



edTPA Breakfast Meeting at AACTE's 66th Annual Meeting

Questions and Answers

March 2, 2014

1. How do programs sustain their mission and values without changing their curriculum to teach to the test?

SCALE staff and edTPA™ national design team member Misty Sato (University of Minnesota) have developed an extensive [FAQ on edTPA and the teacher education curriculum](#).

2. Why hasn't SCALE completed any predictive validity research for edTPA? Has this been linked to variation in classroom performance in any way?

The validation of teacher licensure assessments for standardized tests and performance assessment traditionally is anchored in establishing a systematic evaluation of the relationship between the theoretical constructs that define effective teaching and the individual characteristics that define successful job performance. Predictive validity studies for licensure assessments are routinely conducted after a test or assessment has been in operational use. In fact, examining the validity processes used for other forms of performance assessment of teaching, there is not one instance where predictive validity was established prior to the adoption and operational use of the assessment. Most notably, predictive validity studies for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) were conducted after the implementation of the program; the ProTeach performance assessment developed by ETS for Washington State also did not conduct predictive validity studies prior to the implementation and adoption of the teaching assessment. Moreover, conducting predictive validity studies during a field trial introduces many sources of error that could compromise the results, including the main concern that candidates are not the teacher of record during clinical practice that certainly would confound the results of the study.

The implementation of predictive validity requires following candidates into their teaching practice for several years in order to obtain a stable estimate of student learning based on the research findings of value-added studies conducted for teacher evaluation. Nevertheless, SCALE is committed to conducting predictive validity studies in the future for edTPA that follow candidates into employment. The edTPA National Technical Advisory Committee of leading psychometricians in the field are advising SCALE on the design of criterion and predictive validity studies for edTPA. In summary, validation of edTPA has been guided by the current standards for psychological testing for AERA, APA, and NCME (American Educational Research Association, 1999) and the EEOC Uniform Guidelines (U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training, 1999). See attached references for examples of predictive validity research for other performance-based assessments of teaching.

3. edTPA seems mainly focused on capturing and assessing direct instruction – how can it address other, more innovative methods of teaching?

Interestingly, some members of the teacher education community have posed the opposite question – asking why edTPA is so constructivist? In fact, we have developed the design and architecture of edTPA to allow preparation programs to support candidates using multiple approaches to teaching and learning. Subject-specific design team members used their subject matter content and pedagogical standards to determine the types of teaching and learning edTPA handbooks would emphasize for their field. For all fields, the central focus for student learning must go beyond facts and skills to develop conceptual understandings and engage with content in meaningful ways. edTPA’s focus on deep, meaningful subject-matter learning for students, the importance of connecting instruction to students’ prior academic learning and lived experiences, as well the emphasis on high leverage pedagogical practices, can be accomplished through a variety of instructional approaches. Direct instruction is not a requirement for edTPA, but would certainly be a valid pedagogy if done well.

4. What is SCALE’s position on Sharon’s use of the term “market” and the underlying tone of the “selling” of edTPA?

A response from Sharon Robinson -- When I use the word market, I refer to the fact that educator preparation programs are an entity in the economy; the economy of the university, the economy of the community, and the economy of higher education as an industry. They have expenses and they generate revenue. Further, the extent to which educator preparation programs can act with consensus is the extent to which they have influence regarding important factors such as curriculum and outcome measures. So in one way of thinking, the market is the same as the professional community. As a community, it is possible to articulate a need for certain products essential to getting the work of the community accomplished. The community/market should demand certain specifications and considerations (as is the case with edTPA). These demands would not have the same influence if they reflected the views of a small segment of the community, even an elite segment of the community. When the professional community acts in concert, expressing the best thinking of a considerable and diverse segment of the entire community, it is more influential because it is acting as a well-informed and well-intended professional market/community.

We are not selling edTPA. We are urging more and more involvement in the development and utilization of edTPA so it can remain something that is worthy of use. If that condition is met, we advocate for its use without reservation.

5. Can you speak to edTPA as a formative program component versus edTPA as a summative (yet done prior to program completion), state certification requirement: what have you learned about the educative possibilities and limitations of edTPA in these differing contexts?

edTPA is designed for use as a summative, capstone assessment of teaching embedded in clinical practice. edTPA contributes to a multiple measures assessment system for licensure that complements basic skill and subject matter exams, clinical evaluations, and other program specific formative/summative assessment tools. That said, edTPA prompts and rubrics are available to participating programs and candidates and can be used formatively to guide candidate opportunities to develop knowledge and skills throughout their programs. Based on our experiences with PACT in California and early use of edTPA around the country, educative implementation is a function of faculty engagement, inquiry, leadership and support to ensure that compliance with a mandate does not overshadow thoughtful use. We hear from many programs that the most effective way to maintain educative implementation is by engaging faculty in local evaluation or other processes for reviewing actual candidate portfolios in combination with performance data. Such conversations lead to appropriate formative use, curriculum mapping and support in clinical practice. See also our responses to other items in this document on curriculum change (“teaching to the test”) and appropriate formative support.

6. How will Pearson and SCALE deal with an inadequate number of scorers in particular areas (for example, visual and performing arts)?

SCALE, AACTE and Pearson work together to recruit scorers through subject matter organization networks, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, the National Education Association and other professional educator organizations. Pearson sets and monitors the qualified scorer target numbers for each content area based on estimated numbers of portfolio submissions for each content area and the timeframes those portfolio submissions are expected throughout the year. These estimates are based on state and campus licensure information and the number of submission/scoring/reporting windows offered. Fall operational results were used to adjust hiring and training numbers to assure a large scoring pool. Additionally, scorer hiring was increased in content areas that were challenging to score on schedule due to a higher scorer training and qualification attrition and lower scorer productivity in some fields (i.e. Performing Arts, Physical Education, and Visual Arts). Throughout the year, Pearson monitors portfolio submission numbers, tracks trends in scorer productivity, and forecasts the completion of submissions for each reporting date by content area.

Over the past four months, Pearson has reached out to more than 400 organizations across the country to publicize the edTPA scoring opportunity. In addition, an aggressive online campaign was conducted through various outlets such as Facebook,



Indeed, Monster. Notices for scorer recruiting have run consistently in Education Week and the Chronicle of Higher Education, both online and print.

The target was to recruit an additional 10,000 applicants in 2014; more than 7,500 have been added to the applicant pool since January 2014.

7. Regarding edTPA reciprocity – to what extent has NASDTEC been brought into discussions related to edTPA (to address interstate reciprocity issues)?

edTPA was designed to support a common language and expectation for “ready to teach” and is available for use nationally. Reciprocity has been discussed by the national policy advisory committee, which includes Phil Rogers who is executive director for NASDTEC. SCALE, AACTE and/or Pearson meet regularly with representatives from NASDTEC and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) who are working with the NTEP group. We have also convened a small advisory group of state standards board leaders to discuss a variety of related policies including reciprocity. The first meeting of the smaller group (led by Jennifer Wallace of the Washington Professional Educator Standards Board) was held at the end of the March. Lastly, Sarah Pinsky and Liz Ross of AACTE have convened AACTE state chapter leaders from edTPA states (primarily in the mid-West) to discuss policies that impact IHE teacher preparation programs. More details as we engage with each group.

8. The new Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers (PPAT) sounds like edTPA – what are their similarities and differences?

In contrast to other models, which are generic measures of isolated tasks applied across all grade levels, edTPA is an integrated assessment system that evaluates an authentic cycle of teaching aimed at subject-specific learning goals. It uses evidence about 1) planning, 2) instruction, and 3) student assessment derived from a short unit of instruction taught by a teaching candidate. Submitted artifacts include lesson plans, instructional materials, student assignments and assessments, feedback on student work, and unedited video recordings of instruction. The integrated assessment design, which is shared across all 27 subject-specific edTPA assessments, achieves both an evaluation of pedagogical strategies for specific disciplinary goals, as well as a common set of teaching principles and high-leverage teaching behaviors.

9. Alternative certification programs – what is their experience with requiring edTPA (and when)?

Use of edTPA in alternative certification programs is a state policy decision. Some states are requiring edTPA for licensure regardless of pathway. For example, Georgia will require edTPA for all candidates beginning in 2015-2016, and already Metro Atlanta Teach for America candidates take edTPA as a summative assessment prior to moving forward to a second year in the classroom. Wisconsin’s edTPA policy is not consequential for traditionally prepared candidates until 2016, but those applying for “license by equivalence” must take and pass edTPA now. SCALE and AACTE staff



participate/present at the annual National Association for Alternative Certification (NAAC).

10. Why is the cost so prohibitive? We are creating a system whereby only people with access to extra \$ can become teachers.

The \$300 fee for edTPA is the lowest price point for a subject-specific performance based assessment of teaching. To be clear, the one-time fee covers the cost of registration, online resources, certified scorers and their extensive training, payments to scoring supervisors and trainers who prepare and monitor scorers, calibration of scorers over time to ensure the reliability of scoring and the technical and human infrastructure needed to process and report candidate scores. The fee does not need to be paid directly by the teacher candidate. Some states or programs are paying for and/or subsidizing that cost. Some campuses have found ways to embed the cost of edTPA in a program fee so that students can use financial aid to pay for edTPA. In addition, Pearson has provided fee waivers to states with a formal agreement to participate in edTPA and is using edTPA for consequential purposes (for example, as a requirement for teacher licensure) during 2014.

As Ray commented at the breakfast meeting, it is time for states to examine all fees for licensure exams and determine how these can be reduced. States using edTPA could consider eliminating other licensure exams to offset costs.

11. We are finding that there is a great deal of subjectivity involved in scoring, based on the evidence of re-submitted edTPAs?

In high stakes assessment, evaluating possible instances of subjectivity of scorers is monitored through the training and scoring process. First, no scorer can score without successfully completing the online training modules and demonstrating their proficiency to score consistently. All scorers must meet calibration standards to be eligible to score. That is, within all 27 licensing areas, scorers must meet calibration standards for at least 3 edTPA assessments. Further, all scorers who are scoring in real time are monitored through “read behinds” conducted by expert supervisors and trainers. Additionally, pre-scored edTPA portfolios are randomly put in the scorers’ queue to check whether all scorers maintain their proficiency to score the edTPA reliably (i.e., a real time subjectivity check). In addition, a sample of edTPA portfolios is randomly selected for double scoring to monitor scorer consistency. Lastly, if the total score for a portfolio does not meet the passing standard, the portfolio is scored by a second scorer. If the two sets of scores are not consistent, a scoring supervisor scores the portfolio for the third time and adjudicates any discrepancies. These same proficiency/calibration methods used to evaluate subjectivity and fairness in scoring are routinely applied in high stakes testing whether it is for the NBPTS, edTPA or the ETS PPAT assessment.

12. Why can't we send our supervisors to be trained and have them do the evaluations of the candidates' edTPA? This would bring back local control and maybe bring the price down for the candidates if Pearson doesn't have all the control.

SCALE encourages program faculty to apply as edTPA scorers, complete the training, qualify and officially score in the national pool. Some states may develop policies that allow for regional or campus-based scoring with a centralized audit. For the time being, a national scoring model is in place to ensure a highly qualified, closely monitored, calibrated scoring pool and consistently scored performances.

13. What progress has been made to allow institution to use a combination of local evaluation and a percentage of edTPAs to be sent to Pearson?

As per the item above, we are in discussions about how scorers could be officially trained and not serve in the national scoring pool.

15. How are you addressing the issues of access and equity raised by organizations such as NAME?

Following the release of the resolution from NAME, Sharon Robinson [authored a statement](#) addressing a number of inaccuracies described in the resolution. In addition, members of the edTPA national policy advisory board (including executive directors from NBPTS and NEA) and other edTPA advocates sent letters supporting edTPA to the NAME board and executive director, Kevin Kumishira. Sharon Robinson and Saroja Barnes met by phone with Dr. Kumishira and three board members, and Ray Pecheone and Andrea Whittaker met with Dr. Kumishira and Rick Ayers in San Francisco in late March and made a commitment to continued dialogue. Andrea has also met individually with Francisco Rios (incoming NAME president). We are asking for an open dialogue and correction of misconceptions continually perpetuated by the organization; and we are working with edTPA supporters whose scholarship emphasizes equity, social justice and culturally relevant pedagogy to voice their perspectives (e.g., Marvin Lynn, Etta Hollins, Maria Hyler). See also the recent commentary on [edTPA and culturally relevant pedagogy](#) by Marvin Lynn published by Diverse Issues in Higher Education and posted on edtpa.aacte.org.

16. Why aren't there more NBCTs scoring?

Almost one quarter of all edTPA scorers hired are NBCTs. SCALE has done extensive outreach with NEA and NBPTS leaders to assist in recruiting qualified P-12 educators to become scorers for edTPA. Nicole Merino and Andrea Whittaker are working with the NBPTS support network leaders to identify support providers, NBPTS scorers and other affiliated teachers to score.

17. How do you support diverse populations in succeeding on edTPA (especially first/second generation immigrants)?

SCALE will continue to examine “adverse impact” data throughout operational use of edTPA including candidate demographics and placement contexts. For programs, all candidates should have opportunities to develop the knowledge and skills needed for effective teaching that are assessed by edTPA, as well as formative support for close reading of text, analytic writing and reflection. SCALE and AACTE are committed to developing additional resources for programs to conduct curriculum mapping and embed these essential skills within programs

In addition, edTPA scorers are trained to examine evidence from commentaries and artifacts and are directed explicitly that writing skills are not measured by edTPA. As described in the [Making Good Choices](#) resource for candidates:

“Scoring rubrics do not address the quality of your writing (nor will you be penalized for errors in spelling, grammar, or syntax), you should be mindful that your written work reflects your thinking and your professionalism. Try to let your own voice come through in your writing. Writing errors may change or cloud the meaning of your commentaries, so proofreading is essential.”

18. When will national scores from Fall 2013 be available?

Pearson will release the first interim report of national performance data for edTPA (Fall 2013 data) in May 2014. The interim reports are useful for programs and states to use in comparing their performance to the rest of the edTPA population.

19. Ray shared an idea to provide feedback to institutions that included Low, Proficient, and advanced performance. If that idea is implemented what measures would be taken to ensure that the feedback provided to IHEs remains feedback for the purpose of improvement so that the information would not be published to the public and be used inappropriately?

SCALE and Pearson do not reveal any campus or program-specific data. Educator Preparation Programs receive candidate and program score reports (and state level comparisons) and states receive candidate and/or program level data based on state policy.

Ray’s description of feedback serves a different purpose than interpreted in the question. SCALE will be convening an expert users group to select and tag examples of artifacts, commentary responses, and transcripts of video evidence that help to illuminate differences across score levels. These examples would not be identified with any particular campus or candidate but represent typical performance at a particular score level. These vignettes and samples would be used by programs to help faculty and candidates interpret rubric level expectations.

In the meantime, our local evaluation protocol, local evaluation rubrics with “look fors”, sample candidate portfolios, and completed evidence rubrics are all excellent resources [available to edTPA coordinators](#) to share with faculty. These materials provide faculty and clinical supervisors with strategies to examine their own candidates’ portfolio materials, to provide candidates with feedback, and to interpret official score reports. In addition, experience with local evaluation provides faculty with essential understandings of edTPA performance levels necessary to review candidate portfolios and advise candidates who must retake edTPA. SCALE and AACTE staff and national academy consultants routinely offer face-to-face local evaluation training at state and regional events.

20. Inter-rater Reliability – A concern I have is about the 48% exact agreement. In state like ours where edTPA is consequential (no passing score = no license), one single point is a huge deal!! It could be the difference between spending \$160,000 and leaving with a job and teaching license or spending that much and leaving with no license. Retakes and revisions mean additional semester of enrollment, tuition, etc., that may not be in reach for all. 48% on something so critical does not seem acceptable. Will you continue to make revisions to bring this up? We know that double-scoring will happen for those entries that “fail” but we’d like to see higher inter-rater reliability for the first time around.

As noted in the answer to question number 11 above, edTPA scorer training and scoring is very closely monitored for consistency. Pearson and SCALE staff continuously monitors scorer qualifying rates and agreement rates during live scoring and make modifications to training and calibration processes as needed. The exact and adjacent agreement rate approaches 100 percent in operational scoring. Given the double scoring and adjudication practices applied to portfolios near the cut score, no candidate is at risk of failure based on a single, errant score.

21. Is there a current list of states in which edTPA (successful/passing) will be required for out-of-state candidates with official implementation dates?

The edTPA website includes a policy page that provides an interactive map of edTPA participation, links to state policies and a pdf document describing state policies and implementation timelines and supports.

<http://edtpa.aacte.org/state-policy>

22. Impact of varying “pass” scores?

See the [edTPA Summary Report](#) for a rationale for a common cut score across all fields and a full description of standard setting. A short excerpt is provided here.

During the edTPA standard-setting process conducted in August 2013, the practitioner panel and policy panel recommended a maximum score of no more than 42 as the professional performance standard that should be considered. The final panel (a subset of both the practitioner and policy panel) supported a similar cut score benchmark.

Typically, in setting a cut score for a pass-fail decision, a standard error of measurement is applied to the recommended score so as to minimize erroneous decisions (e.g., false negatives).

States set their own passing scores based on state standard setting that takes into account state-specific data, measurement data, and policy considerations. As discussed by the standard-setting committee members, states may consider setting their initial cut score lower than the committee-suggested cut score to give programs time as they learn to deliver and support edTPA activities and to support candidates' preparation of their submissions. As warranted, the cut score can be raised over time.

23. Sharon and Ray – important aspect of “educative assessment” – yet how does supervisor sort out important feedback for candidates’ learning within acceptable levels of support?

SCALE staff is revising the [Guidelines for Supporting Candidates Completing edTPA](#) based on questions and comments from the field. The new document will be more succinct and clearly delineate authentic support practices from inappropriate coaching. edTPA should not constrict a supervisor’s ongoing conversations, feedback and support for candidates in clinical practice. While supervisors should not edit or offer suggestions for what gets documented in edTPA, they should not be held silent while mentoring candidates about their day to day teaching.

Predictive Validity Research

Performance Based Assessments of Teaching

Bond, L., Smith, T., Baker, W., & Hattie, J. (2000). *The certification system of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards: A construct and consequential validity study*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Educational Research and Evaluation.

Cavaluzzo, L. (2004). *Is National Board Certification an effective signal of teacher quality?* (National Science Foundation No. REC-0107014). Alexandria, VA: The CNA Corporation.

Goldhaber, D., & Anthony, E. (2005). *Can teacher quality be effectively assessed?* Seattle, WA: University of Washington and the Urban Institute; Smith, T., Gordon, B., Colby, S., & Wang, J. (2005). *An examination of the relationship of the depth of student learning and National Board certification status*. Boone, NC: Office for Research on Teaching, Appalachian State University.

Newton, S. P. (2010). *Predictive validity of the performance assessment for California teachers*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education. Retrieved from <http://scale.stanford.edu/>; Newton, S.P. & Darling-Hammond (2012). *Do teacher performance assessments predict teacher effectiveness?* Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education.

Vandevoort, L. G., Amrein-Beardsley, A., & Berliner, D. C. (2004). National Board certified teachers and their students' achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 12(46), 117.

Wilson, M., & Hallum, P. J. (2006). Using student achievement test scores as evidence of external validity for indicators of teacher quality: Connecticut's *Beginning Educator Support and Training* program. Berkeley, CA: University of California at Berkeley.