



219 North Main Street, Suite 402
Barre, VT 05641 (p) 802-479-1030 | (f) 802-479-1835

VSBPE

DATE: May 31, 2019

ITEM: Will the VSBPE act to accept the proposed changes to the Vermont Licensure Portfolio (VLP) made by the Educator Preparation Inquiry Collaborative (EPIC) organization?

AGENCY RECOMMENDED ACTION: The VSBPE act to accept the proposed changes to the VLP made by EPIC.

BACKGROUND: Any organization or individual may request to make changes to the VLP. The VSBPE recognizes EPIC as a highly organized, a valuable group representing teacher preparation programs and understands it continually focusses on the content and structure of the VLP. The VSBPE have enjoyed an ongoing relationship with EPIC welcoming EPIC input and recommendations. Upon accepting recommendations regarding the VLP last year from EPIC, the VSBPE invited the organization to return in 2019 to make another round of annual recommendations.

RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION:

Members of EPIC created the VLP. The organization is a highly valued source of information on the implantation and use of the VLP. The organization meets on an ongoing basis for the purpose of discussing the continual improvement VLP. Currently, there is no other source giving continual consideration to the VLP.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION: May 28th, 2019 Suggested Edits to the VLP, as presented at the annual EPIC conference.



219 North Main Street, Suite 402
Barre, VT 05641 (p) 802-479-1030 | (f) 802-479-1835

Suggested Edits to the VLP
May 28th, 2019

10 respondents

Question	Suggestion	Number of People Suggesting	Response
<p>1-What edits or revisions do you suggest for the Directions of the Vermont Licensure Portfolio? Please paste in the heading and the sentence(s) under the heading for which you are offering edits.</p>	<p>a -"Sets the context in which the evidence was collected."</p> <p>I struggle with what I'm looking for here. This is particularly true for Part III.</p> <p><i>Do they really need to introduce their school setting once again? If not their school setting, then what kind of context do they really need?</i></p>	1	<p>Program-Specific issue.</p> <p>Comment: While Part II is required to be completed during the student teaching placement, EPPs can decide when to complete Part I and III; and, they can be completed in multiple contexts including through coursework and course field placements.</p> <p>Some programs have candidates complete Part III as a course assignment, others as a fieldwork assignment. Hence, the context in which the evidence was collected varies by program.</p> <p>Each Part, therefore, needs a separate Description, Analysis, and Reflection.</p> <p>Suggestion: If all evidence for the VLP comes from the student teaching placement, the EPP can encourage their candidates to tell the reader to refer back to the previous Part for the context versus copying and pasting or rewriting the context description into the Description for that Part. With this guideline, only the second aspect of the Description would need to be addressed: connection to the Theme of the Part.</p>
	<p>b - Required Evidence item #4: "An analysis of samples of one student's work over time (multiple samples of one student) or analysis of samples of multiple students' work over time drawn from the unit of study. (Student work means original products instead of teacher-generated tests, worksheets, etc., or standardized assessment tools.)"</p>	1	<p>Program-Specific issue.</p> <p>Suggestion: Since this item is not scored for the VLP, only marked as complete or missing, programs may develop a plan for further operationalizing the directions in a manner that highlights what "analysis" looks like in their institution.</p>

219 North Main Street, Suite 402
Barre, VT 05641 (p) 802-479-1030 | (f) 802-479-1835

	<p>I recommend either adding a rubric or some form of more specific guidance for what the expectations are for the analysis of student work. Other parts of the evidence charts ask for the evidence to be complete and present, but the word "analysis" in this section suggests a more in-depth process.</p>		
	<p>c - Remove the narratives and expand the evidence chart rationales to include a more expansive evaluation of the evidence provided.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p><u>Change Proposal:</u> <i>Remove the narratives and expand the evidence chart rationales to include a more expansive evaluation of the evidence provided.</i></p> <p>The EPIC EC does not recommend this change.</p> <p><u>Recommended Action:</u> Maintain existing structure for the narratives. Provide opportunities for EPPs to rethink their implementation strategies. Program may expand the use of the Evidence Chart as desired.</p> <p><u>Comment:</u> The VLP was built on the research-supported DAR framework from the NBPTS by the Portfolio Revision Committee to incorporate a holistic overview of a candidate’s professional preparation across three skill domains: description, analysis, and reflection.</p> <p>Description and reflection (along with analysis) are well-documented elements of professional preparation. They are integral to the InTASC Progressions, which form the foundation for the VLP.</p> <p>Eliminating the Description and Reflection would reduce the validity of the VLP by eliminating triangulation of elements and correspondence to expectation of professionalism.</p> <p>While the analysis of the evidence is at the heart of the VLP process, the other domains enable multiple means of representation of the candidate’s preparation, permitting different strength areas to emerge.</p>



219 North Main Street, Suite 402
Barre, VT 05641 (p) 802-479-1030 | (f) 802-479-1835

			<p>Incorporating all three domains into the Evidence Chart would produce clutter and reduce readability, expand candidate's work (addressing each PC), and reduce the significant element of choosing which PCs to analyze.</p> <p>Being able to prepare a formal, organized, cohesive narrative is an essential skill across many professions. As designed, the VLP is intended to provide an opportunity for personalized learning and growth beyond a mechanistic evaluation. Constructing the narrative supports this aim.</p> <p>Suggestion: An option might be for a program to add clarity and structure for their candidates' construction of the narratives.</p>
<p>2-Evidence Chart: What edits or revisions do you suggest for the Evidence Chart of the Vermont Licensure Portfolio? Please paste in the sentence(s) for which you are offering edits.</p>	<p>a - "4. An analysis of samples of one student's work over time (multiple samples of one student) or analysis of samples of multiple students' work over time drawn from the unit of study. (Student work means original products instead of teacher-generated tests, worksheets, etc., or standardized assessment tools.)"</p> <p>I recommend either adding a rubric or some form of more specific guidance for what the expectations are for the analysis of student work. Other parts of the evidence charts ask for the evidence to be complete and present, but the word "analysis" in this section suggests a more in-depth process.</p>	1	See 1b above.
	<p>b - Remove the narratives and expand the evidence chart rationales to include a more expansive evaluation of the evidence provided.</p>	1	See 1c above.

219 North Main Street, Suite 402
Barre, VT 05641 (p) 802-479-1030 | (f) 802-479-1835

<p>3-Part I Rubric and Scoring Report: What edits or revisions do you suggest for the Part I Rubric and Scoring Report of the Vermont Licensure Portfolio? Please paste in the sentence(s) for which you are offering edits.</p>	<p>a -"Your Narrative must adhere to common standards for academic writing including grammar, usage, and mechanics (see the VT State Rubric for Writing Conventions), format (headings, spacing, pagination, etc.), and style (citations, quotes, and references)."</p> <p><i>I don't necessarily want this to have a score, but can it be part of the actual rubrics for each standard?</i></p> <p>It's a challenge currently to give this kind of feedback when the writing rubric is separate. I never reference it, but often this is the kind of feedback a candidate needs before I can even tackle the PCs.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Program-Specific issue.</p> <p>Suggestion: Perhaps a program can determine a means of providing composition feedback for their candidates for each section of the narrative. For example, some program reviewers add comments to the Comments box about the composition for each section of the narrative.</p>
	<p>b - <i>The Description and Reflection on each of the 3 parts is unnecessary.</i></p> <p>That is an instructional piece that instructors can take on and save students additional essays.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Change Proposal: <i>Eliminate the Description and Reflection from each narrative; have the instructors compose these items.</i></p> <p>The EPIC EC does not recommend this change. (See 1.a above.)</p> <p>Recommended Action: Maintain existing structure for the narratives. Provide opportunities for EPPs to rethink their implementation strategies.</p>

219 North Main Street, Suite 402
Barre, VT 05641 (p) 802-479-1030 | (f) 802-479-1835

			<p>The VLP was built on the research-supported DAR framework from the NBPTS by the Portfolio Revision Committee to incorporate a holistic overview of a candidate’s professional preparation across three skill domains: description, analysis, and reflection.</p> <p>Description and reflection (along with analysis) are well-documented elements of professional preparation. They are integral to the InTASC Progressions, which form the foundation for the VLP.</p> <p>Eliminating the Description and Reflection would reduce the validity of the VLP by eliminating triangulation of elements and correspondence to expectation of professionalism.</p> <p>Having instructors write the Description and Reflection would be counter to the learning aims of the VLP.</p> <p>The 10 Core Teaching Standards are grouped into categories “to help users organize their thinking about the standards” (CCSSO.org). The VLP has three themes and candidates apply the DAR framework to each.</p> <p>As mentioned previously in 1a: While Part II is required to be completed during the student teaching placement, EPPs can decide when to complete Part I and III and they can be completed in multiple contexts including through coursework and course field placements. Because of this, each Part needs a separate Description, Analysis, and Reflection.</p>
	<p>c - For each rubric, provide more concrete and specific language.</p> <p>No one agrees on "illuminate".</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Recommended Action: Maintain existing wording for the rubric, except as specifically indicated otherwise by Recommended Actions in this document.</p> <p>Comment: Because no words themselves have either permanent or universal meaning, all the words in the rubric must be interpreted. The VLP rubric is build on a theoretical framework familiar to educators,</p>

219 North Main Street, Suite 402
Barre, VT 05641 (p) 802-479-1030 | (f) 802-479-1835

			<p>and common to our field: The wording in the rubric corresponds with the revised Bloom’s Taxonomy. The way to better <i>read</i> the rubric is to study Bloom’s. A way to have candidates write better narratives is to have them study Bloom’s.</p> <p>“Illumination” captures the the higher order thinking inherent in the revised Bloom’s, particularly “creativity”; it has been a successful tool for representing creative, descriptive expression.</p> <p>Evidence from candidate panels supports use of <i>illumination</i> as an appropriate prompt for dialogue and goal setting.</p> <p>Suggestion: Examine the work of Rex Heer at Iowa State University Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching: http://www.celt.iastate.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/RevisedBloomsHandout-1.pdf</p>
	<p>d - Self-Reflection (all Parts): Level 2 is about "actions" ("...identify actions for additional learning") and Level 3 is about a "vision" (conceptualize a vision for ongoing growth").</p> <p>I'm much more inclined to think someone with "actions" and a specific plan is further along in their reflection (and likelihood of follow through) than someone who describes a vision that does not have specific actions.</p> <p>Can we update wording to make it clear that Level 3 also includes specific actions? (Also not clear what a "vision for ongoing growth" is, beyond a specific plan, so the</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Change Proposal: <i>Update wording for column 3 of the Self-Reflection rubric to indicate that Level 3 includes specific actions.</i></p> <p>Recommended Action: For column 3 of the Self-Reflection rubric, change the word “conceptualize” to “construct and display.”</p> <p>Comment: At level 2, the rubric reads as follows, “the reflection demonstrates the candidate’s ability to recount incidents, recognize personal beliefs, and identify actions for additional learning.” The key words that indicate lower order thinking (i.e. mental action) per Bloom’s are <i>recount</i>, <i>recognize</i>, and <i>identify</i>.</p> <p>Identifying “actions for specific learning” captures <i>application</i> on Bloom’s. Application</p>

219 North Main Street, Suite 402
Barre, VT 05641 (p) 802-479-1030 | (f) 802-479-1835

	<p>difference between Levels 2 and 3 for this portion of the rubric is unclear, with or without this wording update).</p>		<p>is valuable and strong and may indeed yield concrete ends.</p> <p>At Level 3, it reads: “the reflection demonstrates the candidate’s ability to consider specific incidents, rethink long-standing personal perceptions, and conceptualize a vision for ongoing growth in this area.” In the realm of <i>reflection</i>, which is an internal cognitive state, each of the key words indicates higher order mental action: <i>consider, rethink, conceptualize</i>.</p> <p>A <i>vision for ongoing growth</i> implies use of forward-looking imagination to construct an aspiration for personal growth per the Theme of the Part. (Much like we now ask secondary students to do in their PLPs.) Thus, the candidate is nudged to strive for <i>creativity</i> on Bloom’s.</p>
	<p>e - Organization (Writing is well-organized. Sources are utilized to enrich the reflection offering connections and extensions. Sources are accurately cited.)</p> <p>Move what is in yellow to below or delete from Organization.</p> <p>Academic Style (In accordance with academic style guide. Citations and references are used properly. Wording is free of bias. Plagiarism is avoided.)</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Change Proposal: Remove “Sources are accurately cited” from Organization section of the Scoring Report.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Remove “Sources are accurately cited” from Organization section of the Scoring Report.</p> <p>Comment: The Academic Style section includes what is needed through “Citations and references are used properly.”</p>
<p>4-Part II Rubric and Scoring</p>	<p>a - For each rubric, provide more concrete and specific language. No one agrees on "illuminate".</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>See 3c</p>

219 North Main Street, Suite 402
 Barre, VT 05641 (p) 802-479-1030 | (f) 802-479-1835

<p>Report: What edits or revisions do you suggest for the Part II Rubric and Scoring Report of the Vermont Licensure Portfolio? Please paste in the sentence(s) for which you are offering edits.</p>	<p>b - Self-Reflection (all Parts): Level 2 is about "actions" ("...identify actions for additional learning") and Level 3 is about a "vision" (conceptualize a vision for ongoing growth"). I'm much more inclined to think someone with "actions" and a specific plan is further along in their reflection (and likelihood of follow through) than someone who describes a vision that does not have specific actions. Can we update wording to make it clear that Level 3 also includes specific actions? (Also not clear what a "vision for ongoing growth" is, beyond a specific plan, so the difference between Levels 2 and 3 for this portion of the rubric is unclear, with or without this wording update).</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>See 3d</p>
<p>5-Part III Rubric and Scoring Report:</p>	<p>a - For each rubric, provide more concrete and specific language. No one agrees on "illuminate".</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>See 3c</p>
<p>What edits or revisions do you suggest for the Part III Rubric and Scoring Report of the Vermont Licensure Portfolio? Please paste in the sentence(s)</p>	<p>b - Self-Reflection (all Parts): Level 2 is about "actions" ("...identify actions for additional learning") and Level 3 is about a "vision" (conceptualize a vision for ongoing growth"). I'm much more inclined to think someone with "actions" and a specific plan is further along in their reflection (and likelihood of follow through) than someone who describes a vision that does not have specific actions. Can we update wording to make it clear that Level 3 also includes specific actions? (Also not clear what a "vision for ongoing growth" is, beyond a specific plan, so the difference</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>See 3d</p>

219 North Main Street, Suite 402
 Barre, VT 05641 (p) 802-479-1030 | (f) 802-479-1835

) for which you are offering edits.	between Levels 2 and 3 for this portion of the rubric is unclear, with or without this wording update).		
6-Did last year's revisions improve your work with the portfolio? Please explain.	a - I'm not sure. b - I can't remember!	1	No suggestion
	c - It would be helpful if EPIC could provide a document that shows where the changes were in future revisions.	1	<p>Comment: An email is sent to all EPPs with highlighted changes.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Post annual changes to the Website</p>
	d - Yes, I believe it did...although I can remember exactly what changes were made but I think the Portfolio is in a place where I can explain it to candidates in a way that they understand what the goal and process is. I'd like to leave it as is.	1	No suggestion
	e - No, not really.	1	No suggestion
	f - Yes! Wording updates and clarifications are always helpful. Each time we do this thing it becomes more clear.	1	No suggestion
7-What other specific edits or suggestions do you have for the Vermont Licensure Portfolio. Please paste in the	<p>a - "In order to pass the portfolio, candidates must pass each Part in a reasonable amount of time, as determined by the Educator Preparation."</p> <p>Wouldn't this be juicy to talk about as a group?</p>	1	No suggestion
	b - I find that this "call for revisions" is really at the editing level. We would like an opportunity to revisit the whole thing.	1	<p>Change Proposal: <i>Revisit the design and use of the VLP.</i></p> <p>Recommended Action: Maintain VLP materials and process as currently implemented. Implement an annual survey to</p>

219 North Main Street, Suite 402
Barre, VT 05641 (p) 802-479-1030 | (f) 802-479-1835

<p>information for which you are offering edits or suggestions.</p>			<p>assess the EPPs desire to revisit the design in-whole.</p> <p>Comment: The VLP was built by the Portfolio Revision Committee composed of all the EPPs, members of the AOE, and the VSBPE. It is designed to inculcate a genuine learning experience for candidates, implementers, and the policy-making body. The EPPs should continue to be involved in any large-scale revisions.</p> <p>The VLP was approved by the VSBPE and, at that point, the Board became the authorizing body. EPIC implements edits to the VLP textual material as recommended by the educator preparation community--through the EPIC annual report--and as approved by the VSBPE, and distributes this material to the community.</p> <p>EPIC also conduct the Statewide Calibration System for the VLP.</p>
	<p>c - I would cut the Part 1, 2, 3 descriptions - they are redundant</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>See 1a.</p>
	<p>d - I would prefer a robust evidence chart and 1 essay. Unfortunately, the portfolio has continued to be a burden and not a time of integrative learning.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>See 1c and 3b</p> <p>Recommended Action: Maintain current structure for the VLP. Provide opportunities for EPPs to rethink their implementation strategies.</p> <p>Comment: Parts I and III are left to the EPP's discretion in term of VLP implementation and can be integrated throughout a preparation program.</p> <p>A value in three narratives is the implementation of formative learning opportunities, which solves a problem evident in the old Level I Licensure Portfolio.</p>

219 North Main Street, Suite 402
Barre, VT 05641 (p) 802-479-1030 | (f) 802-479-1835

<p>e - It is too redundant. Either the eliminate the narratives or the evidence. Don't need both.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>See 1c</p>
<p>f - The wording for PCs 6.1 and 6.2 is nearly identical, and our students (and faculty) have a hard time interpreting the difference. Is there a way to clarify wording? Both are about "multiple methods of assessment" to "inform/adjust" instruction.</p> <p>"Performance Criterion 6.1: Candidates implement multiple methods of assessment to monitor learner progress to inform instructional practice.</p> <p>Performance Criterion 6.2: Candidates analyze an individual student's work over time using multiple methods of assessment to adjust instruction."</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Change Proposal: <i>Clarify wording to further distinguish between 6.1 & 6.2.</i></p> <p>Recommended Action: Adjust the wording for PC 6.1 & 6.2 to clarify difference.</p> <p>Comment: The slight difference between PC 6.1 & 6.2 is that 6.1 focuses on <i>implementation</i> (planning and operationalizing), while 6.2 focuses on the candidate's ability to use the outcome of the implementation to assess student progress.</p>
<p>PC 10.2 is currently: "Candidates are prepared to advance the profession through advocacy, leadership and/or action research."</p> <p>Do we really mean "advance the profession?" Or do we mean participate in/contribute to the profession, and advance your professional skills/practices/knowledge/dispositions?</p> <p>Suggest deleting "advance" and replace with "participate in": "Candidates are prepared to participate in the profession through advocacy, leadership and/or action research."</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Change Proposal: <i>For PC 10.2, delete "advance" and replace with "participate in."</i></p> <p>Recommended Action: Maintain wording for PC 10.2.</p> <p>Comment: The phrase "to advance the profession" is drawn directly from Standard 10. Hence, teachers are expected to advance the profession. As such, successful candidates are expect to <i>be prepared</i> to advance the profession. A means of preparing candidates to advance the profession is to have them practice these skills while in the preparation program.</p> <p>Standard 10 is more so about advancing the profession by attending to micro-level</p>

219 North Main Street, Suite 402
Barre, VT 05641 (p) 802-479-1030 | (f) 802-479-1835

	<p>Also, action research advances your professional practice (and potentially that of colleagues, if you share your findings with them), but it does not advance "the profession."</p> <p>Leadership at the school level does not advance "the profession." (Both of these are certainly good and important things to do, just using these as examples to show that our wording seems incorrect).</p>		<p>opportunities (student learning, sharing with colleagues, and collaborating with families and community members) than about volunteering for national positions or publishing in journals. As such, preparing candidates for this level of "advancing the profession" seems appropriate.</p> <p>Per Standard 10, action research and leadership at the school level, would be considered suitable means of advancing the profession.</p> <p>BTW: the details of PC 10.2 (advocacy, leadership, action research) are drawn from the Progressions.</p>
	<p>g - I don't have any specific edits to offer. I would like us to work on making the portfolio more appropriate for the School Counseling endorsement though.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p><u>Suggestion:</u> Make the portfolio more appropriate for the School Counseling endorsement.</p> <p><u>Recommended Action:</u> Host a meeting for School Counseling educators.</p>
	<p>h - we really need exemplars that we can share with both scorers as well as students</p>	<p>1</p>	<p><u>Recommended Action:</u> Include exemplars on the website available to both scorers and candidates.</p>
	<p>i - None. Keep up the great work! I appreciate you including our feedback in this process.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>No suggestion</p>