

Assessment Development Subcommittee Meeting
February 23, 2015
The Lyceum, Hartford CT
11:00 AM – 4:00 PM

Time
11:00

Activity

Welcome and Re-Introduction

Purpose of Today's Meeting:

- Present summary of feedback regarding draft of New Teacher Survey
- Review *edTPA* materials – decisions about adoption of *edTPA* are not going to be made today

Summary of Feedback Regarding Draft of New Teacher Survey

Main points of feedback offered by committee members:

- Competencies included in survey are appropriate and aligned to CCT
- Items regarding impact of program faculty and cooperating teacher are appropriate and desirable.
- Suggestion to unpack some questions, so that they isolate specific experiences and skills rather than clustering them in one item. In particular, separate questions regarding clinical experiences and cooperating teachers/university supervisors.
- Likert scale is appropriate but could use descriptions regarding what constitutes degree of agreement with a statement
- Challenge is to ask questions that elicit information about the program holistically/contextually rather than about individuals within the program.
- Another challenge is the timing of survey administration and the self-reporting nature of the instrument. Need enough time for candidate to gain experience as a teacher and reflect on how well they were prepared.

Next steps (for April meeting) include discussing new draft and possible pilot in Fall 2015

Recap of Previous Discussion about a Pre-Service Performance Assessment

- Continuum of educator assessments was reviewed – from pre-service through career. Currently lacking a pre-service performance assessment of pedagogical competency. An assessment with a solid research base is needed.
- Pros and cons of commercially available assessments shown. Participant noted that *edTPA* was not shown in pros and cons format on the slide. [Note from presenter: The slides to which the participant refers serve two differing and distinct purposes. The first two summarize the pros and cons of two performance assessments the group reviewed in a previous meeting and decided against. The third slide summarizes the reasons the group achieved consensus around moving forward with a continued exploration of *edTPA*.]
- At the last committee meeting, the group agreed to find out more about *edTPA*, given the need for reliable and valid tool.

12:10

Presentation of *edTPA* Assessment & Support System

Nathan Estel (Director, Educator Relations for *edTPA* at Pearson) provided information

about the key features of the assessment and an overview of how it is implemented in multiple states.

Kellie Crawford (Manager, Education Relations for *edTPA* at Pearson) facilitated a review of student handbooks and sample assessments for various subject areas.

Themes of questions posed about the *edTPA* assessment:

- Qualifications of scorers and where they are based
- Level of contextualization allowed by the instrument
- How performance standards are determined
- Issues related to big data and privacy
- Feasibility of completing portfolio requirements
- Possibility of writing tasks being too time-consuming
- Ongoing research base behind instrument (e.g., identifying “false positives” and “false negatives”)

2:30

Discussion of *edTPA* Implementation Considerations

Themes of questions and comments:

- Details pertaining to test administration (i.e., at what point in candidate’s trajectory to administer, cut scores, repercussions of failing one or more tasks)
- Cost to participants and models for providing financial assistance
- Impact of a common pre-service or pre-licensure assessment on establishing a common language within and across teacher prep programs, as well as across induction and educator evaluation systems.
- Candidates’ willingness to use a social justice lens in their practice if they feel their curriculum must be “sanitized” to meet the benchmarks specified in the test
- Use of *edTPA* for formative purposes
- Impact on students’ interest in teaching careers
- Possible benefits of having a certification requirement accepted by multiple states
- Lessons learned and challenges faced during the BEST process, which is similar to *edTPA* in that it had a portfolio component, should be considered if there is a decision to move forward

Process clarification: This committee will make a recommendation to the full EPAC regarding *edTPA*, and then EPAC will make a recommendation that goes to the SBOE

3:35

Next steps

- Mr. Estel will share a document that describes how states have implemented *edTPA*, including outlines of the supports that Pearson provides to the state during the ramp-up process.
- The concerns and questions raised today will be discussed further at a future meeting of this committee.
- To continue with information gathering, consider inviting a speaker (IHE and/or SEA representative) who has experience implementing *edTPA*.

3:50

Adjourn