

To: Vermont Standards Board of Professional Educators (VSBPE)
From: Educator Preparation Inquiry Collaborative (EPIC), Executive Committee
Date: June 9th, 2017
Re.: Summary of 2016-2017 Activity and Request for Approval to Implement Wording Changes to the VLP

To the Members of Vermont Standards Board of Professional Educators:

We have participated in another year of exciting work as colleagues in the Educator Preparation Inquiry Collaborative (EPIC). In July of 2016 we revised the Vermont Licensure Portfolio after a pilot year of implementation and your charge to make such revisions; we conducted five Professional Learning Sessions over the 16/17 academic year; we recently collected feedback toward additional revisions and proposed those revisions to the EPIC community; we organized and held a May 2017 EPIC Conference, and we conducted our first/pilot calibration session on May 30th, 2017. Summaries of these events can be found directly below.

- June 2016: After the collaborative work of the May 2016 Conference, EPIC proposed revisions for the VLP to the Vermont Standards Board. The revisions were unanimously approved.
- July 2016: The EPIC Executive Committee revised the VLP and communicated with Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) in time for fall 17 implementation which was the first full year of implementation.
- September and October 2016: Professional Learning Sessions in September and October included reviewing the VLP revisions, sharing varied platforms, sharing of implementation plans, studying portfolio scholarship, and collecting feedback toward future revisions.
- February, March and April 2017: Professional Learning Sessions in February, March and April included platform and implementation sharing, practice scoring and calibration, studying portfolio scholarship, and collecting feedback toward future revisions.
- April/May 2017: We collected feedback from all of the Preparation Programs and organized the feedback into themes and created responses to each as well actionable items.
- May 25th: We organized and held the 2nd Annual EPIC Conference. Please find the agenda [here](#). At this conference, we held a business meeting of the EPIC representatives and proposed a motion to bring the suggested revisions (below this cover letter) to the VSBPE, we discussed the motion and voted. We offer these proposed revisions to the VSBPE for their June 16th, 2017 meeting. Also at this conference, we

practiced scoring and calibration of Part II, conducted six EPP sharing sessions focused on scoring and discussion of Parts I and III, the use of video and other assignments as evidence, and the use of technology in creating the portfolio and analyzing data. Finally, a student panel gave their perspectives and enlightened all. Fourteen EPPs participated.

- May 30th: We conducted a pilot calibration session. Several EPPs provided a Part II of the VLP. Each person present read and scored two Part II submissions. We discussed our score and calculated our calibration results. We plan to provide a report to the Vermont Standards Board at the end of the summer or early fall that summarizes the calibration work completed on May 30th and the feedback (in general) provided to the state's EPPs. Eight EPPs provided a Part II of a portfolio and ten EPPs participated in scoring and calibration.
- June: We finalized revisions in preparation to propose them to the VSBPE for implementation in the 17/18 academic year.

Request for Approval to Implement Wording Changes to the VLP

Based on the input from the EPP community, a review by the EPIC Executive Committee, and a vote by the EPIC Membership, EPIC is seeking VSBPE input on the following items:

- 1) Approval of the changes to the VLP materials that are posted in the attached document titled *Proposed Wording Changes to the VLP based on input from the EPP Community, MAY 2017*, and which are noted as ACTION ITEMS within that document;
- 2) Authorization from the VSBPE for EPIC to implement the changes in #1 to the VLP materials in July 2017, and to disseminate information about those changes to the VT EPP's; and
- 3) Reconsideration of a formal arrangement for managing changes to and dissemination of VLP materials. Specifically, EPIC seeks permission from the VSBPE, and a charge for action following such permission, to have the VT AOE and EPIC engage in discussion regarding the establishment of No Fee/No Cost Contract through which EPIC will be charged with authority to manage, and implement changes to, VLP materials upon review and approval of such changes by the VSBPE.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration,

The EPIC Executive Committee

Revisions below

**Proposed Wording Changes to the VLP based on input from the EPP Community,
MAY 2017**

	Submitted Comments	EPIC Executive Committee Replies & Recommendations
Directions	<p>1 The website state: "Programs may decide to have candidates complete the Part I narrative after collecting all the Part I evidence across various courses or experiences, or a program may decide to have candidates complete multiple narratives for Part I across various courses."</p> <p>If a program breaks Part I apart, what are the candidates supposed to Describe in each narrative?</p> <p>If a program breaks Part I apart, what are the candidates supposed to Reflect on in each narrative?</p>	<p>The Description is an opportunity to practice descriptive writing, in complement to analytic writing and reflective writing.</p> <p>The intent of the Description is to have candidates employ descriptive writing about the Theme of the Part.</p> <p>If a program has candidates construct Part I across separate assignments, then they should refer to Theme in each Description, which would provide more practice with descriptive writing.</p> <p>Similarly, candidates should use reflective writing to ponder their learning in each separate assignment for Part I.</p> <p>ACTION: Add note to Directions & website to clarify.</p>

2	<p>In the Analysis candidates write explicitly about the PC. How is this different from the Description?</p>	<p>The Description is an opportunity to practice descriptive writing. In the Analysis, they employ analytic writing. In the Reflection, they use reflective writing.</p> <p>In the Description, candidates consider the Theme of the Part and illuminate their understanding of it for the reader through literary devices such as story, metaphor, or image. In the Analysis, they consider each PC and unpack its meaning as a representative of the Standard.</p> <p>ACTION: Add note to Directions & website to clarify.</p>
3	<p>Do we need to give a whole number score for each criterion?</p> <p>In situations where a candidate's work demonstrates some aspects from different columns, how do we determine the score? Do we average their score? Do we use half-scores, such as 2.5? Are certain aspects of the PC more important (carry more weight) than others?</p>	<p>A whole number is required.</p> <p>Reviewers must make a judgement, and briefly remark on their decision in the Comment section.</p> <p>In order to earn a PASS for a Part, a candidate needs a majority of 3s and no 1s[BC1] .</p> <p>ACTION: Add note to Directions & website to clarify.</p>
4	<p>I wish that we were not obligated to comment on each PC, I'd rather have one big box to comment on the PCs for each Part. This is a lot of pressure!</p>	<p>Comments are essential for proper calibration. One of the advantages of a much smaller portfolio is that the design allows a better balance of quality and quantity in the review process.</p>

	5	<p>Fix Directions for Description to assure match with rubric.</p>	<p>ACTION: Remove “and explain how the body of evidence helped you make meaning of the theme.”</p> <p>Alter Directions and Rubric as follows. Directions: The purpose of the Description is to use descriptive writing to introduce the narrative. Write a short essay/paragraph that</p> <p>1- Sets the context in which the evidence was collected and 2- Holistically illuminates the meaning of the theme.</p> <p>1-The description employs insufficient details of the context and/or demonstrates misinterpretation of the Theme. 2-The description demonstrates the candidate’s ability to recall the context and discuss the Theme. 3-The description demonstrates the candidate’s ability to depict the context in which the evidence was collected and to illuminate the Theme.</p>
Evidence Chart	6	<p>Must a candidate provide evidence for each PC (i.e. 1.1 and 1.2) when they are only going to analyze one PC for a given Standard? If they must do both, then let’s add a specific scoring mechanism in the Rubric for the Evidence Chart.</p>	<p>The current arrangement emphasizes breadth and depth. The Evidence Chart with evidence and rationales for each PC addresses the breadth of a candidate’s understanding of the 10 Standards. Select one PC per Standard to analyze the emphasizes depth of understanding.</p> <p>Since the purpose of the VLP is to have candidates demonstrate their ability to conduct critical self-study, the narrative is the scoring mechanism.</p>

	<p>7 Rather than having to attach a video, require that they submit just a reflection/analysis of watching a video of themselves along with supervisor feedback. It's a cumbersome process to worry about attaching the video itself and serves the same purpose to simply complete a video analysis and submit the written documentation of that.</p>	<p>A video was a requirement of the original design plan, per VSBPE request. Constructing the video, analyzing it, and uploading it demonstrates a professional skill set that is currently valued in the field.</p>
	<p>8 The Evidence Chart works really well! Just have a single one---with all required and optional evidence in it and labeled as such.</p>	<p>Program flexibility, based on the platform. The Part II Chart should be intact and include the Required Evidence. ACTION: Add note and add required evidence chart for Part II at the top of the Evidence Chart for the entire portfolio and website to clarify</p>
	<p>9 Embedding links in the narrative to evidence work well. Require this.</p>	<p>Program flexibility, based on the platform.</p>
	<p>10 If the Evidence Chart became part of the Score Report, then it would provide an assessment of (a) the saliency of the evidence (this could then be removed from the analysis score report), and (b) the candidate's understanding of how their evidence meets the requirements of the PC (which would be apparent from their rationale statement).</p>	<p>Since the purpose of the VLP is to have candidates demonstrate their ability to conduct critical self-study using descriptive, analytic, and reflective expression, the narrative is the scoring mechanism. The purpose of the Evidence Chart is to have candidates demonstrate their ability to identify, organize, and curate evidence related to the Standards by way of the PCs.</p>

	11	<p>The Evidence Chart does provide a useful checklist for the candidate, but could be a more integral part of the assessment.</p>	<p>The purpose of the Evidence Chart is to have candidates demonstrate their ability to identify, organize, and curate evidence related to the Standards by way of the PCs. Scoring the Evidence Chart would significantly increase the time required for the review cycle, while not clearly addressing the purpose of the portfolio. Additionally, defining the criteria for a rationale will 'move toward analysis which is emphasized in the narrative not in the evidence chart. Programs may scrutinize the Evidence Chart as they wish.</p>
	12	<p>I think that all of the PCs in Part 1 are actually embedded in Part 2. Eliminate Part 1.</p>	<p>The INTASC document maintains these Standards as separate skill sets. For the VLP Part I is intended, in part, to serve as a formative review and can be completed before Part II.</p>
Part I	13	<p>Rubric: Self-Reflection language is not consistent. "Specific incidents" is the language in Levels 1 and 3 but not Level 2. Also, what is the difference between "insufficient" (Level 1) vs. "recounting" (Level 2)?</p>	<p>The rubric is designed on a theoretical grounding, instead of a more straightforward parallel construction. Column 3 demonstrates the higher level of Bloom's Taxonomy. Column 2 demonstrates the middle levels. Column 1 demonstrates earnest effort, but erroneous results.</p>

14	<p>Rubric: Description says “depiction of one’s experience collecting the evidence” change to selecting from collecting or add “while collecting”</p>	<p>ACTION: Remove “and explain how the body of evidence helped you make meaning of the theme.”</p> <p>Alter Directions and Rubric as follows.</p> <p>Directions: The purpose of the Description is to use descriptive writing to introduce the narrative. Write a short essay/paragraph that</p> <p>1- Sets the context in which the evidence was collected and 2- Holistically illuminates the meaning of the theme.</p> <p>1-The description employs insufficient details of the context and/or demonstrates misinterpretation of the Theme. 2-The description demonstrates the candidate’s ability to recall the context and discuss the Theme. 3-The description demonstrates the candidate’s ability to depict the context in which the evidence was collected and to illuminate the Theme.</p>
15	<p>Rubric: (a) Use “limited” in Column 1; (b) add “omits” to Column 1; (c) reword “constructs a perception of” in Column 3; (d) remove “assess” Column 3;</p>	<p>ACTION: Alter wording for Column 3 paragraph 2: “The analysis explicitly interprets the Performance Criterion...”</p> <p>ACTION: remove “assess.”</p> <p>The rubric is designed on a theoretical grounding, instead of a more straightforward parallel construction.</p>
16	<p>PCs 1.1 and 1.2: The wording seems to indicate that the evidence has to convey the use of all 4 identified areas in their design of the learning experience: “in areas such as cognitive, linguistic, social emotional <u>and</u> physical.”. Do we mean “and” or do we mean “or”, when it comes to their evidence? Is evidence sufficient if it demonstrates they used some, but not all, of those areas?</p>	<p>ACTION: use “or” instead of “and”.</p>

	17	4.1: "Candidates accurately communicate central concepts of the discipline"; What does that mean? Does it mean that the student work demonstrates learning (hence, the candidate has accurately communicated it) or is it that the candidate can communicate?	This is about the candidate's communication of the content.
	18	Rubric: Column 1 for Analysis states "overstates the candidate's effectiveness" Suggested edit: "overstates or doesn't state candidate's effectiveness."	ACTION: Change wording in Column 1 to "overstates or does not state candidate's effectiveness."
	19	Rubric: Column 3: Revisit the wording for PC 1. & PC 3.2	ACTION: Remove "assess" from rubric elements in Part 1.
	20	PCs: Are both 4.1 & 4.2 and 5.1 & 5.2 needed, or is 4 embedded in 5.	Both are needed.
Part II	21	PC 10.1: States 5 groups of people with whom candidates must collaborate (wording of the PC is "and" not "or"). That seems to indicate that the evidence has to convey collaboration with all of those stakeholders. Do we mean "and" or do we mean "or", when it comes to their evidence?	ACTION: alter wording to "Prepared to collaborate with stakeholders (such as...or...").
Part III	22	PC 10.2: Can the wording be expanded (or interpreted) to include "research", not just "action research?"	"Action Research" is listed in the InTASC progressions. We believe this is used to emphasize the need for candidates to demonstrate active engagement with others in service of the profession, versus merely the ability to objectively investigate the profession. Interpreting this broadly seems feasible.

	23	I would like to see how we can rework the rubric so that there is more of a distinction between a 2 and 3. Faculty have told me that they feel it is very subjective.	The rubric is designed on a theoretical grounding, instead of a more straightforward parallel construction. Column 3 demonstrates the higher levels of Bloom's Taxonomy. Column 2 demonstrates the middle levels. When stuck, refer to the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy.
Other	24	Only check-off the writing, organization, etc. for the whole document rather than for each Part. Move the box for feedback on writing, organization, sources, etc. from within each Part to at the top of the entire rubric. Readers can respond generally to these trends, and note specifically if there are any aspects that are about one or two parts	Program discretion. Keep for Part II.
	25	Let's simplify the Scoring Rubrics throughout so that the two separate PC's are tied across a particular row. (i.e. PC 1.1 AND 1.2 is one row rather than two).	Program discretion for formatting the rubric based on your platform. Maintain the wording and scoring guidelines.

	<p>26 My edits for the rubric are the same for Parts I, II and III. I know that the group discussed the format of the rubric at many sessions but I still believe and have heard from faculty that there is too much text in each criterion level. Is there a way that we can eliminate the second paragraph and place it somewhere in the beginning since it is entirely redundant for each PC.? It clutters the rubric and distracts the evaluator.</p>	<p>The Analysis is based on two types of cognitive work: content understanding and procedure. Together they constitute a performance. The premise within the VLP, is that candidates should demonstrate proficiency by blending each. Both are necessary for assessment. To enhance validity, it is important to have both immediately available to the reviewers. To enhance reliability, reviewers should identify the specific aspects of each that are demonstrated in the narrative, with highlights, marks, and/or quoted words or phrases from each paragraph. For calibration, we should examine the reasons given for the score across reviewers.</p> <p>Programs may format the rubric as needed for the platform they select, maintaining the wording and the comment section for each scored item.</p>
--	---	--

27	<p>Use one Description for the whole portfolio, which identifies the candidate’s understanding of all three Themes. There is considerable overlap between the three Description sections. Is it really necessary to review the evidence collection process in the Description? The evidence is clearly identified on the Evidence Chart along with clear rationale statements, which explain how the evidence meets the requirements of each PC. This seems repetitive.</p>	<p>ACTION: Remove “and explain how the body of evidence helped you make meaning of the theme.”</p> <p>Alter Directions and Rubric as follows.</p> <p>Directions: The purpose of the Description is to use descriptive writing to introduce the narrative. Write a short essay/paragraph that</p> <p>1- Sets the context in which the evidence was collected and 2- Holistically illuminates the meaning of the theme.</p> <p>1-The description employs insufficient details of the context and/or demonstrates misinterpretation of the Theme. 2-The description demonstrates the candidate’s ability to recall the context and discuss the Theme. 3-The description demonstrates the candidate’s ability to depict the context in which the evidence was collected and to illuminate the Theme.</p> <p>Since the Themes are different, and represent a set of Standards, candidates should describe each.</p>
28	<p>An analysis of one PC for each Standard still seems reasonable and the critical evaluation of effectiveness is an important piece of this.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>
29	<p>Use one Reflection for the whole portfolio, which invites the candidate to: (a) evaluate their personal learning from all three themes; (b) consider how their thinking has been challenged; (c) outline a plan for ongoing development.</p>	<p>Programs could do a holistic reflection, such as Entry 6 of the previous portfolio, but the VLP still needs a Reflection for each Part. The Parts are different and represent different sets of Standards. For best calibration, Part II should have a Reflection that is common across programs.</p>

	<p>30 On the Rubric, there should be boxes for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · the score in each section · the overall score · final grade: Pass/Resubmit 	<p>Programs can add what they need, based on the platform they select.</p>
	<p>31 Clarify the guidelines for #4 of the Required Evidence: "An analysis of samples of a student's work over time (multiple samples of one student) or samples of multiple students drawn from the unit of study." What constitutes "student work"? Does each option require an analysis of "student work"?</p>	<p>ACTION: Alter wording as below: #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>