North Carolina Teaching Fellows Commission: EPP Selection Process

EPP Rubric Development Process:

- On Friday, October 20, after much work and deliberation, the North Carolina Teaching Fellows Commission voted to formally adopt the rubric to evaluate EPP applications for participation in the Teaching Fellows Program.
- The Director of the Teaching Fellows Program sent the rubric to all North Carolina EPPs on Monday, October 23.
- EPPs had week to review the rubric and make final adjustments to their formal applications.
- The application submission deadline was **5:00PM on Monday, October 30, 2017**. All programs were asked to submit applications to the TFP Director as a PDF file.

Important Considerations:

- No Commission member was provided with an application from an institution with which they are affiliated to review, discuss and/or score. Per G.S. 116-209.61(f), a Commission member with a conflict of interest was required to recuse themselves from all proceedings pertaining to the application(s) in question.
- The TFP Director acted only as facilitator for the EPP application review process and did not participate in the review, discussion or vote for any application.
- As communicated on the EPP application, the Commission verified all self-reported data with records from the Department of Public Instruction. In any case of a discrepancy, the Commission uniformly relied upon DPI data.

Outline of EPP Application Review Process:

- After all applications were received, the TFP Director reviewed all applications to ensure that all met the eligibility requirements in Section I of the application -- 16 applications were received. 15 applications were eligible for consideration; 1 application was found ineligible.
- Prior to the beginning of the review process, all Commission members were asked to sign a statement to
 certify that they had no conflicts of interest with any of the applications they would review and to affirm that
 they would not discuss the applications with anyone else, even other members of the Commission. Each
 Commission member was required to return the signed statement to the TFP Director prior to *Thursday*,
 November 2.
- The Commission held a conference call on *Thursday, November 2*.
 - The TFP Director reported the number of applications received and notified the Commission of any application that failed to meet the eligibility criteria in Section I of the application.
 - The Commission Chair instructed members on the proper procedure and process for scoring applications and the Commission discussed the proper scoring method for each portion of the application.
- Following the Commission's conference call, the TFP Director sent each commission member all eligible applications, except in cases where a member had an affiliation/conflict of interest.
- Each Commission member used the application rubric to independently score each application they were sent to review and recorded their scores on a spreadsheet.
- All Commission members sent their individual scoring spreadsheets for all of the applications they reviewed directly to RTI International, which provided external verification of the scoring process. Commission members were given the deadline of sending scores to RTI by 6:00pm on Monday, November 6.
- After all scoring spreadsheets were returned, RTI International averaged the scores for each application
 according to the number of Commission members that reviewed each application and produced a master

- spreadsheet to record the scores for each institution. RTI certified the scoring results and sent the spreadsheet directly to the TFP Director.
- The Commission met on *Friday, November 10*. The TFP Director provided each Commission member present
 with a sealed envelope containing the final score and rank of each institution that submitted an eligible
 application.
- The Commission Chair asked for an individual motion and vote to approve each the five institutions with the highest cumulative scores as partner campuses for the Teaching Fellows Program. Per G.S. 116-209.61(f), a Commission member with a conflict of interest was required to recuse themselves from all proceedings pertaining to the application(s) in question.
- The Commission voted formally on each motion and adjourned.