VSBPE

Date: March 11, 2021

Item: Peer Review Two-Year Report

ITEM: Shall the VSBPE approve Peer Review's Two-Year Report and change their current approval from Conditional to Full?

AGENCY RECOMMENDED ACTION:

That the VSBPE approve Peer Review's Two-Year Report and change the approval from Conditional to Full.

BACKGROUND: At the 2018 ROPA review of the Peer Review program, the review team recommended and the Board granted Two-Year Conditional approval. In the original report from the review team, there were two stipulations and eleven concerns that were to be addressed, with evidence of such to be presented in a Two-Year Report. Per the Office's established process, we contracted with Rommy Fuller, the chair of the 2018 review team, to review the report. AOE ROPA Coordinator Ellen Cairns also reviewed the report. Ellen and Rommy reviewed the evidence separately, then met to discuss it and, finally, to write the attached report. We originally found that the evidence presented to meet the two stipulations was not satisfactory; there was satisfactory evidence of meeting seven of the eleven concerns. Our original recommendation was that Peer Review remain on Conditional Approval status for up to one additional year, and once satisfactory evidence of having met the two stipulations has been presented, we recommended granting Full Approval to Peer Review. However, when this report was presented to Peer Review, we discovered a misunderstanding regarding the second stipulation - the requirement for candidates to hold a Bachelors degree in the liberal arts and sciences. VSBPE Policy N8 states that:

- II. All post-baccalaureate and master's candidates for licensure, unless otherwise exempted by regulation, shall document a major in the liberal arts or sciences by:
- a. A major listed on their transcript; or
- b. Thirty credit hours that fulfill the definition of the equivalent of a major or interdisciplinary major as defined above; or
- c. Documentation and evaluation of equivalent learning experiences.
- d. A combination of "b" and "c".

III. Evaluation and documentation of the major or the equivalent of a major is the responsibility of the recommending institution or process. Each institution with an approved program, the Peer Review process, or any other alternate processes for becoming licensed specified in section 5300 of the licensing regulations shall define its own process for students to document, and for

the institution or process to evaluate, the major in the liberal arts or sciences, coursework equivalent to the major in the liberal arts or sciences as defined above, or equivalent learning experiences. Each institution shall document its process in its Institutional Portfolio for program approval.

Thus, the stipulation that Peer Review candidates must have completed a major in the liberal arts or sciences was not valid, and represented a misunderstanding of the Rule by the original review team.

Peer Review subsequently also submitted an addendum with additional documentation for the first stipulation (*An assessment system should be put in place to provide continuous review and improvement of the PR program within the next two years*). The Peer Review Coordinator has also been serving on a committee with representatives from a majority of the approved Educator Preparation Programs to write surveys that will be sent to program completers and those who supervise them. These surveys will be used by Peer Review as well, as required by Rule, to gather data that can be used for ongoing program improvement. Based on this additional evidence, the ROPA Coordinator believes that Peer Review has or is in the process of addressing the first stipulation and recommends granting full approval until the next ROPA review in 2025.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

Peer Review Two-Year Report and Addendum to the Report

Feedback on the Report from Ellen and Rommy

