AAQEP Annual Report for 2025

Provider/Program Name:	Texas Teachers of Tomorrow
End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term (or "n/a" if not yet accredited):	12/31/2027

PART I: Publicly Available Program Performance and Candidate Achievement Data

1. Overview and Context

This overview describes the mission and context of the educator preparation provider and the programs included in its AAQEP review.

Teachers of Tomorrow (ToT) is an alternative educator preparation provider approved by the Texas Education Agency (TEA). Initially authorized in 2005, ToT prepares candidates for certification across a broad range of licensure areas and serves adult learners seeking an alternative, practice-based pathway into the teaching profession.

The mission of Teachers of Tomorrow is to prepare effective, ethical educators who positively influence student learning and contribute meaningfully to their schools and communities. The program is intentionally designed to support working adults by combining structured online coursework with supervised, job-embedded teaching experiences. This approach allows candidates to enter the classroom as teachers of record while completing certification requirements under sustained program and district support.

In Texas, candidates progress through a defined sequence that integrates preparation, assessment, and clinical practice. Candidates first complete asynchronous, standards-aligned pre-service coursework that introduces foundational pedagogy, professional responsibilities, and classroom practices. Prior to internship eligibility, candidates also complete required field-based experiences and demonstrate content knowledge by passing the appropriate certification examinations.

Once eligible, candidates secure employment in a teaching assignment aligned to their certification area and are issued an intern certificate. During the internship year, candidates receive ongoing supervision and feedback from program-assigned field supervisors, as well as mentoring and support from campus-based personnel. This supervised teaching experience is complemented by continued professional coursework focused on instructional refinement, classroom management, and reflective practice.

Upon successful completion of the internship, coursework, and state requirements, candidates apply for standard certification or, when applicable, a probationary certificate. Throughout the program, Teachers of Tomorrow emphasizes continuous improvement, data-informed decision-making, and collaboration with district partners to ensure candidates are supported and prepared to meet the demands of the profession.

Public Posting URL

Part I of this report is posted at the following web address (accredited members filing this report must post at least Part I):

https://www.teachersoftomorrow.org/texas/aaqep-accreditation/

2. Enrollment and Completion Data

Table 1 shows current enrollment and recent completion data, disaggregated by program and license/certificate, for each program included in the AAQEP review.

Table 1. Program Specification: Enrollment and Completers for Academic Year 2024-2025

Degree or Program offered by the institution/organization	**Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential** granted by the state	**Number of Candidates Enrolled** in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/25)	**Number of Completers** in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/25)
Programs that lead to initial teaching credentials			
As a provider of alternative certification, Teachers of Tomorrow (TOT) does not issue degrees or certificates directly. Instead, (TOT) recommends candidates for certification once they have successfully completed all program and licensure requirements, including clinical experience, testing, coursework, program fees, and any other relevant state or program obligations. After submitting the recommendation for certification, it undergoes review and approval by the Texas Education Agency. *The data presented in the "number of candidates" column reflects those who have attempted certification exams and/or have been hired in the respective areas listed.*	Agriculture Food and Natural Resources (6-12)	49	19

	American Sign Language (EC-12)	14	3
	Art (EC-12)	157	95
	Bilingual Education Supplemental-Mandarin Chinese	1	0
	Bilingual Education Supplemental-Vietnamese	1	0
	Bilingual Education Supplemental-Spanish	81	59
	Business and Finance (6-12)	152	23
	Chemistry (7-12)	30	5
	Computer Science (8-12)	8	5
	Core Subjects with STR (4-8)	40	57
	Core Subjects with STR (EC-6)	2274	961
	Dance (6-12)	54	24
	English as a Second Language Supplemental	238	177
	English Language Arts and Reading (7-12)	237	191
	English Language Arts and Reading with STR (4-8)	169	73
	English Language Arts and Reading/Social Studies with STR (4-8)	61	18

	Family and Consumer Sciences (6-12)	100	36
	Health (EC-12)	55	32
	Health Sciences (6-12)	15	11
	History (7-12)	176	58
	Journalism (7-12)	12	6
	Languages other than English-Arabic (EC-12)	2	0
	Languages other than English-French (EC-12)	6	3
	Languages other than English-German (EC-12)	1	1
	Languages Other Than English - Japanese (EC-12)	0	1
	Languages other than English-Latin (EC-12)	0	0
	Languages other than English-Mandarin Chinese (EC-12)	3	0
	Languages other than English-Spanish (EC-12)	93	24
	Life Science (7-12)	123	48
	Marketing (6-12)	12	2
	Mathematics (4-8)	248	92
	Mathematics (7-12)	192	88

	Mathematics/Physical Science/Engineering (6-12)	4	4
	Mathematics/Sciences (4-8)	73	10
	Music (EC-12)	59	33
	Physical Education (EC-12)	380	251
	Physical Science (6-12)	3	1
	Physics/Mathematics (7-12)	5	4
	Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) (6-12)	0	1
	Science (4-8)	277	82
	Science (7-12)	157	55
	Social Studies (4-8)	220	69
	Social Studies (7-12)	371	121
	Special Education (EC-12)	1657	694
	Special Education Supplemental	53	0
	Speech (7-12)	15	7
	Technology Applications (EC-12)	75	18
	Technology Education (6-12)	87	20
	Theatre (EC-12)	51	33
	Trade and Industrial Education	21	7
Total for programs that lead to initial credentials		8,112	3,528

Programs that lead to additional or advanced credentials for already-licensed educators			
Total for programs that lead to additional/advanced credentials			
Programs that lead to P-12 leader credentials			
Total for programs that lead to P-12 leader credentials			
Programs that lead to credentials for specialized professionals or to no specific credential			
Total for programs that lead to specialized professional or no specific credentials			
TOTAL enrollment and productivity for all programs			
Unduplicated total of all program candidates and completers		8,074	3,095

Added or Discontinued Programs

Any programs within the AAQEP review that have been added or discontinued within the past year are listed below. (This list is required only from providers with accredited programs.)

During this academic year, ToT ceased offering new enrollment for candidates pursuing Core Subjects with STR 4-8, Technology Applications (EC-12), and Computer Science (8-12).

3. Program Performance Indicators

The program performance information in Table 2 applies to the academic year indicated in Table 1.

Table 2. Program Performance Indicators

A. **Total enrollment** in the educator preparation programs shown in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals earning more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.
8,074
B. **Total number of unique completers** (across all programs) included in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals who earned more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.
3,095
C. **Number of recommendations** for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.
3,528
D. **Cohort completion rates** for candidates who completed the various programs within their respective program's expected timeframe **and** in 1.5 times the expected timeframe.
Teachers of Tomorrow operates an asynchronous, self-paced preparation model that allows candidates to progress through coursework and clinical requirements on individualized timelines. While pacing is flexible, the program maintains defined parameters for candidate engagement and completion that align with state requirements and program expectations. As a result, traditional cohort-based completion calculations are not directly applicable. For reporting purposes, program completion is defined by the attainment of a Standard Certificate. Candidates are expected to meet all program and state requirements and earn the Standard Certificate within one year of issuance of the Intern Certificate, which serves as the program's primary benchmark for on-time completion.   During the 2024-2025 reporting year, 3,095 candidates completed the program. Of those actively teaching, 2,672 received their Standard Certificate before September 1, 2025, having met all requirements within one year of obtaining their Intern Certificate. This equates to 86.33% of candidates.   To assess the number of candidates who completed their program within 1.5 times the expected timeframe, we reviewed those who were issued a Standard Certificate before December 1, 2025. Although the 1.5-year mark technically falls in February 2026,

we used December 1, 2025, for this calculation due to the AAQEP report deadline. Among the 3,095 candidates who completed their program in the 2024-2025 year, 2,756 were issued a Standard Certificate within 1.5 years. This represents 89.04%.

Among the 354 interns within the cohort of 3,110 first-year teachers in the 2024–25 school year, 28 exited the program, while the remaining 326 (10.48%) continue to progress toward fulfilling all program requirements.

E. **Summary of state license examination results**, including teacher performance assessments, and specification of any examinations on which the pass rate (cumulative at time of reporting) was below 80%.

TEST NAME	TESTS TAKEN 24/25 Based on first two attempts	TESTS PASSED 24/25 Based on first two attempts
AAFCS: Family & Consumer Science	48	81.20%
Agriculture, Food & Natural Resources 6-12	26	96.20%
American Sign Language EC-12	8	50%
Art EC-12	102	98%
Bilingual Education Supplemental	109	95.40%
Bilingual Target Language Proficiency Test (BTLPT)-Spanish	90	87.80%
Business & Finance 6-12	78	70.50%
Chemistry 7-12	13	61.50%
Computer Science 8-12	6	66.70%
Core Subjects 4-8	22	81.80%
Core Subjects EC-6	1171	81%
Dance 6-12	33	90.90%
English Language Arts & Reading 4-8	89	85.40%
English Language Arts & Reading 7-12	140	95.70%
English Language Arts and Reading/Social Studies 4-8	31	87.10%
English as a Second Language (ESL) Supplemental	179	94.40%
Health EC-12	39	100%
Health Science 6-12	9	88.90%
History 7-12	99	81.80%
Journalism 7-12	6	100%

LOTE: Arabic Oral proficiency	1	100%
LOTE: Arabic Writing proficiency	1	100%
LOTE: French	3	0%
LOTE: Spanish	30	66.70%
Life Science 7-12	61	68.90%
Marketing 6-12	5	80%
Mathematics 4-8	124	83.90%
Mathematics 7-12	110	77.30%
Mathematics/Science 4-8	37	75.70%
Music EC-12	30	76.70%
Physical Education EC-12	175	94.30%
Physical Science/Mathematics/Engineering 6-12	3	100%
Science 4-8	146	69.20%
Science 7-12	87	85.10%
Science of Teaching Reading	1223	96%
Social Studies 4-8	114	76.30%
Social Studies 7-12	178	69.10%
Special Education EC-12	907	84.20%
Special Education Supplemental	43	95.30%
Speech 7-12	4	75%
Technology Applications EC-12	42	57.10%
Technology Education 6-12	51	92.20%
Texas Assessment Of Sign Communication--Amer.Sign Lang.	2	100%
Theatre EC-12	33	78.80%

The chart above reflects the test scores for candidates in our certifying areas based on their last two attempts, in alignment with how Texas evaluates EPP's test pass rates.

There are currently 16 areas below the 80% threshold. It is important to note that of these 16 areas, 9 of them are also below 80% at the state level (based on Pearson testing data for best annual attempt). Additionally, 4 of the low testing areas for TX Teachers of Tomorrow have 10 or less test takers.

Teachers of Tomorrow closely examined assessment areas falling below 80%, with a special focus on areas below 75% (the state threshold), in order to strengthen existing initiatives and implement additional strategies to improve testing pass rates. In addition to offering test preparation modules, the program adopted curricular enhancements related to course sequencing and candidate progression. Adjustments were made to require completion of designated coursework within each module before candidates may advance to subsequent learning modules. These adjustments preserve candidate flexibility while providing a more structured learning environment to better support academic progress and growth.

The program is also strengthening its internal test preparation approach by embedding additional assessment-focused supports within the core curriculum. This effort began with a comprehensive redesign of the Special Education preparation pathway, aligned with recent Texas assessment updates in this certification area, and will continue to expand across other certification fields. In parallel, test preparation modules are being developed and revised to target high-priority content areas identified through ongoing analysis of testing performance data.

To further support candidate success, Teachers of Tomorrow continued to offer targeted financial incentives, including testing stipends and partial scholarships in select certification areas.

Testing pass rates are reviewed on a regular basis, and findings are used to inform continuous improvements to coursework, curriculum alignment, and test preparation resources to reinforce key concepts and support candidate readiness for certification assessments.

F. Explanation of **evidence available from program completers**, with a characterization of findings.

The Texas Education Agency administers a yearly survey of New Teachers and shares these results with Education Preparation Providers. The results below show a summary of the areas that were the highest and lowest during our 2023-2024 year and their current scores for the 2024-2025 school year. The goal of this review was to assess our program growth by examining the key areas from our last reporting year and assessing our progress. The number listed in parenthesis and red text indicated our 23/24 metric. Across the board in all key areas, we saw improvements in 9 out of 11 areas.

Overall, the data over the last two years supports that our completers are prepared/well prepared in organizing a safe classroom and environment and understanding and adhering to the code of ethics. The areas where there seems to be the greatest opportunity in candidates' preparedness is in developing and/or implementing appropriate formal and informal assessments for

students with disabilities to demonstrate their learning and supporting ELLs in mastering the English Language Proficiency Standards (ELPS)

TEACHER SURVEYS
854 total respondents

STRENGTHS:
- 96.72% (96.15%) of respondents felt that they were sufficiently prepared or well prepared to organize a safe classroom
- 96.72% (96.58%) of respondents felt that they were sufficiently prepared or well prepared to organize a classroom learning environment that is accessible for all students
- 95.43% (95.51%) of respondents felt that they were sufficiently prepared or well prepared to organize a classroom in which procedures and routines are clear and efficient
- 98.24% (98.22%) of respondents felt that they were sufficiently prepared or well prepared to understand and adhere to the Code of Ethics and Standard Practices for Texas Educators
- 94.96% (94.09%) of respondents felt that they were sufficiently prepared or well prepared to advocate for the needs of the students in the classroom
- 93.91% (94.02%) of respondents felt that they were sufficiently prepared or well prepared to reflect on their strengths and professional learning needs

AREAS OF OPPORTUNITY:
- 13.11% (13.15%) of respondents felt that they were not sufficiently prepared or not at all prepared to plan lessons that encourage students to persist when learning is difficult
- 7.61% (9.88%) of respondents felt that they were not sufficiently prepared or not at all prepared to differentiate instruction to meet the behavioral needs of students with disabilities
- 8.08% (11.87%) of respondents felt that they were not sufficiently prepared or not at all prepared to develop and/or implement appropriate formal and informal assessments for students with disabilities to demonstrate their learning
- 8.55% (9.6%) of respondents felt that they were not sufficiently prepared or not at all prepared to
- develop and/or implement appropriate formal and informal assessments for emergent bilingual students to demonstrate their learning
- 8.31% (10.38%) of respondents felt that they were not sufficiently prepared or not at all prepared to support emergent bilingual students in mastering the English Language Proficiency Standards (ELPS)

This data will continue to inform ongoing review of coursework and program supports as Teachers of Tomorrow identifies opportunities to strengthen curriculum alignment and candidate preparation.

G. Explanation of **evidence available from employers of program completers**, with a characterization of findings.

The Texas Education Agency administers a yearly survey of Principals and shares these results with Education Preparation Providers. Similar to our approach in prompt "F", the results below show a summary of the areas that were the highest and lowest during our 2024-2023 year and their current scores for the 2024-2025 school year. The goal of this review was to assess our program growth by examining the key areas from our last reporting year and assessing our progress. The number listed in parenthesis and red text indicated our 23/24 metric.

Across all identified strength indicators, employer ratings increased from the prior reporting year, reflecting consistent positive movement in principals' perceptions of candidate preparation. When looking at our areas of opportunity, there was improvement in candidates' ability to differentiate instruction, as the percentage of respondents who felt that ToT candidates do not display this skill decreased. Overall, data from the last two reporting years indicate that candidates are consistently prepared or well prepared in understanding and adhering to the Code of Ethics, organizing safe and accessible classrooms, and meeting district expectations for professional standards. At the same time, the data continue to identify instructional differentiation and the ability to adjust instruction in progress based on data as priority areas for continued program refinement.

PRINCIPAL SURVEYS:
949 total respondents

STRENGTHS:
- 96.26% (94.1%) of respondents felt that our candidates were sufficiently prepared or well prepared to use technology when appropriate to the lesson (to the extent technology was available at the school)
- 96.61% (96%) of respondents felt that our candidates were sufficiently prepared or well prepared to organize a safe classroom
- 96.49% (95.86%) of respondents felt that our candidates were sufficiently prepared or well prepared to organize a classroom learning environment that is accessible for all students
- 97.54% (96.74%) of respondents felt that our candidates were sufficiently prepared or well prepared to find and follow district expectations for professional standards

- 98.13% (97.69%) of respondents felt that our candidates were sufficiently prepared or well prepared to understand and adhere to the Code of Ethics and Standard Practices for Texas Educators
- 96.37% (95.45%) of respondents felt that our candidates were sufficiently prepared or well prepared to advocate for the needs of the students in the classroom

AREAS OF OPPORTUNITY:
- 11.35% (12.74%) of respondents felt that our candidates were not sufficiently prepared or not at all prepared to differentiate instruction
- 9.71% (9.55%) of respondents felt that our candidates were not sufficiently prepared or not at all prepared to adjust the lesson in progress based on data gathered during instruction [data: evidence generated during instruction such as formal/informal, observational, formative, etc.]
- 9.82% (8.27%) of respondents felt that our candidates were not sufficiently prepared or not at all prepared to maintain clear expectations for student behavior in the classroom.
- 9.82% (8.27%) of respondents felt that our candidates were not sufficiently prepared or not at all prepared to plan engaging questions that encourage complex or higher order thinking.

We intend to continue to use this data to examine our existing courses to identify ways we can continue to enhance our curriculum and program supports to enhance candidates' preparation.

H. Explanation of how the program investigates **employment rates for program completers**, with a characterization of findings. This section may also indicate rates of completers' ongoing education, e.g., graduate study.

Our program candidates start their program on an Intern Certificate, which requires employment by the district. They are required to complete a full year as teacher of record in order to apply for their Standard Certificate. During the 2024-2025 academic year, 85.91% of our interns received a positive principal recommendation and were issued a Standard within their first year of teaching on an intern certificate. Less than 14.09% have not yet received their Standard and did not continue to pursue teaching certification.

I. Explanation of how the **staffing capacity** for program delivery and administration and quality assurance system monitoring have changed during the reporting year, if at all, and how capacity matches the current size of the program.

During the 2024–2025 reporting year, Teachers of Tomorrow maintained staffing levels designed to support effective program delivery, supervision, and quality assurance activities aligned with the size and scope of the program. Staffing structures include dedicated teams supporting classroom practice, curriculum development, and the ongoing monitoring of candidate progress. Classroom support services are led by the Director of Classroom Support, who oversees six full-time Teachers of Tomorrow employees and 133 field supervisors assigned to Texas. Field supervisors conducted candidate observations and provided ongoing instructional feedback throughout the academic year. This staffing structure supports sustained supervision of interns during their yearlong teaching experience and allows for individualized feedback aligned with program expectations and district contexts.

Curriculum development and instructional delivery are led by a Director of Product, who oversees a team of six full-time employees and 27 contracted instructors. This staffing model ensures consistent oversight of curriculum quality while providing sufficient instructional capacity to serve a large and diverse candidate population across certification areas.

Additional program support is provided through internal teams including Enrollment, Fulfillment, Program Advisory, Compliance, Certification, and Client Success and Engagement. The Enrollment, Fulfillment (transcript processing), and Program Advisory (academic counseling) teams are led by a Vice President of Customer Success who oversees three managers supporting Texas operations. These managers supervise staff responsible for enrollment processing, transcript evaluation, and academic counseling. Given the self-paced nature of the competency-based program, outreach efforts focus on providing timely support and guidance based on candidates' progression and milestone attainment.

The Compliance and Certification teams are led by the Chief Compliance and Regulatory Officer, who oversees two managers, one for each functional area. These managers supervise staff responsible for Texas compliance tracking, reporting, and certification processing. The Client Success and Engagement team is led by a Director who oversees account representatives working directly with district partners to ensure district hiring needs are addressed and that district-employed candidates are appropriately supported in alignment with district initiatives and timelines.

During the reporting year, Teachers of Tomorrow also added a Superintendent in Residence position. This role was created to support school districts in navigating state-level policy changes and to strengthen district partnerships in order to expand and deepen the organization's impact and support of Texas local education agencies.

Overall, staffing capacity during the reporting year remained sufficient to support program operations, candidate supervision, curriculum delivery, and quality assurance processes. Staffing allocations are reviewed regularly to ensure continued alignment with enrollment levels, regulatory requirements, and continuous improvement priorities.

4. Candidate Academic Performance Indicators

Tables 3 and 4 report on select measures (3 to 5 measures for each standard) of candidate/completer performance related to AAQEP Standards 1 and 2, including the program's expectations for performance (criteria for success) and indicators of the degree to which those expectations are met.

Table 3. Expectations and Performance on Standard 1: Candidate and Completer Performance

Provider-selected measures (name and description)	Criteria for success	Level or extent of success in meeting the expectation
TNT 700.1PBP – Performance Based Project – The Teacher. This performance-based project evaluates candidates' ability to apply ethical decision making and professional communication skills across three professional contexts: identifying and responding to potential violations of the Texas Educator Code of Ethics, communicating effectively with parents, and responding professionally to colleagues. Candidates submit written responses to all tasks in a single document and are evaluated using a multi-criteria rubric aligned to professional standards.	Candidates are assessed on a 4-point rubric. Instructors offer feedback on each criterion to guide the intern to mastery if the first submission does not meet the passing standard of 80%. All interns are expected to pass with at least an 80%. They are not able to progress to the next assignment until they receive this score.	452 candidates completed the TNT 700.1PBP project from 5/6/2025-12/10/2025, with an average score of 3.54 out of 4. When evaluating the rubric criterion elements of this assignment, the lowest alignment was to InTASC 10 (Leadership and Collaboration), with an average score of 3.51, and the highest was InTASC 9 (Professional Learning and Ethical Practice), with scores at 3.56.

This project was updated to 800.1PBP, incorporating instructional revisions, enhanced application, and improved alignment with InTASC standards.		850 candidates completed the updated TNT 800.1PBP project, with an updated score of 3.62. When evaluating the rubric criterion elements of this assignment, the lowest alignment was to InTASC 10 (Leadership and Collaboration), with an average score of 3.58, and the highest was InTASC 9 (Professional Learning and Ethical Practice), with scores at 3.64. In both instances, the newer course version correlated with an increase in scores, suggesting the improvements yielded positive results.
TNT 700.2PBP: Performance Based Project – The Learner In this performance-based assessment, candidates demonstrate their understanding of learners by analyzing the societal, cultural, academic, and emotional factors that influence student development and achievement. Drawing from select coursework, candidates select four representative students and identify the challenges each student faces, including strengths and contextual factors that impact learning.	Candidates are assessed on a 4-point rubric. Instructors offer feedback on each criterion to guide the intern to mastery if the first submission does not meet the passing standard of 80%. All interns are expected to pass with at least an 80%. They are not able to progress to the next assignment until they receive this score.	215 candidates completed this project from 5/6/2025-12/10/2025, with an average score of 3.53 out of 4. When evaluating the rubric criterion elements of this assignment, the lowest scored alignment was to InTASC 9 (Professional Learning and Ethical Practice), with scores at 3.40. The highest scored alignment was to InTASC 2 (Learning Differences), at an average score of 3.58.

Candidates create a professional presentation in which they analyze the developmental impact of each identified issue using research-based evidence, explain how the challenges affect academic performance and behavior, and connect findings to appropriate developmental goals. Candidates also identify community, school, and family resources and propose specific classroom supports and instructional strategies teachers can use to mitigate the impact of these challenges. The assessment evaluates candidates' ability to recognize learning differences, apply research to practice, and recommend supports that promote equitable access to learning. This project was updated to 800.2PBP, incorporating instructional revisions, enhanced application, and improved alignment with InTASC standards.		6 candidates completed the updated TNT 800.2PBP project so far, with an updated score of 3.58. When evaluating the rubric criterion elements of this assignment, the lowest alignment was to InTASC 9 (Professional Learning and Ethical Practice), with scores at 3.50. The highest was InTASC 2, with scores at 3.61. Given the low number of candidates completing the updated project, it is too soon to draw conclusions, but directionally the increased scores support positive results from these slight revisions.
TNT 700.3PBP Planning Instruction Part 1	Candidates are assessed on a 4-point rubric.	1310 took 700.3PBP from 5/6/2025-12/10/2025. This project was recently updated in December 2025 for enhanced tagging and mapping to InTASC to allow out outcomes reporting.

In this performance-based assessment, candidates develop two original lesson plans focused on the foundational components of instructional planning. Candidates use state academic standards to write standards-aligned learning objectives and design performance measures that align to both the objective and the standard. Candidates also articulate student-friendly objective statements, explain the purpose of learning, and identify relevant prior knowledge required for students to successfully meet the learning objective. This assessment evaluates candidates' ability to align standards, objectives, and assessments; communicate instructional goals clearly to students; and plan instruction that builds on prior learning. The project serves as the foundation for subsequent instructional planning performance-based assessments. This project was updated to 800.3PBP. The primary revisions included making directions and overall project layout clearer, as well as updating rubric to include outcomes for InTASC standards. Formatting was also adjusted to match previously revised projects.	Instructors offer feedback on each criterion to guide the intern to mastery if the first submission does not meet the passing standard of 80%. All interns are expected to pass with at least an 80%. They are not able to progress to the next assignment until they receive this score	For 700.3PBP, the average score was 3.73 out of 4. Candidates' lowest scored item was related to learning objectives, with a score of 3.41. The highest scored item was at 3.95 related to Content Standards. 1283 candidates took the updated 800.3PBP. The average score was 3.75, slightly higher than the original project prior to the revision. Candidates' lowest scored item was related to learning objectives, with a score of 3.49. The highest scored item was at 3.93 related to Content Standards. While the average score for the assignment increased slightly, the rubric criterion items for the lowest and highest scored items both decreased slightly. The program will continue to monitor these data and make the appropriate system updated for the needed InTASC outcome reporting.

TNT 700.4PBP: Planning Instruction, Part 2	Candidates are assessed on a 4-point rubric.	122 candidates completed this project from 5/6/2025-12/10/2025, with an average score of 3.62 out of 4.
In this performance-based assessment, candidates build on their prior work in Planning Instruction, Part 1 by developing selected student expectations into standards-aligned lesson plans that integrate instructional strategies, technology, literacy, and small-group instruction. The project is designed to strengthen candidates' ability to plan engaging instruction that promotes critical thinking, collaboration, and active student engagement while addressing diverse learning needs.	Instructors offer feedback on each criterion to guide the intern to mastery if the first submission does not meet the passing standard of 80%. All interns are expected to pass with at least an 80%. They are not able to progress to the next assignment until they receive this score.	When evaluating the rubric criterion elements of this assignment, the lowest scored alignment was to InTASC 8 (Instructional Strategies), with scores at 3.36. The highest scored alignment was to InTASC 2 (Learning Differences), at an average score of 3.91.
Candidates submit two lesson plans that demonstrate purposeful use of multiple learning modalities, structured opportunities for student interaction, and intentional integration of literacy practices, including vocabulary development, reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Lesson plans must also include appropriate and aligned technology use to support instruction and student collaboration.		98 candidates completed the updated TNT 800.4PBP project, with an updated score of 3.64. When evaluating the rubric criterion elements of this assignment, the lowest alignment was to InTASC 8 (Instructional Strategies) at an average score of 3.58. The highest scored item was aligned to InTASC 9 (Professional Learning and Ethical Practice), with scores at 3.70. There was a decrease in the rubric criterion element aligned to InTASC 2 in the updated iteration, decreasing from 3.91 to 3.65. This will be further reviewed for trends during upcoming data reviews during the next year to further explore trends and curricular implications.

The assessment evaluates candidates' ability to align instructional strategies with objectives, design meaningful small-group learning experiences, and integrate literacy and technology to enhance content understanding. This project was updated to 800.4PBP, incorporating instructional revisions, enhanced application, and improved alignment with InTASC standards.		
TNT 700.5PBP – Planning for Instruction Part 3. In this performance-based assessment, candidates submit two original lesson plans using the Teachers of Tomorrow 700.5PBP template and revise them based on instructor feedback until mastery is demonstrated. The assignment is intentionally more detailed than typical classroom lesson plans to allow for comprehensive evaluation of instructional planning skills.	Candidates are assessed on a 4-point rubric. Instructors offer feedback on each criterion to guide the intern to mastery if the first submission does not meet the passing standard of 80%. All interns are expected to pass with at least an 80%. They are not able to progress to the next assignment until they receive this score.	849 candidates completed this project from 5/6/2025-12/10/2025, with an average score of 3.77 out of 4. When evaluating the rubric criterion elements of this assignment, the lowest alignment was to InTASC 2 (Learning Differences), at 3.73, and the highest were InTASC 6 (Assessment) and InTASC 9 (Professional Learning and Ethical Practice), with scores at 3.79.

Candidates are evaluated on their ability to design instruction that includes purposeful questioning and feedback, explicit differentiation, clearly labeled accommodations and modifications, and aligned formative and summative assessments. Lesson plans must demonstrate differentiation in content, process, and or product to address the needs of diverse learners, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and gifted students. Candidates embed and highlight multiple planned questions to assess learning throughout the lesson. The project also includes a written reflection in which candidates explain prerequisite skills, justify differentiation decisions, and describe how instructional strategies and assessments address English Learner needs. This project was updated to 800.5PBP, incorporating instructional revisions, enhanced application, and improved alignment with InTASC standards.		270 candidates completed the updated TNT 800.5PBP project, with an updated score of 3.9. When evaluating the rubric criterion elements of this assignment, the lowest alignment was to InTASC 7 (Planning for Instruction) at an average score of 3.86. The highest scored item was aligned to InTASC 9 (Professional Learning and Ethical Practice), with scores at 3.98. While the rubric criterion item aligned to InTASC 9 scored the highest, all scores increased from the previous iteration.

TNT 700.6PB – The Learning Environment: Planning for Success. In this performance-based assessment, candidates articulate a clear vision for an effective learning environment and develop a comprehensive behavior management plan aligned to that vision. Candidates explain how they will establish and maintain a respectful, collaborative classroom through research-based strategies that support student engagement, accountability, and positive relationships. Candidates also describe strategies for building student-teacher relationships, organizing the physical classroom to support diverse learners, including students with disabilities, and promoting equitable access to learning.	Candidates are assessed on a 4-point rubric. Instructors offer feedback on each criterion to guide the intern to mastery if the first submission does not meet the passing standard of 80%. All interns are expected to pass with at least an 80%. They are not able to progress to the next assignment until they receive this score.	426 candidates completed this project from 5/6/2025-12/10/2025, with an average score of 3.41 out of 4. When evaluating the rubric criterion elements of this assignment, the lowest alignment was to InTASC 3 (Learning Environments), at 3.40, and the highest was InTASC 9 (Professional Learning and Ethical Practice), with scores at 3.62. 613 candidates completed the updated TNT 800.6PBP project, with an updated score of 3.37 out of 4. When evaluating the rubric criterion elements of this assignment, the lowest alignment was to InTASC 3 (Learning Environments) at an average score of 3.37. The highest scored item was aligned to InTASC 9 (Professional Learning and Ethical Practice), with scores at 3.58. In both instances, the revised version did reflect slightly lower average scores for the rubric criterion items aligned to these specific InTASC standards. This will further be reviewed for curricular implications during the next year.

As part of the assessment, candidates create a behavior management plan that includes positively worded classroom rules, expectations that foster individual and group accountability, and detailed procedures for common classroom routines. This assessment evaluates candidates' ability to apply research to practice, design supportive learning environments, and proactively plan structures that promote positive behavior and minimize instructional disruptions. This project was updated to 800.6PBP. The primary revisions included making directions and overall project layout clearer, as well as ensuring clear alignment between the exemplar and the rubric. Formatting was also adjusted to match previously revised projects.		

The TExES Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities EC–12 (160) licensure exam is designed to assess whether candidates have the requisite knowledge and skills for an entry-level educator. The 100 selected-response questions are based on the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities EC–12 test framework and covers four domains: Designing Instruction and Assessment to Promote Student Learning; Creating a Positive, Productive Classroom Environment; Implementing Effective, Responsive Instruction and Assessment; and Fulfilling Professional Roles and Responsibilities.	Candidates are required to pass the PPR exam to qualify for licensure. Our goal is for a minimum of 85% of candidates to pass this exam on their first attempt, in alignment with state expectations for pass rates for this exam. We are meeting and exceeding this goal.	During the last academic year (9/1/2024-8/31/2025), we had 2,788 candidates take the PPR and the PPR for trade and industry exams. Of these, we had 7 take the PPR for trade and industry exams, with a pass rate of 100% within the first 2 attempts. 2781 took the PPR EC-12 exam, with a pass rate of 94.1% within the first two attempts. When compared to our 23/24 scores (9/1/2023-8/31/2024), our scores increased slightly for the PPR EC-12 exam, which previously scored 93.5%. Our PPR for trade and industry exams remained constant at 100%.
Field Supervisors formally evaluate interns during their internship year. They are evaluated on four main domain areas: Planning; Instruction; Learning Environment; Professional Practices and Responsibilities. Under each domain, candidates are evaluated on a series of dimensions. Each dimension is scored on a 1-4 scale with 1=Improvement Needed, 2= Developing; 3-Proficient; and 4. Accomplished.	The program goal is for at least 90% of candidates to receive an evaluation of proficient or higher by their 5th observation for candidates on an intern certificate and on the 3rd observation for candidates on their probationary certificate.	2,593 candidates received their final Field Supervisor Formal Observation during the reporting time frame (24-25 academic year). This number includes candidates both on an intern certificate or a probationary certificate.

		Candidates on an intern certificate receive a minimum of 5 observations during their intern year, and candidates on a probationary certificate (1 year extension after their intern cert), receive a minimum of 3 observations per year. 2,593 candidates received a final observation (5th for intern and 3rd for probationary) during the reporting timeframe. 2,542 received "proficient" or "accomplished" (98.03%). Of the 51 candidates who did not receive proficient or higher, only 2 received "Improvement Needed" and the rest scoring "Developing."
ToT recently updated its alignment and reporting to specifically align Field Supervisor Dimensions to InTASC standards. The Dimensions aligned with AAQEP Standard 1 include: 1.2 Data and Assessment: The teacher uses formal and informal methods to measure student progress, then manages and analyzes student data to inform instruction. [InTASC 6]	The updated reporting and InTASC alignments recently rolled out to allow programmatic level analysis real-time via a dashboard. Once a full year of data is collected, appropriate metrics will be set with this new approach to data reporting and analysis.	A year in review analysis of our Candidate Proficiency by InTASC standards on the Field Supervisor Evaluation found that average scores across all InTASC standards rose by roughly 0.36 points, with the largest gains in InTASC #3 (Learning Environments) and InTASC #8 (Instructional Strategies), signaling effective, balanced development of teaching competencies.

2.2 Content Knowledge and Expertise: The teachers uses content and pedagogical expertise to design and execute lessons aligned with state standards, related content, and student needs. [InTASC 4 and InTASC 5] 2.5 Monitor and Adjust: The teacher formally and informally collects, analyzes, and uses student progress data and makes needed lesson adjustments. [InTASC 6] 3.3 Classroom Culture: The teacher leads a mutually respectful and collaborative class of actively engaged learners. [InTASC 3]		As it relates to the specific dimensions aligned to AAQEP standard 1, the findings for a snap shot in time were: InTASC 6 – (aligned to 1.2): • Observation 1 average score was 2.78 • Observation 5 average score was 3.17 InTASC 4 & InTASC 5 (aligned to 2.2): • Observation 1 average score was 2.83 • Observation 5 average score was 3.23 InTASC 3 – (aligned to 3.3): • Observation 1 average score was 2.87 • Observation 5 average score was 3.28
The program administered a completer survey to candidates. A sample of the questions on this survey that relate to standard 1 are included below. The response options were on a Likert scale (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, and Strongly Agree):	The program goal is for 70% of completers to Agree/Strongly Agree that their preparation aided them in the specific areas denoted by each survey question.	The score distribution for each relevant question is included below. The score distribution for respondents during 2025 is as follows:

➢ Teachers of Tomorrow prepared me to use questioning strategies that promote critical thinking. ➢ Teachers of Tomorrow provided a strong understanding of learning differences (e.g. Special Education, Emergent Bilingual Learners) and how to accommodate and modify instruction to meet these students' needs. ➢ Teachers of Tomorrow prepared me to apply varied instructional strategies and resources, including technology, to provide comprehensible instruction. ➢ Teachers of Tomorrow prepared me to differentiate instruction based on the assessment of student learning needs and differences. ➢ Teachers of Tomorrow provided a strong understanding of formal and informal assessments, allowing me to analyze and use data to plan instruction that meets student learning needs. ➢ Teachers of Tomorrow provided an adequate review of standards-aligned content knowledge and discipline specific practices.		➢ 65% of 40 completers surveyed agree or strongly agree with the statement: Teachers of Tomorrow prepared me to use questioning strategies that promote critical thinking. ➢ 78.05% of 41 completers surveyed completers agree or strongly agree with the statement: Teachers of Tomorrow provided a strong understanding of learning differences (e.g. Special Education, Emergent Bilingual Learners) and how to accommodate and modify instruction to meet these students' needs. ➢ 70.74% of 41 completers surveyed agree or strongly agree with the statement: Teachers of Tomorrow prepared me to differentiate instruction based on the assessment of student learning needs and differences. ➢ 65.86% of 41 completers surveyed agree or strongly agree with the statement: Teachers of Tomorrow provided a strong understanding of formal and informal assessments, allowing me to analyze and use data to plan instruction that meets student learning needs.

Table 4. Expectations and Performance on Standard 2: Completer Professional Competence and Growth

Provider-selected measures (name and description)	Criteria for success	Level or extent of success in meeting the expectation
ToT recently updated its alignment and reporting to specifically align Field Supervisor Dimensions to InTASC standards. The Dimensions aligned with AAQEP Standard 2 include: 1.3 Knowledge of Students Through knowledge of students and proven practices, the teacher ensures high levels of learning, social-emotional development, and achievement for all students.[InTASC #1] 4.3: Professional Development The teacher enhances the professional community [InTASC #10] 4.4: School Community Involvement. The teacher demonstrates leadership with students, colleagues, and community members in the school, district, and community through effective communication and outreach. [InTASC #10]	The updated reporting and InTASC alignments recently rolled out to allow programmatic level analysis real-time via a dashboard. Once a full year of data is collected, appropriate metrics will be set with this new approach to data reporting and analysis.	A year in review analysis of our Candidate Proficiency by InTASC standards on the Field Supervisor Evaluation found that average scores across all InTASC standards rose by roughly 0.36 points, with the largest gains in InTASC #3 (Learning Environments) and InTASC #8 (Instructional Strategies), signaling effective, balanced development of teaching competencies. As it relates to the specific dimensions aligned to AAQEP standard 2, the findings for a snap shot in time were: InTASC 1 – (aligned to 1.3): • Observation 1 average score was 2.82 • Observation 5 average score was 3.21 InTASC 10 – (aligned to 4.3 and 4.4): • Observation 1 average score was 2.95

		• Observation 5 average score was 3.14
		These data are a snapshot in time. The cohort size for observation one was 2,811. The cohort size for observation 5 was 2,560.
The program administered a completer survey to candidates. A sample question on this survey that relates to standard 2 is included below. The response options were on a Likert scale (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, and Strongly Agree): ➢ Teachers of Tomorrow provided strategies and tools to promote a safe, organized, inclusive, and productive learning environment for all students.	The program goal is for 70% of completers to Agree/Strongly Agree that their preparation aided them in the specific areas denoted by each survey question.	The score distribution for the relevant question for respondents during 2025 is as follows: ➢ 70.74% of 41 completers surveyed agree or strongly agree with the statement: Teachers of Tomorrow provided strategies and tools to promote a safe, organized, inclusive, and productive learning environment for all students.
The Texas Education Agency administers a yearly survey of Principals and New Teachers and shares these results with Education Preparation Providers. The survey results included are for principals of our completers for the 2024-2025 school year. There were 952 total respondents.	Principals will score 85% of completers as sufficiently prepared to well-prepared.	The questions aligned to AAQEP standard two on the principal survey and the corresponding results are included below: To what extent was this first-year teacher prepared to: • provide appropriate feedback to students, families, or other school personnel? [appropriate: specific, timely, and confidential] Q8

		o 44% scored completers well prepared o 50% scored completers sufficiently prepared o 94% scored completers sufficiently prepared or well prepared in this area. • work with a diverse student population? Q20 o 49% scored completers well prepared o 46% scored completers sufficiently prepared o 95% scored completers sufficiently prepared or well prepared in this area. • work with a diverse parent and school community population? Q21 o 45% scored completers well prepared o 50% scored completers sufficiently prepared o 95% scored completers sufficiently prepared or well prepared in this area. • advocate for the needs of the students in the classroom? Q35 o 54% scored completers well prepared o 42% scored completers sufficiently prepared o 96% scored completers sufficiently prepared or well prepared in this area. • reflect on his/her strengths and professional learning needs? Q36

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o 52% scored completers well prepared
o 43% scored completers sufficiently prepared
o 95% scored completers sufficiently prepared or well prepared in this area.

• use data from self-assessment, reflection, and supervisor feedback to set professional goals? Q37
o 50% scored completers well prepared
o 45% scored completers sufficiently prepared
o 95% scored completers sufficiently prepared or well prepared in this area.

• prioritize goals to improve professional practice and student performance? Q38
o 50% scored completers well prepared
o 45% scored completers sufficiently prepared
o 95% scored completers sufficiently prepared or well prepared in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Texas Education Agency administers a yearly survey of Principals and New Teachers and shares these results with Education Preparation Providers. The survey results included are for our program completers for the 2024-2025school year. There were 854 total respondents.</td>
<td>85% of completers will score themselves as sufficiently prepared to well-prepared.</td>
<td>The questions aligned to AAQEP standard two on the completer survey and the corresponding results are included below:

To what extent did your education preparation program prepare you to:</td>
</tr>
</table>

		• provide appropriate feedback to students, families, or other school personnel? [appropriate: specific, timely, and confidential] Q8 o 49% scored their preparation as helping them be well-prepared in this area o 44% scored their preparation as helping them be sufficiently prepared in this area o 93% scored their preparation as helping them be sufficiently prepared or well prepared in this area. • work with a diverse student population? Q20 o 51% scored their preparation as helping them be well-prepared in this area o 44% scored their preparation as helping them be sufficiently prepared in this area o 95% scored their preparation as helping them be sufficiently prepared or well prepared in this area. • work with a diverse parent and school community population? Q21 o 47% scored their preparation as helping them be well-prepared in this area o 46% scored their preparation as helping them be sufficiently prepared in this area o 93% scored their preparation as helping them be sufficiently prepared or well prepared in this area.

		• advocate for the needs of the students in the classroom? Q35 o 56% scored their preparation as helping them be well-prepared in this area o 39% scored their preparation as helping them be sufficiently prepared in this area o 95% scored their preparation as helping them be sufficiently prepared or well prepared in this area. • reflect on his/her strengths and professional learning needs? Q36 o 51% scored their preparation as helping them be well-prepared in this area o 43% scored their preparation as helping them be sufficiently prepared in this area o 94% scored their preparation as helping them be sufficiently prepared or well prepared in this area. • use data from self-assessment, reflection, and supervisor feedback to set professional goals? Q37 o 50% scored their preparation as helping them be well-prepared in this area o 45% scored their preparation as helping them be sufficiently prepared in this area o 94% scored their preparation as helping them be sufficiently prepared or well prepared in this area.

		• prioritize goals to improve professional practice and student performance? Q38 o 49% scored their preparation as helping them be well-prepared in this area o 46% scored their preparation as helping them be sufficiently prepared in this area o 95% scored their preparation as helping them be sufficiently prepared or well prepared in this area

5. Notes on Progress, Accomplishment, and Innovation

This section describes program accomplishments, efforts, and innovations (strengths and outcomes) to address challenges and priorities over the past year.

Over the past year, Texas Teachers of Tomorrow focused on strengthening program quality through targeted implementation of curriculum, systems, and support improvements aligned to state priorities and identified areas for growth. Program accomplishments reflect intentional decision-making, phased implementation, and a sustained commitment to continuous improvement.

A key accomplishment during the reporting year was the prioritization and implementation of curriculum revisions in reading, mathematics, and special education. These areas were intentionally sequenced for early implementation to address critical instructional priorities and state expectations. Other identified curriculum enhancements were deliberately staged for phased implementation, with completion planned for the 2026 reporting cycle.

The program also advanced its use of technology and data systems to strengthen candidate support and administrative efficiency. Enhancements to internal systems improved the program's ability to monitor candidate progress, support candidates across their

lifecycle, and streamline coordination among operational teams. These efforts increased consistency in implementation and supported more responsive program management.

Continuous curriculum enhancement remained a central focus. In addition to prioritized reading, mathematics, and special education updates, the program refined performance-based assessments and field-based experience structures to better reinforce skills-based practice. Field-based experiences were updated to align with revised state requirements, including increased hour expectations and clarified guidelines. Progressive field-based experiences were embedded within content modules to strengthen the connection between coursework and instructional practice.

Innovation during the year centered on strengthening coherence between preparation, practice, and support. The program emphasized clearer alignment among coursework expectations, field experiences, and supervision tools, laying the groundwork for more consistent instructional modeling and feedback.

Collectively, these accomplishments demonstrate steady progress in addressing identified challenges while building on validated program strengths. The program's phased approach to implementation, supported by established monitoring and review processes, positions Teachers of Tomorrow to continue refining practice-based learning, instructional consistency, and candidate support as remaining updates are completed in the upcoming reporting cycle.