**STANDARD 1: CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE**
The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.

**Colorado Standards – Historical Perspective**
Colorado Academic & Common Core Standards
It is important to provide context for Standard 1 as Colorado has a unique history regarding InTASC and Common Core standards. In 2009, the Colorado Department of Education was developing the Colorado Academic Standards (CAS) as required by state legislation. About the same time, the Council of Chief State School Officers and the National Governor’s Association began working on the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) initiative. Because Colorado was already developing its own college- and career-ready standards, it was among six states that provided early feedback on the CCSS drafts. The Colorado State Board of Education ultimately adopted the Common Core State Standards in mathematics and English language arts on August 2, 2010. However, the state believed there were significant gaps and inconsistencies between CCSS and CAS. This was resolved by integrating the Common Core State Standards into the Colorado standards.

**Colorado Teacher Quality and InTASC Standards**
Around the same time, Colorado’s State Council for Educator Effectiveness, a state committee tasked with creating new standards, compared Performance-Based Standards for Colorado Teachers; Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching; the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) InTASC Standards; Teacher Standards for North Carolina; and Delaware’s Teaching Standards before determining new guidelines. In 2011 the committee issued the Colorado Teacher Quality Standards (CTQS).

The six “Quality Standards” listed in CTQS include:
1. Teachers demonstrate mastery of and pedagogical expertise in the content they teach.
2. Teachers establish a safe, inclusive, and respectful learning environment for a diverse population of students.
3. Teachers plan and deliver effective instruction and create an environment that facilitates learning for their students.
4. Teachers reflect on their practice.
5. Teachers demonstrate leadership.
6. Teachers take responsibility for student academic growth.

The quality standards incorporate the four general categories listed in the InTASC Core Teaching Standards (ICTS): The Learner and Learning (ICTS 1,2,3) (CTQS 2,3); Content (ICTS 4,5) (CTQS 1); Instructional Practice (ICTS 6,7,8) (CTQS 1,2,3,4,6); and Professional Responsibility (ICTS 9,10) (CTQS 2,5,6).
Teacher preparation programs still fall under the 1991 Educator Licensing Act and the Performance Based Standards for Colorado Teachers (PBSCT). Since we want to prepare our teacher candidates for the standards for which they will be evaluated, in consultation with CDE and CDHE, a decision was made to adopt the new Colorado Teacher Quality Standards and crosswalk them with the PBSCT to ensure that our candidates meet both sets of standards.

As the evidence will show, COE candidates are well-versed in CTQS (InTASC) and C/A (Common Core) Standards.

**Specialized Professional Association (SPA) Reports**

Content and pedagogical knowledge are demonstrated through a variety of means; the first specific artifact chosen to demonstrate candidate success in Standard 1 is the College’s SPA reports. Details are provided in Standard 1 in the Electronic Exhibits.

**PLACE and Praxis**

Further externally validated evidence of content knowledge is demonstrated by candidates’ scores on Praxis or PLACE (Colorado’s licensing exam). As Table 1.1 shows, UCCS candidates’ scores indicate that program completers meet or exceed the cut score established by the state for PLACE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>2011 n</th>
<th>2012 n</th>
<th>2013 n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counselor</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Generalist</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Passing = 220

Fewer candidates complete PRAXIS; however, those individuals generally have a history of doing well, except in those subject areas when few candidates take the exam. The scores for mathematics reflect those of candidates who underwent math preparation before the UCCSTeach program was implemented.
**TABLE 1.2 – Praxis Score Results 2011-2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Praxis</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elem Ed: Content Knowledge</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English LLC: Content Knowledge</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics: Content Knowledge</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies: Content Knowledge</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Science: Content Knowledge</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Portfolios**

Portfolios were chosen as an artifact of evidence for Standard 1 and are detailed in the Electronic Exhibit. Other than the CACREP-accredited counseling programs, all initial preparation and advanced programs use the portfolio as a mechanism to collect and assess student achievement.

Just as a portfolio is a collection of artifacts, the programs’ portfolio processes represent a collection of assessments with varying levels of cohesiveness and quality. The table indicates that all programs use an electronic repository, issue handbooks and rubrics, and ensure candidates are introduced to the portfolio requirements through an orientation process. The one element that shows the greatest need for improvement is the feedback process. School Counseling students contribute to their School Counseling portfolios throughout their coursework. School Counseling faculty review candidate portfolios during the internship courses (fall and spring of final year) and identify collective areas of strengths and weaknesses for the students. This feedback is then used to make modifications to School Counseling coursework.

The other programs are aware of the need to create a system of using the data collected to inform program decisions and are all working to strengthen or standardize the feedback process.
### TABLE 1.3 – Programmatic Portfolio Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SPA ALIGNMENT</th>
<th>Bb/TaskStream</th>
<th>TEAM SCORED</th>
<th>HANDBOOK</th>
<th>RUBRIC</th>
<th>ORIENTATION</th>
<th>FEEDBACK SYSTEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND**

- **E** ESTABLISHED PRACTICE
- **D** DEVELOPING PRACTICE

Portfolios serve as evidence of candidates’ content and pedagogical knowledge, technological skills, experience with K-12 assessments, lesson and unit planning, dispositional assessments, writing ability, progress reports, goal statements, and other necessary skills and understanding. Since all educator preparation candidates, including those in principal and superintendent programs, must meet Colorado standards, candidates are prepared to address the needs of diverse populations (Colorado Quality Principal Standards: #3 Cultural and Equity Leadership; Colorado Teacher Quality Standards: #2 Safe, Inclusive and Respectful Learning Environment; Colorado Standards for Administrators: 6.10 Ethnic, cultural, gender, economic, and human diversity). Technology is specifically addressed in CQPS: 2.3 (integration of technology and formative assessment to increase student engagement and learning) and CTQS: 3.d (integrate and utilize appropriate available technology in their instruction to maximize student learning). Colorado Standards for Administrators address technology through 6.12: Communications, including the use of computers and telecommunications. Table 1.4 provides a summary of sample content required by the programs.
TABLE 1.4 – Programmatic Portfolio Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Content Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCCSTeach</td>
<td>Lesson plans, observations, edTPA documents, samples of student work, interdisciplinary units, reading guides, annotated bibliographies, writing assignments and rubrics, school/district scope and sequence and alignment with standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Generalist Licensure Program</td>
<td>Lesson plans, technology plans, augmentation/alternative communication plan, work samples, cooperating teacher and university supervisor evaluation documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Licensure Program</td>
<td>Assignments addressing each of the Colorado Standards for Principals, site mentor evaluation form, log and journal of practicum activities, leadership platform/philosophy, resume, professional growth plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counseling</td>
<td>Philosophy of Education; resume; small group and classroom guidance curriculums, practicum and internship projects; needs assessment, extended learnings; evidence of professional affiliations; certifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education &amp; Licensure Program</td>
<td>Lesson plans, observations, dispositions, assessments, TWS, parent communication log, graded student work, evidence that candidate has met each of CTQS standards and elements, reflections, evidence of proficiency with SPA standards, edTPA documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Licensure Program</td>
<td>Lesson plans, observations, dispositions, assessments, TWS, parent communication log, graded student work, evidence that candidate has met each of CTQS standards and elements, reflections, evidence of proficiency with SPA standards, edTPA documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator Licensure Program</td>
<td>Assignments addressing each of the Colorado Standards for Administrators, site mentor evaluation form, log and journal of practicum activities, leadership platform/philosophy, resume, professional growth plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership PhD</td>
<td>Synthesis project, coursework and professional work artifacts, annotated bibliography, growth statement, dissertation abstract</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard 1: Summary**

Three years ago, the Assessment and Accreditation Committee assumed a more holistic approach to assessment and created a series of documents noting the information collected across the college, as well as the reports required by the university, various accreditation and regulatory agencies, and conceptualized a college-wide assessment process.

The COE Conversations have provided a vehicle for sharing programmatic information related to CAEP standards. For example, the March 15, 2013 meeting included discussion on CAEP and furthering work on the College’s assessment system, while the
January 21, 2014 meeting featured time for standards chairs to share lessons learned on the work with their standards committees. The involvement of the majority of the faculty on CAEP Standards Committees (begun April of 2013) also heightened awareness of effective practices within the College that need to be replicated and expanded across the unit.

SPA work, especially those components that were completed collaboratively, has also increased our understanding of where programs have deficiencies that need to be addressed, particularly along the broad themes of alignment, measurement, data relevance, and reflection based on data.

The leadership of the department chairs, the work of the Assessment and Accreditation Committee, faculty initiatives related to SPA and CACREP reports, and the support of the Assessment and Operations Specialist have combined to provide the momentum necessary to ensure a robust, iterative, and relevant assessment system.

Through portfolios involving multiple measures, candidates demonstrate content and pedagogical knowledge aligned to standards. This internally validated measure addresses both the art and science of the profession. Externally developed tests (PLACE, Praxis) support this evidence of candidate content knowledge. The College has a solid foundation in utilizing the feedback loop to candidates, and programs are systematically strengthening their use of aggregate data to improve their effectiveness.

Recognizing the need for a shared understanding of the roles and responsibilities of COE and the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences in preparing educator candidates, the two faculties met to share CAEP and content (SPA) standards, aggregate PLACE/Praxis results for specific content fields, and propose changes that will impact LAS programs.

**STANDARD 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge**

1. **Summary of preliminary findings**

   a. **Narrative summary of preliminary findings**

   Standard 1 has established the expectation that the EPP “ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.” To support its claim that the EPP is meeting this standard, it provided context that included the history of Colorado’s the InTASC and Common Core standards. That context demonstrated the link between Colorado Common Core and Colorado Teacher Quality Standards (CTQS) and the national standards embedded in Standard 1. In their Self Study, the EPP reported they adopted the new Colorado Teacher Quality Standards and crosswalk them with the Performance Based Standards for Colorado Teachers (PBSCT) to ensure their candidates could meet both sets of standards.
In addressing component 1.1 (candidate understanding of the InTASC and appropriate professional standards), the EPP elected to use the college’s SPA reports, candidates’ scores on Praxis or PLACE (Colorado’s licensing exam), and candidate portfolios. The data presented show candidate success on these assessments. Portfolios were described as collections of artifacts. The Self Study indicated that the EPP’s program portfolio processes consisted of a collection of assessments with varying levels of cohesiveness and quality. All programs use an electronic repository, issue handbooks and rubrics. The EPP also reported varying degrees of success and implementation of the portfolio as an assessment tool. The EPP noted that feedback on the portfolio process was the area needing the most attention. The EPP provided a table showing the areas in the portfolio process that were “established practices” and “developing practices.” The Self Study also included information on the specific problem content within each program portfolio in table 1.4.

Evidence related to component 1.2 was embedded, to a degree, in the information provided on the professional portfolios candidates create in each program. It was also addressed in a very general manner through the SPA process and the Praxis/PLACE assessments; however, it was difficult to see more that a general connection due to the lack of detail provided in the report and evidence provided.

The portfolios from each of the programs present evidence that programs and candidates have met the various professional standards. Syllabi include the state and national professional standards and how they’re assessed. This link provides access to syllabi and standards crosswalks while access to sample portfolios is available in the TaskStream Virtual Exhibit Room.

SPA, PLACE/Praxis, edTPA, TWS and portfolios all act to ascertain some aspect of depth of professional knowledge. Taken together, these measures provide a significant number of data points for programs to use in assessing the quality of their candidates and programs. Faculty recognized that there was a deficit in the measurement of candidates’ professional practice and P-12 student progress, which is why the College decided to add edTPA as it addresses both those area. Click here to see edTPA pilot data. In reviewing this data, the faculty noted that Task 4: Assessing Students’ Learning was an area of weakness that is being addressed fall 2014.

CTQS Standard III. B also addresses these two issues (Teachers plan and consistently deliver instruction that draws on results of student assessments, is aligned to standards, and advances students’ level of content knowledge and skills) and candidate achievement is documented through this observation form.

Evidence related to component 1.3 was found through a review of the Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) reports provided. Since many of these reports indicated “Recognized with Conditions,” the EPP provided some useful information regarding the history of assessment efforts at the EPP as well as some information about efforts being made to address the concerns noted in the SPA reports.
Evidence related to component 1.4 was provided through information the Colorado Common Core and Colorado Teacher Quality Standards (CTQS). The state assessments include expectations candidates will demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college and career ready standards.

Evidence related to component 1.5 was addressed through reference to Colorado Quality Standards. The portfolio was also noted as an artifact showing master of technology standards.

It should be noted that CTQS III contains a technology standard and the portfolio requires candidates demonstrate mastery of them. Click here to see how the TELP and ALP Portfolios address the CTQS technology standard.

Please click here to see how our candidates performed on Standard 3.d within their portfolios

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

The EPP provided evidence that Standard 1 and its five elements are being addressed in its programs. It appears that state standards are well aligned with national standards. Assessments and data from those assessments show candidates are able to demonstrate appropriate professional skills. The EPP has been very forthcoming with its assessment its status regarding areas where it falls short of the standards and provided information on how it plans to address those areas where improvement is needed.

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

The SPA reports show that the EPP programs, in general, have not fully met the expectation embedded in SPA standards. The EPP provided information about how it plans to address the concerns, but insufficient detail was provided.

The SPA reports have been submitted. Please refer to SPA submissions for examples of specific changes made to address conditions identified by SPA reviewers. For example, see NCSS SPA report section 6 and ACEI, See section 6

The portfolio process was one of the artifacts the EPP choose to demonstrate it meets the standard. Some information was provided about the portfolio, but sufficient detail was not included to show the visiting team all the connections between the multiple assessments embodied in the portfolios for each program area and the appropriate standards. For example, the EPP reports, “Programs have cross-walked course content, assignments and assessment to state and professional standards and built rubrics to ensure candidates are meeting expectations.” But the EPP provides no evidence or examples of these connected elements.
The portfolios from each of the programs present evidence that programs and candidates have met the various professional standards. Syllabi include the state and national professional standards and how they’re assessed. [This link](#) provides access to syllabi and standards crosswalks while access to sample portfolios is available in the TaskStream Virtual Exhibit Room.

The EPP indicated its programs “establish their own thresholds for candidate effectiveness, based on standards and multiple measures.” It provided some details about three programs, but more specifics regarding how this occurs and how the multiple measures are tied to standards and their elements were missing. The same information on the other programs, not currently reported, was not reported.

The three programs referred to originally were TELP, SPED, and Principal Licensure. These were chosen as representative of programs across the College. The table has been redesigned with Alternative Licensure Program UCCSTeach, and Counseling included along with a summary of measures of evidence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Lesson plan</th>
<th>Portfolio</th>
<th>edTPA</th>
<th>TWS</th>
<th>Licensure Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TELP</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCCSTeach</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The EPP did not report in specific enough detail how the addition of new, externally validated measures (edTPA, SPA…) would be used to strengthen its portfolio process and add to it validity.

SPA, PLACE/Praxis, edTPA, TWS and portfolios all act to ascertain some aspect of depth of professional knowledge. Taken together, these measures provide a significant number of data points for programs to use in assessing the quality of their candidates and programs. Faculty recognized that there was a deficit in the measurement of candidates’ professional practice and P-12 student progress, which is why the College decided to add edTPA as it addresses both those areas. [Click here to see edTPA pilot data.](#) In reviewing the data, faculty noted that Task 4: Assessing Students’ Learning was an area of weakness that is being addressed fall 2014.

Implementation of edTPA, CLASS, and SPS (Spring 2015) all provide benchmarks that can be compared to both other EPPS and provide an external check to the quality we identified. For example, we had higher scores than the external ratings on local scoring the first time edTPA was administered. These measures are also less rater dependent so that a change in leadership/instructors does not lead to wholesale change.
in the definition of candidate quality.

**SPS Grades 3-5 Instrument**

**SPS Grades 6-12 Instrument**

**SPS Technical Report**

2. **List of onsite tasks to be completed.** Use the following three prompts for each task. Add additional tasks as needed.

*Standard 1 Task 1* Review the EPP’s plans to address the problems that were called to their attention in SPA reports in which the program was “recognized with conditions.”

The required SPA submissions have been completed. [See completed submissions here.](#)

a. **Evidence in need of verification or corroboration:**

To verify component 1.3—“Providers ensure that completers apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments in response to standards of Specialized Professional Associations…”

**CTQS Standard III. B** addresses this issue (Teachers plan and consistently deliver instruction that draws on results of student assessments, is aligned to standards, and advances students’ level of content knowledge and skills) and candidate achievement is documented through [this observation form](#). This is a new form for 2014 that was created as a result of previous SPA feedback.

b. **Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed:**

The section in the Self Study that addresses “SPA Reports.”

c. **Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews,** including follow up on response to 1.c.

The EPP provided general information about how its plans to address the concerns voiced in SPA feedback. The EPP should include more detail regarding how it plans to address SPA concerns, include evidence of SPA rejoinders completed, or information about changes that have occurred since the Self Study was completed.

The portfolios from each of the programs present evidence that programs and candidates
have met the various professional standards. Syllabi include the state and national professional standards and how they’re assessed. This link provides access to syllabi and standards crosswalks while access to sample portfolios is available in the TaskStream Virtual Exhibit Room (password caep2014).

SPA, PLACE/Praxis, edTPA, TWS and portfolios all act to ascertain some aspect of depth of professional knowledge. Taken together, these measures provide a significant number of data points for programs to use in assessing the quality of their candidates and programs. Faculty recognized that there was a deficit in the measurement of candidates’ professional practice and P-12 student progress, which is why the College decided to add edTPA as it addresses both those area. Click here to see edTPA pilot data. In reviewing this data, the faculty noted that Task 4: Assessing Students’ Learning was an area of weakness that is being addressed fall 2014.

*Standard 1 Task 2* Review the portfolio process to determine its consistency across all programs and EPP operations.

a. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration:

The portfolio process and its component assessments, rubrics and activities need to be examined across all program areas to ensure alignment with appropriate national and state standards. More detail regarding all program portfolios to show the visiting team all the connections between the multiple assessments embodied in the portfolios for each program area and the appropriate standards is needed. For example, the EPP reports, “Programs have cross candidates are meeting expectations.” The EPP needs to provide additional evidence and/or examples of those connected elements.-walked course content, assignments and assessment to state and professional standards and built rubrics to ensure

The portfolios from each of the programs present evidence that programs and candidates have met the various professional standards. Syllabi include the state and national professional standards and how they’re assessed. This link provides access to syllabi and standards crosswalks while access to sample portfolios is available in the TaskStream Virtual Exhibit Room.

SPA, PLACE/Praxis, edTPA, TWS and portfolios all act to ascertain some aspect of depth of professional knowledge. Taken together, these measures provide a significant number of data points for programs to use in assessing the quality of their candidates and programs. Faculty recognized that there was a deficit in the measurement of candidates’ professional practice and P-12 student progress, which is why the College decided to add edTPA as it addresses both those area. Click here to see edTPA pilot data. In reviewing this data, the faculty noted that Task 4: Assessing Students’ Learning was an area of weakness that is being addressed fall 2014.

CTQS Standard III. B also addresses these two issues (Teachers plan and consistently deliver instruction that draws on results of student assessments, is aligned to standards,
and advances students’ level of content knowledge and skills) and candidate achievement is documented through this observation form.

Portfolio rubrics are found here for Administrator Licensure and Principal Licensure.

The evidence in need of corroboration is the evidence provided by the EPP under the heading “Portfolio Summary Data.” The evidence provided is limited and not complete enough for the visiting team to determine if the portfolio is using standards aligned assessments and rubrics. It is not clear what is required of candidates across all program areas. The assessments and their rubrics need to be available to the visiting team for review.

The TELP observation form may be accessed here.

Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed:

Evidence provided by the EPP under the heading “Portfolio Summary Data.”

b. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews, including follow up on response to 1.c.

- Sample portfolios
- Portfolio rubrics
- Detailed plans to make adjustments in the portfolio requirements
- More details on how new assessment will be incorporated into the portfolio process.

3. PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEW AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT AND/OR STIPULATIONS INCLUDING A RATIONALE FOR EACH

Area for Improvement: (component 1.3) Programs are not fully aligned with all SPA and other professional standards.

Rationale: The EPP did not provide sufficient evidence its plans for addressing SPA concerns will result in SPA recognition.

Stipulation: (component 1.2) The EPP does not ensure completers use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure their P-12 students’ progress and their own professional practice.

Rationale: The EPP did not provide sufficient evidence that its plans are adequate for collecting data on student learning, using it to improve candidate, and completers
ability to use research, evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession, and use both to measure their P-12 students’ progress and their own professional practice.