Performance Assessment Model Response
RDI-TPA Workgroup

44320.4

(a) To ensure the teaching performance assessments described in Sections 44320.2 and 44320.3 are valid and authentic, formative in nature, embedded in preparation, and inform program improvement through the accreditation system, the commission shall convene a workgroup to assess current design and implementation of the state's current teaching performance assessments.

Please describe the ways in which your model is "formative in nature". If you choose, please identify possible aligned improvements to the model.
The edTPA® assessment is formative in nature through three distinct features: 1) Access and permission to use all assessment materials, including handbooks and rubrics, to embed formative opportunities into coursework and clinical experiences; 2) the Faculty Feedback Tool; and 3) the edTPA Professional Growth Plan.

<u>**Access to assessment materials and formative rubrics**</u>
As with all TPA models, edTPA is intended to be used as a summative assessment given at the end of an educator preparation program for program completion or initial teacher licensure and to support state and national program accreditation. However, edTPA materials and score results can be used formatively to assist candidates and those who support them with the reflective goal-setting process essential for professional development. The Effectively Implementing edTPA resource provides EPPs with suggestions on how to embed the assessment constructs and activities into coursework and clinical experiences to provide opportunities for candidates to experience components of a performance assessment prior to submission of their edTPA.

All edTPA Handbooks, which include the assessment prompts and rubrics, are made available to EPPs through the Resource Library on edtpa.org. Access to all edTPA assessment materials provides the opportunity for EPP faculty/staff to familiarize themselves with the assessment architecture, requirements, and scoring rubrics. This allows them to embed learning activities that prepare candidates for effective teaching, as defined by the teacher performance expectations (TPEs) and measured by edTPA, into programmatic coursework and clinical work. When these constructs are embedded into a program, candidates benefit from the opportunity to practice them and receive formative feedback from faculty/staff through repeated exposure to the TPEs and the assessment requirements prior to submission of their edTPA.

Candidates, and those who support them, are encouraged to use edTPA's materials throughout the preparation program. By using edTPA materials as part of course assignments and/or early observations, clinical experiences, or discussions of effective

teaching, EPP faculty/staff can provide formative feedback to their candidates to aid in their growth and development aligned with the constructs of effective teaching.

Similarly, candidates and their faculty/staff are encouraged to use edTPA's subject-specific rubrics embedded in the cycle of effective teaching (i.e., Planning, Instruction and Assessment), and their five-level scale as a guide to professional development planning. Each rubric progression shows an expanding repertoire of skills and strategies for teaching and a deepening rationale. Because edTPA's five-level rubric scale represents the full range from "not quite ready" to more advanced practices for beginners, the middle and upper levels of the rubric progressions can be used thoughtfully for goal setting within this plan at the end of preservice and into the first years of the professional lives of teachers. Candidates are also encouraged to use local and state teaching standards or their associated evaluation systems to reflect on practice and set goals.

The Guidelines For Acceptable Support resource for EPPs provides many ideas for supporting candidates before and during the edTPA process.

Prior to the edTPA process, these supports may include:
- Explaining edTPA tasks and scoring rubrics and guiding discussions about them
- Examining lessons or examples of effective teaching using edTPA rubrics or support documents
- Discussing samples of previously completed edTPA portfolio materials (where appropriate permissions have been granted)
- Engaging candidates in formative experiences aligned with edTPA (e.g., assignments analyzing their instruction, developing curriculum units, or assessing student work
- Recommending and/or providing specific assistance to improve performance in areas in which the candidate has demonstrated a weakness, e.g., analytic writing, designing lessons, engaging students
- Explaining scoring rubrics, and using these rubrics in formative exercises or assignments
- Relating expectations in edTPA tasks and scoring rubrics to earlier assignments or experiences in the program
- Using rubric constructs or rubric language to evaluate and debrief observations made by field supervisors or cooperating teachers as part of the clinical supervision process

During the edTPA process, these supports may include:
- Providing a schedule/timeline for completion of sections of the edTPA submission
- Co-planning a learning segment with a cooperating teacher or a peer, as long as each candidate provides his/her own justification for planning decisions and analyses of the teaching and student learning in the commentaries
- Asking probing questions about candidates' draft edTPA responses or videorecordings

- **Providing references to relevant articles or sections of a text to address questions about effective teaching strategies**
- **In contexts where a candidate is unable to access the IEP, the cooperating teacher may provide relevant information about IEP goals, modifications, and accommodations in the IEP. This is subject to approval by the principal or official designee.**

Faculty Feedback Tool
Built within the Pearson e-Portfolio system, the Faculty Feedback tool allows candidates to share their edTPA artifacts and evidence with an identified faculty or staff member prior to submission for review and feedback. Candidates share their edTPA artifacts and evidence with their faculty/staff member. The faculty/staff member can then access the materials, review the candidate's documents and/or video clips, and provide feedback. The Guidelines for Acceptable Support document outlines the wide array of feedback that is appropriate.

edTPA Professional Growth Plan
To support the formative nature and continued learning that naturally follow completion of the edTPA, candidates and their mentors are encouraged to complete the edTPA Professional Growth Plan.

The edTPA Professional Growth Plan is intended to support candidates as they are exiting their program to examine their edTPA results and other sources of evidence in order to establish specific areas for support during their first years of teaching. Aligned with standards for the teaching profession (e.g., InTASC, NBPTS, Danielson's framework), edTPA is intended to be educative; candidates and programs can use assessment evidence to support decisions about next steps for practice. edTPA rubrics and local, state, or national teaching standards should be referenced as needed to support goal setting. Programs and states are encouraged to modify the template provided to explicitly address locally used evaluation frameworks, state pedagogical standards or induction program requirements.

Candidates are encouraged to complete Part I of the edTPA Professional Growth Plan with guidance from cooperating teachers and program clinical supervisors, and to use varied sources of evidence to reflect on and analyze their teaching effectiveness. In Part II, first year teachers use the Plan with induction mentors or other school support providers to determine the supports they need to address areas for professional growth. Part III of the Plan can be used throughout the early years of teaching in conjunction with district/state induction requirements or district observation/evaluation systems, and perhaps, as initial preparation for pursuit of National Board Certification.

To enhance the formative aspects of edTPA, one proposed modification is the introduction of modular submission. Currently, all three edTPA tasks are submitted and evaluated simultaneously, resulting in a single Total Score derived from all rubric scores. State education agencies then establish cut scores based on this Total Score. By adopting a modular submission model, where candidates submit one task at a time, they could receive

feedback and scores after each submission. This approach would give candidates the chance to integrate that feedback into their future submissions. Furthermore, EPP faculty and staff could provide timely formative feedback, guiding candidates' work on subsequent tasks. States could also set cut scores for each individual modular task. This way, candidates and EPPs would gain a clearer understanding of specific areas where candidates may need improvement if they do not meet the passing standard for a given modular task.

Please provide documentation or links to any resources that support your description.
- **Using edTPA**
- **Effectively Implementing edTPA**
- **edTPA Guidance For P-12 Administrators and Leaders**
- **Using the Pearson ePortfolio System**
- **Frequently Asked Questions About the Pearson ePortfolio System**
- **Guidelines for Acceptable Support**

Corresponds with part II of the slide deck template

---

(1) An analysis of any modifications needed to current assessments to ensure they are valid and authentic to the work of teaching, reasonable to implement in the wide range of classroom settings across the state, and appropriate for beginning teachers.

Please describe the ways in which your model is "valid and authentic to the work of teaching". If you choose, please identify possible improvements to the model.
The edTPA was developed within a technical framework of psychometric practice and principles guided by The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (AERA, APA, & NCME, 1999). The edTPA development process yielded important evidence to provide the foundation of the assessments' validity, reliability, and usability for the purposes of teacher licensure, accreditation of teacher preparation programs, and candidate completion of preparation programs. This work then proceeded under the guidance of experts in psychometric practices and procedures. In addition, participating states have subjected the analyses to further review by their own technical advisors. Advisors have held the process to a high standard.

As a valid performance assessment, edTPA provides an accurate measurement of the important features of a performance that are related to candidates' abilities to succeed at that endeavor in a real-world context. Multiple sources of evidence from the edTPA development process and data analyses collectively provide the foundation to support the validity of edTPA scores for licensure and accreditation purposes. The following summarizes validity evidence with respect to the content of the assessment and its relationship to job requirements.

Content Validity
The authenticity and content relevance of edTPA was a continual focus throughout the development process. It is the key feature that indicates that teacher candidates

demonstrate pedagogical and subject-matter knowledge and skills on the same tasks for which they will be responsible as licensed educators. Content validation activities for edTPA consisted of gathering feedback from educators to rate the importance, alignment, and representativeness of the knowledge and skills required for each rubric, and of the rubric itself, in relation to national pedagogical and content-specific standards. The content validation activities provide critical evidence that the content of the assessments is related to knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary for the job of teaching. As a result of the initial round of content validation activities, all tasks and components were rated above 3 on a 5-point scale, reflecting the judgments of reviewers that the knowledge and skills represented by tasks have "importance" to "very great importance," that they align to InTASC standards "well" to "very well," and that the rubrics represent relevant tasks of teaching. To further support content validity, an additional round of activities was conducted to provide additional confirmation of the importance, alignment, and representativeness of the edTPA tasks. The results are shown in the following table:

Content Validation: Pedagogy Ratings for All Fields									
	Importance of Knowledge and Skills			InTASC Standards Alignment			Rubric Representativeness		
Task/Component	N	Mean	Std Dev	N	Mean	Std Dev	N	Mean	Std Dev
Task 1: Planning	52	4.35	0.65	52	4.27	0.72	52	4.25	0.74
Task 2: Instruction	52	4.52	0.58	52	4.25	0.65	52	4.31	0.70
Task 3: Assessment	52	4.44	0.64	52	4.25	0.71	52	4.29	0.72

Content Validity Ratings. The table above displays content validity ratings (on a five-point scale with five being the most positive rating) given by edTPA content validity committee members. The data indicate a strong relationship between the assessment's key tasks and the job of an entry-level teacher.

Job Analysis Studies

The Job Analysis Studies (JAS) conducted for edTPA focused on the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) identified as necessary for successful teachers by the pool of subject matter experts who were involved during the development process. These experts were practicing classroom teachers or teacher educators in each of the content fields. The list of KSAs generated by this panel informed the development of the edTPA rubrics.

The link between these KSAs and teachers' actual work was then confirmed through JAS, which included the following steps: First, a group of teachers identified a list of 105 tasks and behaviors that are critical to teaching. These tasks then were taken to a national group of educators who rated several aspects of each identified task, answering questions such as:
- **Task Performed: Is the task performed on the job by a teacher?**
- **Task Importance: On a scale of one to five, how important is the task to effective job teacher performance?**
- **Time Spent on Task: On a scale of one to five, how much time is spent on the task?**

Responses related to each task were analyzed to identify the importance of each task to the job of teaching. From these ratings, an overall "criticality" value of tasks was calculated (with a minimum possible value of 3.0 and maximum possible value of 15.0). Of the 105 total behaviors and tasks, 86 of them met or exceeded the criticality threshold, which meant that 1) 90% or more of respondents agreed that they perform the task, and 2) each task's mean criticality rating was 8.0 or higher. Overall, the criticality value across the tasks had a mean of 10.35, maximum of 12.45, and minimum of 8.38. A panel of educators confirmed that the 15 rubrics were strongly related to the critical tasks and behaviors. Through this process, the 15 core edTPA rubrics were confirmed as representing knowledge, skills, and abilities that are judged to be important or critically important to perform the job of a teacher.

Construct Validity

Validity refers to the degree to which evidence and theory support proposed interpretations about uses of test scores. In the case of edTPA, we make inferences about candidates' readiness to teach based upon their total score across all rubrics of the edTPA. The AERA, APA, NCME Standards (1999) suggest that studying the internal structure of items or tasks on an assessment is one of the primary sources of evidence that can be used to support construct-based score inferences.

Factor analysis was used to provide support for the use of a total score on the edTPA and strengthen inferences about candidate readiness to teach based on edTPA scores. Factor analysis is a psychometric method that evaluates patterns in the scores of an assessment. It can be used to answer two important questions regarding the interpretation of edTPA scores. First, is there support for using a single total score, summed across all 15 rubrics, to summarize a candidate's performance? Second, do the patterns of scores across rubrics support the theory underlying the development of the edTPA tasks and rubrics? Finding one or a small number of related underlying dimensions in the data supports the validity of inferences that edTPA measures a primary characteristic of effective teaching.

An exploratory factor analysis results in a set of estimated factor loadings. Such loadings can range from about -1.0 to +1.0. We expect the factor loadings to be positive and approaching a score of 1 for all rubrics in order to support use of a total score. To study whether the theoretical task structure is appropriate an additional factor analysis was conducted to determine which rubrics were most strongly related. We expect that rubrics within the same task will be more closely related, and that performance across tasks also will be strongly related.

The data suggest that all factor loadings are positive and of moderate to large magnitude. These results support the use of a single total score. The second factor analysis demonstrated that the hypothesized task structure of the edTPA is supported by the patterns of candidates' scores (see 2013 edTPA Field Test: Summary Report for additional details).

The edTPA® process identifies and collects subject-specific evidence of effective teaching from a learning segment of 3-5 lessons. These lessons come from a unit of instruction for one class of students. Teacher candidates submit authentic artifacts from a clinical field experience. Candidates also submit commentaries that provide a rationale to support their instructional practices based on the learning strengths and needs of their students.

Possible modifications and or enhancements to edTPA to ensure its continued validity and authenticity to the work of teaching may include modifying the academic language requirements to place greater emphasis on disciplinary literacy. As literacy across the disciplines has grown in importance and is part of the work of authentic teaching practices, this can be more clearly reflected in the academic language requirements of edTPA. Additionally, a review could be conducted to ensure that constructs related to culturally relevant teaching practices are demonstrated at the level of proficiency.

Please provide documentation or links to any resources that support your description.
- **2013 edTPA Field Test: Summary Report**
- **edTPA Annual Administrative Reports**

Corresponds with part III of the slide deck template

Please describe the ways in which your model is "reasonable to implement in a wide range of classroom settings". If you choose, please identify possible improvements to the model. Through their edTPA® evidence, candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to help all students learn in real classrooms. As part of edTPA, teacher candidates develop lesson plans and engage students in learning consistent with their school's mission, standards, and curricula. edTPA's common architecture consists of three interconnected tasks that are naturally embedded in clinical practice/teaching: planning, instruction, and assessment. Candidates tailor their teaching to their school context and reflect on their planning, instruction, and assessment practices in preparation for the written commentaries they must submit.

There should be limited changes in overall responsibilities for cooperating/mentor teachers who are supporting candidates as they complete edTPA. As a supervising teacher, their primary role is to mentor, model, and support candidates based on program expectations. Candidates may also benefit from input about the context and background of the student in the classroom early in the process so they can use that knowledge to plan instruction based on specific student strength and needs. Cooperating/mentor teacher and building administrators can assist with acquiring parent/guardian permission for video recording and other logistical considerations.

Candidates who are in co-teaching placements and working with a cooperating teacher or a peer candidate can submit materials and evidence that is developed or selected through the co-planning activities and provide their own justification for planning decisions and

analyses of the teaching and student learning in the commentaries. edTPA can be used in classrooms where the curriculum is scripted or when using high-quality instructional materials (HQIM). When working with HQIM, candidates are encouraged to be explicit about the use of these materials when drafting their prompt responses, particularly in the Context for Learning. Candidates are asked to describe any district, school, or cooperating teacher requirements or expectations that might affect planning or delivery of instruction, such as required curricula, pacing plan, use of specific instructional strategies, or standardized tests. Details can be added to any related prompt where the candidate feels that an explanation of the HQIM curriculum would be beneficial, but candidates should provide examples to show how materials and assessments have been modified to meet the needs of their unique group of learners. Those changes can be modest.

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the edTPA program introduced significant modifications that resulted in greater flexibility to the assessment and the range of classroom settings in which it may be completed. These adjustments included comprehensive guidance for executing edTPA in a Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) and increasing the options for alternative evidence when video submissions are not possible. The VLE guidelines provide candidates with explicit instructions on how to demonstrate student engagement, collect work samples, and offer feedback in virtual instruction scenarios. For placements where video recording is prohibited, such as mental health facilities or juvenile detention centers, the edTPA program has outlined six clear alternatives, including combinations of audio recordings, transcripts, and observation notes.

Beyond the changes prompted by the pandemic, the edTPA program may consider further modifications or improvements, such as implementing a modular submission model. This approach would allow candidates to complete and submit modular tasks at different times, aligning better with the specific requirements of each task, thus ensuring the implementation is practical across diverse classroom settings.

Please provide documentation or links to any resources that support your description.
- **edTPA Guidance For P-12 Administrators and Leaders**
- **Teachers Who Support Teacher Candidates**
- **HQIM Considerations for edTPA**
- **Requesting an Alternative to Video Evidence: Instructions, Options, and Decisions**
- **Requirements and Considerations for Candidates Completing edTPA in a Virtual Learning Environment**

Corresponds with part IV of the slide deck template

Please describe the ways in which your model is "appropriate for beginning teachers". If you choose, please identify possible improvements to the model.
Unlike typical licensure assessments external to programs, edTPA is intended to be embedded in a teacher preparation program and to be "educative" for candidates, faculty,

and programs. Candidates deepen their understanding of teaching while preparing for edTPA and reflecting on their strengths and challenges as they move forward into the profession.

edTPA is a subject-specific performance assessment that evaluates a common set of teaching principles and teaching behaviors as well as pedagogical strategies that are focused on specific content learning outcomes for P–12 students (birth–21 in special education settings). An extensive Review of Research on Teacher Education provides the conceptual and empirical rationale for edTPA's three-task design and the rubrics' representation of initial competencies needed to be ready to teach. The five-level rubrics are progressive in that they align to evidence that indicates a candidate is "not quite yet ready to teach" to an advanced beginning teacher, with level three grounded as the proficient level. Such an approach is developmental in that evidence can be aligned to any place along that continuum.

The assessment systematically examines a cycle of teaching aimed at subject-specific student learning goals using authentic evidence derived from candidates' practice in their student teaching or internship placement. A cycle of teaching, captured by the three tasks that compose an edTPA portfolio, includes:
1. planning
2. instruction, and
3. assessment of student learning.

Authentic and job-related evidence includes lesson plans, instructional materials, student assignments and assessments, feedback on student work, and unedited video recordings of instruction. Also assessed through the three tasks are candidates' abilities to develop their students' academic language and to justify and analyze their own teaching practices.

After candidates receive their scores, they are encouraged to use the Professional Growth Plan to document their edTPA results and other evidence of teaching to inform their goal setting for induction and the early years of teaching.

Possible additional modifications or improvements to edTPA to ensure that it is appropriate for beginning teachers may include revising the assessment materials to make to easier them to navigate and to use language that is more familiar to teacher candidates. Additionally, by offering more flexibility in completing/submitting the edTPA in a modular approach candidate could identify specific points in time that best allow them to create the evidence of their teaching that aligns with the specific requirements of a particular modular task.

Please provides documentation or links to any resources that support your description.
[edTPA Guidance For P-12 Administrators and Leaders](#)
[edTPA Annual Administrative Reports](#)

44320.2

(6) Analyze possible sources of bias in the performance assessment and act promptly to eliminate any bias that is discovered.

Please describe the ways in which your model analyzes and eliminates bias. If you choose, please identify possible improvements to the model.

<u>Bias and Sensitivity Review</u>

State agencies and teacher preparation programs adopting edTPA benefit from an assessment system that has been carefully reviewed for fairness and freedom from potential bias. This review was achieved through the structured examination of handbook prompts, rubrics, and directions by a diverse and trained pool of professional teachers and teacher educators from across the nation who provided feedback on the structure of prompts, phrasing of questions, language of rubrics, and formatting of handbooks to ensure comprehensibility and equitable access and evaluation for all candidates completing edTPA.

<u>Training for Scorers</u>

edTPA scorers complete a series of robust training modules, including modules on recognizing and implicit bias. Training for scorers comprises both individual online and interactive group sessions, totaling about 20 hours. The individualized training includes a series of online training modules that orient scorers to the tasks, rubrics, and scoring system and provides numerous opportunities to identify and evaluate evidence for each rubric.

During training, scorers review and analyze up to five edTPA submissions prior to qualifying to score (one embedded in individual online modules, one interactive practice session, two or three qualifying submissions). After completing the individual portions of the training materials, scorers independently score a sample edTPA submission and then engage in a live (online) interactive group session with a trainer in that content area. The independent scoring activity gives the scorers the opportunity to practice scoring a subject-specific submission that has been coded by experienced scorers and trainers and then discuss evidence and score justifications with the trainer and other scorers in the interactive session.

After completing the interactive training session, scorers score and identify evidence for at least two additional edTPA submissions, previously coded by experienced scorers (i.e., "qualifying submissions"), within their specific content area prior to scoring candidate submissions. The qualifying submissions verify the scorer's understanding of the scoring criteria and his or her ability to score candidate submissions accurately and consistently.

This robust training serves to ensure that new scorers are calibrated and scoring appropriately according to the rubrics. Ongoing calibration exercises ensure scorers are consistent and reliable.

Subgroup Scores

As part of the bias and sensitivity review, average total scores across different subgroups were compared. For the 2013 edTPA field test participants, the following figure displays participation and performance data—including mean scores, standard deviation, and submission volumes—for various participant groups. Gender, ethnicity, and primary language are based on self-reported responses. No noticeable differences were found across different genders or for candidates whose primary language was not English. (Note, however, that very few candidates reported that English was not their primary language.) Comparatively small differences were obtained among the subgroups in ethnic categories, given the standard deviation of mean scores. In other words, there was greater variation in scores within subgroups than there was variation across subgroups. Because many of these comparisons are based on very unequal sample sizes, and some of the subgroup sample sizes are very small, any differences should be interpreted cautiously.

Summary Statistics of Total Score by Subgroups			
Gender	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**
Female	2,819	42.88	8.25
Male	795	42.23	7.89
Undeclared	55	44.55	7.65
Ethnicity	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**
American Indian or Alaskan	19	39.74	9.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	145	44.97	8.09
Black (Non-Hispanic)	83	39.67	8.68
Hispanic	143	42.28	6.85
Other	90	42.58	9.27
Uncategorized	184	44.36	8.11
White (Non-Hispanic)	3,005	42.69	8.14
Primary Language	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**
Non-English	62	42.29	8.07
English	3,568	42.75	8.16
Undeclared	39	44.74	9.55

Summary Statistics by Subgroups. The table shows performance data from the 2013 field test relative to the demographic characteristics of ethnicity, gender, and primary language, based on self-reported responses.

Annual Administrative Reports

Annual Administrative Reports offer insights into candidate performance, broken down by several variables. These include demographic information such as gender, race, and primary language, as well as placement-related factors like geographic location, percentage of English Language Learners (ELL), and Special Education (SPED) eligibility. When applicable, ANOVAs and post-hoc analyses are performed to explore performance differences across these variable groupings.

The edTPA program is committed to analyzing and eliminating bias through the continued review of candidate data and performance across many demographic variables. Programmatic and assessment changes will be made as indicated by the data.

Please provides documentation or links to any resources that support your description.
- [2013 edTPA Field Test: Summary Report
- Annual Administrative Reports]

Corresponds with part VI of the slide deck template