**Performance Indicators by Domain**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Performance Indicators** | **Questions for Consideration** | **Possible Evidence Sources** |
| **Program Design** | Program Design Map and Narrative demonstrating the developmental sequence and progression across all program pathways  Candidate thresholds or developmental benchmarks built into the design of programs to track candidates’ progression and demonstrated evidence of development  Intentional partnerships and structure of the partnerships | What are the core values and shared vision of the program?  How do these impact program design?  How is the program designed?  Why?  How do candidates experience the program? How do candidates experience the core values and shared vision of the program?  What shortage areas exist and how is the program creating partnerships to help minimize these shortage areas? | Candidate Resources (i.e. degree plans, advising materials, handbooks, etc.)  Courses progression, prereqs, benchmarks  Key, common assessments  Dispositional measures  Struggling candidate protocols (look up a better word for this)  Observation protocols  Evidence of bridging among P-20 partners  Other |
| **Educator Knowledge & Competencies** | Systems and procedures in place to ensure alignment of content and pedagogy with state standards (educator quality standards, endorsement standards, and academic standards) to include necessary depth and breadth  Dispositional and professional candidate qualities are embedded and woven throughout the program. | How does each program address: content knowledge, knowledge of pedagogy and pedagogical content knowledge?  How do program leaders/faculty make decisions about content (what, when, why)?  How do content and pedagogy interweave the issues of diversity, equity and inclusion? | Endorsement Standard Matrices  Disposition rubrics or screening tools  Stakeholder feedback (surveys)  Performance task  Content assessment  Observation trend data  Faculty professional learning  Other |
| **Clinical Experiences** | All candidates have opportunities for diversified field experiences that happen early and often throughout the preparation experience. | What strategies/ philosophies impact how candidates in all pathways are placed in field experiences?    What supports are in place to ensure quality field experiences?  How are candidates receiving feedback, from multiple observers, as they implement theory into practice?  What systems are in place to support struggling candidates? | Handbooks for field experiences  Observation and feedback forms  Candidate, mentor teacher, principal, coach, feedback surveys.  Protocols and support systems for struggling candidates  Process for identifying quality classrooms, buildings, or districts  Other |
| **Program Impact & Continuous Improvement** | Description of regularly-occurring processes program engages in to evaluate their strengths, challenges and improvement foci. Systems and protocols in place for ongoing review and reflection.  Formal and informal processes for gathering stakeholder feedback & other impact evidence from candidates, faculty, staff, partners & others. | What is the impact of the program in producing effective educators and how does the program determine effectiveness?    How are workforce needs considered and what is the program impact in meeting the needs of Colorado schools?  How do program faculty use feedback from candidate performance (during and after the program) to influence program improvement? | Trend data from perception surveys (candidates, faculty, partners)  Trend data from common assessments  Trend data from observation protocols  EPP report data: enrollment/ completion trends, placement rates and contexts, effectiveness ratings (standards & MSL/MSOs), retention  Content exams |