	Wayland Baptist – All	San Juan College – All	NNMC – All	Wayland Baptist – All	
San Juan College – All		University of the Southwest – All			University of the Southwest – All	
		UNM – ECE				

Source: PED

*SEC – All related secondary programs, including endorsements. SEC also includes all kindergarten through 12th certification programs.
**ECE – Early childhood and elementary programs and endorsements, including special education.