

## Feedback on Peer Review Two-Year Report

12/15/2020

Rommy Fuller and Ellen Cairns

**Stipulation 1:** *An assessment system should be put in place to provide continuous review and improvement of the PR program within the next two years. We recommend that the Peer Review Advisory Committee be a part of this process.*

Evidence provided: PRAC meeting minutes, panelist training resources, panelist score sheets with scoring rubrics, surveys of Peer Review completers that are administered at the completion of the PR process.

Feedback: The evidence for Stipulation 1 demonstrates that the PR program has been working to put mechanisms in place that could allow for some assessment of the program. The evidence does not, however, demonstrate any data gathered and used to make programmatic changes. Still need surveys of completers once they have been in the field and those who employ the completers, as required by Rule.

**Not satisfactory**

**Stipulation 2:** *Compliance with the requirement of candidates having completed an undergraduate degree in the liberal arts and sciences should be in effect immediately for any new candidates entering the program. (see Rule 5231 and Policy N8). (Note: Stipulation should have said “candidates having completed an undergraduate degree in the liberal arts and sciences OR the content area of the endorsement sought)*

Evidence provided: Peer Review Webpage, Clinic Slideshow, Recorded Clinic, PR Handbook

Feedback: No evidence that you are ensuring that candidates have a *degree in the liberal arts and sciences or content area of endorsement being sought*. Would need to show some sort of verification system that you are checking the undergraduate degree. Should be a simple thing to add to your documentation of applicants' credentials.

**Not satisfactory**

**Concern 1.1:** *The “Peer Review Attributes and Dispositions Verification” is used inconsistently. It can be a mechanism for checking off boxes in the process rather than ensuring that candidates are meeting all of the items on the document. Training is needed to ensure that the form is being used rigorously and consistently. Mentor teachers should be provided with examples of*

*evidence that they might look for in determining whether a candidate has adequately met each item on the form. No policy for when candidates are scored low by their mentor.*

Evidence provided: Panelist training resources, Mentor Observation Form, PR Handbook

Feedback: Mentor observation form gives “examples of evidence that (mentor teachers) might look for...”. Resources created address this concern.

**Satisfactory**

**Concern 1.2:** *There is no formal process to ensure that candidates have to write a minimum number of their own authentic lesson plans.*

Evidence provided: Lesson Plan Template, PR Handbook, PR Clinic Slides

Feedback: Evidence is satisfactory, although we think it could be strengthened by requiring a minimum number of lesson plans (currently, lesson plans are in the category of evidence that may be included in the candidate submission, although with a footnote that states that “It is a requirement that samples of student work and standards-based lesson plans be included in the portfolio.” Also, we recommend adding something to the handbook verbiage that clarifies that the lesson plans should be authentic and created by the candidate (currently that is not specified.)

**Satisfactory**

**Concern 1.3:** *Candidates demonstrate that they know how to guide learners to use technology safely and effectively.*

Evidence provided: VLP Standard 9 required essay

Feedback: This is not strong evidence for this indicator; we would suggest, for your next review, submitting samples of the essays as well as data collected from follow-up surveys to confirm that teachers who earned their licenses via Peer Review are successful at guiding their students to use technology safely and effectively.

**Satisfactory**

**Concern 1.4:** *Panelists have not been trained on the use of the VLP to score candidate work; the inconsistent scoring is a concern and was also noted as a concern in the 2013 ROPA report. In addition, panelists should be required to write comments when scoring a candidate portfolio.*

*Some panelists consistently wrote in justifications, some wrote little to nothing. This would then be information that could be gathered for programmatic assessment and improvement.*

Evidence provided: Panelist training resources, scoring documents

Feedback: Good progress on this overall with the trainings that you have done for the panelists, but it could be strengthened by having something spelled out more concretely about the expectation for notes on the portfolio scoring form. One suggestion is asking EPIC to calibrate several of the PR portfolios, which would be great data/evidence to have for panelist consistency. We realize that you submit a portfolio for calibration to EPIC annually, but we are suggesting going above and beyond that since PR has so many different panelists scoring portfolios, unlike EPPs who generally have the same people scoring them.

### **Satisfactory**

**Concern 2.1:** *There is no evidence to show that candidates are informed that they have to have an undergraduate degree in the liberal arts or sciences, or in the content area of the endorsement sought (Rule 5231).*

Evidence provided: PR Handbook, Website, and Clinic Slideshow

Feedback: The PR Handbook gives exceptions to this requirement:

In order to be considered for Peer Review, all prospective applicants must hold a baccalaureate degree (BA, BS, BFA).

In some cases, the endorsement area may require a specified advanced degree. Examples: School Counselor, Director of Curriculum, Principal and others as noted in the Rules Governing the Licensing of Educators and the Preparation of Educational Professionals.

Entry into the Peer Review program is based on VSBPE rule and our current approval through ROPA.

If a Peer Review candidate does not hold a baccalaureate degree (BA, BS, BFA) in the endorsement (content/subject) they are seeking, the candidate needs to show evidence of having “the equivalent”. The following experiences toward fulfillment of this requirement:

- Number of credits in the content (endorsement) area (example: mathematics)
- Major (30 credits) or Minor (18 credits) in the content/subject area
- Post Graduate course work in education or endorsement sought. (MA, PhD.

Certifications)

- A Master’s degree (if applicable to the endorsement).
- Formal Training without college credit –Education PL workshops

- Years of experience teaching the content area/general education experience, private school, para educator etc.
- Years of experience in the endorsement sought (For example: daycare assistant for ECE, computer programmer for Ed Tech Specialist).
- Passing Praxis Core (or in lieu of test) and Praxis II (if applicable) Tests - Passing scores in the content area sought.

This does not seem like a clear explanation of the requirement to have *“an undergraduate degree in the liberal arts or sciences, or in the content area of the endorsement sought (Rule 5231).”*

**Not satisfactory**

**Concern 2.2:** Same as 1.4 (Reliability/consistency of panelists’ scoring of portfolios; added here too since it also fit with Standard 2)

**Satisfactory**

**Concern 3.1:** Efficacy of Field Experience *“There is not a process for ensuring that student teachers have received observations and feedback. The Team understands that PR does not have any responsibility for the Student Teaching experience, but is concerned that there is not enough information for a panelist to evaluate if the field experiences were effective.”*

Evidence provided: Mentor Observation Form, Mentor Handbook, Professional Attributes Form, Panelist training resources

Feedback: PRAC minutes said previous PR Coordinator was looking into how other states that have alternate routes handle the field experience component- not sure if that happened before she left. Although there have been efforts to strengthen the assessment of the field experiences, this is still an area of concern. One suggestion would be to have a way for mentor teachers to provide feedback on the candidates to the panelists confidentially, much as a cooperating teacher could do with a supervisor from an EPP if a candidate were not performing well. Another suggestion is that if the field experience happened over a certain number of years prior to the candidate going through PR, and thus the candidate does not have observation forms or other documentation from a mentor or supervisor, they would do a 60 hour practicum and get observations and feedback during those hours that could be presented as evidence for PR.

**Not satisfactory**

**Concern 3.2:** Time and impartiality *“A student teaching experience can occur years before the rating form is given to a mentor teacher to complete. Also, since candidates are responsible for finding their own mentor teacher, there is no assurance of impartiality.”*

Evidence and feedback same as for 3.1 above.

**Not satisfactory**

**Concern 3.3:** Policy for poor mentor feedback *“There is not a policy or procedure for evaluating candidates who have been rated as less than “meets standard” on the Student Teacher scoring form.”*

Evidence provided: Same as 3.1.

Feedback: Although there is not a set policy, there have been changes made to address this concern. We recognize there can be many reasons that someone might get lower ratings on the scoring form, and we allow that it should be up to the panelists to determine if the candidate should be able to proceed without having a firm policy in place. Flexibility can be allowed here.

**Satisfactory**

**Concerns 4.1, 4.2:** Program Capacity and Continuity *“As the PR program continues to grow- or even at its current number of candidates- one person may not be sufficient to run it.” “A plan should be developed for sustaining the program and continuing to work towards the goals in the 7-Year Plan even if there is staff turnover.”*

Evidence provided: Cross-trained another AOE specialist who is now able to help with Peer Reviews, and updated the Peer Review Manual.

Feedback: At this time, it seems the program is running well with adequate resources in place. (I admit to having insider information since I work with the PR Coordinator and Division Director.)

**Satisfactory**

**General Feedback:** Overall, most evidence submitted is ‘inputs’ – prompts for the candidates or mentors, but not evidence of the candidates’ success in these areas (“outputs” or results). We understand that two years may not have been adequate time to show output evidence, and thus we have found much of the evidence to be satisfactory, although not strong, and so we have provided recommendations for how to provide stronger evidence at your next ROPA

review. The two stipulations must be addressed before we can recommend moving the program to full approval, but with the majority of the concerns being rated as satisfactory, once the two stipulations have been satisfactorily addressed, we would recommend full approval for Peer Review to the VSBPE