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Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC)

What is TSPC?
TSPC (the Commission) is responsible for the following areas:

- **Licensure:** The Commission establishes standards for licensure and issues licenses to teachers, administrators, school personnel service specialists and school nurses.
- **Professional Practices:** The Commission maintains and enforces professional standards of competent and ethical conduct.
- **Educator Preparation Programs:** TSPC also adopts standards for, and regularly approves, all colleges and universities in the state that have educator preparation programs.

TSPC's mission statement
To establish, uphold and enforce professional standards of excellence and communicate those standards to the public and educators for the benefit of Oregon’s students.

Statement of assurance
It is the policy of the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission that no person be subjected to discrimination on the basis of race, national origin, religion, sex, age, disability, marital status, or sexual orientation in any program, service or activity for which the Commission is responsible. The Commission will comply with the requirements of state and federal law concerning non-discrimination and will strive by its actions to enhance the dignity and worth of all persons.

Authority
ORS 342.147 authorizes the Commission to establish the standards for educator licensure and recognition of Oregon public educator licensure programs. The Commission has adopted standards in Chapter 584 of the Oregon Administrative Rules. Through enforcement of these standards, TSPC assures the public and Oregon’s PK-12 students that licenses are awarded to those who have met these standards.

*TSPC rule-making process information*

This handbook is designed to assist institutional faculty and on-site program review visiting team members to make the program and unit approval process a positive experience. It is also designed to provide TSPC processes and assist new EPP staff to become familiar with broad licensure and program concepts. This handbook supersedes the Site Visit Manual and the Professional Standards Manual adopted by the Commission in November 2011.

Purpose of handbook
This document is provided to clarify Commission guidelines and processes that are not specifically outlined in rule. In order for EPP staff to have complete understanding of what is required, they need to be familiar with provisions in rule (particularly OAR Chapter 584, Divisions 10, 17, 18, 400, 410, and 420) and the contents of the Handbook.

Additionally, this Handbook provides information and guidance on:

- Licensure processes needed by Education Preparation Providers (EPPs, also referred to as units);
- National (CAEP) accreditation and state (TSPC) approval of EPPs;
- Recognition of licensure, endorsement, and specialization programs (the Program Review Process);
- Site visit information and processes; and
- Annual reports.

**Public Records Requests**
For public records requests, please complete the Public Records Data Request form and return it to the TSPC executive director. To locate the form from the TSPC homepage, select [Publications/Reports] (at the bottom of the left-hand navigation panel) and select the fourth link, [Public Records Request Form].

**Rules Advisory Committee**
TSPC's Rules Advisory Committee is an advisory group to the agency. The RAC reviews draft rules or rule concepts related to program approval, educator licensure, and educator professional practices. The committee has standing representatives and topical representation based on the issue being reviewed. The RAC reviews proposed rules prior to Commission review in order to ensure multiple perspectives are considered.

Information about RAC meetings can be found by going to the TSPC website, select [Rules & Statutes] on the left-hand navigation panel, then select [Click here to access Rules Advisory Committee] at the bottom of the page. The page provides meeting dates (past and present) and agendas. RAC questions can be directed to Dr. Anthony Rosilez (anthony.rosilez@oregon.gov).

**TSPC notifications/subscriptions**
- To sign up for TSPC notifications, go to the TSPC Online Services – Account Setup web page and select the type of subscription you desire.
  - General (TSPC's subscription services): With this selection, you will receive email notification of new publications, news releases (including meeting announcements, for example), and Commission meeting information.
  - Director of Teacher Education: This is the master account holder for the EPP. One person from each institution is assigned to this subscription list. This account is required to submit Program Completion Reports (PCRs). Email Jason Hovey (jason.hovey@oregon.gov) and cc Candace Robbecke (candace.robbecke@oregon.gov) to make changes to this account.
  - Office of Teacher Education: This account is required to submit Program Completion Reports (PCRs) for all of the individuals at an institution who are not the master account holder. Select this option to request a subscription, which will trigger an email to be sent to the EPP’s master account holder to request approval to permit the addition.
- To sign up for or unsubscribe to TSPC news releases and announcements, go to http://eepurl.com/glcHjn.
- To sign up for or unsubscribe to receive rules notices, send an email to TSPC.RuleTestimony@oregon.gov.
- To sign up to receive information periodically provided to EPP staff (newsletters, email from TSPC program staff, etc.), notify Candace Robbecke (candace.robbecke@oregon.gov).

**OACTE membership**
The Oregon Association of Colleges for Teacher Educators (OACTE) maintains their own listserv. Contact OACTE: http://oacte.org for additional information.
### OAICU membership
The Oregon Alliance of Independent Colleges and Universities (OAICU) maintains their own listserv. Contact OAICU: [http://oaicu.org](http://oaicu.org) for additional information.

### TSPC Information At A Glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>For more information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator License Redesign</td>
<td><a href="https://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Administrator-License-Redesign.aspx">https://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Administrator-License-Redesign.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Professional Dev. (APD) form</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Forms_and_Instruct.aspx">http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Forms_and_Instruct.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background check information</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Fingerprinting.aspx">http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Fingerprinting.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2 (See Program Completion Reports)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-3 (request for expedited service)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.tspc.state.or.us/logon.asp?id=c-3">http://www.tspc.state.or.us/logon.asp?id=c-3</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint forms</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Complaint-Forms.aspx">http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Complaint-Forms.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Us</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/contact_us.aspx">http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/contact_us.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) info.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Educator_Programs.aspx">http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Educator_Programs.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic accounts</td>
<td><a href="http://www.tspc.state.or.us/General/account.htm">http://www.tspc.state.or.us/General/account.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eLicensing portal</td>
<td><a href="https://apps.oregon.gov/TSPC/eLicense">https://apps.oregon.gov/TSPC/eLicense</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eLicensing tutorial</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/elicensing.aspx">http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/elicensing.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedited service form (C-3)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.tspc.state.or.us/logon.asp?id=c-3">http://www.tspc.state.or.us/logon.asp?id=c-3</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAQs</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/FAQss.aspx">http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/FAQss.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Fees.aspx">http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Fees.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes</td>
<td>2016 2017 2018 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fingerprint information</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Fingerprinting.aspx">http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Fingerprinting.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First license requirements</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/first-time-license.aspx">http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/first-time-license.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First license supporting documents</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/first-time-next-steps.aspx">http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/first-time-next-steps.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms and instructions</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Forms_and_Instruct.aspx">http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Forms_and_Instruct.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name changes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Instruct_Name_Change.aspx">http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Instruct_Name_Change.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Service Account</td>
<td><a href="http://www.tspc.state.or.us/General/account.htm">http://www.tspc.state.or.us/General/account.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs) f/TSPC</td>
<td><a href="https://secure.sos.state.or.us/oard/displayChapterRules.action?selectedChapter=180">https://secure.sos.state.or.us/oard/displayChapterRules.action?selectedChapter=180</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Revised Statutes (ORSs) f/TSPC</td>
<td><a href="https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/Pages/ORS.aspx">https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/Pages/ORS.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEER form</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Forms_and_Instruct.aspx">http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Forms_and_Instruct.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Units (PDUs)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/PDUs-Continuing.aspx">http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/PDUs-Continuing.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Completion Report (PCR)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.tspc.state.or.us/onlines.asp?group=INST">http://www.tspc.state.or.us/onlines.asp?group=INST</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>For more information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Educator Search</td>
<td><a href="https://apps.oregon.gov/TSPC/eLicense/Search/PublicSearch">https://apps.oregon.gov/TSPC/eLicense/Search/PublicSearch</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognized ed preparation programs</td>
<td><a href="http://www.tspc.state.or.us/programs.asp">http://www.tspc.state.or.us/programs.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign information</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Redesign.aspx">http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Redesign.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal requirements</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/renewal.aspx">http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/renewal.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal supporting documents</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/renewal-next-steps.aspx">http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/renewal-next-steps.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td><a href="https://secure.sos.state.or.us/oard/displayChapterRules.action?selectedChapter=180">https://secure.sos.state.or.us/oard/displayChapterRules.action?selectedChapter=180</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutes</td>
<td><a href="https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/Pages/ORS.aspx">https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/Pages/ORS.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions (notifications)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.tspc.state.or.us/account_setup.asp">http://www.tspc.state.or.us/account_setup.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/testing.aspx">http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/testing.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II information</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Educator_Programs.aspx">http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Educator_Programs.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcripts</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tspc.transcripts@oregon.gov">tspc.transcripts@oregon.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSPC staff listing</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/contact_us_directory.aspx">http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/contact_us_directory.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Common Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAEP</td>
<td>Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>Teacher Standards and Practices Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP</td>
<td>Educator Preparation Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL</td>
<td>English for Speakers of Other Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAR</td>
<td>Oregon Administrative Rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORS</td>
<td>Oregon Revised Statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>Specialized Professional Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSPC</td>
<td>Teacher Standards and Practices Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guide to OAR Divisions**

**General:**
- Division 1 (Procedural rules);
- Division 5 (Definitions).

**Licensure rules:**
Licensure rules address what an educator is qualified to teach and how a candidate can attain the licensure, endorsement, or specialization.
- Division 21 (School Nurse Certificates);
- Division 23 (Charter School Registration);
- Division 44 (Personnel Service Licenses);
- Division 46 (Administrative);
- Division 70 (Personnel Licenses);
• Division 80 (Administrators);
• Division 200 (Teaching License General Provisions);
• Division 210 (Teaching Licenses);
• Division 220 (Endorsements);
• Division 225 (Specializations);
• Division 230 (CTE Teaching Licenses);
• Division 235 (School Administrator Licenses);
• Division 255 (Professional Development).

Program rules:
Program rules define the standards that must be met for an EPP to offer a program.
• Division 10 (Procedures for Approval);
• Division 17 (Standards for Unit Approval);
• Division 18 (Standards for Administrator and Personnel Service Programs); and
• Division 400 (State Approval for EPPs);
• Division 410 (State Standards for EPPs);
• Division 420 (Program Standards for Licensure, Endorsement, and Specialization programs).

Professional Practices rules:
These rules provide rules for professional practices matters.
• Division 19 (Rules for investigations / hearings);
• Division 20 (Standards for competent and ethical performance of Oregon educators);
• Division 50 (Commission Sanction).

* * * * * LICENSURE INFORMATION * * * * *

Licensure Processes

Most information about licensure processing can be found on TSPC’s web pages. Key licensure pages include:
• Homepage: https://www.oregon.gov/tspc
• First License Requirements: This page provides a broad overview of requirements necessary for the first TSPC license.
• First License: Supporting Documents: This page identifies the specific documents that must be submitted for each license type.

Contacting TSPC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First point of contact for EPPs</th>
<th>Policy matters: Wayne Strickland</th>
<th>Policy matters: Candace Robbecke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Wayne Strickland | candace.robbecke@oregon.gov
| Candace Robbecke | wayne.strickland@oregon.gov
| candace.robbecke@oregon.gov
| wayne.strickland@oregon.gov |
| Fingerprinting and background clearance questions | Joanne Kandle (Mon.-Wed.) Connie Bock (Thurs.-Fri.) | Finger.Printing@oregon.gov |
| Program Completion Report (PCR) technical questions | Candace Robbecke | candace.robbecke@oregon.gov |

*Note: Please cc: Candace Robbecke when directly contacting Joanne, Connie, or Jason.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate questions about anything application-related:</th>
<th>TSPC’s Public Service Representative Team</th>
<th>General questions: <a href="mailto:contact.tspc@oregon.gov">contact.tspc@oregon.gov</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• eLicensing</td>
<td></td>
<td>eLicensing (technical questions, entry errors, etc.): <a href="mailto:online.tspc@oregon.gov">online.tspc@oregon.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Application status</td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrator License questions: <a href="mailto:AdminLicense.tspc@oregon.gov">AdminLicense.tspc@oregon.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Documents received</td>
<td>Or by phone, M-F, 8 am to 5 pm: (503) 378-3586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate questions about applications or licenses</th>
<th>General questions: <a href="mailto:contact.tspc@oregon.gov">contact.tspc@oregon.gov</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eLicensing (technical questions, entry errors, etc.): <a href="mailto:online.tspc@oregon.gov">online.tspc@oregon.gov</a></td>
<td>Administrator License questions: <a href="mailto:AdminLicense.tspc@oregon.gov">AdminLicense.tspc@oregon.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or by phone, M-F, 8 am to 5 pm: (503) 378-3586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate support letters (e.g. to show a candidate’s progress towards completing an education preparation program)</th>
<th>email to: <a href="mailto:contact.tspc@oregon.gov">contact.tspc@oregon.gov</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Submitting information to TSPC**
Candidates should only send supporting materials once. If they are mailed, they should not also be faxed and/or emailed. Be sure any correspondence includes the candidate’s name and other identifier: Date of birth, last four of the Social Security Number or TSPC account number.

Candidate support letters, such as those needed to show a candidate’s progress towards completing an educator preparation program, should be sent via email to contact.tspc@oregon.gov.

**Course-to-Endorsement Catalogue**
This catalogue provides guidelines for staffing for the 2017-18 school year. Information can be found online at: [http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Licensing/License_Guide.aspx](http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Licensing/License_Guide.aspx)

Feedback is welcome and should be directed to Elizabeth Keller (elizabeth.keller@oregon.gov).

**eLicensing** ([http://apps.oregon.gov/tspc/elicense](http://apps.oregon.gov/tspc/elicense))
Candidates use eLicensing to complete two transactions:
- Apply for a clinical practices clearance; and
- Submit applications for licensure upon program completion.

Clinical practices clearance instructions
- Candidates must select [Sign Up] to create a username and password.
- Unless they already hold a TSPC license, they would not successfully complete [Record Connect]. They would simply need to select [OK] to continue.
- For license type, they should select [Clinical Practices].

Note: As of late summer 2017, Hotmail.com addresses may not be receiving email notices from Oregon.gov, which is the eLicensing platform. For this reason, we ask that EPPs discourage candidates from providing a Hotmail.com email address for eLicensing.

Program completers applying for licensure
- If a candidate has completed a clinical practice clearance, they will use the same username and password to access eLicensing.
- From eLicensing, they select [Submit New Application].
- Please instruction students to do two things to avoid being charged the incorrect fee:
  1. On the License History Questionnaire screen: Select the top checkbox;
  2. On the Tell us about your license history screen: Select [+ Add a License] to show a record for clinical practice clearance. The dates selected are not important, but the candidates must enter the record.

Note: These instructions are also included on the application itself. Failure to follow these instructions will result in an overpayment. Fees paid in eLicensing are not refundable.

Endorsements: OAR 584, Division 220
Endorsements indicate the content area(s) for which the teacher is authorized to teach. OAR 584, Division 220 provides information specific to the various endorsements offered in Oregon. This area of rule provides general information about endorsements (in -0010 and -0015). The remainder of the rule provides standards specific to the content areas.

Adding endorsements and specializations

Note: This section is for candidates who wish to add endorsements and specializations to their licenses. For information on requesting the Commission to create a new specialization, see the New Specializations Criteria section, below.

Please let candidates know endorsements and specializations will not automatically be added to their license. Candidates must also apply in eLicensing to add the endorsement or specialization. If this is done at renewal, there is no additional charge for the added endorsement or specialization.

Pre-service candidates: OAR 584, Division 420
- Pre-service teacher candidates must complete a Commission-recognized Preliminary Teaching License program in one or more endorsement area(s).
- Providers may only recommend candidates who have successfully completed their Commission-
recognized programs.

- The rules for adding endorsements to existing licenses, provided below, are not applicable for pre-service candidates and may not be used with pre-service candidates.

**Licensed Oregon educators: OAR 584, Division 220**

The rules for a licensed educator to add an endorsement to an existing license are as follows:

- Determine if a program is required:
  - A program is required for:
    - Art;*
    - Drama;
    - Elementary – Multiple Subjects;
    - English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL);
    - Library Media;
    - Music;*
    - Physical Education (PE);*
    - Reading Intervention;
    - Special Education (all areas); and
    - World Languages: Russian and Japanese.

*Note:* Due to the difficulty that licensed candidates have experienced in finding advanced programs in Art, Music, and PE, the Commission is temporarily allowing licensed candidates to complete initial Art, Music, and PE programs until June 30, 2020. The EPP may waive any initial course requirements that are not needed for the licensed candidates. Any waived courses must be reported in the annual report.

- Educators who wish to add an endorsement for any of the above areas must:
  - Contact an EPP with a Commission-approved endorsement program in the area they wish to add.
  - Providers may only recommend candidates who have successfully completed their Commission-recognized programs.

- If a program is not required, next steps depend on the type of license held by the educator.
  - Preliminary Teaching License holders (not pre-service candidates): The licensed educator with one of these credentials must:
    - Complete and pass a content test. However, some endorsements permit completion of alternative coursework in lieu of the content test. See OAR 584, Division 220 for specific endorsement rules.
    - AND
    - Provide proof of pedagogy skills. This can be done by completing one of the following:
      - A pedagogy course (verified through official transcripts);
      - OR
      - A supervised practicum (verified by a school district on a PEER form);
      - OR
      - A program (verified through a Program Completion Report (PCR)).
  - Professional, Legacy, or Teacher Leader license holders (not pre-service candidates or Preliminary Teaching License holders): The licensed educator with one of these credentials must pass a content test. **Note:** Some endorsements permit completion of alternative coursework in lieu of the content test. See OAR 584, Division 220 for specific endorsement rules.
Fingerprint information
Comprehensive fingerprinting and background check Information is available online at: http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Fingerprinting.aspx.

International issues
If you recommend candidates who earned their bachelor’s degree outside of the US AND the candidate will not be awarded a master’s degree when they complete their program, the candidate must submit an official foreign transcript evaluation with their application for the Preliminary License. Commission rule requires that TSPC has evidence of at least a bachelor’s degree earned on file.

The foreign transcript evaluation must:
- Be a course-by-course analysis; and
- Verify that the degree was earned at an institution equivalent to a regionally accredited US institution.

TSPC accepts foreign transcript evaluations from most agencies who are members on the National Association of Credential Evaluation Services (NACES) list: http://www.naces.org/members.html.

If a provider wishes to use an evaluation company that is not on the NACES list, a request must be made to the Director of Licensure for approval. Such request should be sent to the Liaison to Higher Education (candace.robbecke@oregon.gov) to process.

For information related to international field experiences, see the Clinical Practices section of this handbook.

Online Service Accounts
- New EPP staff who will submit Program Completion Reports must set up an account in order to make electronic submissions.
- Training information: http://www.tspc.state.or.us/General/account.htm

Program Completion Reports (584-400-0160)

Program Completion Reports (PCRs)
EPPs must submit a PCR for all candidates in a Commission-recognized initial teacher preparation program and who, regardless of whether or not they intend to obtain an Oregon license:
- Have completed their licensure coursework;
- Passed their required assessment(s); and
- Met all other program requirements (e.g. edTPA).

EPPs cannot recommend candidates to any other state unless they have been recommended to TSPC (through a PCR).

Recency (584-400-0160 [6])
Completers:
Effective May 1, 2018, EPP recommendations for licensure, endorsements, or specializations are valid for three years from submission of the PCR. Candidates who apply for licensure, endorsement(s), and/or specialization(s) more than three years after the Program Completion Report submission date must request a new Program Completion Report from their EPP. If the EPP did not submit a PCR for the candidate, TSPC does not consider the candidate to be a completer and the recency limitations do not apply. Therefore, it is within the discretion of the EPP to recommend the candidate.
Note: In accordance with OAR 584-400-0160, the EPP must submit program completion reports for all completers in preliminary teaching, preliminary administrator, preliminary school counseling, preliminary school psychology, and preliminary school social worker programs by September 30 for the previous academic year.

Non-completers:
With one exception, TSPC will accept test scores for non-completers even if the test required has changed, so long as it was the test required when the examinee completed the test.

The exception is the Elementary Multiple Subjects Examination (MSE), because it did not cover reading. The MSE was allowed until September 1, 2014. Since then, the NES Elementary Education Subtests I and II have been required and the MSE has not been accepted.

Program confirmations
EPP staff occasionally need to submit letters to confirm a candidate is in a program (for Licenses for Conditional Assignment, for example). These letters should be written to TSPC and include the candidate’s name and TSPC ID number or the last four of their Social Security Number. The letter should be emailed to: contact.tspc@oregon.gov.

Public Educator Search
The Public Educator Search allows a search of public educators with active and valid licenses by account number, first name, or last name: https://apps.oregon.gov/TSPC/eLicense/Search/PublicSearch

Restricted Teaching Licenses (584-210-0100)
This type of license requires district sponsorship. Information required from the district is provided in rule.

Q.: I need to submit a letter on the progress a candidate has made towards qualifying for a Preliminary Teaching License. How do I get the letter to TSPC?
A.: The letter should be sent via email to contact.tspc@oregon.gov.

Q. Can the holder of a Restricted Teaching License teach in more than one district on the license?
A. Yes, but the additional district(s) must submit a letter to indicate sponsorship. This includes licenses that may be used to substitute teach.

Q. Are Restricted Licenses renewable?
A. No. In elicensing, applicants must select [Submit New Application] to request that this type of license be reissued. Restricted Teaching Licenses are not eligible for renewal but they can be reissued at the request of the sponsoring district, as long as the applicant meets the criteria to reissue the license.

Specializations: OAR 584, Division 225
These are optional indications of specialized expertise or preparation in areas the Commission recognize as “added value” on a license. A specialization indicates the educator has demonstrated exceptional knowledge, skills, and related abilities in that area. A specialization must meet standards set by the Commission. Specializations are not required to teach or work in the specialized area.

Most specializations require candidate completion of a program. The exception is the Bilingual Specialization, which requires a test. See the testing section of this handbook for additional information.
New Specializations Criteria
In order to have a new specialization considered by the Commission, the requesting EPP must demonstrate that the requested specialization meets the following criteria:

- Promotes K-12 student learning.
- Partners with a school district to develop the proposed specialization.
- Aligns with the goals of the Commission, Governor, and Legislature.
- Aligns with equity goals and standards.
- Has sufficient demand in the field. *(The proponents of the proposed specialization can demonstrate at least four to five school districts want to hire educators with, or encourage current educators to obtain, the specialization.)*
- Is valuable to educators as a career development pathway.
- Strengthens partnerships between the EPP and school districts and/or other partners.
- Is value-added to a license, beyond the endorsement for a related area (i.e., the proposed content for the specialization is not able to be embedded into an existing endorsement program).

Specialization testing information
Testing information for specializations can be found in the *Testing* section of this handbook.

**Student teachers as substitutes** *(OAR 584-400-0140)*
The rules for student teaching placements are provided in OAR 584-400-0140 (6)(g)-(h). EPP staff are encouraged to review the rule and discuss the limitations around student teachers as substitutes with partner school districts.

One of the limitations in rule is a requirement that the candidate holds a Restricted Teaching License. TSPC considers a Restricted Substitute License as a type of license allowed for this requirement.

Another requirement is that the school district must notify the EPP if they assign a candidate as a substitute teacher during the 15-week student teaching placement. If the EPP is not informed of the candidate substitute teaching, the time does not count toward the candidate’s student teaching requirement.

---

**PROGRAM INFORMATION**

---

**Starting a New Unit in Oregon**

See also: OAR 584, Division 10

**General information**
Licensure programs include teaching, administrator, school counseling, school psychology, and school social work.

**First-time unit approval requirements** *(OAR 584-10-0015)*

**Pre-condition steps**
A college or university seeking first-time unit approval in Oregon must complete the following pre-condition steps:

- Obtain full regional accreditation from the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities.
or another appropriate institutional regional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education;

- Obtain approval by the Oregon Office of Degree Authorization or its equivalent authorizing body, and if an Oregon public institution, by the Oregon Higher Education Coordinating Commission or its equivalent authorizing body;
- Provide a letter from the institution’s administrative body recognizing and identifying the professional educational unit as having responsibility and authority for the preparation of licensed educators;
- Provide evidence that a dean, director or chair has been officially designated as head of the unit and is assigned the authority and responsibility for its overall administration and operation;
- Provide written policies and procedures that will guide the operations of the unit, including, but not limited to: student handbooks; procedures on admission; program waivers; and student appeal rights;
- Provide the unit’s conceptual framework that establishes the shared vision for a unit’s efforts in preparing educators to work in P-12 schools and provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, leadership, service, and unit accountability. Additional information is provided in the Conceptual Framework subsection in this section;
- Provide evidence that the unit regularly monitors and evaluates its operations, the quality of its offerings, the performance of its candidates, and the effectiveness of its graduates; and
- Provide evidence that the unit has published criteria for admission to and exit from all initial teacher preparation and advanced programs and can provide summary reports of candidate performance at exit from the program.

EPPs seeking first-time approval to offer any educator preparation licensure program must demonstrate that the unit proposing the program has satisfied the pre-conditions set forth above. Once these steps have been completed, the provider must request to appear before the Commission for approval of pre-conditions. To request appearance before the Commission for this step, contact the TSPC Liaison to Higher Education (Candace.Robbecke@Oregon.gov).

Program review and unit approval steps

Once the pre-conditions have been approved by the Commission, the provider may apply to become an approved educator preparation provider (EPP) in Oregon. To do so, the EPP must:

- Formally request state approval of the Unit. The Executive Director or designee reviews the petition and makes a recommendation to the Commission. The Commission provides a finding on state approval of the Unit.
- Obtain state recognition of all licensure, endorsement, and/or specialization programs they wish to offer.

To formally request state approval of the unit or obtain program recognition, contact the TSPC Liaison to Higher Education (Candace.Robbecke@Oregon.gov).

Conceptual Framework

Note to current EPPs: This sections is for new units, for whom a Conceptual Framework is still required.

The conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for a unit’s efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P-12 schools. The framework provides a direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is
knowledge-based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

Faculty members are expected to collaborate with members of their professional community in developing a conceptual framework that establishes the vision for the unit and its programs. The conceptual framework provides the basis for coherence among curriculum, instruction, field experiences, clinical practice, assessment, and evaluation. The framework makes the unit’s professional commitments and professional dispositions explicit. It reflects the unit’s commitment to diversity and cultural competency, and the preparation of educators who help all students learn. It reflects the unit’s commitment to the integration of technology to enhance candidate and student learning. The conceptual framework also aligns the professional and state standards with candidate proficiencies expected by the unit and programs for the preparation of educators.

The conceptual framework includes the following aligned structural elements:

- Vision and mission of the institution and unit;
- Philosophy, purposes, goals and institutional standards of the unit;
- Knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and educational policies that drive the work of the unit;
- Candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, including proficiencies associated with cultural competency and technology, that are aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional standards; and
- A summarized description of the unit’s assessment system.

**Focused Site Visit**
After a new EPP is approved, a focused site visit is conducted two years later.

---

**Program Review and Unit Approval Processes: Overview**

**Program Review and Unit Approval: At A Glance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate Dates</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Review and Recognition Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPA option:</strong></td>
<td>Program review reports (including SPA reports and State-Specific Unit-Level Standards Reports) are required as provided in the Program Review flowchart approved by the Commission in April 2019, item 5.1j (1), which is by this reference incorporated into this handbook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAEP requires these be done three years before the site visit. TSPC requires these to be submitted with other submitted program reports.</td>
<td>The institution submits electronic program reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialty accredits option:</strong></td>
<td>See the Program Review Processes section of this publication for additional information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSPC requires these be submitted with other submitted program reports.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State review option:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 2 years before the site visit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate Dates</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Approximately 5 months later     | TSPC provides the EPP with Program Review Reports, which include a Program Review Team Summary of AFIs and Program Recommendations and a Program Review Report for each report submitted by the EPP for state review.  
**Note:** Information from the Program Review Reports provide information for the subsequent site visit. |
| Approximately 1 month prior to the scheduled Commission meeting | The institution has an opportunity to submit an optional Institutional Rejoinder. Information from the rejoinder provides additional information for the Executive Director’s recommendations and for the subsequent site visit. The purpose of the rejoinder is to clarify or dispute findings. New evidence of meeting standards may not be included in the report. |
| At the next scheduled Commission meeting | A Commission docket item and Executive Director’s Program Review Recommendations report are submitted to the Commission for consideration. The EPP’s program review reports, Addendum (if provided), and (optional) Institutional Rejoinder are provided to Commissioners on the secure server for review and decision. |

### Site Visit (Unit Approval) Process

| 18 months prior to the visit | The EPP petitions the Commission for continuing state approval of the Unit and to identify specific dates for the site visit. EPPs coordinate with their CAEP associate and TSPC to identify site visit dates.  
The EPP requests the Self-Study Report (SSR) template from CAEP. |
| 9-12 months before the scheduled visit | The EPP submits a Self-Study Report in AIMS.  
*Unit review reports are required as provided in the Unit Review flowchart approved by the Commission in April 2019, item 5.1j (2), which is by this reference incorporated into this handbook.* |
| 5 months before the site visit | The site visit team provides a Formative Feedback Report, which provides written feedback on the content and format of their SSR, feedback on the evidence in the report, and/or requests for clarification of evidence. |
| Site visit                     | The site visit team conducts the site visit.                                                                                                                                                  |
| No later than 30 calendar days following the site visit | Comprehensive findings are submitted in AIMS as a written Site Visit Report.                                                                                                                       |
Approximate Dates | Actions
--- | ---
Within 30 days of receipt of the report | The EPP submits an optional Institutional Rejoinder to the findings in the Site Visit Report. If the EPP does not rejoin any of the findings, a letter must be submitted to acknowledge receipt of the report.
The following April or October | The CAEP Accreditation Council makes an accreditation decision.
Next scheduled Commission meeting | The Commission considers recommendations regarding unit approval based on the Executive Director’s Unit Review Recommendations, which encompasses the CAEP recommendation, the Site Visit Report, and the optional EPP Institutional Rejoinder.

**Transitioning to national accreditation (e.g. CAEP)**

Until 2015, national accreditation was optional. Currently, due to the passage of the 2015 Legislature’s [SB 78](https://leg.or.us/2015/rcs/Chk584/Chk58478/) and the 2018 Legislature’s [SB 1520](https://leg.or.us/2018/rcs/Chk584/Chk5841520/), all units must be nationally accredited by July 1, 2025. EPPs must receive both state approval and national accreditation by this date.

Joint review teams are created for joint site visits, which include both CAEP and state representatives. Reports issued follow the national format. Oregon’s state-specific unit-level items are reported using the State-Specific Unit-Level Standards template. The completed template is due to TSPC when the EPP submits its Self-Study Report to CAEP. The report should be sent via email to the TSPC Deputy Director (Trent.Danowski@Oregon.gov).

To help EPPs manage the transition to national accreditation, the Commission adopted transition rules ([OAR 584-400-0015](https://www.leg.state.or.us/laws/584-Series/584-400-0015/)).

**Program Review and Recognition Process**

See also: [OAR 584, Divisions 18, 400, 410, and 420](https://www.leg.state.or.us/laws/584-Series/)

**General Information for all Program Review Options**

**Purpose of Program Review**

Program review is how EPPs demonstrate program efficacy. Program review is an essential component of the overall accreditation process that provides evidence that candidates have a strong foundation of content and pedagogical knowledge. All EPPs seeking state approval and national accreditation must complete the program review process. Units that do not have state recognition of a program cannot recommend candidates for licenses, endorsements, or specializations in those areas. Note: Once approved, specializations do not go through the program review process. They are reported on in the annual report. See the Annual Report section of this publication for additional information.

The program review process occurs prior to a self-study and site visit. EPPs may use the results of program review as evidence toward meeting applicable national standards.

The program review process determines whether an endorsement or licensure program can demonstrate candidates’ mastery of the state program standards.
The program review process is also used to determine whether candidate performance on the assessments is appropriate to demonstrate mastery of the program’s subject matter.

In addition, program review documentation is used in the unit approval process. The program review process provides site visit team members with information they need to determine whether candidates completing recognized programs demonstrate required competencies.

Finally, program review is used to ensure program designs meet TSPC program standards. The standards required for Oregon program review are state-specific standards and CAEP Standard 1 (candidate data). Standards required for unit approval are CAEP Standards 1-5 and state-specific standards. Oregon program standards are provided in [OAR 584, Division 420 and Division 220](#). Additional information on standards can be found in the CAEP and state-specific standards sections of this handbook.

Note: The complete review cycle involves two separate processes: State recognition of licensure and endorsement programs (program review) and unit approval (site visits / unit review).

**Timelines**

The first step in the overall review process is program review. Timelines are determined based on the unit’s site visit date and the type of program review selected by the EPP (see Program Review Options, below).

The Commission determines the amount of time allowed for the program review process. General timelines are:

- **New program or unit:** When a new program is recognized or a unit is approved, a focused program review or site review is conducted two years after implementation.
- **Established EPPs:** Site visits generally occur every seven years.

**What is included in program review?**

Program review reports are required as provided in the Program Review flowchart approved by the Commission in [April 2019, item 5.1j (1)](#), which is by this reference incorporated into this handbook.

EPPs are required to include the following for the program review process:

- All on-campus, educator licensure and endorsement programs;
- All off-campus educator licensure and endorsement programs;
- All online educator licensure and endorsement programs; and
- Any combination of on-campus, off-campus, or online educator licensure and endorsement programs.

Note: Specializations are not included in program review. They are part of the annual report process.

**Program Review Options**

EPPs select a program review method(s) to demonstrate their programs meet content standards. New CAEP applicants select the program review method(s) at Phase II of the application process.
Program review options are provided in the Oregon/CAEP Partnership Agreement (originally signed 2013 and renewed 2018) and OAR 584-400-0015:

- SPA Program Review;
- Specialty accreditor review; and/or
- State Review.

Information about each option is provided below.

It is up to the EPP to decide which option(s) to pursue for each of their programs. For instance, an EPP with 10 programs may choose the SPA review option for one program, a specialty accreditor review for one program, and state review for the remaining programs. If a unit submits a SPA and/or specialty accreditor program review in any area, state program review is waived for that area. SPA and/or specialty accreditor program review results must be submitted as part of the accreditation process.

Once the decision is made:

- The EPP must list the review option selected for each program in AIMS. Additional information about AIMS is provided in the CAEP section of this publication.
- EPPs may use the evidence provided through program review to meet some elements of national accreditation (e.g. CAEP Standard 1).
- Based on the review option(s) selected in AIMS, on-site reviewers look for the evidence in the form of either:
  - SPA reports;
  - Specialty accreditor reports; or
  - State program reports.

**National Recognition through the Specialized Professional Association (SPA option)**

This is the process by which CAEP, in collaboration with its specialized professional associations (SPAs), assesses the quality of programs offered by EPPs.

CAEP accepts program reports during two review cycles each year:

- Spring (due by March 15); and
- Fall (due by September 15).

**SPA submissions:**

- Templates are built in AIMS. Each time a program wishes to submit a SPA report, a request for a shell/template is made through AIMS. CAEP staff create the shell, which the provider uses to submit a report, along with the required documentation.
- The submitted report is used by SPA reviewers to conduct a review, provide feedback, and provide National Recognition decisions.
- States and programs are notified about the SPA decision automatically through AIMS. On-site reviewers also have access to these reports.
- After the EPP submits program reports to CAEP, they will receive a Recognition Report from CAEP. See the CAEP section (AIMS, Recognition reports) of this publication for information on how to access this report.
- Results are provided in a Recognition Report as:
  - Nationally Recognized;
  - Nationally Recognized with Conditions;
  - Further Development Required;
Nationally Recognized with Probation; or
Not Nationally Recognized.

- Comprehensive information is available from CAEP for this option. See: Guidelines on Program Review with National Recognition Using Specialized Professional Association (SPA) Standards (January 2017).
- State-specific program-review items:
  - EPPs that complete SPA reviews submit a state addendum to their SPA program reports to demonstrate how the program meets Oregon’s state-specific program items.
  - For more information, see the state-specific standards section of this handbook.
- EPPs submit SPA reports along with their other program reports due as part of the state recognition process.
- SPA reports are included with other program reports when they go to the Commission for state recognition.
- SPA reports are required as provided in the Program Review flowchart approved by the Commission in April 2019, item 5.1j (1), which is by this reference incorporated into this handbook.

**Specialty accreditor submissions:**
- Specialty accreditors approved by the Commission include those listed in the current Directory of CHEA-Recognized Organizations.
- EPPs will be approved to follow specialty accreditor processes for SPAs that are applying to become specialty accreditors if:
  - The SPA requires site visits as part of their accreditation process; and
  - They are approved by the Program Approval Committee.
- NASP (National Association of School Psychologists) was approved in this manner by the PAC at their October meeting, as reported to the Commission in the PAC chair report at the November 2019 meeting.
- State-specific program-review items:
  - EPPs that complete specialty accreditor reviews must submit a report that demonstrates how the program meets Oregon’s state-specific program items.
  - For more information, see the state-specific standards section of this handbook.
- EPPs submit specialty accreditor reports along with their other program reports due as part of the state recognition process.
- Specialty accreditor reports are included with other program reports when they go to the Commission for state recognition.
- Specialty accreditor reports are required as provided in the Program Review flowchart approved by the Commission in April 2019, item 5.1j (1), which is by this reference incorporated into this handbook.

**State Program Review: General Information**

When the state program review process is selected, the process is handled entirely by TSPC using Commission timelines, standards, requirements, and protocols. The EPP must coordinate with CAEP to provide them with the program review documentation they require.

**Program report submissions**

EPPs that select the state program review option must use the TSPC Program Report template.

Program reports will be assessed by a program review team based on the Program Review Rubric in this handbook. See the next section for additional information about the rubric.
EPPs must submit SPA reports and/or specialty accreditor reports at the same time they submit program reports for state review. Program reports (including SPA reports and specialty accreditor reports) are required as provided in the Program Review flowchart approved by the Commission in April 2019, item 5.1[1], which is by this reference incorporated into this handbook.

State Program Review Process

Program review team process
This section provides a step-by-step overview of the program review team process.

- A program review team is convened for the EPP’s program review.
- Individuals who have received CAEP site visitor training are selected to serve as program review team members. Other individuals may also be asked to serve in this capacity, if needed; however, the intention is to utilize the same team members for program review and site visits, where possible, and CAEP requires site visitors to be CAEP trained.
- A program review team chair is identified for each program review team.
- TSPC staff provide program review team members with program review training, in order to assure consistency of practices.
- The EPP electronically submits program reports to the TSPC Liaison to Higher Education via Dropbox, SharePoint Online, by website links, etc. All program report documentation, including hyperlinked documents, must be provided to TSPC on a thumb drive when the program reports are submitted.
- The TSPC lead staff member provides the EPP’s submitted program reports to team members, along with the Program Review Rubric (included in this Handbook, below), and a Program Report State Team Template (Template).
- In most cases, all team members review all program reports; however, team members are only required to complete the Template for assigned reports, as determined by the team chair. A minimum of two team members (primary and secondary) are assigned to complete the Template for each report. The primary reviewer provides a draft analysis for each section of the report. Completed templates are returned to the TSPC staff lead, who compiles the primary and secondary reviews and identifies areas for discussion. The focus of the team discussions are on areas where items rated by reviewers were marked as partially met or not met and where the primary and secondary reviewers had differing opinions.
- Program review team members and the TSPC staff lead meet virtually to talk through areas for discussion and develop recommendations for the Commission.
- Review team members, through the team chair, may optionally communicate with the EPP if they wish to do so in order to resolve matters they believe would be easily addressed by the EPP.
- If the review team requests additional information from the EPP, the EPP must submit supplemental information in writing and it will be considered the Program Report Addendum report(s).
- The following recommendations will be used for recognition of the EPPs’ individual licensure or endorsement programs:
  - **State recognition**: The preponderance of the evidence indicates the licensure or endorsement program fully meets the program review standards.
  - **Recognition with conditions**: The preponderance of the evidence indicates the licensure or endorsement program has met the program review standards but conditions on the
recognition are required, such as the unit must provide additional information about the program in its annual report.

- **Non-approval**: The preponderance of the evidence indicates the licensure or endorsement program has not met the program review standards and should not receive state recognition.

“The preponderance of the evidence” is determined by the program review team chair, in consultation with the TSPC staff lead, after an evaluation of the “met,” “partially met,” and “unmet” designations for each rubric item, as noted below.

- The team chair and TSPC staff lead work together to generate the program review reports, which include a summary report of AFIs and review team recommendations, as well as one report for each EPP program. Team members have an opportunity to provide feedback on the draft program reports.
- After review of the feedback from team members and the EPP (for factual feedback only), the team chair, with the assistance of the TSPC staff lead, finalizes the program reports.
- The program review team’s final reports are sent to the EPP.
- The EPP is provided an opportunity to submit a Program Report Institutional Rejoinder.
- The TSPC Executive Director accepts or rejects any part or the entirety of the program review team’s final reports and develops Executive Director Recommendations, which include a Commission docket item and an Executive Director’s Program Review Recommendations. At the next Commission meeting, these items are submitted for Commission review with the EPP’s program reports, the EPP’s program report addendum report(s) (if any), the program review team’s final reports, and the EPP’s (optional) Institutional Rejoinder for consideration of State Recognition of Programs.
  - Public documents include the docket item and the Executive Director’s Recommendations.
  - The remaining items are placed on the Commission’s secure server.

**Program Review Rubric**

Program review teams use the rubric below to determine if an EPP’s licensure or endorsement program has met the Commission’s standards for state recognition. Where rules have been newly revised, describe how the previous requirements were met and the plan for meeting the new requirements.

**Background:**
Rubric development information is available on pages 4-5 of June 2017 Commission [Item 6.3](#).

**Program description:**
The purpose of this section is for the EPP to provide basic information about the program (e.g. Elementary – Multiple Subjects, ESOL, or Counseling program). This section is not intended to solicit basic information about the educator preparation provider. Note: The EPP might consider how they would describe the program to perspective students in the catalogue.

The EPP must provide basic program information, including:
- The licensure and/or endorsement program information is indicated, using TSPC’s license and endorsement names cross-referenced, if needed, to the EPP’s program names, as provided in the “What to report” subsection of this handbook.
  - Met: The licensure and/or endorsement program information is provided.
• Partially Met: The license and/or endorsement program information was provided; however, some incompletions and/or weaknesses were found.
• Not met: The licensure and/or endorsement program information is not provided.

• FOR SINGLE-SUBJECT CONTENT AREA PROGRAM (AKA SECONDARY PROGRAMS) REPORTS ONLY: The EPP provided all of the single-subject endorsement areas that are offered.¹
  o Met: All single-subject content areas are indicated.
  o Partially Met: Single-subject content areas are noted; however, some incompletions and/or weaknesses were found.
  o Not met: All initial endorsement areas are not indicated.
  o N/A: Not applicable.

• IF THE REPORT INCLUDES MULTIPLE PROGRAM LEVELS (GRADUATE, UNDERGRADUATE, AND/OR POST-GRADUATE), AND/OR PRE-SERVICE AND IN-SERVICE OFFERINGS: The description clearly identifies how the offerings vary between one another. Example: How does the undergraduate program differ from the graduate program? How does the pre-service program differ from the in-service program?
  o Met: The report clearly identifies how offerings vary between one another.
  o Partially met: The report provides some information about how offerings vary between one another; however, some incompletions and/or weaknesses were found.
  o Not met: The report does not identify how offerings vary between the single-subject areas, program levels, and/or initial and advanced offerings.
  o N/A: Not applicable.

• A general description of the program is provided (e.g. history of the program, special recognitions, etc.).
  o Met: A general description of the program is provided.
  o Partially Met: A general description of the program is provided; however, some incompletions and/or weaknesses were found.
  o Not met: A general description of the program is not provided.

• The name of the school or college where the program is housed is indicated. (Example: College of Education, School of Music, School of Social Work)

• The degree awarded is indicated, if applicable.
  o Met: The degree awarded is provided.
  o Not met: The degree awarded is not provided.
  o N/A: Not applicable.

• A summary is provided of any major or minor modifications made since the previous state recognition of the program or the provider indicated there were no major or minor modifications.
  o Met: A description is provided of all relevant major or minor modifications made since the previous state recognition of the program.
  o Partially met: Some of the description information is provided; however, some information is missing.
  o Not met: Modification information is not provided.

Program delivery and variants:
• The standard delivery of the program is identified, as well as variations to the delivery. Examples of variations include: Alternate locations, weekday/weekend offerings, online offerings, or hybrid programs, etc.
  o Met: All program standard delivery and variations information is provided.

¹ If this report is for the EPP’s Preliminary Teaching License: Single-subject content areas, the endorsement areas offered within the Preliminary Teaching License program must be listed separately in the report. It must be clear how the various program offerings are similar and how they differ from one another.
- Partially met: Some of the program standard delivery and variations information is provided; however, some information is missing.
- Not met: The program standard delivery and variations information is not provided.
- N/A: There are no program delivery variants.
- If more than one delivery option is offered, the differences between the delivery options are described. It is indicated if this section is not applicable.
  - Met: A description is provided for differences between delivery options.
  - Partially met: Some description is provided for differences between delivery options; however, some incompletions and/or weaknesses were found.
  - Not met: A description of program delivery option differences is not provided.
  - N/A: Not applicable.
- If more than one delivery option is offered, the license and/or endorsement name of the variant is provided. If the license and/or endorsement name of the variant is the same as the standard delivery method, it is indicated that the names are the same.
  - Met: The license and/or endorsement name is provided for each variant.
  - Partially met: The license and/or endorsement name is provided for each variant; however, some incompletions and/or weaknesses were found.
  - Not met: It is not indicated whether the license and/or endorsement name is different for each variant.
  - N/A: Not applicable.

Number and type of credit hours required to complete the program:
- The number of credit hours required to complete the program is identified, as well as whether they are semester or quarter hours.
  - Met: The number and type of credit hours information is provided.
  - Partially met: Either the number or type of credit hours information is provided but some information is missing.
  - Not met: The number and type of credit hours information is not provided.

Select the applicable section below and provide information for those rubric items.

Syllabi:
- For this section, the EPP is required to provide a hyperlink(s) to program course syllabi. This information is used to provide program review team members with course descriptions as noted in the Program Alignment tables, as required in the next section.
  - Met: All relevant syllabi that matches the course descriptions noted in the Program Alignment tables are provided and the information provided understandable to program review team members.
  - Partially met: Syllabi are provided; however, the information provided is incomplete, does not match the course descriptions noted in the Program Alignment tables, and/or is not understandable to program review team members.
  - Not met: The syllabi is not provided.
- **IF THE REPORT INCLUDES SINGLE-SUBJECT CONTENT AREAS:** The report provides syllabi for all of the single-subject content areas offered.
  - Met: The report provides syllabi for all of the single-subject content areas offered.
  - Partially met: The report some syllabi; however, some incompletions and/or weaknesses were found.
  - Not met: The report does not provide syllabi for all of the single-subject content areas.
  - N/A: Not applicable.
• If the report includes multiple program levels (graduate, undergraduate, and/or post-graduate), and/or pre-service and in-service offerings: The report provides syllabi for all of the offerings.
  o Met: The report provides syllabi for all of the offerings.
  o Partially met: The report provides some syllabi for the various offerings; however, some incompletions and/or weaknesses were found.
  o Not met: The report does not provide syllabi for all of the offerings.

Program Alignment to State Standards:
For this section, a license or endorsement program must meet its specific state standards, as provided in OAR 584, Division 420. Program review teams will use courses, assessments, syllabi, and information provided on submitted tables to determine if standards are met. Program review team members are provided with a program standards tool that contains required program standards for each license or endorsement area against which to check the information provided by the EPP.

• If the report includes single-subject content area areas: EPPs must clearly differentiate between the single-subject content areas to demonstrate how each single-subject content area meets the standards. It is particularly important for the EPP to demonstrate differentiation in the Content Knowledge and Instructional Practice areas.
  o Met: The report clearly differentiates between the single-subject content areas to demonstrate how each area meets the standards.
  o Partially met: The report differentiates between the single-subject content areas to demonstrate how each area meets the standards; however, some incompletions and/or weaknesses were found.
  o Not met: The report does not differentiate between the single-subject content areas to demonstrate how each area meets the standards.
  o N/A: Not applicable.

• If the report includes multiple program levels (graduate, undergraduate, and/or post-graduate), and/or pre-service and in-service offerings): The report clearly identifies how offerings vary between the various offerings.
  o Met: The report clearly identifies how offerings differ between the various offerings.
  o Partially met: The report provides some information about how offerings differ; however, some incompletions and/or weaknesses were found.
  o Not met: The report does not identify how offerings differ between the various offerings.
  o N/A: Not applicable.

• The EPP describes, in a two-dimensional table, how program elements meet all required standards. Note for EPPs: Because standards vary from program to program, please refer to Oregon Administrative Rule for specific program standards.
  o Met: The program is aligned to state program standards, as demonstrated in the program reports (e.g. by courses and assessments).
  o Partially met: Overall, the program is aligned to the state program standards, as demonstrated in the program reports (e.g. by courses and assessments), but some weaknesses exist.
  o Not met: The program is not aligned to the state program standards, as demonstrated in the program reports (e.g. by courses and assessments).
Clinical Practices – General information:
Clinical practice requirements differ between candidate types; therefore, clinical practice requirements are provided below for the various types of program offerings. EPPs should select the section(s) that apply/applies to the report being completed and disregard the other sections.

In April 2018, program rules were substantially redesigned in the clinical practices areas. If this report includes the time period prior to the redesign, the report should clearly describe how the previous clinical practice requirements were met and how the EPP is meeting or will meet the requirements adopted April 2018.

Clinical Practices – Preliminary teacher candidates: (OAR 584-400-0140)

- The EPP provides a two-dimensional table (program term, horizontal – program field experience, vertical) and/or a narrative report to describe how the program’s field or clinical experience in a public or private school setting ensures the candidate will be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be a successful candidate for a license or endorsement.
  - Met: The EPP provides a field or clinical experience in a public or private school setting that ensures the candidate will be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be a successful candidate for a license or endorsement.
  - Partially met: The EPP provides a field or clinical experience in a public or private school setting that ensures the candidate will be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be a successful candidate for a license or endorsement; however, some weaknesses were found.
  - Not met: The EPP does not provide a field or clinical experience in a public or private school setting that ensures the candidate will be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be a successful candidate for a license or endorsement.

- The field experience is at least 15 weeks in length and is in the candidate’s endorsement area(s). At least nine consecutive weeks is full-time in schools. The number of hours required to be considered a full-time week is indicated. If the field experience varies in length by term, the variance is noted.
  - Met: The nine-week consecutive field experience requires the candidate to assume the full range of responsibilities and the experience is in the candidate’s endorsement area(s).
  - Partially met: Overall, the field experience meets the length requirements of the standards and the experience is in the candidate’s endorsement area(s), but some weaknesses exist.
  - Not met: The field experience does not meet the length requirements of the standards and/or the field experience is not in the candidate’s endorsement area(s).

- In the nine-week consecutive field experience, the candidate assumes the full range of responsibilities of the classroom teacher in order to develop and demonstrate the competencies required for initial licensure. The specific duties assumed by the candidate are provided.
  - Met: The nine-week consecutive field experience requires the candidate to assume the full range of responsibilities.
  - Partially met: Overall, the field experience requires the candidate to assume some of the responsibilities of the classroom teachers; however, some weaknesses exist.
  - Not met: The field experience does not require the candidate to assume the responsibilities of the classroom teachers.
• The remaining six weeks: The field experience can be met either through full-time or the equivalent part-time experience. The assignment of responsibilities may be incremental in keeping with the objectives of the experience. If the length of the field experience varies by term, please note the variance in the narrative.
  o Met: The field experience meets or exceeds the remaining six-week requirements.
  o Partially met: Overall, the field experience meets the remaining six-week requirements but some weaknesses exist.
  o Not met: The field experience does not meet the remaining six-week requirements.
• The EPP requires the cooperating teacher to conduct at least four formal observations and at least two formal evaluations of the candidate.
  o Met: The EPP requires the appropriate number of formal observations and evaluations of candidates.
  o Partially met: The EPP requires some, but not all, of the appropriate number of formal observations and evaluations of candidates.
  o Not met: The EPP does not require formal observations and evaluations of candidates.
• The EPP requires the faculty supervisor to conduct at least four formal observations and at least two formal evaluations of the candidate.
  o Met: The EPP requires the appropriate number of formal observations and evaluations of candidates.
  o Partially met: The EPP requires some, but not all, of the appropriate number of formal observations and evaluations of candidates.
  o Not met: The EPP does not require formal observations and evaluations of candidates.
• If the report includes single-subject content areas: The report clearly identifies how clinical placement requirements vary between the single-subject content areas.
  o Met: The report clearly identifies how clinical placement requirements vary between the single-subject content areas.
  o Partially met: The report provides some information about how offerings vary between the single-subject areas; however, some incompletions and/or weaknesses were found.
  o Not met: The report does not identify how offerings vary between the single-subject areas.
  o N/A: Not applicable (This is either not a single-subject content area report or it is but there are no differences in the clinical placement requirements between the single-subject content areas.)
• If the report includes multiple program levels (graduate, undergraduate, and/or post-graduate): The report clearly identifies how clinical placement requirements vary between the program levels.
  o Met: The report clearly identifies how clinical placement requirements vary between the program levels.
  o Partially met: The report provides some information about how offerings vary between the program levels; however, some incompletions and/or weaknesses were found.
  o Not met: The report does not identify how offerings vary between the program levels.
  o N/A: Not applicable (The report does not include multiple program levels or it is such a report but the clinical placement requirements are the same for the program levels.)
Clinical practices – in-service (advanced) teacher candidates in program-required areas: (OAR 584-400-0140)

- The EPP provides a two-dimensional table (program term, horizontal – program field experience, vertical) and/or a narrative report to describe how the program’s field or clinical experience in a public or private school setting ensures the candidate will be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be a successful candidate for licensure or endorsement.
  - Met: The EPP provides a field or clinical experience in a public or private school setting that ensures the candidate will be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be a successful candidate for licensure or endorsement.
  - Partially met: The EPP provides a field or clinical experience in a public or private school setting that ensures the candidate will be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be a successful candidate for licensure or endorsement; however, some weaknesses were found.
  - Not met: The EPP does not provide a field or clinical experience in a public or private school setting that ensures the candidate will be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be a successful candidate for licensure or endorsement.

- The required field experience is at least two semester or three quarter hours in length.
  - Met: The field experience meets or exceeds the length requirements.
  - Partially met: A field experience is required but does not meet the length requirements.
  - Not met: A field experience is not required.

- The EPP requires the mentor to conduct at least two formal observations and at least one formal evaluation of the candidate.
  - Met: The EPP requires the appropriate number of formal observations and evaluations of candidates.
  - Partially met: The EPP requires some, but not all, of the appropriate number of formal observations and evaluations of candidates.
  - Not met: The EPP does not require formal observations and evaluations of candidates.

- The EPP requires the faculty supervisor to conduct at least two formal observations and at least one formal evaluation of the candidate.
  - Met: The EPP requires the appropriate number of formal observations and evaluations of candidates.
  - Partially met: The EPP requires some, but not all, of the appropriate number of formal observations and evaluations of candidates.
  - Not met: The EPP does not require formal observations and evaluations of candidates.

- IF THE REPORT INCLUDES MULTIPLE PROGRAM LEVELS (GRADUATE, UNDERGRADUATE, AND/OR POST-GRADUATE): The report clearly identifies how clinical placement requirements vary between the program levels.
  - Met: The report clearly identifies how clinical placement requirements vary between the program levels.
  - Partially met: The report provides some information about how offerings vary between the program levels; however, some incompletions and/or weaknesses were found.
  - Not met: The report does not identify how offerings vary between the program levels.
  - N/A: Not applicable (The report does not include multiple program levels or it is such a report but the clinical placement requirements are the same for the program levels.
Clinical practices – administrative, school social worker, and school psychologist candidates:  \((OAR\ 584-400-0140)\)

- The EPP provides a two-dimensional table (program term, horizontal – program field experience, vertical) and/or a narrative report to describe how the program’s field or clinical experience in a public or private school setting ensures the candidate will be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be a successful candidate for licensure or endorsement.
  - Met: The EPP provides a field or clinical experience in a public or private school setting that ensures the candidate will be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be a successful candidate for licensure or endorsement.
  - Partially met: The EPP provides a field or clinical experience in a public or private school setting that ensures the candidate will be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be a successful candidate for licensure or endorsement; however, some weaknesses were found.
  - Not met: The EPP does not provide a field or clinical experience in a public or private school setting that ensures the candidate will be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be a successful candidate for licensure or endorsement.

- The EPP requires the mentor to conduct at least two formal observations and at least one formal evaluation of the candidate.
  - Met: The EPP requires the appropriate number of formal observations and evaluations of candidates.
  - Partially met: The EPP requires some, but not all, of the appropriate number of formal observations and evaluations of candidates.
  - Not met: The EPP does not require formal observations and evaluations of candidates.

- The EPP requires the faculty supervisor to conduct at least two formal observations and at least one formal evaluation of the candidate.
  - Met: The EPP requires the appropriate number of formal observations and evaluations of candidates.
  - Partially met: The EPP requires some, but not all, of the appropriate number of formal observations and evaluations of candidates.
  - Not met: The EPP does not require formal observations and evaluations of candidates.

Clinical practices – initial (preliminary) school counselor candidates:  \((OAR\ 584-400-0140\ and\ OAR\ 584-018-0305)\) The EPP provides a two-dimensional table (program term, horizontal – program field experience, vertical) and/or a narrative report to describe how the program’s field or clinical experience in a public or private school setting ensures the candidate will be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be a successful candidate for a Preliminary School Counselor License.
  - Met: The EPP provides a field or clinical experience in a public or private school setting that ensures the candidate will be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be a successful candidate for a Preliminary School Counselor License.
  - Partially met: The EPP provides a field or clinical experience in a public or private school setting that ensures the candidate will be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be a successful candidate for a Preliminary School Counselor License; however, some weaknesses were found.
  - Not met: The EPP does not provide a field or clinical experience in a public or private school setting that ensures the candidate will be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be a successful candidate for a Preliminary School Counselor License.
• The EPP requires the mentor to conduct at least two formal observations and at least one formal evaluation of the candidate.
  o Met: The EPP requires the appropriate number of formal observations and evaluations of candidates.
  o Partially met: The EPP requires some, but not all, of the appropriate number of formal observations and evaluations of candidates.
  o Not met: The EPP does not require formal observations and evaluations of candidates.
• The EPP requires the faculty supervisor to conduct at least two formal observations and at least one formal evaluation of the candidate.
  o Met: The EPP requires the appropriate number of formal observations and evaluations of candidates.
  o Partially met: The EPP requires some, but not all, of the appropriate number of formal observations and evaluations of candidates.
  o Not met: The EPP does not require formal observations and evaluations of candidates.
• In accordance with OAR 584-018-0305, the EPP requires candidates who have two years of teaching experience in Oregon schools or out-of-state public or regionally accredited private schools to complete a practicum consisting of 200 clock hours of supervised counseling in a public school setting and assemble a portfolio or work sample to demonstrate the candidate’s ability to meet the expectations of the public school’s counseling program.
  o Met: The EPP requires candidates who have two years of teaching experience in Oregon schools or out-of-state public or regionally accredited private schools to complete a practicum consisting of 200 clock hours of supervised counseling in a public school setting and assemble a portfolio or work sample to demonstrate the candidate’s ability to meet the expectations of the public school’s counseling program.
  o Partially met: The EPP requires candidates who have two years of teaching experience in Oregon schools or out-of-state public or regionally accredited private schools to complete a practicum consisting of 200 clock hours of supervised counseling in a public school setting and assemble a portfolio or work sample to demonstrate the candidate’s ability to meet the expectations of the public school’s counseling program; however, some weaknesses exist.
  o Not met: The EPP does not require candidates who have two years of teaching experience to complete the required practicum and/or assemble a portfolio or work sample to demonstrate the candidate’s ability to meet the expectations of the public school’s counseling program.
• In accordance with OAR 584-018-0305, the EPP requires candidates who do not have two years of teaching experience in any public or regionally accredited private schools to:
  o Complete a supervised practicum consisting of a minimum of 200 clock hours in a regular classroom in a public school, to include a minimum of 75 clock hours of full responsibility for directing learning.
  o Complete a minimum of 600 clock hours of supervised counseling experience in a public school.
  o Assemble and analyze one work sample to illustrate his/her ability to foster student learning.
  o Assemble a portfolio or work sample to demonstrate the candidate’s ability to meet the expectations of the public school’s counseling program.
  o Determine jointly with the practicum site supervising counselor that the candidate has demonstrated the skills and competencies required for licensure in the practicum.
o Establish and implement policies on supervision of practicum candidates that state the responsibilities of unit supervisors, practicum site supervisors and administrators, including the frequency of observations and conferences with the candidates.

o Make a minimum of four supportive/evaluative visits during the practicum. At least twice during the practicum, the unit’s supervisors meet with the candidate and the practicum site supervisor in joint conferences to discuss performance and evaluation.
  - Met: The EPP meets the practicum requirements, as listed above, for candidates who do not have two years of teaching experience.
  - Partially met: The EPP meets some, but not all, of the practicum requirements, as listed above, for candidates who do not have two years of teaching experience.
  - Not met: The EPP does not adequately meet the practicum requirements, as listed above, for candidates who do not have two years of teaching experience.

Key Transitions:

- For this section, the EPP is required to develop a table, or provide a hyperlink to a table, that demonstrates the key transition points (admission, retention, and completion) and the assessments used for those transitions. The table must clearly show key assessments used in the program: 6-8 for initial programs and 3-5 for advanced programs. **Note:** For the Preliminary Teaching License: For single-subject area reports, the information must be provided in a manner that clearly describes which endorsement areas are impacted with each transition point and assessment listing.
  - Met: The EPP provided a table that clearly demonstrated the transition points (admission, retention, and completion) and provided key assessments used for those transitions: 6-8 key assessments for initial programs and 3-5 assessments for advanced programs.
  - Partially met: The EPP provided a table; however, not all of the transition points were addressed and/or not all of the assessments information was provided, and/or some incompletions and/or weaknesses were found.
  - Not met: The EPP did not provide a transition point assessments table.

- If the report is for single-subject content areas, the EPP must provide key transition information for each single-subject content area separately or note that there are no differences across the areas.
  - Met: The EPP provided key transition information for each single-subject content area separately or indicated there was no difference across the areas.
  - Partially met: The EPP provided key transition information for each single-subject content area separately or indicated there was no difference across the areas; however, some incompletions and/or weaknesses were found.
  - Not met: The EPP did not provide key transition information for each single-subject content area separately or indicate there was no difference across the areas.
  - N/A: Not applicable.

- If the report includes multiple program levels (graduate, undergraduate, and/or post-graduate) and/or pre-service and in-service offerings, the EPP must list key transitions for each program separately or note that there are no differences across the areas.
  - Met: The EPP listed key transitions for each program separately or indicated there was no difference across the areas.
  - Partially met: The EPP listed key transitions for each program separately or indicated there was no difference across the areas; however, some incompletions and/or weaknesses were found.
Not met: The EPP did not list key transitions for each program separately or indicate there was no difference across the areas.

N/A: Not applicable.

Assessments and Rubrics/Scoring Guides (e.g. surveys, ORELA tests, etc.)

Note: Grades are not considered an acceptable assessment for this section.

- EPPs are required to provide a brief (approximately two-page) narrative for 6-8 assessments for initial programs and 3-5 assessments for advanced programs.
  - The appropriate number of assessments is provided.
    - Met: Narrative was provided for 6-8 assessments for initial programs and/or 3-5 assessments for advanced programs.
    - Partially met: Narrative was provided for assessments; however, the information was incomplete and/or an incorrect number of assessments were provided.
    - Not Met: Assessment narratives and/or assessments were not provided.

- Each assessment will be individually evaluated based on the following:
  - The assessment includes the following information:
    - A description of the assessment;
    - How it is used in the program;
    - When it is administered in the program;
    - How the assessment demonstrates candidates’ ability to meet the program’s standards, as provided in the Commission-approved program and in OAR 584, Division 420;
    - For EPP-developed assessments, indicate if the assessment will be submitted to CAEP for unit review. If no, the two sub-bullets just below are not required. If yes, provide a brief narrative that describes:
      - How the assessment was developed; and
      - The EPP’s plan for determining validity and reliability of the assessment.
    - Assessment documentation to provide includes:
      - A copy of, or link to, the assessment;
      - The scoring guide for the assessment (i.e. rubric), if appropriate. (Surveys, for example, would not use a scoring guide.)
        - Met: All of the above information is provided.
        - Partially met: Some, but not all, of the above information is provided.
        - Not met: The above information is not provided.
  - The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), measures what it purports to measure.
    - Met: The assessment measures what it purports to measure.
    - Partially met: Overall, the assessment measures what it purports to measure, but some weaknesses exist.
    - Not met: The assessment did not measure what it purports to measure.
  - The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), is clearly defined.
    - Met: The assessment is clearly defined.
    - Partially met: Overall, the assessment is adequately defined but there are some areas that are vague or poorly defined.
    - Not met: The assessment is vague and poorly defined.
The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), addresses the specific assessment area. For example, candidate content knowledge, content pedagogy, pedagogy and professional knowledge, student learning, dispositions, or technology.

- **Met:** The assessment addresses the specific assessment area. For example, candidate content knowledge, content pedagogy, pedagogy and professional knowledge, student learning, dispositions, or technology.
- **Partially met:** Overall, the assessment addresses the specific assessment area but some weaknesses exist. For example, candidate content knowledge, content pedagogy, pedagogy and professional knowledge, student learning, dispositions, or technology.
- **Not met:** The assessment does not adequately address the specific assessment area. For example, candidate content knowledge, content pedagogy, pedagogy and professional knowledge, student learning, dispositions, or technology.

The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), is consistent with the complexity, cognitive demands, and skills required by the standard it is designed to measure. ([OAR 584, Division 420](#))

- **Met:** The assessment is consistent with the complexity, cognitive demands, and skills required by the standard it is designed to measure.
- **Partially met:** Overall, the assessment is consistent with the complexity, cognitive demands, and skills required by the standard it is designed to measure, but some weaknesses exist.
- **Not met:** The assessment is not consistent with the complexity, cognitive demands, and skill required by the standard it is designed to measure.

The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), is a fair measure. A fair measure returns the same results even if applied by different observers under different circumstances or at different points in time.

- **Met:** The assessment is a fair measure.
- **Partially met:** Overall, the assessment is a fair measure, but some areas could be strengthened.
- **Not met:** The assessment is not a fair measure or an evaluation for fairness was not completed.

The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), allows for different levels of candidate proficiency to be determined.

- **Met:** The assessment allows for different levels of candidate proficiency to be determined.
- **Partially met:** Overall, the assessment allows for levels of candidate proficiency to be determined, but some weaknesses exist.
- **Not met:** The assessment does not allow for different levels of candidate proficiency to be determined.

The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), provides candidates or supervisors with substantive guidance as to what is being sought.

- **Met:** The assessment instrument provides candidates or supervisors with substantive guidance as to what is being sought.
- **Partially met:** Overall, the assessment instrument provides candidates or supervisors with guidance as to what is being sought, but some weaknesses exist.
• Not met: The assessment instrument does not provide candidates or supervisors with substantive guidance as to what is being sought.
  o IF THE REPORT INCLUDES SINGLE-SUBJECT CONTENT AREAS: The report clearly identifies any differences in how the assessment is used for the single-subject content areas.
    ▪ Met: The report clearly identifies any differences in how the assessment is used for the single-subject content areas.
    ▪ Partially met: The report provides some information about differences in how the assessment is used for the single-subject content areas; however, some incompletions and/or weaknesses were found.
    ▪ Not met: The report does not identify how offerings vary between the single-subject areas, program levels, and/or initial and advanced offerings.
  o IF THE REPORT INCLUDES MULTIPLE PROGRAM LEVELS (GRADUATE, UNDERGRADUATE, AND/OR POSTGRADUATE), AND/OR PRE-SERVICE AND IN-SERVICE OFFERINGS: The report clearly identifies any differences in how the assessment is used among the various offerings.
    ▪ Met: The report clearly identifies any differences in how the assessment is used among the various offerings.
    ▪ Partially met: The report provides some information on differences in how the assessment is used among the various offerings; however, some incompletions and/or weaknesses were found.
    ▪ Not met: The report does not identify any differences in how the assessment is used among the various offerings.

Data from key assessments for program areas:
  • This section requires data generated from the 6-8 key assessments submitted for initial programs or 3-5 key assessments for advanced programs. Program review team members will individually evaluate each assessment based on the rubric items provided below. **Note:** If an initial program includes licensed (advanced) candidates, the licensed candidates’ data is included with the initial program.
    o Data for the correct number of assessments is provided.
      ▪ Met: Data was provided for 6-8 assessments for initial programs and/or 3-5 assessments for advanced programs.
      ▪ Partially met: Data was provided for assessments; however, the correct number was not provided.
      ▪ Not Met: Assessment data was not provided.
  • Each assessment will be individually evaluated based on the following:
    o **Cycles of data for the assessments:**
      - **Ongoing assessment:** The EPP provides a minimum of two cycles of data for the assessment; or
      - **Revised assessments:** The EPP provides a minimum of two cycles of data for the assessment, including as much data as is available from the revised assessment plus data from the original assessment, to total a minimum of two cycles; or
      - **New assessments that do not have a predecessor:** The EPP indicates it is a new assessment and provides as many cycles of data as are available.
        ▪ Met: The EPP provided the required data for the assessment. For a new assessment, the EPP indicates it is a new assessment and provides as many cycles of data as are available.
        ▪ Partially met: The EPP provides fewer than the required number of cycles of data for the assessment; however, the EPP provides some data.
- Not met: The EPP does not provide the required data for the assessment.
  - The assessment data demonstrates most candidates meet the standards being assessed:
    - Met: The assessment data demonstrates most candidates meet or exceed the standards being assessed.
    - Partially met: Overall, the assessment data demonstrates most candidates meet the standards being assessed; however, some weaknesses exist.
    - Not met: The assessment data does not demonstrate most candidates meet the standards being assessed.
- The assessment data is summarized and analyzed:
  - Met: The assessment data is summarized and analyzed.
  - Partially met: Overall, the assessment data is summarized and analyzed; however, some weaknesses exist.
  - Not met: The assessment data is not summarized and analyzed.
- If the report includes single-subject content areas: The report provides data for each single-subject content area.
  - Met: The report provides data for each single-subject content area.
  - Partially met: The report provides data for each single-subject content area; however, some incompletions and/or weaknesses were found.
  - Not met: The report does not provide data for each single-subject content area.
  - N/A: Not applicable
- If the report includes multiple program levels (graduate, undergraduate, and/or post-graduate), and/or pre-service and in-service offerings: The report provides data for each program.
  - Met: The report provides data for each program.
  - Partially met: The report provides data for each program; however, some incompletions and/or weaknesses were found.
  - Not met: The report does not provide data for each program.

**What to report**

**Inactive programs**

EPP’s are required to submit program reports for inactive program(s), unless they select to eliminate the program(s), in accordance with [OAR 584-400-0090](#), Elimination of Programs, prior to program review.

**Reporting by program type**

The EPP must submit one report for each of the following programs that are offered by the institution, as provided below or as agreed to in writing with the TSPC Liaison to Higher Education.

### Teaching Programs

The EPP must submit one report for each program area and include within the report all of the endorsements that are offered by the institution.

- Preliminary Teaching License: Elementary – Multiple Subjects – Undergraduate program;
- Preliminary Teaching License: Elementary – Multiple Subjects – Graduate program;
- Preliminary Teaching License: Single-subject areas – Undergraduate program: Include the endorsement areas that are offered by the EPP in the Preliminary Teaching License undergraduate program. *(Note: Except for World Language [OAR 584-420-0490](#), program standards for single-subject areas are provided in Division 220.)*
- Advanced Mathematics (includes Foundational);
- Agricultural Science;
- Biology;
- Business: Generalist;
- Business: Marketing;
- Career Trades: Generalist;
- Chemistry;
- English Language Arts (includes Foundational English Language Arts);
- Science;
- Health;
- Integrated Science (includes Foundational Science);
- Physics;
- Social Studies (includes Foundational Social Studies);
- Speech (Forensics); and

- Preliminary Teaching License: Single-subject areas – Graduate Program (MAT/M. Ed.): Include the endorsement areas that are offered by the EPP in the Preliminary Teaching License graduate program.  (Note: Except for World Language [OAR 584-420-0490], program standards for single-subject areas are provided in Division 220.)
  - Advanced Mathematics (includes Foundational);
  - Agricultural Science;
  - Biology;
  - Business: Generalist;
  - Business: Marketing;
  - Career Trades: Generalist;
  - Chemistry;
  - English Language Arts (includes Foundational English Language Arts);
  - Science;
  - Health;
  - Integrated Science (includes Foundational Science);
  - Physics;
  - Social Studies (includes Foundational Social Studies);
  - Speech (Forensics); and
  - World Languages: Chinese, French, Japanese, German, Latin, Russian, and Spanish.

- Program-required endorsement areas: (Note: Each of these areas has its own program standards.)
  - Art (OAR 584-420-0310 – Art: Program Standards), including whether the report is for undergraduate, graduate, and/or post-graduate;
  - Drama (OAR 584-420-0365 – Drama: Program Standards), including whether the report is for undergraduate, graduate, and/or post-graduate;
  - Elementary – Multiple Subjects (OAR 584-420-0345 – Elementary Education — Multiple Subjects: Program Standards), including whether the report is for graduate and/or post-graduate (initial reports are submitted in the Preliminary Teaching License: Elementary – Multiple Subjects report);
  - English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) (OAR 584-420-0360 – English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL): Program Standards), including whether the report is for undergraduate, graduate, and/or post-graduate;
Library Media (OAR 584-420-0415 – Library Media: Program Standards), including whether the report is for undergraduate, graduate, and/or post-graduate;
Music (OAR 584-420-0420 – Music: Program Standards), including whether the report is for undergraduate, graduate, and/or post-graduate;
Physical Education (PE) (OAR 584-420-0425 – Physical Education: Program Standards), including whether the report is for undergraduate, graduate, and/or post-graduate;
Reading Intervention (OAR 584-420-0440 – Reading Intervention: Program Standards), including whether the report is for undergraduate, graduate, and/or post-graduate;
Special Education: Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing (OAR 584-420-0475 – Special Education: Deaf and Hard of Hearing: Program Standards), including whether the report is for undergraduate, graduate, and/or post-graduate;
Special Education: Early Intervention (OAR 584-420-0460 – Special Education: Program Standards), including whether the report is for undergraduate, graduate, and/or post-graduate;
Special Education: Generalist (OAR 584-420-0460 – Special Education: Program Standards), including whether the report is for undergraduate, graduate, and/or post-graduate;
Special Education: Visually Impaired (OAR 584-420-0460 – Special Education: Program Standards), including whether the report is for undergraduate, graduate, and/or post-graduate.

Commission-Recognized Dual-Program areas:
A report must be submitted for each Commission-recognized dual-program area, including the program names and whether the report is for undergraduate, graduate, and/or post-graduate.

Professional Teaching License Program;
Teacher Leader License Program.

Administrator Programs

In February 2019, administrator rules were substantially revised. Administrator reports submitted during the transition to the new administrator rules must include in the report how the EPP met the administrator rule requirements in place prior to February 2019 and the EPP’s plans to meet the new requirements.

The EPP must submit one report for each program area offered by the institution:
• Principal License Program;
• Professional Administrator License Program;

School Personnel Programs

The EPP must submit one report for each program area offered by the institution:
• Initial (Preliminary) School Counselor License Program;
• Continuing (Professional) School Counselor License Program;
• Initial (Preliminary) School Psychology License Program;
• Continuing (Professional) School Psychology License Program;
• Initial (Preliminary) School Social Worker License Program;
• Continuing (Professional) School Social Worker License Program.
**Program review steps**

**EPP submits program reports to TSPC:**
The EPP submits electronic program reports to TSPC by the date identified on the TSPC Site Visit Schedule. The reports are to be submitted to the Liaison to Higher Education via Dropbox, SharePoint Online, by website links, etc. Reports shall be provided in electronic format unless exigent circumstances prohibit this format. Approval to submit paper evidence must be approved in advance by the Liaison to Higher Education. All program report documentation, including hyperlinked documents, must be provided to TSPC on a thumb drive when the program reports are submitted.

**Program Review team:**
TSPC selects members for a program review team. Program review team members may also serve as members of the institution’s site visit team. CAEP training is required in order for individuals to serve on joint CAEP/state site visit teams.

TSPC staff sends program reports, the Program Review Rubric, covered earlier in this section, and a Program Review Survey tool (to be developed) to team members.

Program review team members review and analyze the submitted documents and provide the EPP with a Program Review Report for each program area and a deadline by which the institution must submit an optional Institutional Rejoinder. The Program Review Reports identify items for follow-up at the site visit.

**Results:**
Within approximately five months, results are provided by TSPC in a Program Review Report. The report makes recommended findings, as follows:
- State Recognition;
- Recognition with Conditions;
- Non-recognition.

The Program Review Report provides information for the subsequent site visit.

**Institutional Rejoinder:**
The institution has an opportunity to submit an Institutional Rejoinder. Information from the rejoinder provides information for the Executive Director’s recommendations and for the EPP’s subsequent site visit. The purpose of the rejoinder is to clarify or dispute findings. New evidence of meeting standards may not be included in the report.

**Next Commission meeting:**
The Executive Director’s Program Review Recommendations report goes to the Commission for consideration of official program recognition.

**CAEP’s role when the state process is selected:**
The EPP is responsible to provide CAEP with a state report generated on completion of the review to provide evidence for CAEP Standard 1. TSPC will work to provide clarification and update this information as that process becomes more clearly defined.
Site Visit Processes (aka Continuing State Approval of the Unit)

See also: OAR 584, Divisions 10, 17 and 410

What the unit review process includes
EPPs are required to include the following in the Unit review process:

- All on-campus educator licensure and endorsement programs;
- All off-campus educator licensure and endorsement programs;
- All online educator licensure and endorsement programs;
- Any combination of on-campus, off-campus, or online programs;
- A completed State-Specific Unit-Level Standards report for each separate accreditor, such as NASM, NASP and AAQEP/CAEP (due to TSPC on the same day the EPP’s Quality Assurance Review [AAQEP] or Self-Study Report [CAEP] is due); and
- Documentation necessary for completion of student records’ field audit (see field audit subsection in this handbook).

Key steps in the unit approval process: in brief

Note: The EPP’s programs are reviewed through the program review process prior to the unit approval process. See the Program Review section of this Handbook for additional program review information.

Petition for continuing state approval of the unit
The EPP must petition the Commission for continuing state approval of the Unit 18 months prior to the expiration of their current state approval period. This can be completed by notifying TSPC’s Liaison for Higher Education (Candace.Robbecke@Oregon.gov) through an email.

Petition for extension of state approval of the unit
The EPP may petition the Commission for an extension of the Unit by notifying TSPC’s Liaison for Higher Education (Candace.Robbecke@Oregon.gov) through email. Any extensions granted by the Commission will result in a reduction of the subsequent term of unit approval.

Self-Study
The EPP must complete an SSR as part of the unit approval process and submit the document through AIMS at least nine months prior to the site visit. The SSR contains the EPP’s evidence of meeting CAEP standards, components, and cross-cutting themes. For EPPs seeking continuous accreditation, the SSR also contains evidence that any previously identified areas for improvement or stipulations from a prior accreditation decision have been addressed.

For additional information on the Self-Study report, see Self-Study Reports, below, and the CAEP website: http://caepnet.org.

SPA and State-Specific Unit-Level Standards Reports
Unit review reports are required as provided in the Unit Review flowchart approved by the Commission in April 2019, item 5.1j (2), which is by this reference incorporated into this handbook.
Formative review
After the EPP submits its Self-Study report, a site visit review team is identified and the EPP undergoes a formative review, where the EPP’s Self-Study Report is reviewed, evidence is assessed against each standard, and site team members write a Formative Feedback Report (FFR). For additional information on the FFR, see Formative Feedback Reports, below.

Site visit and field audit
A joint team of nationally-trained reviewers is selected. CAEP selects the national reviewers and TSPC selects the state review team members. The joint team conducts a Formative Feedback Meeting more than five months prior to the site visit, and then the site visit is conducted to investigate the quality of the EPP’s evidence, including its accuracy and consistency or inconsistency with the EPP’s assertions in the Self-Study report. At the site visit, site team members check the authenticity of evidence, conduct interviews with stakeholders, validate and probe data, and identify strengths and weaknesses.

At the conclusion of the visit, the site team presents to the EPP an oral exit summary of the preliminary, non-binding findings relevant to the strength of the evidence provided in support of each standard. The site team does not make recommendations or assessments regarding whether standards are met or unmet.

Student record field audits are conducted in conjunction with site visits. See the Field Audits subsection in this section of the handbook for additional information.

Site Visit Report
A draft of the Site Visit Report is due to the EPP within 30 calendar days after the site visit. The EPP has 7 days to complete factual corrections and 30 days from the date they receive the draft Site Visit Report to complete and submit their rejoinder. The lead site visitor is able to respond to the rejoinder within 2 weeks of receiving the rejoinder.

Compliance with standards will be determined based on:
- Information and evidence submitted by the unit;
- Findings and recommendations of the Site Visit Review team;
- Results of staff audits of selected elements of the program conducted pursuant to OAR 584-410-0100; and
- Information obtained through any surveys administered by the Commission.

The EPP has an option to submit an Institutional Rejoinder within 30 days of receipt of the Site Visit Report. See the CAEP Joint Team Site Visit Report section of this handbook for additional information.

Accreditation Council
The CAEP Accreditation Council reviews the EPP’s case and makes an accreditation decision.

Commission action
At the next scheduled Commission meeting, Commissioners make a recommendation regarding unit approval based on the CAEP accreditation decision, an Executive Director’s Recommendations, the Site Visit Report, and the optional EPP Institutional Rejoinder.
**Self-Study Reports**

**General information**

- The SSR template is available 18 months prior to the site visit.
- The SSR is due 9-12 months prior to the site visit.
- Some of the fields in AIMS have a 30,000 character limit. This is about 12 typed pages.

The term “Self-Study” is used to describe both a process and a report. The CAEP Handbook – Initial-Level Programs 2018 glossary describes Self-Study as the process that an EPP undergoes to evaluate its practices and results in relation to CAEP standards. The glossary defines the Self-Study Report (SSR) as the document that an EPP creates, following its internal self-study, that assembles evidence demonstrating its case for CAEP standards.

The EPP must complete an SSR as part of the unit approval process and submit the document through AIMS at least nine months prior to the site visit. The SSR contains the EPP’s evidence of meeting CAEP standards, components, and cross-cutting themes. For EPPs seeking continuous accreditation, the SSR also contains evidence that any previously identified areas for improvement or stipulations from a prior accreditation decision have been addressed.

**Organizing for evidence gathering tips**

- Have each program review how they meet CAEP standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAEP standard and component</th>
<th>Why the [name] program is doing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Organize a committee for each of CAEP’s five standards.

**Self-Study sandbox:**

EPPs can view the most current self-study report template (along with the self-study evidence room) in AIMS using the sandbox logins. EPPs with visits within a few semesters will likely have other versions of the template and those with visits beyond the next few years may see changes made by the time their SSR template is available.

**SSR Sandbox login template:**

To use the sandbox Self-Study Report template:


  - **INITIAL ONLY:**
    - Login ID: 29535
    - Password: boe1
  
  - **ADVANCED ONLY:**
    - Login ID: 24319
    - Password: caep
  
  - **INITIAL AND ADVANCED:**
    - Login ID: 29536
    - Password: boe2
Once you are in AIMS, select [Site Visit Reports].

Change the semester to F16.

These will be used for Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 visits. Since this is a continuous improvement process, changes are anticipated for subsequent visits.

Note: This is a sandbox, which is set up for many people to use, so when you open a document, it will have left off wherever the last person exited that document. You may need to scroll back to get to the beginning of the document.

Steps to preparing the SSR (to be repeated for all five CAEP standards)

- Review the CAEP standards.
- Inventory available evidence.
- Gather information, categorize and prepare evidence to upload, and draft a table to be completed.
- Analyze and discuss the evidence.
- Formulate summary and narrative statements. Write statements that both summarize and analyze the information you wish to present.
- Draft the SSR.

Drafting the SSR tips

- Internal reviewers: Make sure the SSR is written as a collaborative process and not by just one person.
- External reviewers: Hire an external consultant to provide feedback.
- The better written the SSR is, the less confusion there will be on the part of the review team.
- At least one person who is not part of the team should review the document.
- Be sure to include program strengths.

Prior to submitting the SSR to AIMS

- Have each program provide information for how their program meets the standards in Word, so edits can be more easily made.
- Make sure the CAEP coordinator or dean thoroughly review all information for one voice.
- Consider who might be able to provide good feedback (e.g. TSPC staff, other EPP staff, etc.)

Uploading evidence to AIMS tips

- Login to AIMS.
- To upload the SSR, click on [Add] in the upper left.
- Choose [File] or [Folder]. Up to 90 items can be added to the SSR. Be kind to your team! If there are five people on the team and 90 files to review, make sure all information is relevant and valuable.
- EPP-wide Assessment Instrument = Rubric
- Description: Name your file. Make sure it matches the narrative.
- Select [Edit] to tag to standards.
- Assessments are mostly for Standards 1 and 2.

After the SSR is uploaded

- A team lead and team members are assigned to the EPP.
- Site visit review team members read and review the SSR and evidence.
- The team holds an off-site meeting via video conference/phone.
Formative Feedback Reports (FFRs)
- What was called the Offsite Report under NCATE is called a Formative Feedback Report (FFR) by CAEP.
- The FFR is submitted to the provider by five months prior to the site visit.
- The EPP has 60 days to respond to the FFR with an addendum and evidence.
- The site visit review team writes the FFR, which includes:
  - Questions for clarification;
  - Possible AFIs; and
  - Possible stipulations.
- The FFR is provided to the EPP through AIMS.

Site Visit Schedule
A schedule of EPP program reviews and site visits is kept up-to-date as TSPC’s Site Visit Schedule. Revisions must be reviewed and approved by Commissioners and, as needed, by CAEP. The most current version of the site visit schedule is available on the Commission meeting webpage.

Commission approval is required for an EPP to modify site visit dates. If the Commission approves a delay, the amount of time for the delay is deducted from the EPP’s subsequent seven-year unit approval period. Exceptions may be made by the Commission.

CAEP definitions of Fall and Spring
CAEP operates using two review cycles annually: Spring and Fall. Their definition of seasons differs from TSPC’s, as used on the Site Visit Schedule.

CAEP’s definitions of seasons for Site Visit Schedule purposes:
- CAEP’s fall = Generally September to December
- CAEP’s spring = generally February to May
- No month is off-limits for site visits but CAEP generally schedules site visits September to December and February to May.

TSPC’s definitions of seasons for Site Visit Schedule purposes:
- Winter = January, February, March
- Spring = April, May, June
- Summer = July, August, September
- Fall = October, November, December

Determining the site visit dates
Site visit dates are set once the EPPs reach Phase II of the application process. EPPs have five years after submitting their Phase II application to complete a site visit.

The unit shall identify a lead staff member for purposes of communicating and scheduling. The information shall be provided to the Commission’s Deputy Director. The unit’s liaison and Deputy Director will cooperate to set a schedule for the program review and site visit.

Dates for the site visit are determined in consultation with CAEP, the Commission, and the institution.
- It is important that the on-site visit is scheduled when students are on campus and student teachers are in public school and university classrooms.
• The scheduled date should not conflict with local school holidays, major conferences, or any event that will draw away faculty, students, or supervising teachers.
• The institution will coordinate the site visit schedule with the Deputy Director and Site Visit team chair.

Site visit timeline
Site visits typically last 2.5 days and generally occur all day Sunday, all day Monday, and Tuesday morning. There may be reasons to adjust the length of a site visit and those are considered on a case-by-case basis.

Typical schedule:
• **Day One:**
  - Presentation by the unit;
  - Review of exhibits;
  - Beginning interviews with key individuals; and
  - During the evening of the first day, the team begins working on its report.
• **Day Two:**
  - Continued interviewing of administrative staff and various faculty members on campus. Interviews usually are conducted with members of the unit’s consortium, students, and program completers.
  - Visits to the PK-12 schools with the unit’s student teachers. Team members interview student teachers, administrators, school counselors and psychologists, and supervising teachers at that time.
  - Agency staff completes a field audit of student records, as provided in the Field Audit subsection of this section.
• **Day Three:**
  - Completion of the report and exit interview.

Site visit review team member training
State selected team members are required to have CAEP site visit training. In-person training takes place over three days in the summer and is complemented by online training, which volunteers can complete on their own schedule prior to the in-person session. The training also involves a summative assessment on CAEP Standards and analyzing evidence.

Each site visit team member is also required to attend a TSPC training session prior to the scheduled unit review. Individuals employed at EPPs with upcoming unit reviews are often invited by the Commission to participate on site visit review teams to provide experience they will need in conducting their own unit review. The site visit team chair assigns standards for site visit team members to review.

Site visit review team member selection
Onsite visits are conducted by a team of 3-6 CAEP and state volunteers and the responsibility for the visit and report-writing process is shared among the team members.

The Commission and CAEP appoint the site visit review team members. The site visit team may consist of public school teachers, public school administrators, and teacher/faculty educators. Team members are
selected based upon background and expertise. Team members may not have been alumni of the institution and may not have any other conflicts of interest.

Case Managers
Each site visit is assigned a CAEP staff member who is the primary contact for CAEP. The case managers review drafts of reports and provide technical edits as well as feedback on policy and process and suggested edits to enhance clarity for the EPP. Case managers are unable to provide substantial edits or rewording that would affect the content or intent of the report.

Expectations of site visit review team members
The performance of site visit review team members is evaluated by institutions and other national and state site visit review members who serve on the same visiting team. The TSPC Commission reviews this data regularly. The data helps determine if changes need to be made in training and site visit review team member participation.

Site visit review team members are expected to:
- Work effectively as a team member;
- Use multiple evaluation tools effectively;
- Have in-depth knowledge of the Oregon standards, and where appropriate, CAEP standards (Oregon team members);
- Conduct on-site visits appropriately;
- Have a mastery of word processing and other technical skills;
- Be professional in all aspects of their work; and
- Assist in the review and drafting of the final report.

Continued assignment on a team is predicated on satisfactory performance in accordance with these expectations.

Site visit logistics
Arrangements for the site visit should begin well in advance of the actual visit. The following checklist is a guide to assist the EPP site coordinator:
- Make lodging reservations for all team members. Include the following in selection of a facility:
  - The facility should be located near the campus to minimize travel time.
  - Reserve a private single room for each team member.
  - Reserve a meeting room in the hotel where team members may work upon arrival and throughout the visit. This room should include computers, Internet access and printers. Consult with the team chair on room arrangements and needed supplies.
  - Ensure there is a restaurant in or near the hotel.
  - If possible, arrange direct billing to the unit by the hotel. If direct billing is not possible, please contact the team chair as soon as possible.
- Plan transportation for team members between the hotel and institution upon arrival and departure. Arrangements should be made in consultation with the team chair.
- Set up an on-campus workroom for the team. The room could also double as an exhibit room. Check with the chair to ensure needed supplies are provided and to determine the technology needs of the visit team.
- Set up an exhibit room for any materials not provided electronically, including multiple computer workstations with Internet access and printers.
• The EPP should also provide:
  o The name and telephone number of the technology support person who can provide basic support services to the team during the visit;
  o Support staff assistance, as required;
  o Access to photocopying;
  o Convenient access to a public telephone, restroom facilities, and a kitchen or vending machines;
  o Arrangements for off-campus visits;
  o Arrangements for observation of professional education classes;
  o Access to candidate and faculty records on campus; and
  o Access to samples of candidate products.
• Check with the team chair about arrangements for meals, including special dietary needs of team members.
• Provide clear directions or escorts to scheduled interviews; and
• Provide nametags for all team members, students, faculty, staff, and other interviewers and interviewees.

The role of state team members in joint CAEP reviews
State site visit team members join CAEP staff to conduct the visit as a single team. All members of these joint teams participate as equals while conducting the visit, including data collection, reaching a consensus, voting on standards being met, and writing the national and state team reports.

While team member assignments are made in advance, all team members familiarize themselves with all of the standards prior to the visit and are ready to identify necessary follow-up steps to validate strengths and check areas of concern.

Site visit team members work to understand the institutional mission, data sources, collective perspectives toward reaching consensus, continuous institutional improvements and changes, and the quality of evidence presented by institutions.

The state consultant (Commission staff member):
• May elect to participate in the formative meeting and site visit;
• Is included in all discussions of the site team;
• Provides state context for the site team;
• Addresses site team questions that arise regarding state policies and data provided to the EPP by the state.

State-specific unit-level standards review report
Commission selected site team members also write a separate report that focuses on state-specific standards. A member of the Oregon team is asked by TSPC to serve as the state-specific site visit team lead.

Responsibilities of the state-specific site visit team lead
• Participate in a phone meeting with Oregon site team members and the state consultant to review questions and issues related to state-specific standards;
• Assign each team member an Oregon state-specific standard to read, analyze, and report on;
• Explain to team members that each member will be responsible to analyze one CAEP standard and one state-specific standard.
• Collect team member standards reports and draft a final summary report.
State-specific unit-level standards team tasks

- Using a TSPC-provided template, the team completes a State-Specific Standards Review Report within 30 days after the site visit and submits the report to the TSPC Executive Director and TSPC Director of Program Approval.
- State-specific interviews and analysis may be positioned on Tuesday afternoon after conclusion of the site visit. If the CAEP chair agrees, interview questions may be integrated with CAEP interviews.
- Basic steps and timetable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Timetable</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3 Months Prior to Site Visit      | • Read and review the EPP’s State-Specific Unit-Level Standards Report; and  
|                                   | • Develop a draft of the State-specific Unit-Level Standards Review Report. |
| Site Visit                        | • Conduct interviews and evaluate evidence; and  
|                                   | • Conduct oral exit interview with EPP staff to discuss findings. |
| Post Site Visit (30 days after Site Visit) | • Submit final State-specific Unit-Level Standards Review Report to the TSPC Executive Director and Director of Program Approval, which includes conclusions, a summary of findings, and recommendations for AFIs. |

- The TSPC Executive Director will provide the final report to the EPP.
- The EPP may issue a rejoinder.

Additional information is provided in the section below titled State-Specific Unit-Level Standards Review Report.

Field Audits (OAR 584-410-0100)

Field audits are conducted to ensure EPPs meet the standards for recommending candidates for licensure, endorsements, and specializations. Audits are conducted as part of unit reviews (site visits), by a review of a portion of the EPP’s student records.

On the first full day of the on-site visit, agency staff will provide EPP staff with a list of student names that were randomly selected for the EPP’s current state recognition period, including five percent or 15 completer records, whichever is greater. EPP staff will make those student records available for review by noon of the second day of the on-site visit.

The candidate records will be reviewed for evidence of completion of the following:

- Fingerprinting and background clearance;
- Teacher performance assessments, if required;
- Evidence of knowledge of civil rights and ethics: Each student record must include evidence of one of the following:
  - The date of passage of the Protecting Student and Civil Rights in the Educational Environment exam. The exam date must occur prior to the start date of the candidate’s student teaching, final internship, or practicum experience;
• Completion of an Anti-Discrimination Workshop, is acceptable for candidates who completed the workshop prior to implementation of the civil rights exam. The workshop date must have occurred prior to the start date of the candidate’s student teaching, final internship, or practicum experience; or
• Evidence that the candidate holds or held a TSPC-issued license prior to the start date of the candidate’s student teaching, final internship, or practicum experience (which is acceptable evidence of passage of the exam or workshop);
  o Clinical practices information, including:
    ▪ The start date of the candidate’s student teaching, final internship, or practicum experience, whichever comes first (which must be after passage of the Protecting Student and Civil Rights in the Educational Environment exam or workshop and fingerprinting / background clearance).
    ▪ Records of completion of the required supervision, observations, and evaluations (dates, names, etc.).
    ▪ For candidates enrolled in two or more endorsement programs, evidence that they met the clinical practice requirements for both or all endorsement areas.
  o Content assessment(s);
  o Required coursework;
  o Waiver(s) of program requirements; and
  o Program completion reports (PCRs).

**Site visit review team reports**

After completion of the site visit, the following reports are issued:

**CAEP Joint Team Site Visit Report:**
- An oral report of findings is provided to the institution at the conclusion of the site visit.
- A draft Site Visit Report is provided to the institution within 30 calendar days of the site visit.
- The institution has seven days to request factual corrections.
- The EPP has 30 days from the date they received the draft Site Visit Report to complete and submit an optional institutional rejoinder. The purpose of the rejoinder is to clarify information or dispute findings. New evidence of meeting standards may not be included in the report.
  - **Note:** The rejoinder is optional; however, CAEP highly encourages EPPs to submit this report.
- The lead site visitor is able to respond to the rejoinder within two weeks of receiving the rejoinder.
- The CAEP Accreditation Council makes all final decisions and recommendations on whether standards are met or unmet.

**State-Specific Unit-Level Standards Review Report:**
- A draft oral report is given to the institution at the conclusion of the site visit.
- A draft State-Specific Unit-Level Standards Review (SSULSR) Report is provided by TSPC’s Office of Program Approval to the institution within 30 days of the site visit.
- The institution has seven days to request factual correction.
- The EPP has 30 days from receipt of the SSULSR to complete and submit an institutional rejoinder to TSPC.
- The TSPC Executive Director provides a recommendation to the Commission based on the final SSULSR report and the institutional rejoinder.
- The Commission makes all final decisions and recommendations on whether standards are met or unmet.
**Executive Director’s recommendations**
The Executive Director writes a recommendation based on the On-site Report and Institutional Rejoinder.

**Commission action**
The Executive Director Report, On-site Report, and Institutional Rejoinder (if completed) are provided to Commissioners for review and decision.

The Commission takes one of the following actions for state approval:

- **Unconditional approval;**
- **Approval with conditions.** The unit will present plans for removal of the conditions and correction of areas for improvement, as designated by the Commission;
- **Probationary approval and designation as an “at-risk institution.”** The unit must correct the conditions and areas for improvement within two years; and
- **Non-approval and designation as a “low-performing institution.”**

Unless stipulated otherwise, the Commission’s approval of a unit shall expire on August 31 of the final year of the seven-year approval period.

**Note:** It is the institution’s responsibility to apply for renewal in advance of unit or program expiration.

**Communication with team members**
Communication with the team chair and members is conducted primarily through email. Team members should never contact the unit independently, nor should the unit contact team members directly without the knowledge of the team chair. Team members should make all requests for information through the team chair.

**Arranging interviews**
The site visit review team members will spend much of the second day interviewing individuals and groups. The individuals to be interviewed may vary from institution to institution.

**Organizing the exhibit room**
The exhibit room has traditionally referred to the centralized location in which the unit organizes and displays documents and other evidence that demonstrates the unit meets standards. **Units shall display all exhibits on a website, which will be accessible to team members prior to arrival.** Exceptions to electronic exhibits will be worked out and approved in advance by the team chair.

Evidence should include unit and program assessment of candidate proficiencies and the effectiveness of the unit. Evidence includes, but is not limited to, data related to: end-of-course assessments, internship assessments, candidate portfolios, candidate projects, results of testing, follow-up studies, and program evaluations.

**Hosting the site visit**
The unit makes arrangements for overnight housing for team members, provides for meals, and reimburses team members for mileage based upon established state rates.
The unit provides a work room for the team where the exhibits are available or accessible. Computers must be available for use by the team members and internet access at the hotel accommodations is required.

It is important that the unit’s liaison is available and accessible to the team during the visit to answer questions, find any additional information that is needed and provide general guidance for the team.

**Site visit review team responsibilities**

Site visit review team members all review all materials; however, the team chair makes assignments for each team member. Team members are expected to emphasize the specific team assignment they have as they conduct their interviews and complete the review of exhibits. They should be thorough in the review and should maintain complete notes for use in completing their reports. It is important team members maintain a record of interviews and the people who attend all interviews they conduct.

Usually, the interviews on campus are completed during the second day. During the evening, the team will have an opportunity to share information and indicate if there is additional information that is needed. Team members should begin to organize their reports. During the afternoon of the second and third day, team members will generally meet to discuss their findings on the standards and to complete reports on their specific assignments. The team will recommend *met or not met* on each of the standards that apply to the specific programs. The team will also recommend Areas for Improvement (AFIs), if appropriate. The team supports its findings with facts and evidence based on the review of exhibits and the interviews that were conducted.

Before the team leaves the campus, it meets with the unit to give an exit report, which states the general preliminary findings of the team.

**The Site Visit Report**

The site visit report includes each standard reviewed, with a recommendation of the team’s findings. The report will identify any recommendations for Areas for Improvement (AFIs) and/or Stipulations, if appropriate.

The report cites evidence that shows compliance with or deviation from each standard that applies to the unit’s programs. The report contains a list of contacts that were made and the exhibits or evidence reviewed.

The report is completed based on the findings of the off-site and on-site reviews by team members. Once a draft has been completed, it is circulated to the team members for their review. After that, the edited draft is sent to the unit for the unit’s review and response. Amendments are made that are necessary to correct information and the report is forwarded to the Executive Director, who prepares the resolutions and recommendations for the Commission.

**Recommendations of the Executive Director** *OAR 584-010-0025 (2)*

The Executive Director may prepare resolutions proposing any combination of the following:

- **Unconditional approval**;
- **Approval with conditions**. The unit will present plans for removal of the conditions and correction of AFIs, as designated by the Commission;
- **Probationary Approval and designation as an “at-risk institution.”** The unit must correct
the conditions and areas for improvement within two years; or

- **Non-approval and designation as a “low-performing institution.”**

**Accreditation Council**

The CAEP Accreditation Council meets in April and October and reviews the EPP cases from the previous semester to make accreditation decisions.

**Commission Action**

The report is presented to the Program Approval Committee of the Commission for initial review. The Site Visit Report, Institutional Rejoinder (if provided), and Executive Director’s Recommendations are taken to the full Commission for action. After a vote by the full Commission, a copy of the Executive Director’s Report and the results of the Commission’s action are provided to the unit head.

**Confidentiality and Code of Ethics**

**Program review and site visit review team members’ Code of Ethics**

The program review and site visit review processes are sensitive by their nature. Therefore, objectivity and credibility are essential. The purpose of TSPC’s Code of Ethics is to prevent both actual and perceived conflicts of interest and unethical behavior by TSPC representatives, including staff. While participating on a TSPC program review or site visit review team, team members represent the Commission.

**TSPC’s Code of Ethics:**

Program review team members, site visit review team members, and TSPC Commissioners and staff shall conduct themselves as thoughtful, competent, well-prepared, and impartial professionals at all times while representing TSPC.

To assure institutions and the public that TSPC program and site visit reviews are impartial and objective, to avoid conflicts of interest, and to promote equity and high ethical standards in the review process, Commissioners, program reviewers, site visit reviewers, and staff must follow this Code of Ethics. They shall also exclude themselves from TSPC activities for any other reasons not listed in the Code that may represent an actual or perceived conflict of interest. Violation of any part of the Code will result in the individual’s removal from the current program review or site visit and from future consideration for program review or site visit review teams.

**Fairness (formerly Bias)**

Commissioners, program and site visit reviewers, and staff must:

- Not advance personal, non-Commission, or non-CAEP approved agendas in the conduct of accreditation reviews by attempting to apply personal or partisan interpretations of standards;
- Examine the facts as they exist and not as they are influenced by past reputation, media accounts about institutions or programs being reviewed;
- Exclude themselves from participating in Commission and CAEP activities if, to their knowledge, there is some predisposing factor that could prejudice them with respect to the accreditation of institutions, partnerships with states, or approval of a professional organization’s guidelines; and
• Exclude themselves from Commission and CAEP activities if they are philosophically opposed to or are on record as having made generic criticism about a specific type of institution or program allowable under the standards.

Compensation or gifts
Program or site visit review team members, Commissioners, and staff shall not request or accept any compensation whatsoever or any gifts of substance from the institution being reviewed or anyone affiliated with the institution. (Gifts of substance could include briefcases, tickets to athletic or entertainment events, etc.)
• If the giving of small tokens is important to an institution’s culture, these items may be accepted from the institution. (Tokens might include, for example, coffee mugs, key chains, tee shirts, and articles that cost less than $50.)
• If unsure, program or site visit review team members, Commissioners, and staff shall err on the side of declining gifts of any kind.

Program and site visit review team members, Commissioners, and staff must not expect elaborate hospitality during visits.

Program and site visit review team members, Commissioners, and staff must use restraint in any expenditures charged to the campus being visited, and shall abide by the guidelines set forth in State of Oregon and CAEP’s travel reimbursement policies.

Under no circumstance may staff accept any personal compensation whatsoever or any gifts of substance from an institution, although institutions may pay for staff travel when they invite staff to their institutions, consistent with the guidelines set forth in State of Oregon and CAEP’s travel reimbursement policy. If the institution wishes to compensate a TSPC staff member for a visit, payment must be made to TSPC.

Conflicts of interest
Program and site visit review team members and staff shall not participate in any decision-making capacity if they have a close, active association with an institution.

A "decision-making capacity" includes serving on a program review or site visit team. A "close, active association" includes:
• Having been a member of the faculty, staff, or student at the institution within the past 10 years. ("Student" includes people enrolled in a significant course of study or degree program, or having been a graduate of the institution.)
• Participating (on an individual basis) in a common consortium or special research relationship;
• Having jointly authored research or literature with a faculty member at that institution;
• Having an immediate family member attending or employed by the institution, professional organization, or state;
• Having former graduate advisees or advisors employed by the institution. When supervision of dissertations is involved, personal prejudice is especially difficult to avoid and bias is often assumed;
• Having applied for a position at the institution or professional organization;
• Having been a consultant at the institution within 10 years; and
• Having profited or appeared to benefit from service to the institution, professional organization, or state.
**Consulting**

When considering or accepting a personal consulting or similar arrangement with an institution, Commissioners, program reviewers, site visit review team members, and staff shall:

1. Be clear that they are not serving as the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission’s agent but rather are providing their own professional expertise for consulting purposes;
2. Inform the institution that their advice and recommendations do not guarantee program or unit approval outcomes;
3. Not solicit consultation arrangements with institutions preparing for program approval or site visits;
4. Not advertise their status as Commissioner, commission staff, program review team member, or site review team member for the purpose of building a consulting clientele;
5. Not accept a consulting arrangement at an institution for which the person served on a program review or site visit review team for at least two years following the review decision;
6. Refrain from voicing an opinion about the institution to others; and
7. Under no circumstance accept fees from an institution, though institutions may pay for travel when they invite individuals to their institutions. If the institution wishes to compensate for a visit by a site visit review team member, payment must be approved by TSPC and must be to reimburse actual expenses only.

**Confidentiality**

Confidentiality is an integral part of the review process. The Commission, program and site visit review team members, and staff must have access to sensitive information in order to conduct reviews of professional education programs. The Commission, review team members, and staff must protect the confidentiality of this information.

*Confidentiality has no expiration date—it lasts forever.*

Program reviewers, site visit review team members, and staff shall treat as confidential all elements of the review process and information gathered as part of the process, including: documents, interviews, data, discussions, interpretations, and analyses related to the review of educator preparation programs.

Program reviewers, site visit team members, and staff shall not discuss in public places the particulars of a program review or site visit, or the specifics of any case.

Program reviewers, site visit team members, and staff shall not discuss details about an institution related to a review or site visit with anyone other than site review team members before, during, or after the review or visit. Commission members shall refrain from discussing the specifics of individual cases and decisions regarding programs or institutions with individuals who are not Commission members.
CAEP Information

Note: Extensive information about CAEP is available on the CAEP website at: http://caepnet.org. This handbook is primarily intended to provide processes and basic information.

CAEP contact information
Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation
1140 19th St. NW, Ste. 400
Washington, DC 20036
Main phone: 202-223-0077
General information: caep@caepnet.org
CAEP staff listing

Full information about CAEP standards is on the CAEP website: http://caepnet.org/standards/introduction. Additional CAEP information is available in the CAEP section of this publication.

Summary of CAEP standards
Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge
Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice
Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

   Advanced standards: Candidate Quality and Selectivity

Standard 4: Program Impact
Standard 5: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity

   Advanced standards: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

Cross-cutting themes
In addition to these five standards, diversity and technology are important cross-cutting themes in educator preparation. The themes are presented in the standards as embedded in every aspect of educator preparation. When EPPs develop their Self-Study reports, they will have an opportunity to address how the themes are integrated into preparation. Additional information is provided in the CAEP Handbook – Initial Level Programs 2018.

CAEP one-pagers

   CAEP standards (Revised Feb. 2019)
   CAEP advanced standards

State-specific standards
See also: OAR 584, Divisions 17 and Division 420

In addition to CAEP standards, Oregon has the following state-specific standards:

- Program-review state-specific standards:
  State-specific standards are embedded within each program’s standards, as demonstrated in OAR Chapter 584, Division 420, and are, therefore, an automatic part of the state program review
process. However, EPPs that complete SPA reviews will need to submit an addendum to their SPA program reports to demonstrate how the program meets the following Oregon requirements.

- Reading Instruction, for these programs ([OAR 584-420-0015](#)):  
  - Elementary – Multiple Subjects;
  - Reading Intervention; and
  - Special Education: Generalist

- Dyslexia Instruction, for these programs ([OAR 584-420-0016](#)):  
  - Elementary – Multiple Subjects;
  - Reading Intervention; and
  - Special Education: Generalist

- Equity (included in each program standard, as provided in [OAR Chapter 584, Division 420](#))
- Knowledge of School Law for Licensed Educators ([OAR 584-017-1020](#))

- **Unit-review state-specific standards:**
  - Cultural Competency and Equity in the Classroom ([OAR 584-410-0070](#));
  - English Language Learners: Program Standards ([OAR 584-410-0080](#));
  - EPP Partnerships ([OAR 584-410-0090](#)); and
  - Verification of Candidate Recommendations (Field Audit) ([OAR 584-410-0100](#)).

### CAEP Topical Information

**Accreditation information online**

To find CAEP’s accreditation resources:

- Go to their home page: [http://caepnet.org/](http://caepnet.org/);
- Hover over [Accreditation and Program Review];
- Select [Accreditation Resources];
- Documents provided include these areas:
  - AIMS;
  - CAEP Accreditation Process;
  - Evidence;
  - Assessments;
  - EPP Annual Reporting;
  - Webinars;
  - Recent Presentations;
  - Accreditation by Other Associations; and
  - Legacy Accreditors: NCATE & TEAC.

**Accreditation Handbooks**

*Initial programs*: The [CAEP Handbook – Initial Level Programs 2018](#) is the source of procedures for initial-level programs.

*Advanced programs*: The [CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level 2017](#) is part of a comprehensive system of guidance and capacity-building support to assist EPPs in making their case for meeting CAEP advanced-level programs.
Add-on programs
Add-on programs (CAEP’s definition):
Add-on programs are designed for educators who hold valid teaching licensure and are seeking to add additional teaching field(s); or

Programs that lead to licensure but for which the licensing authority (e.g., state or country) does not require completion of an internship for eligibility.

Add-on programs do not lead to a degree (but may lead to a certificate) and require either a licensure examination or an assessment of candidate proficiency to understand and apply knowledge and skills in the specialty licensure area that provides access to employment in a P-12 setting.

Add-on programs will be reviewed under CAEP Standard A.1, component A.1.1, and require the EPP submit evidence of candidate content knowledge documented by state licensure test scores or other proficiency measures.

Add-on programs are not required to be reviewed by CAEP, per a decision of the CAEP Board on June 6, 2019.

Advanced-level and initial-level programs
CAEP considers initial programs to be programs that lead to the initial license to be a classroom teacher. Anything else that has a credential is advanced or add-on.

Advanced-level programs are:
- EPP programs at the post-baccalaureate or graduate levels that lead to licensure, certification, or endorsement; and
- Designed to develop P-12 teachers who have already completed an initial preparation program, currently licensed administrators, other certificated (or similar state language) school professionals for employment in P-12 schools / districts.
- These programs are submitted to CAEP using the CAEP Standards for Advanced-Level Programs.

For EPPs with advanced-level programs only, or both initial- and advanced-level programs, a single self-study report is submitted for review.

See the table below for information about which of Oregon’s programs are considered to be initial and advanced programs.

General information
The CAEP Standards for Advanced-Level Programs exist to support EPPs at the graduate level and beyond, whereas the CAEP Standards focus on initial teacher licensure. The CAEP advanced standards mirror the same principles of rigor, evidence, and outcomes focus of the CAEP Standards. See CAEP Standards for Advanced-Level Programs for complete details.

Scope of accreditation for advanced programs
Advanced-level programs required to be submitted for CAEP review include programs that meet any of the following conditions:
- Programs designed to develop P-12 teachers or other school professionals for employment in P-12 schools/districts or to further the pedagogical knowledge and skills of P-12 teachers and/or other school professionals;
- Programs where more than 50% of the program’s enrollees serve as teachers and/or other school professionals in P-12 schools/districts;
- Programs that are part of M.Ed.; M.S.; M.A.; Ed.D, or Ph.D., programs that are specific to the preparation of specialists for P-12 schools/districts (e.g., reading specialists, school librarians; school psychology, school administrators);
- Advanced level programs designed to further the knowledge and skills of P-12 teachers and/or other school professionals such as curriculum and instruction, educational technology, etc.; and
- Add-on programs:
  - Are designed for educators who hold valid teaching licenses and who are seeking to add additional teaching field(s); or
  - Are programs that lead to licensure but for which the licensing authority (e.g. state or country) does not require completion of an internship for eligibility. Do not lead to a degree but may lead to a certificate. Require a licensure examination or an assessment of candidate proficiency to understand and apply knowledge and skills in the specialty licensure area that provides access to employment in a P-12 setting.

**Advanced-level programs NOT reviewed by CAEP include the following:**
- Any advanced-level degree programs not specific to the preparation of teachers or other school professionals for P-12 schools/districts are not reviewed.
  - Any advanced-level, non-licensure degree programs, including those specific to content areas (e.g. M.S., M.A., Ph.D.).
  - Educational leadership programs not specific to the preparation of teachers or other school professionals for P-12 schools/districts.
- Other advanced level programs already recognized by another national accreditor that is recognized by either the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) or the US Department of Education.

**Commission-approved list of advanced programs, initial programs, and add-ons OAR 584-410-0010 (3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>License, endorsement, or specialization area</th>
<th>Pre-service or inservice teacher?</th>
<th>Initial, Advanced, or Add-on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single-Subject Content Areas</strong></td>
<td>Pre-service teacher</td>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Mathematics (includes Foundational Math)*</td>
<td>Inservice teacher</td>
<td>Add-on**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business: Generalist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business: Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Trades: Generalist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts (includes Foundational ELA)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Consumer Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Science*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies (includes Foundational Social Studies)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech (Forensics)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Language: Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Language: French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Language: German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Language: Latin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Language: Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Leader License</td>
<td>Inservice</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Pre-service teacher Inservice teacher</td>
<td>Initial Add-on**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>Pre-service teacher Inservice teacher</td>
<td>Initial Add-on**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary – Multiple Subjects</td>
<td>Pre-service teacher Inservice teacher</td>
<td>Initial Add-on**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)</td>
<td>Pre-service teacher Inservice teacher</td>
<td>Initial Add-on**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Media</td>
<td>Pre-service teacher Inservice teacher</td>
<td>Initial Add-on**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Pre-service teacher Inservice teacher</td>
<td>Initial Add-on**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>Pre-service teacher Inservice teacher</td>
<td>Initial Add-on**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Intervention</td>
<td>Pre-service teacher Inservice teacher</td>
<td>Initial Add-on**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education: Generalist</td>
<td>Pre-service teacher Inservice teacher</td>
<td>Initial Add-on**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education: Early Intervention</td>
<td>Pre-service teacher Inservice teacher</td>
<td>Initial Add-on**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education: Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing</td>
<td>Pre-service teacher Inservice teacher</td>
<td>Initial Add-on**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education: Visually Impaired</td>
<td>Pre-service teacher Inservice teacher</td>
<td>Initial Add-on**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Language: Japanese</td>
<td>Pre-service teacher Inservice teacher</td>
<td>Initial Add-on**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Language: Russian</td>
<td>Pre-service teacher Inservice teacher</td>
<td>Initial Add-on**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal License</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Administrator License</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial School Counselor License</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing School Counselor License</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial School Psychology License</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing School Psychology License</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial School Social Worker License</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing School Social Worker License</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note about foundational endorsements:* EPPs do not need a separate approved foundational program and candidates that have an advanced endorsement do not need the foundational endorsement in that area. The reason for this is because the advanced endorsement includes all of the course codes of the foundational endorsement within that area. If a candidate wishes to add a foundational endorsement, though, he or she must pass the content test for that area.

**Note about add-on programs for licensed candidates:** Add-on programs are not required for CAEP review.
Specializations
Specializations do not fall within CAEP’s scope because CAEP is interested in programs that lead to licensure. Specializations are not required to teach or work in the specialized area.

AIMS (Accreditation Information Management System)
General information:
AIMS is CAEP’s data collection and management system used by:
- EPPs: To submit and access reports and forms;
- CAEP staff: To monitor the accreditation process, site visitor assignments and reports, program reviews, annual reports, and state partnership agreements;
- CAEP site visitors and Accreditation Council members: As a workspace to review and complete assignments related to accreditation and/or governance; and.
- State contacts: To view CAEP member EPPs in the state (candidate or accredited), pathway selection, or standard (legacy or CAEP).
- AIMS Changes are made by CAEP staff. Users can make recommendations. To make AIMS changes, select [Export], note changes, and send the information to techsupport@caepnet.org.
- To update your profiles: Select [Update My Profile] on the bottom of the left-hand navigation panel, make changes, then select [Submit].
- For help: techsupport@caepnet.org.

EPPs receive access to AIMS at Phase I of the application process.

Recognition reports:
Results of the site visit are shared via recognition reports. Recognition report decisions are “Nationally Recognized,” “Recognized with Conditions,” “Further Development Required,” “Recognized with Probation,” or “Not Nationally Recognized.”
- CAEP notifies EPPs when recognition reports have been uploaded to AIMS.
- To access recognition reports:
  - Open AIMS.
  - Select [Program Review System (PRS)].
  - Select the current semester or quarter from the drop-down box in the upper-left corner. Reports from that semester or quarter will be listed by EPP.
- Recognition decision definitions and next steps information.
- Part G of the Recognition Report contains specific information and dates for the next step in the process.

Application process
For complete CAEP application information, see the CAEP Application webpage.

There are two phases to the application process:

1. Candidacy for Accreditation – This is the logical starting point for many EPPs who believe they will meet all standards successfully within five years.

2. Accreditation Eligibility – This is the starting point for EPPs who believe they will meet all standards successfully within two years.

As soon as the EPP applies, the cost associated with membership in CAEP apply. CAEP membership fees are influenced by the number of candidate completers.
Assessments
CAEP uses the term “assessments” to cover content tests, observations, projects or assignments, and surveys. Assessments and scoring guides are used by faculty to evaluate candidates and provide them with performance feedback. Assessments and scoring guides should address candidate knowledge, performance, and dispositions that are aligned with standards.

- EPP-created assessments: CAEP site teams follow guidelines provided in the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments. EPPs can also use this tool to design, pilot, and judge the adequacy of EPP-created assessments.

Family Engagement course
The CAEP Family Engagement course can support EPP faculty to prepare candidates to engage with their students’ parents.

Required components
Some of the CAEP standards were initially referred to as “required components.” However, this term was eliminated by the CAEP Board of Directors because EPPs are required to address and submit evidence for all CAEP standards and component. All components weigh equally during the accreditation process.

Program Rules and Policies
See also: OAR 584, Divisions 400 and 420

Annual reports OAR 584-400-0100
Annual reports are due April 15 of each year. When April 15 falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the annual report is due the following Monday.

If an EPP is unable to submit an annual report by the due date, the Commission must be notified by an email to the Liaison to Higher Education (Candace.Robbecke@Oregon.gov) that there will be a delay. The EPP must provide the date by which the report will be complete and the reason(s) the EPP is unable to meet the deadline.

TSPC will provide a template that contains prompts for the items listed in this section. The template will be emailed to deans/directors/chairs and program liaisons upon approval by the Commission. This will typically be by February 1 annually (or the following Monday, when February 1 falls on a weekend) or within one week following the winter Commission meeting if that meeting occurs in February. The template requires the following information.

1. Oregon Unresolved AFIs and Conditions
The EPP must provide a summary of EPP activities and outcomes of those activities as they relate to unresolved Areas for Improvement (AFIs) and conditions cited in the last state program review and unit approval process.

2. Cooperating Teachers for Clinical Practices

2.1 General Cooperating Teacher training information OAR 584-400-0145
The EPP must report:
How the EPP training provides Cooperating Teachers with an understanding of program and licensure requirements for the Cooperating Teacher candidates;

How the EPP assures the training is provided prior to the Cooperating Teacher’s first assignment;

What is included in the training; and

The training method of delivery (in-person, virtually, etc.).

2.2 Individual Cooperating Teacher qualifications and training information – reporting requirements \textit{OAR 584-400-0145}

- The name of the Cooperating Teacher;
- The name of the employing school and school district;
- The Cooperating Teacher’s license and endorsement type;
- The date the Cooperating Teacher received the EPP program training (e.g. Fall 2015, Spring 2018, etc.);
- The name(s) of the candidate(s) supervised by the Cooperating Teacher; and
- The planned endorsement(s) of candidate(s) supervised by the Cooperating Teacher.

\textit{Note}: EPPs are not required to list the cooperating teachers that were reported in the last annual report. This list must include the names of CTs that received training during the reporting cycle. Also, it is acceptable to report training that was completed prior to the academic year, as long as the prior training meets current training requirements.

3. Alternative Cooperating Teachers – reporting requirements \textit{OAR 584-400-0145 (8)}

The EPP must report the:

- The names of all Alternative Cooperating Teachers (not only for candidates applying for Preliminary Teaching Licenses);
- Name of the employing school name and school district or employer;
- Alternative Cooperating Teacher’s license and endorsement type, if applicable;
- Date the Alternative Cooperating Teacher received the EPP program training (e.g. Fall 2015, Spring 2018, etc.);
- Name(s) of the candidate(s) supervised by the Alternative Cooperating Teacher;
- Planned endorsement(s) of candidate(s) supervised by the Alternative Cooperating Teacher;
- Reason an Alternative Cooperating Teacher was required; and
- Alternative Cooperating Teacher’s qualifications to supervise the candidate(s).

4. International/out-of-state field placements – reporting requirements \textit{OAR 584-400-0140 (5)}

The EPP must report:

- The name of the candidate in the international/out-of-state field placement;
- The name of the school;
- International only: If it is an English-speaking school or a foreign language endorsement placement;
- International only: The license or credential of the school’s principal;
- If the CT meets CT requirements for licensure, endorsement, selection, and training;
- How the candidate uses Oregon program standards in the field placement, as provided in \textit{OAR 584, Division 420}; and
- If the standards for evaluating the candidate are the same as for local field placements. If no, an explanation is required.
5. Virtual supervision for field placements – reporting requirements [OAR 584-400-0140 (6)(f)]

The EPP must report the:
- Faculty supervisor’s name;
- Name(s) of candidate(s) supervised by the faculty supervisor;
- Supervised candidate(s) planned endorsement(s);
- Reason virtual supervision was selected;
- Method of delivery of supervision;
- Number of observations conducted virtually;
- Number of evaluations conducted virtually.

6. Minor program modifications – reporting requirements

Minor modification reporting requirements are provided in [OAR 584-400-0080].

7. Experimental programs – reporting requirements

Experimental programs reporting requirements are provided in [OAR 584-400-0170].

8. Multiple measures

EPPs must include in their annual reports an analysis of the means by which their completers fulfilled requirements for demonstrating content knowledge or professional practice. Candidates are listed that:
- For content options: Did not demonstrate content competency through the content testing (ORELA or NES); and
- For performance options: Did not meet the requirement of edTPA through the standard method.

9. Waivers

9.1 Partial waivers for clinical practice requirements in the event of school or district closures [OAR 584-400-0140 (16)]

If the EPP granted partial waivers for clinical practice requirements for school district closures, the information must be provided in the annual report, including the following information for each such candidate:
- The school district and school building where the candidate was placed; and
- Verification that the partial waiver did not have an adverse impact on the candidate’s clinical practice, which is provided in [OAR 584-017-1038].

9.2 Waivers for advanced Art, Music, and PE candidates in initial programs

In April 2018, the Commission approved EPPs to enroll advanced (in-service) candidates into initial (pre-service) Art, Music, and PE endorsement programs until June 30, 2020, and to waive initial program requirements for advanced candidates. EPPs are required to report those waivers to the Commission in the annual report.

9.3 Waiver of program requirements [OAR 584-400-0180]

EPPs may waive certain program requirements (see rule for details) for individual candidates when competency is otherwise demonstrated, as long as the candidate is able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, competencies, and dispositions required by state and institutional standards. In the annual report, EPPs must provide narrative information about their processes for ensuring candidate competency.
10. Restricted Teaching Licenses – reporting requirements OAR 584-400-0145 (9)
The EPP must report on their use of plans for candidates with Restricted Teaching Licenses who were employed by school districts.

11. Internship Agreements OAR 584-400-0150 (2)-(3)
The EPP must report on their use of internships as a substitute for clinical practices requirements.

12. Historical enrollment: Licensure, Endorsement, and Specialization programs OAR 584-410-0100 (2)(d)
The EPP must submit data that indicates the number of students enrolled in Commission-recognized programs by endorsement, licensure, and specialization area and provide comparable information for the previous five year.

13. Program Recruitment and Retention
The EPP must provide information about student personnel services and procedures, including selective recruitment, counseling, admissions, and policies for retention. Evidence may be provided as a narrative and/or as an addendum to this report.

14. Administrator and Personnel Programs Completer information
EPPs with approved administrator and personnel programs must submit data that indicates the number of candidates enrolled in approved administrator and personnel services programs by endorsement, licensure, and specialization area for 2018-19, and provide comparable information for the previous five years. This information is not required for Title II completers.

Licensure, endorsement, and specialization program standards: Additional guidance
Additional guidance and required areas:
The Commission has approved additional guidance and requirements for the following areas:

- **584-420-0460** Special Education: Program Standards – See the Candidates section of this publication for additional information.
- **584-420-0490** World Language: Program Standards – See the Testing section of this publication for additional information.
- **584-420-0630** Dual Language Specialization: Program Standards – See the Testing section of this publication for additional information.
- **All specializations** – See the Specializations section below for additional information on underlying endorsement requirements.

Areas where additional guidance is not required:
The Commission has not approved additional guidance or requirements for the following program areas, so current administrative rules contain all Commission-approved requirements for these standards:

- **584-420-0020** Preliminary Teaching License: Licensure Program Standards
- **584-420-0030** Professional Teaching License: Program Standards
- **584-420-0050** Preliminary CTE License: Program Standards
- **584-420-0310** Art Endorsement: Program Standards
- **584-420-0345** Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects Endorsement: Program Standards
- **584-420-0360** English for Speakers of Other Languages Endorsement (ESOL): Program Standards
Specializations

- Specializations are an optional indication of specialized expertise or preparation in an area the Commission recognizes as “added value” on a license.
- A specialization indicates the educator has demonstrated exceptional knowledge, skills, and related abilities in that area.
- A specialization is not required to teach or work in a specialized area except as noted just below.
- Specializations are addressed in two places in rule: OAR 584, Division 225 (licensure rules) and OAR 584, Division 420 (EPP rules).

Underlying requirements

Endorsement requirements:
The Commission requires additional and exceptional preparation in certain areas. Educators who work in these areas must hold the specialization in that area on their license in order to be labeled as a specialist or to call themselves a specialist.

Candidates cannot receive the specialization without also obtaining its underlying endorsement for the following specializations:

- Adaptive Physical Education Specialization: Candidates must be recommended for, or already hold, an endorsement in Physical Education.
- Autism Spectrum Disorder Specialization: Candidates must be recommended for, or already hold, any special education endorsement.
- Early Childhood Education Specialization: Candidates must be recommended for, or already hold, an Elementary – Multiple Subjects endorsement.
- Elementary Mathematics Instructional Leader Specialization: Candidates must be recommended for, or already hold, an Elementary – Multiple Subjects endorsement.

Language proficiency requirement:
In order for candidates to receive the Dual Language Specialization, they must be professionally proficient in at least two languages. The candidates may demonstrate proficiency in the second language through the ACTFL test or the World Language test. See the Testing section of this handbook for additional information.

The following specializations do not require any specific underlying endorsement:

- American Sign Language Specialization;
- Bilingual Specialization; and
- Talented & Gifted Specialization.
Clinical Practices (aka Field Experiences)

See also: OAR 584-400-0140 and ORS 342.223

Effect of licensure redesign
In January 2016, Oregon licensure rules were redesigned to eliminate the requirement that candidates complete two field experiences: One at the elementary level and another at the middle school or high school level. Therefore, candidates were no longer required to complete two placements from that time forward.

Providers should be mindful, however, that this rule does not apply for programs that otherwise specified an alternative clinical practices arrangement when a program was recognized by the Commission. If the program’s plan was silent on the issue at the time of Commission approval, this is interpreted to mean a single placement is appropriate.

Determining appropriate field placement experiences
In most cases (unless the candidate’s program was recognized otherwise by the Commission), the following factors should be considered to determine the level at which a candidate should be placed for their field experience:

- Determine the number of placements needed. This is generally one, depending on how the program was recognized by the Commission.
- Determine the program being completed. If the candidate is enrolled in a secondary program, for example, their placement would be at the secondary level.
- Determine the candidate’s career goals. If the candidate intends to teach at the elementary level, their placement would be at the secondary level.
- The EPP is required to provide field or clinical experiences in public or private school settings that ensure the candidate will be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be a successful candidate for educator licensure.
- Field placements at correctional institutions that are operated by ESDs are considered acceptable because ESDs are public school settings. These candidates still must be supervised by an appropriate Cooperating Teacher and meet other field placement requirements.

Full assumption of duties during student teaching
At their 10/25/18 meeting, Program Approval Committee members approved this clarification on what is intended in rule, at OAR 584-400-0140 (6)(e), which requires that student teaching for pre-service candidates must be 15 weeks, with at least nine consecutive full-time weeks in a school setting “during which the candidate assumes the full range of responsibilities of a classroom teacher” for the purpose of developing and demonstrating the competencies required for initial licensure:

Throughout their nine-week full-time clinical experience, pre-service candidates are given the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to teach by assuming the full range of responsibilities of the classroom teacher. The candidate must be able to demonstrate the competencies required for initial licensure. For school districts that only allow student teachers to co-teach, co-teaching is considered to meet the requirement for full range of duties.
**International/out-of-state field placements** *OAR 584-400-0410 (5)*

**Teacher candidates**
Requirements for international/out-of-state teacher candidate field placements:

- The candidate’s cooperating teacher must meet the requirements of cooperating teachers, as provided in *OAR 584-400-0145*.
- The teacher candidate must teach to Oregon program standards, as provided in *OAR 584, Division 420*.
- The standards for evaluating the candidate in the international or out-of-state placement are the same as for evaluating candidates in local field placements.
- The EPP must report the use of international or out-of-state field placements in their annual report. *See the Annual Report section of this publication for additional information.* The EPP is not required to obtain pre-approval of international or out-of-state placements that meet these requirements.
- All observations may be conducted virtually for international and out-of-state field placements. However, the EPP must report all virtual observations and evaluations in the EPP’s annual report. See the annual report section for additional information.
- **International placements only:**
  - The international school must be approved by the government entity authorized to approve schools in that jurisdiction.
  - The candidate’s teaching experience must be conducted in an English-speaking school (unless the practicum is for a foreign language endorsement).
  - The international school’s principal must have a valid administrative license/credentials. The license or credential is not required to be from a US institution.
- **Out-of-state placements only:**
  - Public PreK-12 classrooms, including charter school classrooms;
  - Private, regionally-accredited PreK-12 classrooms; or
  - Alternative education, post-secondary, or other similar teaching settings closely-related to PreK-12 classroom instruction.

**Administrator and personnel service candidates**
Contact TSPC *(Candace.Robbecke@Oregon.gov)* for information related to this topic.

**Internship agreements**

**Definition of intern** *(OAR 584-005-0005 [20])*  
Interns are students who serves as a teacher, personnel specialist, or administrator under the supervision of the institution and school district in order to acquire practical experience in lieu of student teaching or supervised practica. Interns may receive both academic credit from the institution and financial compensation from the school district. Interns may serve as assistant coaches.

**Requirements and guidelines** *(OAR 584-400-0150)*  
Requirements and guidelines for the use of internships is located in *OAR 584-400-0150*. The EPP must report use of internships as a substitute for the required clinical practices in the annual report. *See the Annual Report section of this publication for additional information.*
Pre-student contact requirements

Background clearance
EPPs must verify candidates in their preparation programs have completed a background clearance through the Commission prior to candidate contact with P-12 students. EPPs may require candidates to obtain background clearance through the Commission any time after candidates’ admission into the program. The background clearance requirement applies to field placements in Oregon, other U.S. jurisdictions and foreign countries.

Note: Individuals who completed a background clearance process other than TSPC’s process are not able to transfer or use those clearance results. They must complete the TSPC clearance process. Unfortunately, the systems are not inter-connected and this is the only way to ensure all of TSPC’s requirements are met.

Knowledge of Civil Rights Prior to Formal Clinical Practice
Prior to placing a candidate in a student teaching, final internship, or practicum experience, an EPP must verify the candidate has demonstrated knowledge of Protecting Student and Civil Rights in the Educational Environment (civil rights requirement).

EPPs must document in student records evidence of completion of civil rights and the start date of the student teaching, final internship, or practicum experience. Acceptable forms of evidence for completion include:

- The date of passage of the Protecting Student and Civil Rights in the Educational Environment requirement;
- Completion of an Anti-Discrimination Workshop, which is acceptable for candidates who completed the workshop prior to implementation of the civil rights exam; or
- Evidence that the candidate holds or held a TSPC-issued license prior to placing a candidate in a student teaching, final internship, or practicum experience.

Non-school district partners in clinical practice
Alternative field placements with non-school district partners are permissible according to OAR 584-400-0145.

If the EPP is unable to find a partner with a school district or ESD in a clinical placement, the EPP is permitted to develop an alternative field placement with another partner in lieu of a school district, such as a community-based organization.

- This alternative plan must be agreed to and signed by the EPP university supervisor, candidate and partner.
- Someone licensed in that field who is working in a school district must review and approve the plan. The licensed educator/reviewer and their credentials must be identified in the plan.
- The plan must meet the remaining TSPC practicum standards for the placement. The placement must mimic or provide a classroom-type environment, e.g. working with children, providing instruction, and similar activities to lesson planning, etc.
- Plans do not need to be pre-approved, but the list of non-traditional clinical placements must be submitted as part of the EPP’s annual report. In addition, the plan itself must be available for audit or submitted upon request.
Cooperating Teachers

See: OAR 584-400-0145 and OAR 584-400-0140

Cooperating teachers and faculty supervisors licensing requirements
When a teacher candidate has their clinical experience, they have both a cooperating teacher at the school where they are doing their placement and a faculty member who is assigned to them as a supervisor. Licensure requirements are as follows:

- Cooperating teachers are required to be licensed in the same area as the candidate unless an Alternative Cooperating Teacher is used.
- Supervising faculty are not required to be licensed in the same area as the candidate. They must meet one of the requirements in OAR 584-400-0140 (4):
  - Hold a license and endorsement in the candidate's license and endorsement areas;
  - Demonstrate exceptional expertise in the candidate's license and endorsement areas; or
  - Demonstrate exceptional expertise in supervising licensed educators in the candidate's license area.

Alternative Cooperating Teachers
If an EPP and partnering school district do not have a qualified educator to serve as a Cooperating Teacher, the EPP and partnering school district may:

- Use a Cooperating Teacher with a related endorsement area (e.g., a biology teacher supervising a teacher candidate for a chemistry endorsement);
- Use an appropriately qualified provider-based clinical educator (e.g., adjunct faculty) as the Cooperating Teacher; or
- Use an appropriately qualified (non-school district) supervisor employed in an area related to the endorsement area (e.g., a supervisor in a community-based early childhood program for a SPED early intervention program).

Alternate CTs for ESOL candidates
It is acceptable to match a licensed educator who does not have an ESOL endorsement but who does have significant ESOL and/or ELL training as an alternative cooperating teacher for ESOL candidates. The EPP may determine if the teacher has sufficient ELL/ESOL experience to act as the alternative CT. As with all alternative CTs, the EPP must report the reason for using the alternative ESOL CT in their annual report.

The alternative cooperating teacher must meet program training requirements, as provided in OAR 584-400-0145 (13).

The EPP must report the use of alternative cooperating teachers in their annual report, including the reason the alternative Cooperating Teacher was required. See the Annual Report section of this publication for additional information.

The EPP is not required to obtain pre-approval for use of alternative Cooperating Teachers.

Candidates with Restricted Teaching Licenses OAR 584-210-0100
If a school district has employed a candidate as a teacher under the provisions of the Restricted Teaching License, the EPP and employing school district must develop a plan to address the Cooperating
Teacher requirements within the clinical experience required by the Commission in OAR 584-400-0140 – Clinical Practices.

The EPP must submit the Restricted Teaching License plan in their annual report. The EPP may supervise, evaluate, and observe the candidate in the clinical practice, as required by the plan, in lieu of the requirements in rule. See the annual reports section for details of what must be provided for the annual report.

**Cooperating Teacher training**
*See the Annual Report section of this publication.*

**Substitute partner in co-selection**
If the EPP is unable to find a partnering school district to meet the requirements of subsection (10) – Co-Selection of Cooperating Teachers for a specific endorsement area, the EPP may use another partner in lieu of the school district. The EPP must develop a plan to utilize a substitute partner.

The plan must be submitted for approval prior to implementation to the TSPC Liaison to Higher Education, via email to Candace.Robbecke@Oregon.gov.

The information provided must include:
- Substitute Partner in Co-Selection in the subject line of the email;
- The name of the endorsement or licensure program;
- The name of the substitute partner (e.g. the community-based program name); and
- The plan to meet the co-selection requirement with the substitute partner.

---

**Equity Information**
*See also: OAR 584, Division 410*

**Chief Education Office**

**Equity Reports**
The annual Educator Equity Reports includes a summary of:
- The most recent available data on diversity in Oregon’s educator workforce;
- Promising practices for recruiting, preparing, hiring, and retaining culturally and linguistically diverse educators;
- Plans being implemented by public teacher education programs; and
- Recommendations for achieving an educator workforce that more closely mirrors Oregon’s K-12 student demographics.

**Equity Lens**
In 2011, education agencies adopted an “equity lens,” which is a public policy statement explicitly acknowledging the salience of race and ethnicity in contributing to disparate student outcomes and committing to narrow achievement and opportunity gaps from cradle to career through a focus on race and ethnicity.
Equity Lens beliefs:
- Every student has the ability to learn.
- Speaking a language other than English is an asset.
- Special education services are an educational responsibility.
- Students previously described as “at risk” are the best opportunity to improve outcomes.
- Intentional, proven practices must be implemented to return out of school youth to an educational setting.
- Supporting great teachers is important.
- Ending disparities and gaps in achievement begin in quality delivery.
- Resource allocation demonstrates priorities and values.
- Shared decision-making with communities will improve outcomes.
- All students should have access to information about future opportunities.
- Community colleges and universities play a critical role in serving diverse, rural, and ELL communities.
- Rich history and culture are assets to celebrate.

Teacher Candidates’ Performance Assessments

General information OAR 584-400-0120
All pre-service teacher candidates from Oregon EPPs must complete a teacher candidate performance assessment in order to be recommended for a Preliminary Teaching License.

Licensed teachers adding endorsements to existing licenses are not required to complete a teacher performance assessment.

The Commission has approved the following teacher performance assessments for Oregon teacher candidates:
- edTPA, which is a national standardized teacher performance assessment (select here to see the areas that require candidates to complete edTPA); or
- If the Commission has not adopted edTPA for a subject-matter area, EPPs may complete:
  - Oregon Work Sample, as provided in OAR 584-400-0120 (7);
  - A teacher performance assessment that is developed, delivered, and evaluated by the EPP; or
  - edTPA in non-adopted areas, which may be either nationally scored or locally evaluated.

See the Oregon Work Sample and EPP Teacher Performance Assessments areas, below, for additional information on those requirements.

edTPA
See also: OAR 584, Division 400

edTPA support
- edTPA.aacte.org: Program resources and support (Resource Library, Online Community);
- www.edtpa.com: Candidate help using the website and Pearson’s ePortfolio system; technical support for programs; users of Integrated Platform Provider Systems
edTPA is a teacher performance assessment that was developed by the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity (SCALE). In 2014, the Commission adopted an implementation plan to require edTPA as the primary educator assessment in Oregon. edTPA is a program completion requirement for initial licensure candidates only.

edTPA is not required for:

- Licensed educators adding licenses, endorsements, or specializations; and
- Licensed educators transitioning to Oregon from other states seeking Reciprocal Teaching Licenses.

**AACTE’s role in edTPA**
The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) is a national edTPA implementation partner. As such, AACTE provides communication and online resources for edTPA, including hosting the national edTPA website.

AACTE provides an edTPA Resource Library for materials needed by faculty and candidates. Because of the proprietary nature of edTPA materials, an AACTE password is required to access the Resource Library.

**Consequentiality**
edTPA was non-consequential for Oregon teacher candidates in 2016-17 and 2017-18. It became consequential September 1, 2018, which means 100 percent of candidates in edTPA adopted areas are required to complete the edTPA. A list of the required areas is available online.

**Coordinators and stakeholders**
Oregon has a statewide network of edTPA coordinators and stakeholders that meet virtually each month on the first Wednesday of the month, from 10-11 a.m. Each EPP has a primary edTPA contact that serves as their coordinator. Other individuals with interest in edTPA are included as stakeholders. Coordinators’ contact information is shared with Pearson and SCALE, national edTPA partners, and coordinators receive regular updates and other information directly from those partners. TSPC communicates with both groups and relies on coordinators to serve as the primary edTPA contact and to coordinate edTPA at their institutions.

**Performance assessment requirements for dual-enrolled candidates**
- *Preservice (non-licensed) candidates*: Preservice candidates are required to complete edTPA for only one of their two endorsement areas. The second endorsement area is completed through a Commission-recognized program and content area assessments.
- *In-service (licensed) educators seeking additional endorsements*: In-service educators completing a program to add an endorsement to an existing license are not required to complete the edTPA or Oregon Work Sample. Information on adding endorsements for licensed educators can be found in the Licensed Oregon educators’ topic in the Licensure section of this publication.

**edTPA Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)**
This February 2017 document provides information in a concise question and answer format. It is a good way to get to know a lot about edTPA: https://secure.aacte.org/apps/rl/res_get.php?fid=3148&ref=edtpa.

**Handbooks**
In July 2014, the Commission adopted edTPA handbooks for edTPA required areas. Candidates are advised to confirm the appropriate edTPA portfolio handbook with their faculty advisor before registering for the assessment.
Additional handbooks were adopted at the November 2017 Commission meeting, as indicated on Attachment 5.4a: edTPA handbook inventory. The added handbooks are shown using tracked changes. The additional handbooks are required for candidates who enroll on or after September 1, 2018.


Candidates pursuing two or more endorsement areas
- Only one teacher performance assessment is required.
- When one area requires edTPA and the other(s) area(s) do not require edTPA: The candidate must complete edTPA.
- When all of the areas require edTPA: The EPP, in consultation with the candidate, may select which handbook to use from the handbooks listed for the endorsement areas.

Passing scores (aka cut-scores)
The Commission has adopted the following minimum passing scores (cut-scores), effective January 1, 2018, and consequential for candidates September 1, 2018:
- 35 (for 15-rubric handbooks);
- 29 (for 13-rubric handbooks); and
- 42 (for 18-rubric handbooks).

The Commission will review the scores next when Multiple Measures is reviewed, in order to determine if adjustments are needed.

OAR 584-400-0120, adopted by the Commission in February 2019, requires all Oregon pre-service teacher candidates to complete a Commission-approved teacher performance assessment, as required in this Handbook, if the Commission has adopted a performance assessment for the endorsement area. Until such time that the Commission adopts alternative assessments of teacher candidate performance, a passing score on the edTPA is required for candidates to meet these requirements.

Required areas
edTPA is required in the following Oregon endorsement areas:
- Advanced Mathematics;
- Agricultural Science;
- Art;
- Biology;
- Business Generalist;
- Business: Marketing;
- Career Trades: Generalist;
- Chemistry;
- Drama (effective for candidates enrolled on or after 9/1/2018);
- Elementary – Multiple Subjects;
- English Language Arts;
- ESOL (effective for candidates enrolled on or after 9/1/2018);
- Family & Consumer Science;
- Foundational English Language Arts (effective for candidates enrolled on or after 9/1/2018);
- Foundational Mathematics;
- Foundational Science (effective for candidates enrolled on or after 9/1/2018);
• Foundational Social Studies (effective for candidates enrolled on or after 9/1/2018);
• Health;
• Integrated Science;
• Library Media – for pre-service candidates only (effective for candidates enrolled on or after 9/1/2018);
• Music;
• Physical Education;
• Physics;
• Reading Intervention – for pre-service candidates only (effective for candidates enrolled on or after 9/1/2018);
• Social Studies;
• Special Education: Generalist; and
• World Languages (All: Chinese, French, German, Japanese, Latin, Russian, and Spanish).

Results Analyzer (https://edreports.nesinc.com/or)
Results Analyzer (RA) is a reporting tool that, in part, provides edTPA results. Coordinators can use RA to view, analyze, reorganize, print, and export data to Excel.

Results Analyzer questions:
• Email es-raprodutcsupport@pearson.com; or
• Call 800-998-3787.

Score report contacts
Score report contacts are identified at each institution by the dean or designee as the person responsible to retain secure log-in credentials to view and interact with data files such as those available through Results Analyzer. Each institution with initial teacher programs has an identified score report contact.

Each EPP has an identified score-report contact who may provide data to faculty, departments, etc., by using Results Analyzer. Some institutions have separate coordinators and score-reporting contacts and other have the same person in these roles.

Score reports
Score reports are produced by Pearson / Evaluation Systems each January and July. Annually, in July, a condition codes report is also generated and provided to the EPPs. The score reports provide guidelines and suggestions for how information can be shared with faculty.

Providers receive raw data for their program, aggregate results for the state, and aggregate results nationally by field and rubric. Only the local report has individual candidate data.

Tasks
• Task 1  Planning
• Task 2  Instruction
• Task 3  Assessment
• Task 4  Math (Elementary Education handbook only)

Testing requirements for edTPA
See the Test Information section of this publication for edTPA testing requirements.
Top 10 edTPA resources
SCALE has created a variety of resources to support edTPA implementation. The Top 10 edTPA Resources showcases the most vital resources for programs to access as they support candidates in preparing for edTPA and engaging in this educative process. Use this quick reference as a starting point to understand the purpose of the most important edTPA support materials.

Websites
- National edTPA web page: http://edtpa.aacte.org/

Oregon Work Sample
See also: OAR 584-400-0120

General information
For teacher candidates in program areas that do not require an edTPA assessment, either the Oregon Work Sample or an EPP adopted teacher performance assessment is required.

Oregon Work Sample
See OAR 584-400-0120 for information on the Oregon Work Sample.

Test Information

Oregon Testing Information

Multiple measures
The following was approved by the Commission at the June 2019 (options 1-4) and November 2019 (option 5) Commission meetings.

A Multiple Measures Approach to Demonstrating Content Knowledge

Rationale
- Utilizing multiple measures in assessment is a strengths-based approach that will allow candidates to demonstrate the knowledge and skills required to be effective in the classroom.
- Utilizing multiple measures as an assessment policy supports efforts to diversify the teaching profession and helps provide all students with the teachers they need to learn and be successful.
- A multiple measures approach models for teacher candidates an approach to assessment that will be applicable in their practice.

Proposed model for demonstrating content knowledge required for licensure
All candidates recommended for licensure will need to complete one of the following four options in demonstrating their content knowledge preparation for the classroom.
(1) **Option one: subject matter test** *(per current policy)*
- **Requirement:** Take and pass the TPSC-approved content test based on the established cut score.
- **Documentation:** Candidate submits passing score to TPSC; EPP notates successful completion on Program Completion Report (PCR).

(2) **Option two: program completion** *(per current policy)*
- **Requirement:** Candidate completes TSPC approved program at EPP (available only for those endorsements for which there is no TSPC-approved test or in addition to any required test).
- **Documentation:** EPP notates satisfactory completion of program on PCR.

(3) **Option three: undergraduate or graduate degree in the endorsement area**
- **Requirement:** Candidate completes an undergraduate or graduate degree from an accredited higher education institution (or the equivalent, thereof, as determined by the Executive Director or Director of Licensure) in a major approved by TSPC as consistent with the content requirements of the endorsement area (as specified in TSPC rules). The degree must include a minimum of 30 semester hours (45 quarter hours) in the major, with a 3.0 or higher GPA in that coursework. *(See Appendix One below.)*
- **Documentation:** Candidate submits official transcript(s) to TPSC; EPP verifies completion of appropriate degree/credit hour/GPA requirements and notates on PCR. For major equivalency, EPP submits recommendation to TSPC for approval.
- **Coursework may be completed at any time prior to EPP recommendation for licensure.**

(4) **Option four: subject matter test with supplemental data**
- **Requirement:** Candidate scores 70 points or greater on the TPSC-approved content preparation matrix. The matrix includes individual scores on the TPSC-approved content subject matter test, GPA in non-remedial level courses consistent with the endorsement area, and data from a TSPC-approved EPP assessment of content knowledge demonstrated in the clinical experience. *(See Appendix Two).*
- **Documentation:** EPP verifies score on TPSC-approved test, GPA in content courses consistent with the endorsement, and data from at least six applications of the EPP’s clinical assessment instrument, approved by TSPC as a rigorous assessment of content knowledge. Results are notated on PCR.
- **The EPP university supervisor and the Cooperating Teacher must each complete at least two and an EPP faculty member at least one of the clinical assessment instruments, and each of the six assessments must be from a different observation period.**
- **The EPP clinical assessment instrument must be approved by the Executive Director prior to its utilization for demonstration of subject matter competency. The Executive Director will evaluate the assessment for content and construct validity as it relates to demonstration of subject matter knowledge within the endorsement area, and the EPP will be required to demonstrate the reliability of the assessment. The Executive Director may utilize an industry specific validity and reliability tool, such as the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments, in making this determination. Proprietary instruments utilized by the EPP for this purpose will be similarly evaluated. The decision of the Executive Director whether to approve the instrument will be final.**

(5) **Option five: holistic assessment of content knowledge**

**Application of the Holistic Assessment**
In order to satisfy content knowledge requirements utilizing the Holistic Assessment, the candidate must demonstrate competency within a majority of the standards within each theme of each domain of the
endorsement. (See Content Knowledge Matrix, below, for an example of a matrix for Integrated Science.) Sufficiency of knowledge within each standard is determined as follows:

1. The candidate is not required to attempt the Commission adopted content exam in the endorsement area sought prior to utilizing this Holistic Assessment. However, an EPP may choose to require the exam for purposes of admissions, advising, or program completion.

2. The candidate may demonstrate knowledge in each standard through a combination of coursework, verified work experience relevant to the endorsement, P-20 teaching experience, alternative academic learning, and/or cultural practice.

3. Any coursework, experiences, or cultural practice utilized in this assessment must be directly related to the standard as determined and verified by members of the EPP established Content Knowledge Evaluation Team per the following:
   a. Coursework or alternative academic learning experiences: University faculty within endorsement area.
   b. Work experience or cultural practice: EPP program lead (or designated committee/assessment team) in consultation with subject area experts.
   c. Teaching experience: Fully licensed school/district level administrator or teacher with at least three year’s full-time experience in public education (in the endorsement area, if a teacher).

4. Sample forms of proof could include:
   - Transcripts
   - Letter from supervisor or Elder, as appropriate, for work, teaching, internship, related camp experience, or cultural knowledge
   - Certificate of completion from community course/online course; or other type of PDUs
   - Portfolio artifacts demonstrating knowledge
   - Essay describing their experience
   - Oral presentation of experience to the review/assessment team

5. Documentation
   a. Candidate collects artifacts and/or documentation or artifacts relevant to each of the standards within the endorsement area as defined above.
   b. The candidate with support of the EPP creates a portfolio of documentation and evidence demonstrating competency within the majority of endorsement area standards within each theme of each domain.
   c. The candidate completes the Content Knowledge Matrix by noting the portfolio item(s) applied to each of the standards within the appropriate cell of the matrix.
   d. The candidate provides the documentation and artifacts to the appropriate Evaluation Team member.

---

2 Cultural Practice is defined as lived experiences within the community which by tradition, heritage, social norm, or community involvement, provide a candidate with applied knowledge related to the endorsement field at such a level that demonstrates a working understanding of the particular content standard(s) assessed.
e. The Evaluation Team member verifies the experience or suggests other documentation or experiences needed in each of the standards within the endorsement area.

f. Upon satisfaction of the required content knowledge verified by each team member, each team member signs the Content Knowledge Matrix, attesting the candidate has satisfied the content knowledge requirements of the standards for which the team member has evaluated documentation and artifacts.

g. Once approved by all Evaluation Team members, the EPP documents satisfaction of content knowledge requirements on the Program Completion Report (TSPC) through the multiple measure process and provides the PCR to TSPC.

h. The EPP maintains a copy of the signed Content Knowledge Matrix and the portfolio of the documentation and evidence supporting the signed Matrix. The Content Knowledge Matrix and portfolio may be viewed by TSPC at TSPC’s request and may be included within unit/program audits.

6. The Holistic Assessment of Content Knowledge recognizes that unique experiences of educators may positively contribute to K-12 student learning. To determine the appropriateness of the adopted assessment, the Commission will collect data on educator effectiveness. Therefore, any candidate utilizing the Holistic Assessment of Content Knowledge for licensure purposes shall authorize TSPC and the EPP from which the candidates completed teacher preparation to request and receive data on their performance and effectiveness on K-12 student learning for a period of no more than three years from their teaching assignment(s) subsequent to licensure. The candidate will assist TSPC and the EPP in obtaining the requested documentation from their employer.

Content Knowledge Matrix
An example Content Knowledge Matrix for Integrated Science was developed for the November 2019 Commission agenda item and attached to that item as Item 5.11b.

ALL OPTIONS:

Reporting
EPPs will include in their annual reports an analysis of the means by which their completers fulfill the requirements for demonstrating content knowledge. This analysis will include the instrument(s) used in the clinical field experience to assess content knowledge preparation. Per TSPC rule, EPPs must have all documentation of subject matter competency available for TSPC audit at any time.

Waiver
These options do not preclude or replace the current waiver authority of the Executive Director provided by OAR 584-200-0100:

(1) The Executive Director may waive, in part or in whole, the requirements for teaching, administrative and personnel service licenses if the applicant provides evidence of academic skills, experience and knowledge demonstrating mastery of the Commission-adopted standards for the license.

The Executive Director reports waivers to the Commission which monitors the Executive Director’s use of this waiver authority. OAR 584-200-0100 (1)(c)
## Appendix One: Undergraduate/graduate degree in endorsement area

### Single-subject area endorsements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endorsement area</th>
<th>Undergraduate/graduate major or degree</th>
<th>Transcript must include course(s) content in the area(s) noted (= number of courses required)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Art**         | Any studio art degree (painting, drawing, sculpture, ceramics, etc.) | Studio art (3)  
H引起ial/cultural context of art (1)  
Aesthetics/art criticism (1) |
| **Biology**     | Biology  
Environmental Studies/Science  
Or any other degree in the biological sciences (e.g. Biochemistry, Bioengineering, Genetics, Molecular Biology, Marine Biology) | Ecology and environment (2)  
Genetics and evolution (2)  
Nature of science (1)  
Biochemistry and cell biology (1)  
Biological unity and diversity (1) |
| **Chemistry**   | Chemistry  
Or any other degree in the chemical sciences (e.g. Chemical Engineering, Biochemistry) | Chemical reactions/energy/bonding (3)  
Matter and atomic structure (1)  
Stoichiometry and solutions (1)  
Nature of science (1) |
| **English Language Arts** | English (including area/period studies)  
Comparative Literature  
Creative writing  
Linguistics  
Journalism  
Humanities | Analysis/interpretation of literature (3)  
Composition/writing (2)  
Literacy/language conventions (1) |
| **Health**      | Public/Community Health  
Kinesiology | Health promotion/risk reduction (2)  
Health advocacy/literacy (2)  
Health over the lifespan (1) |
| **Integrated Science** | Biology  
Chemistry  
Physics  
Integrated Physical Science, Life Science  
Earth Science (e.g. Marine Science, Geology, Meteorology, Astronomy) | Physical science (2)  
Life science (2)  
Earth/space science (2)  
Nature of science (1) |
| **Mathematics** | Mathematics  
Mathematics and Computer Science  
Statistics | Patterns, algebra, and functions (2)  
Mathematical processes/number sense (1)  
Measurement and geometry (1)  
Trigonometry and calculus (1)  
Statistics/probability/discrete mathematics (1) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endorsement area</th>
<th>Undergraduate/graduate major or degree</th>
<th>Transcript must include course(s) content in the area(s) noted (= number of courses required)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music</strong></td>
<td>Music (studio, composition, theory)</td>
<td>Music methodology and performance (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>Aural analysis skills (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Music theory and composition (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Music history and culture (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Education</strong></td>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>Growth and motor development (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>The physical education program (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Movement activities (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lifelong physical fitness (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physics</strong></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Modern physics (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>Mechanics (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Electricity and magnetism (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nature of science (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Studies</strong></td>
<td>History</td>
<td>US History (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>World/non-US history (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Affairs/Policy</td>
<td>Geography/cultures (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global Studies</td>
<td>Government, economics, political science (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area studies (Asia, Middle East, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthropology/Sociology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>World Languages</strong></td>
<td>Degree in specific language</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multiple-subjects endorsement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary/Multiple Subjects</th>
<th>An undergraduate degree in any academic content area, with the following course content/credit hours reflected on the candidate’s transcript:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities/language arts (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social sciences (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art, health, fitness (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

i The Executive Director may later request Commission approval of course requirements for TSPC endorsements not included in this Appendix.

ii A course is generally defined as at least 3 semester or 4 quarter hours. In addition to the specific courses required herein, candidates must complete other courses in the endorsement area as needed to total 30 semester or 45 quarter hours. Courses which are used to meet the minimum course/credit hour requirement must be required as part of the major and must not be at the remedial level.
Appendix Two: Commission Approved Subject Matter Test with Supplemental data

Using this method, candidates must receive a combined total of 70 out of 100 possible points, utilizing the following matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commission Approved Subject Matter Test (40 points maximum)(^{iii})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points are provided for the highest single total test score received by the candidate as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 40 points: 80-99% of passing score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 30 points: 70-80% of passing score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 20 points: 60-70% of passing score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Point Average in Content Area Courses (30 points maximum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates will be awarded points for their GPA in undergraduate or graduate level courses taken within the content area/subject of the sought endorsement as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 30 points: content GPA 3.5-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 20 points: content GPA 3.0-3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 10 points: content GPA 2.75-3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidates are required to have a minimum of 20 semester hours or 30 quarter hours of non-remedial level coursework to calculate these points. In evaluating the number of units attempted and the GPA of this coursework, the candidate’s entire post-secondary academic record shall be considered. This may include courses taken after matriculation in the teacher education program and after the candidate’s attempt(s) on the Commission approved subject matter examination. Note: content pedagogy courses are not included in this calculation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Knowledge Demonstrated through Clinical Experiences (30 points maximum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates will be scored on their demonstration of content knowledge based on the key assessment(s) used by the EPP for this purpose. At least six iterations of the assessment must be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 30 points: candidate scores at highest level of proficiency in at least 75% of the rubric elements, and at least proficient in the remaining, for all items related to content preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 20 points: candidate scores at highest level of proficiency in at least 50% of the rubric elements, and at least proficient in the remaining, for all items related to content preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 10 points: candidate scores at the proficient level in all items related to content preparation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At least two assessments must be completed by a cooperating teacher, two by the EPP supervisor, and one by an EPP faculty member.

\(^{iii}\) This is a provisional exam score calculation. The Executive Director will study the impact of this factor and report to Commission by July 1, 2020, with recommended adjustments.
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A Multiple Measures Approach to Teacher Performance Assessment

Rationale

❖ Utilizing multiple measures in assessment is a strengths-based approach that will allow candidates to demonstrate the knowledge and skills required to be effective in the classroom.

❖ Utilizing multiple measures as an assessment policy supports efforts to diversify the teaching profession and helps provide all students with the teachers they need to learn and be successful.

❖ A multiple measures approach models for teacher candidates an approach to assessment that will be applicable in their practice.

Proposed model for teacher performance assessment
All candidates recommended for licensure will need to complete one of the following three four options in demonstrating their preparation for the classroom.

(1) Option one: nationally normed teacher performance assessment (per current policy)
   ➢ Requirement: Take and pass the TPSC-approved teacher performance assessment based on the established cut score.
   ➢ Documentation: Candidate submits passing score to TPSC; EPP notates successful completion on Program Completion Report (PCR).

(2) Option two: Oregon Work Sample (per current policy)
   ➢ Requirement: Candidate completes Oregon Work Sample (available only for those endorsements for which there is no nationally normed performance assessment).
   ➢ Documentation: EPP administers and scores Oregon Work Sample, noting satisfactory completion on PCR.

(3) Option three: nationally normed teacher performance assessment with supplemental data
   ➢ Requirement: Candidate completes a nationally normed teacher performance assessment and scores within one standard error of measurement (SEM) of the established cut score. Candidate scores proficient or greater on each domain of the EPP’s clinical assessment instrument, approved by TSPC as a rigorous assessment of teacher performance.
   ➢ Documentation: Candidate submits score on nationally normed teacher performance assessment to TSPC; EPP verifies score on nationally normed teacher performance assessment, and provides scores demonstrating a level of proficiency or greater on each of the required domains on at least six applications of the EPP’s clinical assessment instrument, approved by TSPC.
➢ The EPP university supervisor and the Cooperating Teacher must each complete at least two and an EPP faculty member at least one of the clinical assessment instruments, and each of the six assessments must be from a different observation period.

➢ The EPP clinical assessment instrument must be approved by the Executive Director prior to its utilization for demonstration of teacher candidate performance. The Executive Director will evaluate the assessment for content and construct validity as it relates to demonstration of teacher candidate performance, and the EPP will be required to demonstrate the reliability of the assessment. The Executive Director may utilize an industry specific validity and reliability tool, such as the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments, in making this determination. Proprietary instruments utilized by the EPP for this purpose will be similarly evaluated. The decision of the Executive Director whether to approve the instrument will be final.

**Reporting**

EPPs will include in their annual reports an analysis of the means by which their completers fulfill the requirements for demonstrating performance as a candidate prepared to enter the profession. This analysis will include the instrument(s) used in the clinical field experience to assess performance. Per TSPC rule, EPPs must have all documentation of performance assessment available for TSPC audit at any time.

**Waiver**

These options do not preclude or replace the current waiver authority of the Executive Director provided by [OAR 584-200-0100](#):

(1) The Executive Director may waive, in part or in whole, the requirements for teaching, administrative and personnel service licenses if the applicant provides evidence of academic skills, experience and knowledge demonstrating mastery of the Commission-adopted standards for the license.

The Executive Director reports waivers to the Commission which monitors the Executive Director’s use of this waiver authority. [OAR 584-200-0100 (1)(c)](#)
Oregon testing information

Testing information, including tests required in Oregon, is provided on the TSPC website at: http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Testing.aspx. The Commission-approved tests for Oregon endorsement areas are located on this website.

Work Sample and edTPA information can be found in the edTPA and Oregon Work Sample section of this publication.

Accepting NES tests from other states
To determine if NES tests can be accepted from other states, go to: http://www.nestest.com/PageView.aspx?f=GEN_Tests.html.

- Go to the passing score section. If Oregon are both listed as approved to offer the test, the same test is currently required in both of those states.
- Check the cut-score. The Commission changed cut scores for 20 ORELA tests in April 2017. Previous cut-scores: http://www.tspc.state.or.us/meetings/April2017/4.12a.pdf

Note: Oregon has not adopted all of the tests listed on the NES web page.

Evaluation Systems Group of Pearson (ES/Pearson)
The Evaluation Systems group of Pearson develops standards-based, criterion-referenced teacher licensure testing programs. Evaluation Systems provides states with a wide variety of teacher licensure services such as test development, administration, and scoring and collaborates with state education agencies and teacher preparation programs to provide support for prospective teachers preparing to take the exams.

National Evaluation Series (NES)
The NES is a teacher certification testing program from the Evaluation Systems group of Pearson. Oregon contracts with ES/Pearson for some required tests. NES tests are aligned to professionally accepted, national subject and pedagogy standards. The test fields range from tests of essential academic skills in reading, writing, mathematics, and technology literacy to tests of a candidate’s knowledge of pedagogy and specific content areas.

ORELA
Most of the tests required in Oregon are ORELA exams. TSPC has contracted with the Evaluation Systems group of Pearson for the development, administration, and scoring of the Oregon Educator Licensure Assessments® (ORELA®). The ORELA program consists of educator licensure tests designed to measure a candidate’s knowledge and skills in relation to applicable Oregon standards.

A list of Oregon endorsements and the tests required to pass them is located on the TSPC testing webpage.

ETS
ETS develops, administers, and scores assessment tests. In addition, they conduct educational research, analysis and policy studies and develop a variety of customized services and products for teacher certification, English language learning and elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education.
Praxis
The Praxis exams are offered by ETS. A limited number of Oregon licensure exams are offered by Praxis. Praxis tests measure the academic skills and subject-specific content knowledge needed for teaching. Oregon contracts with Praxis for some required tests. The Praxis tests are taken by individuals entering the teaching profession as part of the certification process required by many states and professional licensing organizations.

A list of Oregon endorsements and the tests required to pass them is located on the TSPC testing webpage.

Specializations

Bilingual specialization
In January 2016, TSPC discontinued the ESOL/Bilingual endorsement and replaced it with two distinct options, the Bilingual specialization and the ESOL endorsement.

Examinations required
The Commission has selected the American Sign Language Proficiency Interview (ASLPI) and the Official American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Oral Proficiency Assessment as approved language proficiency exams for the Bilingual Specialization. The ACTFL Oral Proficiency Assessment may be either OPI (interview) or OPIC (computer). Candidates may select which exam is most appropriate for the language they seek to add to their licenses.

Passing score levels
ASLPI: The Commission has set the passing score level for the ASLPI as a rating of 3 or better or an ASLPI rating of Advanced Plus.

ACTFL: The Commission has set the passing score level for the Official ACTFL Oral Proficiency Assessment for Bilingual Specialization as Advanced Mid or Higher proficiency level in the language the applicant is seeking to add to the license. The current levels for the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Assessment are: Novice Low; Novice Mid; Novice High; Intermediate Low; Intermediate Mid; Intermediate High; Advanced Low; Advanced Mid; Advanced High; Superior; Distinguished.

Languages available
ASLPI: American Sign Language.

ACTFL: Official ACTFL OPIs and OPICs are currently available in the following languages (but are subject to change): Afrikaans, Akan-Twi, Albanian, Amharic, Arabic, Armenian, Azerbaijani, Baluchi, Bengali, Bosnian, Bulgarian, Burmese, Cambodian, Cantonese, Cebuano, Chavacano, Czech, Dari, Dutch, Egyptian, English, French, Georgian, German, Greek (Modern), Gujarati, Haitian Creole, Hausa, Hebrew, Hindi, Hmong/Mong, Hungarian, Igbo, Ilocano, Indonesian, Iraqi, Italian, Japanese, Javanese, Kazakh, Kashmiri, Korean, Kurdish, Lao, Levantine, Malay, Malayalam, Mandarin, Marshallese, Nepali, Norwegian, Pashto, Persian Farsi, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Romanian, Russian, Serbian, Croatian, Sindhi, Sinhalese, Slovak, Somali, Spanish, Swahili, Swedish, Tagalog, Tajik, Tamil, Tausug, Telugu, Thai, Tigrinya, Turkish, Turkmen, Uighur, Urdu, Uzbek, Vietnamese, Wolof, Wu and Yoruba.
Submission process
The candidate may be issued a Bilingual Specialization indication on a license without an EPP recommendation, as the indication does not require completion of a program.

ASLPI: The candidate must submit the exam Results Report with a score of 3 or better or an ASLPI rating of Advanced Plus with their application for the Bilingual Specialization.

ACTFL: The candidate must submit the original copy of the Official ACTFL Certificate with the Advance Mid or Higher score for the appropriate language with their application for the Bilingual Specialization.

Dual language specialization
The Commission has approved the following as the approved language proficiency exams for the Dual Language Specialization:

- Official American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Oral Proficiency Assessment; or
- The Commission approved World Language test.

Additional World Language test information:
Additional information on World Language tests is available on the ORELA website.

Additional ACTFL test information:
The ACTFL Oral Proficiency Assessment may be either OPI (interview) or OPIC (computer).

The Commission has set the passing score level for the Official ACTFL Oral Proficiency Assessment for Dual Language Specialization as Advanced Mid or Higher proficiency level in the language the applicant is seeking to add to the license. The current levels for the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Assessment are: Novice Low; Novice Mid; Novice High; Intermediate Low; Intermediate Mid; Intermediate High; Advanced Low; Advanced Mid; Advanced High; Superior; Distinguished.

Official ACTFL OPIs and OPICs are currently available in the following languages (but are subject to change): Afrikaans, Akan-Twi, Albanian, Amharic, Arabic, Armenian, Azerbaijani, Baluchi, Bengali, Bosnian, Bulgarian, Burmese, Cambodian, Cantonese, Cebuano, Chavacano, Czech, Dari, Dutch, Egyptian, English, French, Georgian, German, Greek (Modern), Gujarati, Haitian Creole, Hausa, Hebrew, Hindi, Hmong/Mong, Hungarian, Igbo, Ilocano, Indonesian, Iraqi, Italian, Japanese, Javanese, Kazakh, Kashmiri, Korean, Kurdish, Lao, Levantine, Malay, Malayalam, Mandarin, Marshallese, Nepali, Norwegian, Pashto, Persian Farsi, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Romanian, Russian, Serbian, Croatian, Sindhi, Sinhalese, Slovak, Somali, Spanish, Swahili, Swedish, Tagalog, Tajik, Tamil, Tausug, Telugu, Thai, Tigrinya, Turkish, Turkmen, Uighur, Urdu, Uzbek, Vietnamese, Wolof, Wu and Yoruba.

The candidate must submit the original copy of the Official ACTFL Certificate with the Advance Mid or Higher score for the appropriate language with their application for the Dual Language Specialization.

Japanese and Russian endorsements
The Commission has selected the Official American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Oral Proficiency Assessment as the approved language proficiency exam for Japanese and Russian endorsements. The ACTFL Oral Proficiency Assessment may be either OPI (interview) or OPIC (computer).
(The Commission has selected the NES/Pearson subject-matter exam as the approved language proficiency exam for all other world language endorsements. NES/Pearson does not currently have a subject-matter exam for Japanese or Russian endorsements.)

The Commission has set the passing score level for the Official ACTFL Oral Proficiency Assessment for Japanese or Russian endorsements as Advanced Mid or Higher proficiency level in the language the applicant is seeking to add to the license. The current levels for the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Assessment are: Novice Low; Novice Mid; Novice High; Intermediate Low; Intermediate Mid; Intermediate High; Advanced Low; Advanced Mid; Advanced High; Superior; Distinguished.

The candidate must submit the original copy of the Official ACTFL Certificate with the Advance Mid or Higher score for the appropriate language with their application for the Japanese or Russian Endorsement.

---

**Title II**

See also: [http://www2.ed.gov/policy/highered/leg/hea08/index.html](http://www2.ed.gov/policy/highered/leg/hea08/index.html)

*Title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (HEA), amended in 2008 (PL 110-315) by the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA)*

**Contact information**

Westat  
1600 Research Blvd.  
Rockville, MD 20850  
Toll-Free (877) 684-8532  
Fax (301) 294-4475  
[Title2@westat.com](mailto:Title2@westat.com)  
[https://title2.ed.gov/Public/Home.aspx](https://title2.ed.gov/Public/Home.aspx)  
Twitter: [@Title2HEA](https://twitter.com/Title2HEA)

Pearson Support:  
Phone: 800-998-3787  
[https://www.educationreports.net](https://www.educationreports.net)

**Background**

Title II reporting is required in order to provide accountability for programs that prepare teachers. Title II requires states to report annually on key elements of their teacher preparation programs and requirements for initial teacher credentialing. Title II only collects information for initial teacher licensing programs.

The law requires institutions of higher education to submit timely and accurate reports or risk a fine of up to $27,500.

EPPs report to the states, which report to the US Department of Education. Pearson does much of this work under contract in Oregon using the Institutional and Program Report Card (IPRC)
**Academic year**
A period of 12 consecutive months, starting September 1 and ending August 31.

**IPRC (Institutional and Program Report Card)**

The IPRC is an online tool by which IHEs and other organizations with state-approved teacher preparation programs can meet the annual reporting requirements. IHEs may need to develop their own internal systems or processes to collect the necessary information to enter into the IPRC system.

The IPRC reporting cycle closes on April 30 annually. When the day falls on a weekend, the deadline remains the same; however, staff is only available during the regular work week.

To access the IPRC data: [https://title2.ed.gov/Public/Login.aspx](https://title2.ed.gov/Public/Login.aspx).
Technical assistance using the IPRC:
- title2@westat.com
- 877-684-8532
- [https://title2.ed.gov/Public/TA.aspx](https://title2.ed.gov/Public/TA.aspx)

**Program completer definition**
For purposes of Title II, a program completer is a person who has met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program.

Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of:
- A degree;
- Institutional certificate;
- Program credential;
- Transcript; or
- Other written proof of having met the program’s requirements.

In applying this definition, the fact that an individual has or has not been recommended to the state for initial certification or licensure may **not** be used as a criterion for determining who is a program completer.

**State Report Card (STRC)**
States submit Title II data through the State Report Card reporting system (STRC). The STRC is an online reporting system supported by the Title II Support Center at Westat.

---

**Commission information online**
Commission information is online at: [http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Commission/Welcome.aspx](http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Commission/Welcome.aspx).

Online information includes:
- [Introduction to Commissioners](#);
- [Meeting information](#);
Commission deadlines
Items are due from EPPs to agency staff one month prior to the Commission meeting at which the item is to be considered.

New program requests
How are new programs recognized? *(OAR 584-400-0060)*
New program requests must go to the Commission for approval. To add a new program, contact TSPC Deputy Director Trent Danowski *(trent.danowski@oregon.gov)* and request the New Program template.

Program modification process
When are modifications required? *(584-400-0080)*
A major modification is a change substantive enough to alter the program last recognized by the Commission. Examples of triggering events are listed in rule, as noted above. To initiate a major modification, contact Liaison to Higher Education Candace Robbecke *(candace.robbecke@oregon.gov)*. A major modification request form must be completed one month prior to the Commission meeting at which the item is to be considered. A narrative report providing details about the modification is due at the same time. If the report contains confidential information, that information is to be submitted as a separate document and the confidential information will be placed on the TSPC secure server.

Major modification request process *(Process adopted at June 2017 Commission meeting.)*
If the institution may or does require a program modification:

- The EPP submits the major modification form, narrative report, and confidential information (if any) to the TSPC Liaison to Higher Education *(Candace.Robbecke@Oregon.gov)* one month prior to the Commission meeting at which the item is requested to be considered;
- TSPC staff prepares Commission meeting materials for PAC members to review three weeks prior to the Commission meeting;
- PAC meetings are conducted two to three weeks prior to the Commission meeting. At the meeting, PAC members review the major modification request and recommend approval, non-approval, or a request for additional information;
- If approved, the request is reviewed by the full Commission at the next meeting and considered for approval or non-approval.

Core curriculum
Major modifications include, but are not limited to, substantive changes to the core curriculum of the program. Core curriculum is defined as the sequence of courses and/or key transition points in the program that are utilized to meet state standards.
Core clinical practice
Major modifications include, but are not limited to, substantive changes to the core clinical practice of the program. Core clinical practice is defined as the sequence, structure, and/or length of the experiences in the clinical practice that are utilized to meet state standards.

Program elimination process
If an EPP wishes to eliminate a currently approved licensure, endorsement, or specialization program, they must notify the TSPC Liaison to Higher Education (Candace.Robbecke@Oregon.gov).

Inactive programs:
An inactive program is defined as a program that, for five years, is not listed on the institution’s website, included in the course catalog, and has not had candidate recommendations.

Request to speak at a Commission meeting
Individuals who wish to speak to the Commission during their regularly scheduled meeting are asked to complete and submit the “Request to speak during the TSPC Commission Meeting form,” at http://www.oregon.gov/tspc/documents/Request-to-speak.pdf. Speakers are provided no more than three minutes to speak during the Delegations portion of the meeting. To speak on items not listed on the meeting agenda, the form is required to be submitted two weeks prior to the meeting.

Waivers
See the Annual Report section of this publication for waiver reporting information.

Waivers of program requirements (OAR 584-400-0180)
EPPs may waive certain program requirements for individual candidates (see rule, linked above, for complete details) when competency is otherwise demonstrated. For these types of waivers, Commission approval is not required; however, these waivers must be reported in the EPP’s annual report.

EPPs may not waive the following:
- Teacher performance assessments (except as noted below, in the edTPA waivers subsection);
- Completion of the Protecting Student and Civil Rights in the Educational Environment requirement; and
- Passage of the subject-matter exam related to the endorsement area.

Complete information on program requirement waivers is available in OAR 584-400-0180, which includes information on coursework waivers, clinical practice waivers, waiver prohibitions, EPP waiver policy requirements, annual reporting requirements, and candidate appeals of EPP denials of waiver decisions.

edTPA waivers
The TSPC executive director has authority to approve waiver requests for edTPA requirements. Examples include:
- When candidates had non-passing test scores that became passing test scores based on cut-score changes made by the Commission in April 2017 and June 2017, whereby making the candidates program completers;
- When there is a lapse between an applicant’s program completion and licensure application, subject to the three-year recency requirement provided in OAR 584-400-0160 (6);
- When a candidate substantially completed his/her program when Work Sample was required but did not complete some component, such as testing, and an EPP is willing to attest that the candidate meets the requirements to be considered a quality educator through submission of a Program Completion Report; and
• When there are other similar types of circumstances not currently anticipated that, in the judgement of the Executive Director, meet the intent of this authority.

**EPP requests for waiver of state standards (OAR 584-400-0190)**

EPPs may petition the Commission for waiver of state standards. The petition must include information and the reasons the EPP is seeking the waiver. In considering the petition, the Commission must determine that the waiver of state standards does not adversely impact the intent of the standards or rules and does not contradict any Oregon statutory requirements.

To make a waiver of state standards request to the Commission, submit a letter to the Commission, addressed to the TSPC executive director, and email it to the Liaison to Higher Education, Candace Robbecke (candace.robbecke@oregon.gov).

Waiver letters should include all applicable information, such as the candidate’s name, birthdate, last four of their SSN, and sufficient details that Commissioners understand why the waiver is needed. The letters are considered confidential and will be placed on the secure drive so only Commissioners and key agency staff can view them.

Waivers granted shall be reported to the Commission at the next regularly scheduled Commission meeting.

Waiver letters are due one month prior to the Commission meeting at which the EPP wishes them to be considered.