Assessment Development Subcommittee Meeting
July 21, 2016
307A
9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Present: Sarah Barzee, Ken Daly, Jay Feldman (called-in), Ann Gruenberg, Stephen Hegedus, Nancy Hoffman, Mel Horton, Shannon Marimón, Gary Maynard, Georgette Nemr, Katie O'Callaghan, Katie Toohey, Amanda Turner, Nitya Vankatswaran

9:00 – 9:10   Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review

Amanda Turner welcomed the subcommittee. She explained that the meeting summary and any materials shared at today's meeting will be posted to the EPAC website. A summary of the pilot work was summarized for the subcommittee:

- Seven educator preparation programs volunteered to participate in the edTPA pilot in Spring 2015, including both public and private programs, Alternative Route to Certification (ARC) programs, and Teach for America CT.
- The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) then contracted with RTI International to provide a clear picture of structured supports and policies when implementing the pilot of edTPA in 2015-2016.
- In the November 2013 meeting, several assessments were reviewed, which included Note, PPAT and edTPA.
- Based on information at the November meeting and hearing from other states that have used edTPA, this committee recommended piloting the edTPA.

Amanda Turner explained that the subcommittee will hear from three of the seven programs that piloted the assessment. The subcommittee will also listen to the evaluation report and identify adaptions to the implementation of a rigorous assessment to ensure teacher candidate success from day one. She stated that the subcommittee would make a formal recommendation at the end of the meeting, which the CSDE will present to EPAC for their consideration.

9:10 – 9:20   Recapping 2015-16 Subcommittee Work

Georgette Nemr provided an update on the New Teacher and Employer Survey. She explained the findings from the pilot and next steps for implementation of the survey. Georgette discussed the IHE District Partnership MOU Template and a survey that measured the participation between IHEs and districts. This work was put on hold to wait for a preliminary report to be released. It was suggested by members of the committee to inquire with Mike Alfano about the progress of the IHE district partnership work.

Sarah Barzee reiterated that the updates from the CSDE were the New Employer Survey and the need to develop guidance and an interview protocol for IHE and district partnership. The survey is being done to take the burden off of the programs and provide consistency. Amanda Turner reminded the subcommittee that the draft of the New Employer survey was brought to this committee in May of 2015.

Georgette Nemr stated that the CSDE's work related to CAEP standards includes the need for a metric to record partnership in Standard 2. This year, through CEEDAR and AACTE CT, stakeholders need to come together to discuss the measurement of the quality of partnerships. It is understood that CAEP is

working on piloting something but it is not final. Teacher Prep Analytics is piloting a measure, but it does not go to the district. This measurement is something that is needed, so the discussion will be ongoing.

9:20 – 10:15   2015-2016 Voluntary edTPA Pilot External Evaluation Report, RTI International

Nitya Vankatswaran of RTI International presented on the findings of the voluntary pilot. She was joined, via telephone, by Jay Feldman also of RTI International. She shared that the goals in the evaluation were to examine the pilot, provide feedback in what programs did in the process, provide information on the implementation of the assessment, and facilitate learning to help programs and the state department moving forward. For further information, see the RTI PowerPoint presentation and report.

10:15-10:30   Break

Perspectives from the edTPA Voluntary Pilot
Amanda Turner introduced the panel of representatives of three programs that participated in the edTPA Voluntary Pilot. The three members on the panel were Dr. Stephen Hegedus, Dean at Southern Connecticut State University (SCSU); Dr. Mel Horton, Assistant Dean at Central Connecticut State University (CCSU); and Dr. Katie O'Callaghan, Department Chair at Western Connecticut State University (WCSU).

Katie O'Callaghan shared a handout that described the key takeaways from the edTPA pilot in the spring of 2016. WCSU conducted an analysis of the pilot, and the findings mirror RTI's. The program had both nationally and locally scored portfolios. Most of the challenges they had was with the vendor assessment platform. In the future, their program will increase the focus on data literacy. The assessment and the glossary also provided a common language for faculty. Additional feedback from stakeholders was that edTPA is aligned with TEAM. Videoing was never raised as a concern by their school partners.

Mel Horton explained that CCSU did not have any issues using their vendor assessment platform. The students used a free program to compress videos to upload into the platform. Next year, there will be more of a focus on writing commentaries. It is important for all of the full-time faculty and adjuncts to know the expectations, as there were some inconsistencies. They found that the local evaluators scored much harder than the national scorers. The common language across the handbook is what the faculty has discussed the most. It provides them a common language to talk across content areas. One challenge in completing the learning segment is the difference in length of time in placements for particular content areas and grade levels. edTPA. should be embedded throughout a program so that teacher candidates do not learn how to do the assessment in their student teaching experience.

Stephen Hegedus discussed that the pilot at SCSU was similar to what the other two programs shared. The seminar course had a mix of students who were and were not completing the edTPA. The program purchased iPads and video devices for students to use, which they found got a lot of use. SCSU has access to exemplar videos, which is useful for students to see examples of videos. Students strongly requested examples of edTPA assessments. He recommended that there be deadlines to complete the different tasks because students became overwhelmed. Methods courses should do mini edTPA units to prepare for the student teaching experience. He discovered that candidates in inclusion classes received more permission to video record than self-contained classrooms. Those who were in eight week placements found it difficult to complete the assessment. Students were asked at the end of the semester whether they would endorse future students complete the assessment. The students

unanimously endorsed it. They did recommend that adjustments be made in the curriculum and support provided in all areas not just video recording. It is important with this assessment to have a phased in process. Amanda Turner explained that she has discussed with SCALE securing the rights to use candidate portfolios, including videos that remain within their program. Stephen Hegedus also recommended revisions to the handbooks and assessments to make it easier for candidates to understand. Overall, training is necessary, local training and local evaluation. Adjuncts should be included in more than just overviews of edTPA. There needs to be clear and timely communication to superintendents about the student teaching placement. He also recommended that the cost of the assessment be considered.

11:15-11:45   Discussion and Recommendations

Amanda Turner asked the subcommittee to make a recommendation to EPAC. EPAC will then consider this recommendation and make a final recommendation to the CT State Board of Education in November.

Sarah Barzee emphasized that there are three parts that need to be considered with the recommendation. The first is that the subcommittee did an exploration of implementation and policy challenges. A decision then needs to be made about whether this is an assessment for program completion or a certification requirement. Then there needs to be a timeline for implementation that includes the supports needed as recommended by RTI.

Stephen Hegedus asked whether the assessment was consequential. Georgette Nemr clarified that if the edTPA was adopted for certification it would be consequential. There was further discussion from the subcommittee about the assessment and the implications to individuals if the assessment is consequential.

Members of the subcommittee were concerned about the cost involved in the assessment whether it is consequential or not. Amanda Turner reiterated that the cost of the assessment, the assessment being a certification requirement, and a very phased in implementation of the assessment are the most important things this subcommittee has discussed.

Amanda Turner asked the subcommittee if they could recommend to EPAC the adoption of the pre-service performance assessment, edTPA, for certification. Stephen Hegedus elaborated on the proposed recommendation that the caveat of including additional supports be added. Katie O'Callaghan reiterated that the recommendation is for edTPA to be used for certification but to explore avenues of financial assistance for those who cannot afford the cost. Stephen Hegedus emphasized the endorsement includes an awareness of the necessary supports needed from the recommendations of the pilot sites and RTI. Amanda Turner ensured that the supports that were heard in this meeting would be included as part of the caveats for the recommendation to adopt edTPA.

Sarah Barzee explained that the supports identified by the evaluation and pilot sites would support the phased in implementation. The RTI report will be used to identify what went well and they will also look to the pilot districts for additional support for the programs.

Nancy Hoffman asked if it is possible to replace Praxis 2, which might address the minority teaching taskforce and reduce the cost for students. Sarah Barzee explained that there needs to be an assessment that shows that the teacher is ready on day one. When considering the Praxis 2 and edTPA

one is a content assessment and the other is a pedagogical assessment. The subcommittee continued to discuss that there still needs to be a further exploration of a balanced assessment and that everything cannot rely on one single assessment. The cost of the assessment needs to be compared with other licensure fees. Amanda Turner shared that they have another set of vouchers. There are ten other educator preparation programs that can use those vouchers. The remaining vouchers that are not used will open up to the other programs.

Amanda Turner emphasized that the recommendation will not be made to EPAC until September. She reiterated that she heard unanimously that they will continue with the assessment.

The group discussed if the recommendation would result in law or policy. Amanda Turner explained it would be policy and include a scaled implementation of the assessment over the next three to four years.

Stephen Hegedus recommended that the subcommittee endorse edTPA for implementation in educator preparation programs subject to the necessary supports and issues for programs and school districts as outlined in the RTI report and the pilot programs. Then he added that there be a clear policy created on implementation.

Amanda Turner explained that 2016-17 would focus on increased engagement, 2017-19 would phase in the assessment with increasing numbers of candidates, and then 2019-20 would be full implementation with consequentiality. She reiterated that the recommendation is to endorse edTPA for implementation in educator preparation programs subject to the necessary supports and issues identified in the RTI report and pilot programs. There were no objections.

Sarah Barzee reminded the subcommittee that the recommendation still goes before other groups. This recommendation is from an advisory body. It is still important to pilot the assessment with these caveats and these recommendations and be brought to EPAC.

11:45 – 12:00   Wrap-up and Next Steps

Amanda Turner stated she will send an executive summary with the recommendation and the caveats.

The meeting was adjourned.