Peer Review Two-Year Report 2020 Addendum

Program Name	Peer Review
Address	Vermont Agency of Education, 1 National Life Drive, Davis 5, Montpelier, VT 05620-2501
Contact Name	Andrew Prowten
Phone	802-828-0768
Email	Andrew.Prowten@vermont.gov

The Purpose of this document is to provide context and evidence to better show how the Peer Review program has in fact addressed the stipulations of the 2018 ROPA Review. Upon reflection, the 2-Year report submit Fall of 2020 did not effectively and specifically show how these stipulations have been addressed.

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*.

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.

The Peer review program has utilized these new data gathering assessments to make multiple programmatic changes since the 2018 ROPA Review. The table below expands on some of the evidence provided in the 2-year report.

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

Source	Specific Evidence	Programmatic Change
PR Candidate Survey – Online Resources	While all respondents gave positive feedback on the online resources, only 25% responded that they were "Very helpful." Specific comments from this, and through daily communications led to several programmatic changes. Comments: "A simpler and more streamlined process, with one site rather than multiple sites, and providing better examples would have made it more accessible and equitable" "The pages are redundant and this makes it seem like there's much more work than there really is. The website takes circles and once you think you've got a hang of the site, forms change, expectations change, and WORDING changes. If it is expected of the candidate to use the correct wording, the titles/headings need to be consistent. The Google Site Template supplied by AoE was entirely false - I needed to redo most pages and I understand that Google Sites changed their format, then we shouldn't have been told there's a simple template to use because pages had dead ends, false entities, miscoded headings, etc."	Since these comments were made, the Peer Review Webpage has been re-written and structured more clearly. Additionally the Peer Review Coordinator created a short video to make the program more accessible. Prior to this, the only resources available were the 40-page Peer Review Handbook, or the once-a-month clinic. Once this video is closed captioned, it will be the first resource on the Peer review Webpage before being directed to attend a clinic and review the handbook.
PR Candidate Survey – Peer Review handbook	Again, Feedback in the survey is overwhelmingly positive, but only 37% listed the resources as "Very Helpful." Additional communication with candidates has revealed frustration with it as well. Specific comments from the survey informing programmatic changes include:	Currently the Peer Review coordinator is drafting an overhaul of the Peer Review Handbook. This is a very time-consuming process, so it has not been completed by the personal deadline set last spring of December 2020. Obviously, a large reason for this was due to addressing programmatic complications caused by COVID-19.

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

Source	Specific Evidence	Programmatic Change
	"Although long and at times contradictory, overall, it is a good resource and comprehensive to the program." "The descriptions of the Core Competencies requirements are too wordy and hard to follow. These could be streamlined: Step 1: Choose two pieces of evidence Step 2: Write a brief description for each Step: 3 Write a narrative pick one piece of evidence for each section. I got lost in this section and initially did A LOT more writing than I needed to because I started to analyze each piece... Wendy helped when I asked for clarification."	Current Progress: I have heavily marked up a printed copy of the handbook and have started making revisions digitally. While these changes and edits are progressing, it has become clear that a full formatting overhaul is necessary to better organize the instructions of the portfolio, and to eliminate redundancy and a few contradictions left over from the "Old Format" handbook. I hope to reengage with this work fully this spring.
PR Candidate Survey – PR Clinic *New* Post Clinic Survey	Again, mostly positive feedback in the survey, but anecdotally a lot of negative feedback was received around the old in-person clinic format. "The presentation was centered around applying to the program and not actually at all about how to complete the portfolio. When I completed the clinic, I had already been accepted into the program." "I struggled w/ this session, as it reiterated so much of what's already presented in print." From new post clinic survey: "I thought this was great. It was my second time going to a peer review clinic and I thought I came away knowing what I needed to do more this time. I look forward to working with you and my reviewers over the next year or two! I am concerned about having all the evidence needed which is why I selected the "3" on question 4 above."	Prior to going online due to COVID-19, the Peer Review clinic was an in-person presentation that utilized a slideshow that had been edited extensively over the years. The slideshow's organizing was confusing, and, like the handbook, included some hold over information from the "old format" that was contradictory or unapplicable to the new VLP format. Even before moving to remote work, the Peer Review coordinator started a full overhaul of the slideshow by taking a UbD approach. Instead of a presentation, he took the approach of a lesson plan to create a much more organized clinic that target the most important objectives. The resulting slideshow and clinic structure are much more pedagogically effective. Since this change was made, the feedback has been exceedingly positive. Anecdotally, individuals who attended these clinics has submitted stronger portfolios with high praise from panelists.

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

Source	Specific Evidence	Programmatic Change
	"To be honest, I thought this clinic may be red tape. However, I was surprised and pleased to find that the presentation was very informative and helpful. The information Andrew provided clarity and insight into the entire process. By the end of the presentation, the process seemed much more manageable and I felt much more confident in my approach. Thank you!"	
PR Candidate Survey-Acceptance packet (including exemplars)	"Most of the exemplar links I received did not work, but the ones that did were helpful to be able to see the bigger picture. The peer review acceptance materials were overwhelming and confusing. The same document appears in multiple places and in sometimes slightly different versions. I used the handbook often and referenced some of the other documents for specific details, but it would probably be best to re-write and consolidate the numerous documents into a comprehensive handbook with the required forms as appendices." "There is simply too much. Again finding a way to streamline the amount of information, without leaving something out, is important. For example there is a flow chart in the package, which at first appeared to be helpful... but ended up being confusing and perhaps irrelevant due to the change in requirements for core competency. The videos are not helpful either."	Based on Candidate feedback like this, the Peer Review Coordinator has been developing one exemplar site with only the best examples from successful candidates. This site is still being developed but is currently being shared with candidates. The Peer Review coordinator cross references interview notes and score sheets to ensure that selected evidence was given the highest possible score. Previously, candidates were shared full portfolio links, which led to several issues. Bad habits and formatting errors were become pervasive, and some examples were chosen to represent all endorsements, rather than quality of work. For example, one ECE exemplar only had one piece of evidence for each Performance Criterion. This was a major issue that contradicted the VLP instructions and many candidates had to revise their portfolios before going to a panel. Another example is that exemplars in the old format were given out for less frequent endorsements like PE. This resulted in candidates submitting portfolios that were not in the VLP format, which needed to be revised and resubmitted. Additionally, the acceptance packet itself has been revised and reorganized. Previously, an acceptance packet was one folder with almost 2 dozen separate documents. The VLP rubrics alone were three separate documents that lacked context and instructions. The VLP rubrics have been reformatted into one pdf, and the

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

Source	Specific Evidence	Programmatic Change
		packet has been organized with subfolders. Additionally, documents have been rewritten to include more explicit instructions.
PR Candidate Survey- Interview Panelist Scoring documents

new old Panelist scoring documents | Almost 11% of completers indicate that they felt their panelists we only "Somewhat Familiar" or "Not familiar" with the candidate's portfolio.

A similar number felt that the questions asked were only "somewhat" or "not" appropriate and pertinent"

About 10% also said they were only "somewhat satisfied" or "not satisfied" with the overall interview experience.

Specific Comments:
"I wondered if they even read the first section of my portfolio??? I spent so much time and energy creating a quality representation of my work, but couldn't help but wonder if they actually read my work."

"It was very validating to speak with my panelists. They asked specific questions that informed me that they had really taken the time to read through my evidence and gently push me to think a bit harder about how my evidence demonstrated competence in the classroom. I really appreciated how thoughtful they were."

"They seemed intimately acquainted with my portfolio and had even written quotes from some of my essays." | Previously, Peer Review interviews involved the coordinator reading off each standard aloud, while panelists flipped through printed scoresheets. When a standard was read, they would look at their notes, and ask questions if the current standard was unmet. While this system worked okay, it was confusing, did not appear professional, and unmet standards were sometimes missed in the interview. Part of the problem was that panelists had five separate packets of standards to flip through. One for each VLP narrative section, one for basic CTS evidence, and one for the endorsement competencies. Flipping through these paper packets (if the panelists remembered to bring it) was awkward and would cause panelists to become flustered or embarrassed as they searched for interview questions. The inconsistencies caused by this was simply unacceptable.

The Peer Review coordinator utilized the survey data, panelist straw polling, and anecdotal observation to completely revise the scoring documentation and the interview format. This is perhaps the greatest programmatic change to come from programmatic self-assessment, and it has led to a much more effective process.

Now instead of 5 packets, panelists record their scores for the narratives, CTS evidence and endorsement competencies on the same 2-page summary document. This document utilizes the standards based VLP rubric as a companion PDF (as well as a quick reference rubric), while also making the VLP scoring easily "calculable" for more objective questioning and determinations. It |

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

Source	Specific Evidence	Programmatic Change
	"The format was so sterile, where the coordinator would simply read verbatim one of the standards descriptors, wait, then do it again. So... I came to learn that the long wait and silence was a good thing that meant the panelists were satisfied with the evidence they had in front of them. It was an odd process for 30-something descriptors, yet I understand that it was efficient and made sure everyone was covered." "Again, super impressed with the Peer Review Panelists and their ability to ask questions based on areas where they believed I needed to demonstrate more evidence."	also helps organize panelists to quickly identify which standards and competencies need to be addressed during the interview. This also has made the panelists inter-rater check-in prior to the interview much more effective. Instead of shuffling through multiple rubric packets, panelists discuss specific standards, evidences, or themes on their summaries. The Peer Review Coordinator will then note which standards need to be addressed in the interview. The interview is then structured around these notes, instead of reading through all of the standards and endorsement competencies. The result is a much more focused interview and determination process. By utilizing the VLP scoring standard of the, "Majority of scored items must achieve the targets listed in the third [Rubric] column, none can be scored in the first column," I created a simple "grading" equation that leads to a required 51/60 in order to make a recommendation. This also translates to an 85%, or "B" which parallels well with VSBPE requirement of a "'B' or Better" throughout the licensing rules. If a panelist scores below a 51 on the portfolio, we identify which standards must be addressed by the candidate in the interview. After the interview, the panelists will determine if these concerns have been met, or if a plan of action needs to be developed around these standards. Since making this change, interviews have been much more focused and better utilize time. Feedback from panelists has been overwhelmingly positive of this change.
Panelists Training Resources-	Emails and communications with panelists during panels	Much of the above scoring changes went into effect March of 2020 in response to the transition to remote work and the new online interview format. The original plan was to develop the new scoring

Source	Specific Evidence	Programmatic Change
FY2020 FY2021		document in collaboration with PRAC during the Summer of 2020. Since remote interviews required a streamlined process for panelists to submit documentation (and many did not have printers or scanners at home), the 2-page summary document was developed early and pushed out. When it was sent out the Peer Review coordinator developed a brief training video giving an overview. As sights turned to summer training with the FY2021 Contracting season approaching, the Peer Review coordinator started polling panelists after interviews for feedback and suggestions for training. Many panelists sited the above training video as a great starting point. The biggest benefits of videos over a "live" training event, is that panelists were able to re-watch them, and could complete the work on their own time during a very busy summer of planning for the unknowns of fall 2020. Additionally, the training materials have been able to be shared throughout the year, as new panelists were put on contract. The second piece of the training involved panelists scoring a portfolio. As detailed in the 2-year report narrative section, valuable data were collected that showed some variation in panelist scoring. Many panelists communicated a lack of confidence scoring a science portfolio, but it was a valuable exercise to increase awareness of rigorous portfolio evaluations. Programmatically, the Peer Review coordinator sent follow up communications and training to clarify that panelists should be very critical during the portfolio review, as they are able to follow up with candidates during the interview. This has led to many panelists developing more targeted and rigorous interview questions, even when they have high confidence in a candidate.

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

Source	Specific Evidence	Programmatic Change
		It is planned for FY2022 Training will take a similar format, so the two data sets can be compared. This will lead to continued programmatic changes, as the program strengthens inter-rater reliability among panelists.

There are several additional ways in which new data and assessment initiatives have improved the Peer Review Program, which were not detailed in the 2-year Report. Simply digitizing candidate information has been vital to making data informed programmatic changes in response to COVID-19. For example, this data was used last spring to identify how many Peer Review candidates were on Provisional licenses with a 2020 expiration date (43 total). Since so many panelists were impacted by the transition to remote teaching, this data point was used to identify which endorsements needed panelists recruitment. Additionally, this data was used by the EQ Division Director and the VSBPE when they established the 2020 license extension that ended in October 2020.

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)

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.

The Peer Review Coordinator maintains that the Program is currently in compliance with Rule 5231. While there was an initial misunderstanding that led the coordinator to believe that any baccalaureate degree is in either the liberal arts or sciences, Policy N8 allows for Peer Review to evaluate candidate's qualifications and accept candidates in the rare situation that their baccalaureate degree is not covered by Rule 5231.

From VSBPE Policy N8:

> 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

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

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".

….

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.

In the hypothetical case where an applicant's baccalaureate degree is not in, "The Liberal Arts or Science, or in the content area of the endorsement sought," Policy N8 enables Peer Review to evaluate, "equivalent learning experiences" when accepting a candidate into the program.

When reviewing a Peer Review application, the Peer Review coordinator evaluates applicant's transcripts and resume to ensure they have the experience to meet the requirements for Peer Review. Most often, candidates have a major in the endorsement area, and/or are working in the endorsement area under a provisional license or in an independent school. If an applicant does not appear to have either the degree or work experience in the endorsement area, the Peer Review coordinator with communicate via email or meet with them to discuss the 13-week experience. Most of these applicants never respond and their applications are closed. For those who do, they have an experience not detailed on their resume or are in the process of setting up a field experience through employment or volunteer work.

Upon review of current Peer Review candidates, 19 individuals were identified as having a major not in their requested endorsement area, and that some universities may not classify as a liberal arts or science degree. Upon a second review of their transcripts, all appeared to have a Bachelor of Arts or Sciences, or a higher degree in the endorsement area. While not every current candidate was examined for this purpose, the Peer Review coordinator believes all current Peer Review candidates meet the requirements of Rule 5231 even without evaluating equivalent learning experiences detailed in Policy N8.

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION