Division 410: Standards for Educator Preparation Programs (Units) – New Division


Nationally based standards
584-410-0020 Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge
584-410-0030 Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice
584-410-0040 Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity
584-410-0050 Standard 4: Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development
584-410-0060 Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

State-Specific Standards
584-410-0070 Standard 6: Cultural Competency and Equity in the Classroom
584-410-0080 Standard 7: English Language Learners (Currently in 584-420-0010)
584-410-0090 Standard 8: Consortium – EPP Partnerships
584-410-0100 Standard 9: Verification of Candidate Recommendations (Field Audit)

Former State-specific standards moved to program review: EPPs did not have concerns with moving the following standards to program review:

- **Knowledge of School Law for Licensed Educators** (OAR 584-017-1020);
  - Moving school law requirement to individual program standards. As a result, the school law requirement would be reviewed as a part of program review.

- **Field or Clinical Experiences** (OAR 584-017-1042);
  - Moving to individual program standards (Division 420) and general provisions (Division 400). The clinical practices standards will be reviewed as a part of individual programs during the program review process.

- **Student Teaching** (OAR 584-017-1045);
  - Moving to individual program standards (Division 420) and general provisions (Division 400). The clinical practices standards will be reviewed as a part of individual programs during the program review process.

- **Internship Agreements** (OAR 584-017-1048);
  - Moving to individual program standards (Division 420) and general provisions (Division 400). The clinical practices standards will be reviewed as a part of individual programs during the program review process.

- **Selection, Recruitment, Admission and Retention of Candidates** (584-017-1028)
  - Moving specific admission requirements to individual program standards. The general admission standards are now in Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment and Selectivity.

- **Reading Instruction: Program Standards** (584-420-0015);
  - The Reading Instruction provisions only apply to Elementary Education, Reading Intervention, and SPED programs. The Reading Instruction standards will be reviewed during the program review process.

- **Dyslexia Instruction: Program Standards** (584-420-0016);
The Dyslexia Instruction provisions only apply to Early Childhood, Elementary Education, Reading Intervention, and SPED programs. The Dyslexia Instruction standards will be reviewed during the program review process.

- **Request for Waiver of Rules** (OAR 584-017-1010)
  - Moving to annual report requirements.

- **Partial Waivers for Field or Clinical Requirements in the Event of School District Closures** (OAR 584-017-1040)
  - Moving to annual report requirements.

- **Evidence of Effectiveness for Initial I Teaching License Preparation** (OAR 584-017-1030)
  - This rule was replaced by the new rule for Teacher Candidate Performance Assessments. The review of teacher candidate performance assessments will take place in the program review for the Preliminary Teaching License program.

- **Evidence of Effectiveness for Continuing Teaching License Preparation** (OAR 584-017-1032)
  - This rule will be repealed and the provisions will be added to the program standards for the Professional Teaching License. (584-420-0030)

---

**Division 410: State Standards for Oregon Education Preparation Programs**

**584-410-0010 Standards for State Approval: General Provisions**

1. Pursuant to ORS 342.147, the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission has established standards for state approval of educator preparation providers (Units) and educator preparation programs leading to educator licensure. The unit standards apply to:

   (a) Initial preparation and advanced preparation programs for teachers and other school professionals;

   (b) Off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs;

   (c) Online institutions and non-higher education organizations offering programs for the professional preparation of educators.

2. To obtain state approval to a unit, an educator preparation provider (EPP) must meet the following standards:

   (a) Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge;

   (b) Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice;

   (c) Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity;

   (d) Standard 4: Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development;

   (e) Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement;

   (f) Standard 6: Cultural Competency and Equity in the Classroom;

   (g) Standard 7: English Language Learners (Currently in 584-420-0010);

   (h) Standard 8: Consortium;

   (i) Standard 9: Verification of Candidate Recommendation (Field Audits).
The Commission has defined licensure and endorsement programs as initial or advanced programs for the purposes of Unit Approval. The Commission-approved list of advanced and initial programs is provided in the Program Review and Standards Handbook. As:

(a) The Preliminary Teaching License program in the elementary multiple-subjects endorsement area; and

(b) The Preliminary Teaching License program in the single-subject content areas, including:
   (A) Advanced Mathematics (including Foundational Mathematics)
   (B) Agricultural Science
   (C) Art
   (D) Biology
   (E) Business: Generalist
   (F) Business: Marketing
   (G) Career Trades: Generalist
   (H) Chemistry
   (I) Drama
   (J) English Language Arts (including Foundational English Language Arts)
   (K) Family and Consumer Studies
   (L) Health
   (M) Integrated Science (including Foundational Science)
   (N) Library Media
   (O) Music
   (P) Physical Education
   (Q) Physics
   (R) Social Studies (including Foundational Social Studies)
   (S) Speech (Forensics)
   (T) World Languages

(4) For the purposes of Unit Approval, the Commission has defined advanced programs as:
   (a) Teacher Leader License Programs;
   (b) Professional Teaching License Programs;
   (c) Administrator License Programs;
   (d) School Counselor License Programs;
   (e) School Psychologist License Programs;
   (f) School Social Worker License Programs;
   (g) Endorsement Programs, including:
      (A) English to Speakers of Other Languages (Pre-service and In-service)
      (B) Elementary Multiple-Subjects (In-service only)
      (C) Art (In-service only)
      (D) Music (In-service only)
      (E) Physical Education (In-service only)
      (F) Reading Intervention (Preservice and In-service)
      (G) Special Education: Generalist (Pre-service and In-service)
      (H) Special Education: Early Intervention (Pre-service and In-service)
      (I) Special Education: Deaf and Hard of Hearing (Pre-service and In-service)
      (J) Special Education: Vision Impaired (Pre-service and In-service)
EPP feedback on Definition of Initial and Advanced Programs – and Program Report Requirements:
EPPs had a long discussion on this issue and raised many questions about the CAEP process and the
criteria for initial and advanced. The main question is how much control the state has to define
advanced and initial. They asked the Commission to be an advocate for the EPPs with CAEP. For
example, the CAEP process requirement for ACT/SAT is problematic for graduate and transfer students.
Some people entering their graduate program took the ACT/SAT twenty years ago, some universities
don’t require it anymore (Willamette), and some transfer students from community colleges were not
required to take them. They also wondered if there is a way to define all graduate programs as
advanced.

Staff Response: After hearing the discussion of the webinar participants, agency staff is suggesting
moving the list of initial and advanced programs to the Program Review and Standards Handbook.
Placing the specific list of initial and advanced programs into the Handbook will allow for flexibility while
the Commission determines the definition for Oregon programs in light of the new CAEP standards and
other factors. Staff will also be meeting with CAEP staff to get more information on the state’s role in
defining initial and advanced. In addition, staff will work on developing a program report system that
works with the EPPs on their unique situations but still provides the state a uniform way to report on
programs for program reviewers and, ultimately, outside stakeholders.

(5) When the Commission adopts new or revised unit or program standards, the Commission must
adopt one of the following actions:
(a) Affirm continued approval of the units or relevant programs under the new or revised standards; or
(b) Require the EPPs to submit their units or relevant programs for continued approval under the new or
revised standards, in the form and manner adopted by the Commission in the Program Review and
Standards Handbook;

Fiscal Impact or Cost of Compliance:
Other state agencies: The rule restates existing general provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal
impact or cost of compliance to state agency related to this rulemaking.
Local governments: The rule restates existing general provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal
impact or cost of compliance to local government related to this rulemaking.
Public: The rule restates existing general provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost
of compliance to the public related to this rulemaking.

Small Business: The agency does not anticipate small business, as defined by the Oregon Administrative
Procedures Act, to be affected by this rulemaking.

584-410-0020 Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

(1) Initial Programs: The Education Preparation Provider (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 flexibility to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of
college- and career-readiness standards.
(2) **Advanced Programs:** The Education Preparation Provider (EPP) ensures that candidates for professional specialties develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their field of preparation and, by completion, are able to use professional specialty practices flexibly to advance the learning of all P-12 students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.

(3) **Candidates Knowledge, Skills and Professional Dispositions: Initial Programs:** Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the (10) InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.

(4) **Candidates Knowledge, Skills and Professional Dispositions: Advanced Programs:** Candidates for advanced preparation demonstrate their proficiencies to understand and apply knowledge and skills appropriate to their professional field of specialization so that learning and development opportunities for all P-12 are enhanced, through:

(a) Applications of data literacy;
(b) Use of research and understanding of qualitative, quantitative and/or mixed methods research methodologies;
(c) Employment of data analysis and evidence to develop supportive school environments;
(d) Leading and/or participating in collaborative activities with others such as peers, colleagues, teachers, administrators, community organizations, and parents;
(e) Supporting appropriate applications of technology for their field of specialization; and
(f) Application of professional dispositions, laws and policies, codes of ethics and professional standards appropriate to their field of specialization.

(5) **Education Preparation Provider (Provider) Responsibilities: Initial Programs:** Educator preparation providers (EPPs) ensure that candidates:

(a) 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; and
(b) Apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments in response to standards of Oregon, Specialized Professional Associations (SPA), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), or other accrediting bodies (e.g., National Association of Schools of Music – NASM);
(c) Demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, National Career Readiness Certificate, Common Core State Standards); and
(d) Model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice.

(6) **Education Preparation Provider (Provider) Responsibilities: Advanced Programs:** Educator Preparation Providers (EPPs) ensure that advanced program completers have opportunities to learn and apply specialized content and discipline knowledge contained in approved state and/or national discipline-specific standards. These specialized standards include, but are not limited to, Oregon standards, Specialized Professional Association (SPA) standards, standards of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and standards of other accrediting bodies [e.g., Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)].
**EPP input on Standard 1:** This rule simply incorporates CAEP standard 1 as Oregon’s unit standard for content and pedagogical knowledge. Staff did not bring any specific issues on this rule in the webinar. The EPP representatives also did not bring up any issues with this rule.

**Staff Response:** No changes to draft rule at this time.

**Fiscal Impact or Cost of Compliance:**

*Other state agencies:* The rule restates existing Standard 1 provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to state agency related to this rulemaking.

*Local governments:* The rule restates existing Standard 1 provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to local government related to this rulemaking.

*Public:* The rule restates existing Standard 1 provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to the public related to this rulemaking.

*Small Business:* The agency does not anticipate small business, as defined by the Oregon Administrative Procedures Act, to be affected by this rulemaking.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 342
Stats. Implemented: 342.120 – 342.430; 342.455 – 342.495; 342.553
Hist.: 584-410-0030

**584-410-0030 Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice**

(1) **Initial Programs:** The Education Preparation Provider (EPP) ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students’ learning and development.

(2) **Advanced Programs:** The EPP ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions appropriate for their professional specialty field.

(3) **Partnerships for Clinical Preparation: Initial and Advanced Programs:** Initial Programs: Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for candidate outcomes.

(4) **Partnerships for Clinical Preparation: Initial and Advanced Programs:** Advanced Programs: Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of advanced
program candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for advanced program candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for advanced program candidate outcomes.

(5) **Clinical Educators: Initial Programs:** Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates’ development and P-12 student learning and development. In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications to establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings.

(6) **Clinical Experiences: Initial and Advanced Programs:** Initial Programs: The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students’ learning and development. Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates’ development of the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, as delineated in Standard 1, that are associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all P-12 students.

(7) **Clinical Experiences: Initial and Advanced Programs:** Advanced Programs: The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) works with partners to design varied and developmental clinical settings that allow opportunities for candidates to practice applications of content knowledge and skills that the courses and other experiences of the advanced preparation emphasize. The opportunities lead to appropriate culminating experiences in which candidates demonstrate their proficiencies, through problem-based tasks or research (e.g., qualitative, quantitative, mixed methods, action) that are characteristic of their professional specialization as detailed in component 1.1.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 342
Stats. Implemented: 342.120 – 342.430; 342.455 – 342.495; 342.553
Hist.:

**EPP input on Standard 2:** This rule simply incorporates CAEP standard 2 as Oregon’s unit standard for clinical experience and practice. Staff did not bring any specific issues on this rule in the webinar. The EPP representatives also did not bring up any issues with this rule.

**Staff Response:** No changes to draft rule at this time.

**Fiscal Impact or Cost of Compliance:**
*Other state agencies:* The rule restates existing Standard 2 provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to state agency related to this rulemaking.
*Local governments:* The rule restates existing Standard 2 provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to local government related to this rulemaking.
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The rule restates existing Standard 2 provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to the public related to this rulemaking.

The agency does not anticipate small business, as defined by the Oregon Administrative Procedures Act, to be affected by this rulemaking.

584-410-0040 Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

(1) Initial Programs: The Education Preparation Provider (EPP) demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The EPP demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program.

(2) Advanced Programs: The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) demonstrates that the quality of advanced program candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility so that completers are prepared to perform effectively and can be recommended for certification where applicable.

(3) Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs: Initial Programs: The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) presents plans and goals to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission. The admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America’s P-12 students. The EPP demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields, currently, STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities.

(4) Admission of Diverse Candidates Who Meet Employment Needs: Advanced Programs: The provider sets goals and monitors progress for admission and support of high-quality advanced program candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission. The admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America’s teacher pool and, over time, should reflect the diversity of P-12 students. The EPP demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for school and district staff prepared in advanced fields.

(5) Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement: Initial Programs The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) meets minimum criteria or the state’s minimum criteria for academic achievement, whichever are higher, and gathers disaggregated data on the enrolled candidates whose preparation begins during an academic year.

(6) Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully: Advanced Programs: The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) sets admissions requirements for academic achievement, including CAEP minimum criteria, the state’s minimum criteria, or graduate school minimum criteria, whichever is highest, and gathers data to monitor candidates from admission to completion. The EPP determines additional criteria intended to ensure that candidates have, or...
develop, abilities to complete the program successfully and arranges appropriate support and counseling for candidates whose progress falls behind.

(7) **Additional Selectivity Factors: Initial Programs:** Educator preparation providers establish and monitor attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability that candidates must demonstrate at admissions and during the program. The EPP selects criteria, describes the measures used and evidence of the reliability and validity of those measures, and reports data that show how the academic and non-academic factors predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching.

(8) **Selectivity During Preparation: Initial Programs:** The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) creates criteria for program progression and monitors candidates’ advancement from admissions through completion. All candidates demonstrate the ability to teach to college- and career-ready standards. EPPs present multiple forms of evidence to indicate candidates’ developing content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology in all of these domains.

(9) **Selectivity During Preparation: Advanced Programs:** The EPP creates criteria for program progression and uses disaggregated data to monitor candidates’ advancement from admissions through completion.

(10) **Selection at Completion: Initial Programs:** Before the Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate:

(a) Has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the fields where certification is sought and can teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development; and

(b) Understands the expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies.

(11) **Selection at Completion: Advanced Programs:** Before the Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) recommends any advanced program candidate for completion, it documents that the candidate has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the field of specialization, data literacy and research-driven decision making, effective use of collaborative skills, applications of technology, and applications of dispositions, laws, codes of ethics and professional standards appropriate for the field of specialization.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 342
Stats. Implemented: ORS 342.120 – 342.430; 342.455-342.495; 342.553
Hist.: TSPC 3-2012, f. & cert. ef. 3-9-12

**EPP input on Standard 3:** This rule simply incorporates CAEP standard 3 as Oregon’s unit standard for candidate quality, recruitment and selectivity. Staff did not bring any specific issues on this rule in the webinar. The EPP representatives also did not bring up any issues with this rule.

**Staff Response:** No changes to draft rule at this time.

**Fiscal Impact or Cost of Compliance:**
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Other state agencies: The rule restates existing Standard 3 provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to state agency related to this rulemaking.

Local governments: The rule restates existing Standard 3 provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to local government related to this rulemaking.

Public: The rule restates existing Standard 3 provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to the public related to this rulemaking.

Small Business: The agency does not anticipate small business, as defined by the Oregon Administrative Procedures Act, to be affected by this rulemaking.

584-410-0050 Standard 4: Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development

(1) Initial Programs: The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools and the satisfaction of these completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

(2) Advanced Programs: The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) documents the satisfaction of its completers from advanced preparation programs and their employers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

(3) Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development: Initial Programs: The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) documents, using multiple measures that program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth. Multiple measures shall include all available growth measures (including value-added measures, student-growth percentiles, and student learning and development objectives) required by the state for its teachers and available to educator preparation providers, other state-supported P-12 impact measures, and any other measures employed by the provider.

(4) Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness: Initial Program: The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) demonstrates, through structured validated observation instruments and/or student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.

(5) Satisfaction of Employers: Initial Programs: The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data and including employment milestones such as promotion and retention, that employers are satisfied with the completers’ preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students.

(6) Satisfaction of Employers: Advanced Programs: The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) demonstrates that employers are satisfied with completers’ preparation and that completers reach employment milestones such as promotion and retention.

(7) Satisfaction of Completers: Initial Programs: The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data, that program completers perceive
their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective.

(8) **Satisfaction of Completers: Advanced Programs:** The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) demonstrates that advanced program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 342
Stats. Implemented: ORS 342.120 – 342.430; 342.455-342.495; 342.553
Hist.:

**EPP input on Standard 4:** This rule simply incorporates CAEP standard 4 as Oregon’s unit standard for student learning and development. Staff did not bring any specific issues on this rule in the webinar. The EPP representatives also did not bring up any issues with this rule.

**Staff Response:** No changes to draft rule at this time.

**Fiscal Impact or Cost of Compliance:**
Other state agencies: The rule restates existing Standard 4 provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to state agency related to this rulemaking.
Local governments: The rule restates existing Standard 4 provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to local government related to this rulemaking.
Public: The rule restates existing Standard 4 provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to the public related to this rulemaking.

Small Business: The agency does not anticipate small business, as defined by the Oregon Administrative Procedures Act, to be affected by this rulemaking.

584-410-0060 Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

(1) The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates’ and completers’ positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The EPP supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The EPP uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers’ impact on P-12 student learning and development.

(2) **Quality and Strategic Evaluation Initial and Advanced:** The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP)’s quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and EPP operational effectiveness. Evidence demonstrates that the EPP satisfies all Oregon standards.
(3) **Quality and Strategic Evaluation Initial and Advanced:** The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP)'s quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

(4) **Continuous Improvement: Initial and Advanced:** The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.

(5) **Continuous Improvement: Initial and Advanced:** Measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on P-12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.

(6) **Continuous Improvement: Initial and Advanced:** The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the EPP, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.

**EPP input on Standard 5:** This rule simply incorporates CAEP standard 5 as Oregon’s unit standard for provider quality assurance and continuous improvement. Staff did not bring any specific issues on this rule in the webinar. The EPP representatives also did not bring up any issues with this rule.

**Staff Response:** No changes to draft rule at this time.

**Fiscal Impact or Cost of Compliance:**
- **Other state agencies:** The rule restates existing Standard 5 provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to state agency related to this rulemaking.
- **Local governments:** The rule restates existing Standard 5 provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to local government related to this rulemaking.
- **Public:** The rule restates existing Standard 5 provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to the public related to this rulemaking.

**Small Business:** The agency does not anticipate small business, as defined by the Oregon Administrative Procedures Act, to be affected by this rulemaking.

584-410-0070 Standard 6: Cultural Competency and Equity in the Classroom

(1) The EPP designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn equitably.

(a) Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to cultural competency and equitable student learning.
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(b) Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

(c) A cohort of candidates and faculty from diverse groups informs the unit’s curriculum, pedagogy, and field experiences in culturally inclusive meaningful ways.

(d) Diverse faculty and peers assist candidates in addressing teaching and learning from multiple perspectives and different life experiences. These experiences provide for different voices in the professional development and work of the education profession.

(e) The greater range of cultural backgrounds and experiences among faculty and candidates enhances understanding of cultural competency, inclusion and equity for all students in the classroom.

(2) Areas evaluated under this standard include:

(a) Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences;

(b) Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty; and

(c) Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates; and

(d) Experiences Working with Diverse Student in the P–12 Schools.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 342
Stats. Implemented: ORS 342.120 – 342.430; 342.455-342.495; 342.553
Hist.: TSPC 3-2012, f. & cert. ef. 3-9-12

**EPP input on the cultural competency and equity standard:** Because of the new CAEP standards, which weave equity throughout all five standards, some EPP members feel we no longer need a separate Oregon equity standard. The EPPs suggested that the Commission could look at the CAEP reports and read what is said about equity threaded throughout all five standards. If the Commission finds that the CAEP reports/standards do not adequately meet equity needs, the Commission could then create a separate Oregon standard.

In the alternative, if the Commission does keep a separate Oregon standard, the EPPs request that the Commission research if the Oregon equity standard could be aligned with the existing reporting requirements for public higher education. EPPs would really appreciate not having to do two different sets of data in the equity area.

If the Commission chooses to keep the current equity standard, the EPPs request that the Commission define “diverse” and “faculty” so the EPPs are clear as to which groups are included: first generation? LGBT? Or specifically focused on racial diversity? In addition, the EPPs request that the Commission assess what data or evidence the current equity standard has provided to the Commission since its adoption. Is this standard meeting its goals and, if the Commission moves to using the CAEP standards for equity goals, would the Commission lose something in that transition?
Staff Response: Agency staff would like the PAC to recommend next steps for the equity standard. Does PAC recommend keeping the standard, revising the standard, repealing the standard and use the CAEP standards only, or doing more research?

Fiscal Impact or Cost of Compliance:
Other state agencies: The rule restates existing Standard 6 provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to state agency related to this rulemaking.
Local governments: The rule restates existing Standard 6 provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to local government related to this rulemaking.
Public: The rule restates existing Standard 6 provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to the public related to this rulemaking.

Small Business: The agency does not anticipate small business, as defined by the Oregon Administrative Procedures Act, to be affected by this rulemaking.

584-410-0080 Standard 7: English Language Learners (ELL)

(1) Purpose of the Standards: It is the Commission’s policy that every p-12 educator has a responsibility to meet the needs of Oregon’s English Language Learner students. As such, accreditation and educator preparation requirements must support the demand for well-prepared educators to work with second language learners of all ages.

(2) These standards apply to pre-service or in-service candidates working to become teachers, administrators, personnel service educators and educator preparation program (EPP) faculty.

(3) The ELL Knowledge, Skills, Abilities and Dispositions:

(a) Language: Candidates, and higher education faculty know, understand, and use the major concepts, theories, and research related to the nature and acquisition of language to construct learning environments that support ELL and bilingual students' language and literacy development and content area achievement. Candidates and higher education faculty:

(A) Understand concepts related to academic versus social language, oracy versus literacy, and grammatical forms and linguistic functions;

(B) Are familiar with characteristics of students at different stages of second language acquisition and English Language Proficiency (ELP) levels;

(C) Recognize the role of first language (L1) in learning the second language (L2); and

(D) Are aware of personal, affective and social variables influencing second language acquisition.

(b) Culture: Candidates, and higher education faculty know and understand the major concepts, principles, theories, and research related to the nature and role of culture and cultural groups to construct learning environments that support ELL students' cultural identities, language and literacy development, and content area achievement. Candidates, and higher education faculty:
(A) Understand the impact of culture on language learning;

(B) Recognize and combat deficit perspectives and views on second language learner students;

(C) Understand that learners’ skills, knowledge and experiences should be used as resources for learning; and

(D) Understand how one’s own culture impacts one’s teaching practice.

(c) Planning, Implementing, and Managing Instruction: Candidates and higher education faculty know and understand the use of standards-based practices and strategies related to planning, implementing, and managing ESL and content instruction, including classroom organization, teaching strategies for developing and integrating language skills, and choosing and adapting classroom resources. Candidates and higher education faculty:

(A) Are familiar with different ELL program models for language acquisition English Language Development (ELD) and content pedagogy (sheltered & bilingual models);

(B) Incorporate basic sheltered strategies (e.g., visuals, grouping strategies, frontloading, and explicit vocabulary) appropriate to learners at different levels of English language proficiency within a gradual release of responsibility model;

(C) Are familiar with state-adopted English Language Proficiencies standards, and are able to develop lessons that include both content and language objectives related to those standards; and

(D) Incorporate primary language support within instruction.

(d) Assessment: Candidates and higher education faculty understand issues of assessment and use standards-based assessment measures with ELL and bilingual learners of all ages. Candidates and higher education faculty:

(A) Understand the role of language in content assessments; and

(B) Implement multiple and varied assessments that allow learners to demonstrate knowledge of content regardless of language proficiency level.

(e) Professionalism: Candidates and higher education faculty demonstrate knowledge of the history of ESL teaching. Candidates keep current with new instructional techniques, research results, advances in the ESL field, and public policy issues. Candidates use such information to reflect upon and improve their instructional practices. Candidates provide support and advocate for ELL and bilingual students and their families and work collaboratively to improve the learning environment. Candidates and higher education faculty:

(A) Understand the importance of fostering family and school partnerships; and
(B) Understand the importance of collaborating and consulting with English Language Development specialists.

(f) Technology: Candidates and higher education faculty use information technology to enhance learning and to enhance personal and professional productivity. Candidates and higher education faculty:

(A) Demonstrate knowledge of current technologies and application of technology with ELL students;

(B) Design, develop, and implement student learning activities that integrate information technology; and

(C) Use technologies to communicate, network, locate resources, and enhance continuing professional development.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 342
Stats. Implemented: ORS 342.120 – 342.430; 342.455-342.495 & 342.553
Hist.: TSPC 13-2015(Temp), f. 11-13-15, cert. ef. 1-1-16 thru 6-28-16; TSPC 1-2016, f. & cert. ef. 2-10-16

**EPP input on ELL standards:** This rule simply moves the current ELL standards into the new rule division. Staff did not bring any specific issues on this rule in the webinar. The EPP representatives also did not bring up any issues with this rule, except one EPP member suggesting that this could be moved to program standards.

**Staff Response:** No changes to draft rule at this time.

**Fiscal Impact or Cost of Compliance:**
*Other state agencies:* The rule restates existing ELL standard provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to state agency related to this rulemaking.
*Local governments:* The rule restates existing ELL standard provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to local government related to this rulemaking.
*Public:* The rule restates existing ELL standard provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to the public related to this rulemaking.

*Small Business:* The agency does not anticipate small business, as defined by the Oregon Administrative Procedures Act, to be affected by this rulemaking.

584-410-0090 Standard 8: **EPP Partnerships Consortium**—This DRAFT rule combines CAEP standards and TSPC current consortium rule requirements. The combination of provisions is provided as a starting point for discussion.

1. **Purpose:** A consortium is an advisory body to the educator preparation provider (EPP). The purpose of the consortium is to advise the EPP on program development, [TSPC] evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence for licensure, endorsement and specialization programs [CAEP Standard 5.5] for mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements [CAEP Standard 2].
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(2) The consortium must:
(a) Have written by-laws that govern its operation; (TSPC) and
(b) Meet regularly, but no less than twice each year. (TSPC)

(3) The EPP must provide opportunities for the consortium to:
(a) Evaluate programs for improvements and to identify models of excellence; (TSPC and CAEP Standard 5.5)
(b) Provide recommendations on new licensure, endorsement or specialization programs; (TSPC)
(c) Review program activities; (TSPC)
(d) Review annual reports; (TSPC)
(e) Review program modifications; (TSPC)
(f) Establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings; (CAEP Standard 2) and
(g) Make recommendations to the EPP based on review of programs and other relevant information. (TSPC)

(4) The EPP must provide written responses to all recommendations made to the EPP by the consortium. (TSPC)

(1) The EPP must assure that appropriate partners are represented in meeting the following unit standards:
(a) 584-410-0030 Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice
(b) 584-410-0060 Standard 5, Subsection (6): Continuous Improvement: The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the EPP, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.
(c) n the consortium, including but not limited to:

(2) The appropriate partners must include, but are not limited to:
(a) School and community partners; (CAEP Standard 2, CAEP Standard 5.5 and TSPC – TSPC is for community members)
(b) Organizations; (CAEP Standard 2)
(c) Employers and businesses; (CAEP Standard 2 and CAEP Standard 5.5)
(d) Agencies; (CAEP Standard 2)
(e) Districts, and/or EPPs interested in candidate preparation or education; (CAEP Standard 2)
(f) Alumni; (CAEP Standard 5.5)
(g) Practitioners; (CAEP Standard 5.5)
(h) Teachers who are members of their district’s teacher bargaining unit; (TSPC)
(i) Public school administrators; (TSPC)
(j) Under-represented populations; (TSPC)
(k) Faculty from the institution (TSPC), and
(l) Students in the program (TSPC).

(3) The EPP shall report, in the state addendum portion of the Self-Study:
(a) The specific partners involved with assisting the EPP to meet the standards; and
(b) How each partner participated in the EPP activities, decision-making process, or other aspects of the clinical practices, partnerships and continuous improvement efforts.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 342
Stats. Implemented: 342.120 – 342.430; 342.455 – 342.495; 342.553
Hist.:

**EPP feedback on the Consortium:** The EPPs generally would like to use CAEP standards 2 and 5.5 as the method to ensure EPPs have strong partnerships with their communities, instead of having a very specific consortium requirement. By removing the consortium requirement and using CAEP standards 2 and 5.5, the EPPs would have more flexibility in working with partners.

If the Commission decides to keep its own partnership standards, the EPPs suggest to not require a very specific consortium, but rather to require the EPP to partner with certain groups. This way, the Commission can be assured these certain groups will be “at the table” for EPP decisions and policies. The EPP can then report on how they implemented those partnerships, e.g. faculty had school administrators participate in professional development for candidates or representatives of the tribe reviewed the curriculum.

**Staff Response:** Staff has revised the rule to incorporate the EPP suggestions. The revised rule requires EPPs to partner with certain groups in the EPP activities and decision-making process. It also requires EPPs to report on those partnerships in the state addendum to the Self-Study. The Self-Study will be reviewed by Oregon members as part of the joint site visit process and provided to the Commissioners as part of the unit approval process. We will bring this issue to the PAC members at their next meeting.

**Fiscal Impact or Cost of Compliance:**
Other state agencies: The rule eliminates the requirement for consortium and requires the EPP to partner with certain groups in its activities and decision making process. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to state agency related to this rulemaking.
Local governments: The rule eliminates the requirement for consortium and requires the EPP to partner with certain groups in its activities and decision making process. The agency anticipates some districts may incur costs associated with partnering with the Educator Preparation Program. Because this rule allows EPPs to determine what type of partnerships to create, it is difficult for the agency to determine the costs associated with facilitating the partnerships.
Public: The rule eliminates the requirement for consortium and requires the EPP to partner with certain groups in its activities and decision making process. The agency anticipates interested parties, groups, and educator preparation may incur costs associated with partnering with the Educator Preparation Program. Because this rule allows EPPs to determine what type of partnerships to create, it is difficult for the agency to determine the costs associated with facilitating the partnerships.
Small Business: The agency does not anticipate small business, as defined by the Oregon Administrative Procedures Act, to be affected by this rulemaking.

**584-410-0100 Standard 9: Verification of Candidate Recommendations (Field Audit)**

(1) The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) meets the standards for recommending candidates for licensure and endorsements, as provided in 584-400-0130 Candidate Recommendation.
(2) The agency will verify compliance with the standards for candidate recommendations through a field audit of student records.

(3) The field audit will be conducted during the unit review process, in the form and manner adopted by the Commission in the Program Review and Standards Handbook.

**EPP feedback on Field Audits:** The EPPs asked to research what CAEP will do in the field audit area. If CAEP process already includes a field audit, the EPPs asked if the Commission could align with that process.

**Staff Response:** The staff will research the CAEP process on field audits and bring this information to the next Program Approval Committee meeting on October 12, 2017.

**Fiscal Impact or Cost of Compliance:**
- **Other state agencies:** The rule restates existing field audit provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to state agency related to this rulemaking.
- **Local governments:** The rule restates existing field audit provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to local government related to this rulemaking.
- **Public:** The rule restates existing field audit provisions. The agency does not anticipate fiscal impact or cost of compliance to the public related to this rulemaking.

**Small Business:** The agency does not anticipate small business, as defined by the Oregon Administrative Procedures Act, to be affected by this rulemaking.