

# Asynchronous Interviews for Peer Review

---

Vermont Agency of Education

# Quantity of Interviews

---

# Completed Interviews

---

## Online Interviews

- Average 8 per month

## Asynchronous Interviews

- 28 completed in March 2024
- 13 completed in April 2024
- 16 completed in May 2024
- 22 completed in June 2024

And we still have a backlog, only a few of which were included in the provisional extension waiver requests.

# Average Wait Time Between Portfolio Submission and Interview

---

Endorsement Area	Average Wait Time for Traditional Interview	Average Wait Time for Asynchronous Interview
Elementary Education	3-4 months	2 months
English	2-4 months	1 month
Physical Education	6 months	3 months
Science and Social Studies	3 months	1 month
Early Childhood Education	3 months	2 months
School Counselor	6 months	2 months
Special Educator	4-5 months	2 months

**Clear decrease in wait time when conducting asynchronous interviews, despite a rise in the number of candidates.**

# Quality of Interviews

---

# Question and Answer for Special Educator Candidate during Traditional Interview Format

---

- Q: Can you talk to your experience writing IEPs? How do you determine what level of needs are needed for students?
- A: I've been a consulting special educator for the past two years with a lot of guidance from my consulting supervisor. My first year I had 8 students on my caseload I wrote IEPs for, and then we added four so I did four initial evaluations and added data for MTSS to use as a data gathering tool that we created. Then last year I had 11 students on my caseload and wrote all the IEPs for them. It was students who had specific learning disabilities to more complex working with the Vermont Eye Team for students with disabilities that were more complex and needed more teamwork.

# Similar Answer for Special Educator Question about preparedness to prepare IEPS during Asynchronous Interview

---

Assessments in Special Education: Achievement Testing and Report Writing (with a link to transcript)

This class, hosted by VT-HEC, was one of the first classes I took in special education assessment. It was my introduction to how to use assessments to identify students' needs and align IEP goals with students' demonstrated weaknesses.

Assessment in Special Education: Achievement Testing and Report Writing – with link to a syllabus

This class prepared me to conduct Assisted Study, a study hall for students with disabilities, who receive targeted instruction in a quieter, more focused environment. As their case manager, I provide them with services in both literacy and mathematics in addition to supporting them in completing homework for all academic areas. This allows us to deliver specialized services within the general education environment so students are fully immersed in the life of the school and yet receive curriculum review and support needed to achieve the goals as stated in their IEPs.

Special Education: Comprehensive Evaluations – with a link to syllabus

This class, hosted by VT-HEC, is the third in the assessment series. It covers preparation for an evaluation planning meeting, reading and understanding assessment results and using this information to write an evaluation report that parents can understand, using this report to establish eligibility for special services, and using the report itself to guide the development of a specific, helpful IEP that teachers can use to ensure students receive the instruction they need across the curriculum.

# Two Questions & Answers from Traditional Interview regarding math teaching and content knowledge

---

- Q: You presented lots of Performance Standards for Math and Grade 6, and most of the evidence for math was from Illustrative Math: So can you speak to your lesson planning process for creating Illustrative Math Lessons and do you have evidence outside of grade 6 for math?
- A: For creating lessons for 6<sup>th</sup> grade which I did last year, and this year I'm not teaching math, my colleague and mentor would go over lesson plans together because we tried to stay together and she went through the VMI program. I was also math interventionist as well. Looking at the portrait of a 6<sup>th</sup> grade to go along with the lesson plans. We would look over units, look at practice problems and met weekly which was really collaborative. Outside of 6<sup>th</sup> grade, I taught summer school and practicing skills, not quite new skills, doing subtraction and addition things like that. I also kept stuff from my time as math interventionist, student work, and examples of what I did with the younger grades from a couple of years ago. For the portfolio I used the current what I was doing, but I have examples from other grade levels.
- Q: Can you speak to the Math Knowledge Standards? Is there coursework linked in your portfolio?
- A: I took Calculus 1 and 2 in college. I republished the portfolio to include more of the math coursework and PD I have done in some of those areas. I think I could use additional support for younger grades but when I was working as the math interventionist, I got a lot of insight using Bridges program for younger grades. We also used Connected Math for 6<sup>th</sup> grade and supplemental work for students when needed.



# One Question & Answer from Asynchronous Interview regarding math teaching and content knowledge

---

- **Regarding competency 2.1, can you give specific examples of curriculum choices you have made which reflect your knowledge of priority standards? And, how do you plan to further your knowledge of the math scope and sequence across grade levels?**

- There are three specific examples of curriculum choices I made that reflect my knowledge of our priority standards. These include sequencing, enduring standards, and developing new proficiency scales. In terms of sequencing I adjusted my scope and sequence to create a better progression towards specific priority standards. One example of this I mentioned frequently throughout my portfolio. One of our priority standards, CC.6.NS.6c, involves positioning and ordering rational numbers on a number line or coordinate plane. I mentioned how in my first year of teaching I did not anticipate the students to have such a challenge with ordering and graphing rational numbers. However, I recognized that graphing required the students to use a variety of skills. This included understanding place value, comparing fractions, and comparing fractions to decimals. As a result of this realization I reordered my scope and sequence. Ultimately, I decided to teach the standards that addressed operations before ordering and graphing. This gave the students more time to build their number sense. Additionally, it gave me the opportunity to reteach place value. Finally, it provided the students with better ideas on how to compare numbers such as converting.

The second example I mentioned was enduring standards. By enduring I mean I took a priority standard and addressed it constantly throughout the school year. An example of this is standard CC.6.G.1. This standard involves finding the area of polygons such as triangles and various quadrilaterals. I should note in my original scope and sequence this standard was addressed at the end of the year in our geometry unit. However, knowing the importance of it I decided to address it throughout the school year. I first introduced it to the students during our operations units. While dividing fractions I provided the students with parallelograms that had fractional measurements, fractional areas, and missing values. Therefore, they needed to divide to find the missing values of the base or height. While multiplying decimals I gave the students base and height measurements with decimals for triangles, parallelograms, and other quadrilaterals. Therefore, they needed to perform the procedure for decimal multiplication properly to find the area. Furthermore, I continued to address the standard in other units. During our unit on expressions the students wrote expressions based on unknown values of measurements for given polygons. Additionally, the students would be given multiple polygons and write expressions for the surface area the shapes created. More so, finding the area of polygons helped them model equivalent expressions. With all that said, not only did I address this priority standard in multiple units, I addressed it routinely at the beginning of classes. Several bonus questions on our beginning of class activities required the students to find the area of polygons. All in all, I endured this standard by addressing it in a variety of ways throughout the school year.

- The final example of a curriculum choice I made was improving my proficiency scales. At certain points throughout my portfolio I mentioned the proficiency scales I adopted. When arriving at Riverside Middle School my predecessor had already developed proficiency scales for every standard we assessed. Unfortunately, while reviewing these scales in our PLC's many of us found they weren't authentic to the standard being assessed. For me this was overwhelming because I knew they needed to be improved. However, I knew improving them would take a great deal of time. With that said, in the process of prioritizing standards, it allowed me to focus my time productively. I have begun creating new proficiency scales that better reflect each priority standard being assessed. Luckily, the assistance of my PLC colleagues helped me develop a streamlined process to improve these scales. The process starts by creating my level three learning target. On our grading scale a level three problem reflects that the student is proficient in meeting the given standard. Therefore, all of our scales should have a level three learning target that directly aligns with the standard. Using this as our set point it allows us to create level one learning targets that demonstrate the student is beginning, level two learning targets that demonstrate the student is developing towards the standard, and level four learning targets that demonstrate the student is expanding past the standard. Overall, I explain my process because it will better allow you to understand the issues with the proficiency scales I inherited from my predecessor. That issue was that they did not backwards map with the level three learning target in mind. Therefore, when I used their scales for my assessments the results were less authentic. Thus, my knowledge of our priority standards allowed me to develop new proficiency scales in a timely manner. As a result, my assessments became more authentic throughout the school year. I state this because we constantly reflect on data in our grade level data teams. I noticed when comparing my grade book to our i-Ready data the students scored more similarly when using the new scales.

- In the end, I plan to increase my knowledge of our priority standards across grade levels in our district curriculum alignment meetings. I stated briefly in my portfolio how our district is restructuring our curriculum with the direction of an outside contractor. This contractor is CBE Solutions which is led by Dr. Daniel Joseph. During the school year all math teachers within the middle school have met monthly with Dr. Joseph. During this time we discuss our priority standards and have professional discussions about each. I use this time to learn about what the seventh and eighth grade teachers prioritize and how they teach specific standards. With that said, we also plan to meet during the summer and will continue the process next school year. Furthermore, we plan to start meeting with high school and elementary teachers to consolidate the alignment process. I am lucky enough to be in this position as it allows me to constantly increase my knowledge about the scope and sequence throughout all grade levels. Overall, I will continue to ask questions in these meetings, meet with my colleagues outside of the meetings, and begin to build a rapport with our high school and elementary teachers. In the end, this will further my knowledge of all of our priority standards.

# Comparing the Answers

---

## Traditional Format

- Can reference additional examples but can't share them
- Being put on the spot limits reflectiveness and clarity of answers

## Asynchronous Format

- Able to share additional evidence to demonstrate abilities
- Increased description and clarify of answers
- More detailed and in-depth reflections from candidates

# Anecdotal Notes

---

- Over the weekend when interviews are not traditionally conducted, numerous reviews are received. The panelists are working educators and the asynchronous format allows them to complete the reviews at their convenience. This approach enables panelists to manage their time effectively and avoids adding evening hours to their teaching work days. **Our aim is to enhance panelist participation without increasing educators' stress levels.**
- The scheduling aspect of the traditional interviews is a challenge. The **asynchronous approach reduces process delays and the backlog**, which in turn increases the number of licensed practicing educators in the field.
- Feedback from candidate survey:
  - Question: Did the interview provide you with an opportunity to elaborate on your experience/portfolio evidence/teaching practice?
  - Yes, the written interview allowed ample time to answer each question thoughtfully.