Working Group to Study Issues Relating to the Implementation of the Pre-Service Assessment, edTPA, as Adopted by the Connecticut State Board of Education, December 7, 2016

FINAL REPORT
JANUARY 31, 2020

The edTPA Working Group was established by the Connecticut General Assembly pursuant to Pursuant to Public Act No. 19-139, *An Act Concerning Education Issues*, Sec. 3., which set forth both the organizational membership of the edTPA Working Group and the edTPA Working Group's statutory charge.

Pursuant to Pursuant to Public Act No. 19-139, Sec. 3., the edTPA Working Group's charge was to examine:
   (1) how such assessment is being implemented in teacher preparation programs in the state,
   (2) the financial costs associated with such assessment on institutions of higher education and students enrolled in teacher preparation programs,
   (3) whether such assessment is evidence-based or a best practice,
   (4) whether other states are using such assessment as part of teacher preparation programs or requiring completion of such assessment for professional certification, and
   (5) any effect on world languages instruction.

Table of Contents

STATUTORY LANGUAGE PERTAINING TO edTPA WORKING GROUP MEMBERSHIP AND WORKING GROUP MEMBERS

"One appointed by the speaker of the House of Representatives, who is a professor in a teacher preparation program in the state."

Aram Ayalon, Ph.D.
Professor, Central Connecticut State University

Monica L. Cavender, Ed.D.
Assistant Professor, Quinnipiac University

"One appointed by the president pro tempore of the Senate, who is a dean of a teacher preparation program in the state."
Michael P. Alfano, Ph.D., edTPA Working Group Chairperson; Dean, Isabelle Farrington College of Education, Sacred Heart University

"One appointed by the majority leader of the House of Representatives, who has expertise in pre-service performance assessments for teacher preparation programs."
Mel Horton, Ed.D., Associate Dean, Isabelle Farrington College of Education, Sacred Heart University

"One appointed by the majority leader of the Senate, who is a student who is currently enrolled in a teacher preparation program in the state."
Kathrine Grant, M.A. teacher candidate, Neag School of Education, University of Connecticut

"One appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives, who is a student currently enrolled in a teacher preparation program in the state."
Vacant

"One appointed by the minority leader of the Senate, who is a recent graduate of a teacher preparation program in the state."
Vacant

"The Commissioner of Education, or the commissioner's designee."
Christopher Todd, Bureau Chief, Connecticut State Department of Education, Talent Office

Introduction:

On March 7, 2012, in fulfillment of the expectations of Connecticut Special Act 12-3, the Connecticut State Board of Education (SBE) approved a resolution to establish the Educator Preparation Advisory Council (EPAC). EPAC was established to advise the SBE on the transformation of Connecticut's system for the approval and oversight of educator preparation providers (EPPs). EPAC first convened on August 3, 2012, with membership taken from professional organizations, PK-12 schools and EPPs, representing both traditional programs and alternate route to certification (ARC) programs. The Adoption of the Recommendations of the Educator Preparation Advisory Council report was formally presented to, and subsequently approved by the SBE on December 7, 2016.

Outcomes of the EPAC process included the recommendation for the adoption of a pre-service performance assessment. This recommendation was based on the work of an EPAC-sanctioned, concurrently convened, assessment subcommittee. The assessment subcommittee of EPAC was explicitly charged with reviewing several pre-service performance assessments. As part of their review of several assessments, the assessment subcommittee considered Connecticut developing its own pre-service performance assessment. Ultimately, the assessment committee chose to recommend edTPA for adoption in Connecticut, due to edTPA's alignment with Connecticut standards for educators, rigorous psychometric properties, and potential costs associated with the development of another assessment.

edTPA was piloted by several EPPs during academic year 2016-2017 and 2017-2018. At the conclusion of the pilot phase of edTPA implementation in Connecticut, a formal evaluation was conducted by a third-party research firm, RTI International. Findings of the evaluation were made available to the public.   Subsequently, an initial "cut score" (i.e. passing score for Connecticut) was developed during academic year 2018-2019. Since September 1, 2019, a passing score on the edTPA is required for all candidates completing Connecticut initial teacher preparation programs.

edTPA Working Group Process:

Each edTPA Working Group member solicited data from stakeholder groups, of their own choosing, relative to the five queries noted in the statute. Additional data sources consulted included peer-reviewed research articles, monographs, nonscientific surveys, interviews, and other publications, as related to edTPA, broadly defined. Qualitative data generated were redacted in an effort to remove institutional and personal identifying information, where appropriate. Data generated were then submitted, in aggregate, to the Clerk of the Education Committee Co-Chair, for posting on the www.ct.gov. website. Care was taken to exclude any copywritten materials from public posting.

Following the delay in appointment of members, the edTPA Working Group convened for the first time on November 19, 2019 to review Connecticut's pathway toward edTPA,

the charge of P.A. 19-139 and select a working group chair. The Working Group's December 17th meeting was cancelled as a result of inclement weather. Members reconvened for two face-to-face meetings on January 14 and15, 2020, where the edTPA Working Group discussed and organized data generated by each member. The membership was then organized, by the chairperson, in to five writing teams; one aligned to each statutory query. Each writing team was then charged with reviewing data pertinent to their assigned statutory query. A thematic analysis approach was conducted in an effort to make meaning of the data. Each writing team identified themes related to their assigned statutory query. Draft themes were then shared and cross-checked across the membership. Each theme was then independently voted on by membership at the January 21st meeting. A simple majority of present membership was required for a theme to be approved for inclusion in the current document. The membership votes, by
Query, were as follows:

> Query One: Five in favor; A. Ayalon absent;
> Query Two: Five in favor: A. Ayalon absent;
> Query Three: Four in favor; K. Grant, opposed; A. Ayalon absent;
> Query Four: Five in favor; A. Ayalon absent; and
> Query Five: Five in favor; A. Ayalon absent.

The themes that were generated and approved by membership, through the above process, provide the evidence-base and rationale for the recommendations that are provided herein.

The final report was voted on by edTPA Working Group membership. A "yes" vote indicated a member's endorsement of the final draft. A "no" vote indicated a member's lack of endorsement of the final draft. An abstention indicated that either a final vote was note received from a member during the time period allotted, or the member formally indicated an abstention. The edTPA Working Group votes, regarding the disposition of the final report, were as follows:

> M. Alfano- Yes;
> A. Ayalon- No;
> M. Cavender- Yes;
> K. Grant- No;
> M. Horton- Yes; and
> C. Todd- Yes.

The edTPA Defined:

edTPA is a performance-based, subject-specific assessment and support system used by teacher preparation programs throughout the United States to emphasize, measure and support the skills and knowledge that all teachers need from Day 1 in the classroom. In its most basic form, edTPA is a performance-based assessment which is built on the core aspects of teaching – i.e., planning for instruction, engaging students in learning, assessing learning, and supporting academic language development. edTPA requires an aspiring educator to link these areas together to show the full cycle (a three to five-day segment of instruction in one discipline) of effective teaching. edTPA is

designed for teaching candidates to submit real artifacts –i.e., lesson plans, video, and student work samples- to show the authenticity of the local teaching context and the way the teaching candidate responds to real students when teaching them in a real setting. Candidates' submissions provide evidence of how they planned and implemented a segment of instruction to deepen student learning of subject-specific learning outcomes (SCALE, 2019).

In addition to ensuring teacher candidates possess the knowledge and skills required of a beginning teacher, edTPA performance data are also being used in Connecticut and others states to identify areas for professional development for induction purposes during the first two years of an educators' teaching career. For example, instructional coaches in some state can identify strengths and weaknesses of beginning educators based on edTPA data. This information is then used to set goals and professional development opportunities for the beginning teacher. Similar efforts have been underway in Connecticut as the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE), PK-12 district partners and education preparation faculty have collaborated to build connections between preparation, including edTPA, and Connecticut's Teacher Education and Mentoring (TEAM) program.

edTPA was developed by Stanford University faculty and staff at the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE). SCALE personnel received substantive advice and feedback from teachers and teacher educators and drew from experience gained from over 25 years of developing performance-based assessments of teaching (including the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards [NBPTS], the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium [InTASC] Standards portfolio, and the Performance Assessment for California Teachers) (SCALE 2019).

edTPA's design receives ongoing scrutiny by measurement experts, that include hundreds of university faculty, national subject-matter organization representatives (e.g., NCTM, NCTE, NSTA, ACTFL, etc.), and K–12 teachers. Stanford University is the exclusive author and owner of edTPA (SCALE, 2019). Pearson Education is the licensed and sole vendor for edTPA.

Queries, Themes and Recommendations:

Query One: "how such assessment is being implemented in teacher preparation programs in the state"

Theme 1. Since 2015, the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) has provided numerous trainings regarding the implementation of the edTPA in Connecticut.

The CSDE Talent Office has conducted monthly conference calls with Connecticut EPP edTPA coordinators, who serve as liaisons between their EPPs and the CSDE, SCALE and Pearson. Beginning fall 2019, calls are now bi-monthly. The calls, which include SCALE and Pearson representatives, as well as the CSDE edTPA coordinator, provide a forum for Connecticut EPP edTPA coordinators to receive edTPA-related updates;

ask questions and receive clarification; problem solve collaboratively around implementation challenges and successes; and share best practices.

As noted above, SCALE and/or Pearson have collaborated with the CSDE to provide numerous professional development opportunities for Connecticut EPP faculty and other Connecticut constituency groups designed to support the adoption and implementation of edTPA in Connecticut. Attendance data, when available are noted parenthetically:

- February, 2015. *edTPA Overview*. CSDE Assessment Development Subcommittee held at The Lyceum, Hartford CT.
- April, 2015. *edTPA Conversation with delegation from Georgia and New York.* EPAC assessment development subcommittee held at The Lyceum, Hartford CT.
- October, 2015. *edTPA Orientation for piloting programs*. Implementation support workshop for EPPs held at ITBD in New Britain, Connecticut (N=65).
- October, 2015. *edTPA Orientation for Special Education Programs.* Implementation support webinar for EPPs.
- February, 2016 (2 days). *edTPA Local Evaluation for Special Education and General Education.* Implementation support workshop for Connecticut EPPs, Berlin, Connecticut (N=61).
- March, 2016. *edTPA Overview.* Informational session for AMTEC held at Central Connecticut State University, New Britain, CT (N=20).
- March, 2016. *edTPA Academic Language.* Implementation support webinar for Connecticut EPPs (N=25).
- May, 2016. *edTPA Local Evaluation Refresher*. Implementation support webinar for Connecticut EPPs. (N=25).
- September, 2016. *edTPA Handbook and Rubric Deep Dive.* Implementation support workshop for Connecticut EPPs held at The Lyceum Conference Center, Hartford, CT. (for EPPs joining 2nd year of pilot) (N=27).
- November, 2016. *Building an Instructional Framework for Candidate Success*. Implementation support workshop for Connecticut EPPs held at The Lyceum Conference Center, Hartford, CT (N=44).
- January, 2017. *edTPA Academic Language.* Implementation support workshop for Connecticut EPPs held at The Lyceum Conference Center, Hartford, CT (N=25).
- April, 2017. *edTPA Orientation and Handbook Walkthrough* and *Local Evaluation Training*. Implementation support workshop for Connecticut EPPs held at Southern Connecticut State University, New Haven, CT (N=58).
- September, 2017. *edTPA Handbook Deep Dive and Local Evaluation Training for edTPA*. Implementation support workshop for Connecticut EPPs held at University of Bridgeport, Bridgeport, CT. (N=30)
- September, 2017. *edTPA Handbook Deep Dive and Local Evaluation Training for edTPA*. Implementation support workshop for Connecticut EPPs held at Quinnipiac University, North Haven, CT (N=88).

- October, 2017. *Local Evaluation Training for edTPA*. Implementation support workshop for Connecticut EPPs held at Eastern Connecticut State University, Willimantic, CT (N=30).
- March, 2018. *Local Evaluation Training for edTPA.* Implementation support workshop for Connecticut EPPs held at University of Saint Joseph, West Hartford, CT (N=52).
- April, 2018. *edTPA Handbook Deep Dive and Candidate Support* and *Local Evaluation Training.* Implementation support workshop for Connecticut EPPs held at the University of Bridgeport, Bridgeport, CT (N=44).
- May 2018. *Academic Language Workshop.* Implementation support workshop for Connecticut EPPs held at the Lyceum Conference Center, Hartford, CT (N = 104).
- October 2018. *Using edTPA Data*. Implementation support workshop for Connecticut EPPs held at Sacred Heart University, Fairfield, CT (N=61).
- November 2018 (2 days). *Equity and edTPA.* Implementation support workshop for Connecticut EPPs hosted by AACTE-CT, held at Sacred Heart University.
- April 2019. *edTPA Overview and District Partnership Role.* Implementation support workshop for Connecticut superintendents, principals, and TEAM district facilitators sponsored by CAPSS and AACTE-CT, held at Central Connecticut State University in New Britain, CT.
- October, 2019. *edTPA Overview and 101.* Informational session for Social Studies teachers' association held at Central Connecticut State University, New Britain, CT (N=20).

Theme 2. The CSDE continues to be responsive to the EPP community's needs regarding the implementation of the edTPA in Connecticut.

Based on a need's assessment data gathered from Connecticut EPP edTPA coordinators, additional professional development support opportunities are being designed for Connecticut EPPs for spring 2020 and beyond. For example, based on coordinator feedback, an annual full-day workshop will be conducted annually beginning spring 2020, whereby Connecticut EPP faculty will be invited to convene to review edTPA data, along with other EPP assessment data, for program evaluation and curriculum design purposes.

Theme 3. The implementation of the edTPA in Connecticut's EPP has direct relevance to supporting the induction of Connecticut's new teachers.

The CSDE received a Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability and Reform (CEEDAR) Center grant, funded by the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The work, in its third round in Connecticut, is focused on supporting EPP and district partners in collaboratively aligning the training and support of Connecticut educators from pre-service to in-service, specifically focusing on using edTPA performance data to inform professional development goal setting between mentors and beginning teachers participating in Connecticut's Teacher Education and

Mentoring (TEAM) program (Connecticut's mentoring and induction program for beginning teachers).

Theme 4. The CSDE is developing capacity, at the district level, regarding the implementation of the edTPA in Connecticut schools.

The CSDE Teacher Educator and Mentoring Program (TEAM) manager has been working with the Regional Education Service Center (RESC) alliance and other stakeholders to provide guidance and support to district educators who are working with teacher candidates as they complete edTPA. The first step was to provide district leaders with an overview of edTPA and clarify the role of the cooperating teacher during the student teaching placement in relation to edTPA completion. In 2018, in partnership with SCALE and CT EPPs, an introductory edTPA workshop was developed and presented to TEAM-trained district facilitators at each of the six RESCs across the state (approximately 180 district facilitators). In collaboration with RESC, EPP and district partners, the CSDE TEAM manager developed and delivered a new "Train the Trainer" workshop for cooperating teachers in January 2020. Ninety-five (95) TEAM-trained district facilitators and lead mentors participated in the January workshop so that they could, in turn, facilitate training in their districts for cooperating teachers working with student teachers.

Theme 5. Connecticut EPPs are in the early stages of integrating the edTPA into their teacher preparation programs' curricula.

Theme 6. Some stakeholders, from within and from outside of Connecticut EPPs, do not support and/or understand the purpose or relevance of the edTPA, as related to assuring that Connecticut's beginning educators, regardless of EPP, are demonstrably ready to enter the profession.

Theme 7. Some Connecticut teacher preparation candidates do not understand the purpose or relevance of the edTPA to their practice.

Theme 8. Some Connecticut teacher candidates and teacher preparation faculty perceive the completion of the edTPA as highly stressful, narrowing to the student teaching experience and as a significant amount of "extra" written work during an already busy student teaching experience.

Theme 9. Some Connecticut teacher preparation candidates are unclear with procedural aspects of edTPA implementation, to include expectations for completion and submission, during student teaching.

Query One Recommendations:

Query One recommendations overlap with Query Three recommendations. Please refer to **Query Three Recommendations** or the **Executive Summary of edTPA Working Group Recommendations** sections.

Query Two: "the financial costs associated with such assessment on institutions of higher education and students enrolled in teacher preparation programs"

Theme 1. There is a financial burden associated with edTPA for Candidates

Effective 2019, edTPA costs $300, which includes official scoring and score reporting to both the candidate and to their respective EPP which is designated by the candidate during the registration process. Additional score reports are $50. In cases where a candidate does not successfully met the necessary qualifying score, the candidate is required to resubmit for a single task (planning, instruction, or assessment) at an additional cost of $100.00 per task, or resubmit a complete edTPA portfolio at an additional $300.00.

The use of voucher programs to ease the financial burden of edTPA have been a consistent approach both nationally and throughout Connecticut's EPPs. Pearson currently provide Connecticut institutions vouchers annually which are based on financial need as determined by Pell Grant amounts. As a result, 35 fee waiver credits were issued to Connecticut by Pearson for both the 2018-19 and 2019-20 years, each valued at $300 for the cost of a single portfolio submission. The table below indicates the distribution of vouchers across Connecticut educator preparation programs:

Education Preparation Program	Total Fee Waivers (2018-19)	Total Fee Waivers (2019-20)
Albertus Magnus College	1	1
Alternate Route to Certification	1	1
Central Connecticut State University	4	4
Charter Oak State College	1	1
Connecticut College	1	1
Eastern Connecticut State University	2	2
Fairfield University	1	1
Mitchell College	1	1
Quinnipiac University	1	1
Relay Graduate School of Education	1	1
Sacred Heart University	1	1

Southern Connecticut State University	4	4
Teach for America-Connecticut ARC	1	1
University of Bridgeport	2	2
University of Connecticut	8	8
University of Hartford	2	2
University of Saint Joseph	1	1
Western Connecticut State University	2	2
TOTAL	35	35

In addition to the fee waivers provided by Pearson, several EPPs have implemented policy to incorporate the cost of edTPA into either a lab fee or a student fee. By attaching the fee to student teaching course, financial aid can be used as support. Other EPPs have built the cost of edTPA registration in to operating budgets and then purchased vouchers to distribute to candidates that showed a financial need.

The rising cost of both post-secondary education as well as licensure assessments and fees compound the financial burden of edTPA. In Connecticut alone, tuition continues to climb. In spring 2019, the Connecticut State College & University System (CSCU) announced a 5% tuition increase for the current 2019-20 school year. In the last ten years, tuition and fees in the CSCU have increased by approximately 52 percent from $7,178 in 2008-09 to $10,938 in 2018-19. Comparable tuition increases have, and continue to present to take place at EPPs housed at Connecticut's private institutions of higher education.

While concerns of rising higher education attendance costs are noted both regionally and nationally, Connecticut currently maintains the highest initial licensure costs for educators in the region when both assessment fees and licensure application fees are combined.

	CT	MA	NY	RI	VT	NH	ME
Elementary Education	**$809**	$490	$646	$416	$370	$439	$270
Special Education	**$785**	$490	$601	$392	$200	$276	$246
Secondary Education	**$620**	$351	$601	$366	$320	$250	$220

While the implementation of edTPA has added to the overall financial burden, Connecticut's higher certification costs are also driven by the highest licensure fees in the region which are established by CGS Sec. 10-145b(l):

	CT	MA	NY	RI	VT	NH	ME
Initial Educator Certificate Fee	$200	$100	$50/$100	$100	$200	$130	$100

While the cost of licensure and assessment fees, including edTPA, create a financial burden on a teacher candidate; licensure/assessment fees are not unique to the education profession. In fact, assessment & licensure fees are found to be consistently lower in education when compared to other professions that maintain similar licensure standards. The table below compares the licensure and assessment fees for an initially certified secondary educator to other professions in Connecticut:

	Teacher (Secondary)	Dental Hygienist	CPA	Physician Assistant	RN
Cost of Assessments & Licensure Fees	$620-$809	$1,515	$1,327	$1,230	$755
Average Starting CT Salary	$62,149	$69,000	$70,000	$105,000	$76,300

Theme 2. There is a financial burden associated with edTPA for Connecticut Institutions of Higher Education and their respective EPPs.

In addition to the financial burden faced by teacher candidates, some of Connecticut's EPPs have had to budget additional financial, physical and human resources to support the implementation of edTPA. Some EPPs have purchased edTPA fee vouchers in several denominations for distribution to candidates who may use them in lieu of payment. Some EPPs are advising teacher candidates earlier in their academic career of the reality of licensure costs, and the importance of saving/budgeting for said costs.

Query Two Recommendations:

The Bureau of Educator Standards and Certification, working directly with Connecticut policy makers, enact legal changes to reduce educator certification fees by proposing statute changes to CGS Sec. 10-145b(I).

The Connecticut General Assembly appropriate funds to offset the cost of educator certification, specifically providing funding for increased edTPA vouchers.

Re-examine the Praxis II for certification for elementary candidates.

EPP edTPA coordinators, in collaboration with CSDE, should create a shared resource on how EPPs across the state are supporting candidates with the costs associated with

the testing regimen required for initial licensure in Connecticut, which now includes the edTPA.

Query Three: "whether such assessment is evidence-based or a best practice"

Theme 1. edTPA is a subject-specific performance-based assessment designed to measure a common set of teaching principles, teaching behaviors, and pedagogical strategies that are focused on specific content learning outcomes for P-12 students.

edTPA was designed and developed by the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE). The design was informed by research on effective teaching and based on professional standards from the Interstate New Teacher Assessment Consortium (InTASC) and National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. edTPA represents initial competencies needed to be ready to teach in that it examines the effective cycle of teaching through three tasks: planning, instruction, and assessment. Candidates' ability to develop students' academic language and justify and analyze their own teaching are woven throughout the three tasks. Teachers and teacher educators were involved in the development of edTPA. Candidate evidence required in edTPA are "authentic job-related artifacts of teaching" (lesson plans, student work samples, instructional materials). However, some opponents contend that edTPA results in a "narrowing of the curriculum" and "diminishes the voices and professionalism of faculty."

Theme 2. Measures of validity of edTPA are consistent with the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (AERA, APA, & NCME, 2014).

edTPA has consistently met or exceeded these standards for licensure. However, Gitomer, et. al, 2019 recently called into question the content validity of edTPA. SCALE responded with several examples that refute this claim. Other empirical evidence also exists confirming construct validity and predictive validity of edTPA.

Theme 3. Measures of reliability of edTPA are consistent with the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (AERA, APA, & NCME, 2014).

edTPA has consistently met or exceeded these standards for licensure. However, Gitomer, et. al, 2019 recently called into question the reliability of the scoring of edTPA. SCALE responded by with a description of methods utilized in establishing reliability of scoring to address any misunderstandings about the scoring processes of edTPA.

Theme 4. Some opponents contend that edTPA "diminishes the student teaching experience" and "creates high levels of stress and impacts candidates' mental health."

edTPA was designed as a summative assessment to be completed during student teaching. The assessment consists of a learning segment (3 to 5 lessons). Many EPPs have always utilized some type of summative assessment such as unit plans, teacher

work samples, and portfolios. However, these were not necessarily high stakes for program completion and/or licensure. Like other professions that have professional standards, teaching is hard work and learning to teach is complex. Managing edTPA during student teaching along with other "life" responsibilities can be daunting if candidates are not supported throughout the preparation of becoming a teacher.

Theme 5. When used as a tool for inquiry and not approached through the lens of "compliance," edTPA provides actionable feedback to candidates and programs which can inform program improvement and foster faculty inquiry.

Claims have been made that candidates only receive a score and do not receive feedback from the official scoring process. However, candidates do indeed receive rubric level feedback.   Some states are utilizing edTPA evidence to inform teacher induction support programs in that first-year teacher use their edTPA data and rubric level feedback to identify strengths and weaknesses and set goals to inform their induction years.

Theme 6. Some opponents contend that edTPA "infringes on the authority of teacher education faculty over teacher quality and development."

Policy discourse continues to focus on improving the preparation of teachers. Educator preparation programs (EPPs) are under pressure to provide evidence-based program improvement. Many EPPs continue to rely solely on locally designed measures for evaluating program outcomes and candidate competency. The reliability and validity of these locally designed measures is often unknown. As such, the need for a valid and reliable performance-based assessment is evident in the literature. High-stakes assessments are contentious and disruptive, but the stakes are also high for parents/guardians and their children.

Theme 7. There are gaps in edTPA performance across some groups.

Analyses on all demographic variables account for less than 3% of the total variance in scores on edTPA. As stated in the most recent annual Administrative Report (SCALE, 2019), "Differences by racial/ethnic group were small, women generally scored more highly than men, and suburban teachers on average scored more highly than teachers in other teaching contexts. Performance differences were found between African American and White candidates, with differences in mean performance at less than one half of a standard deviation; although, African American candidates are closing the mean performance gap. Small sample sizes for some groups and differences in group sizes prevent strong generalizations" (p. 3). Hispanics are the second largest ethnic group and these candidates' scores have consistently been within one point of White candidates (SCALE, 2019). It is important to note that gaps across some groups are much narrower versus standardized tests, such as Praxis II. Specifically, a NEA Research Brief (2017) cites an ETS study, published in partnership with the NEA, examining 12 Praxis II exams. The findings suggest that "all test takers of color lagged behind non-minority educators, with the largest gaps in performance existing between

White and African American test-takers" (p.2). A recent study by NCTQ also lends support to this claim relative to the Praxis II Multi-Subject tests for elementary education candidates (Will, 2019). It is important to note the comparison between standardized tests and edTPA (a performance-based assessment), in that EPPs have the ability and responsibility to provide support for all candidates in preparing for any assessment leading to licensure. Furthermore, SCALE's commitment to supporting faculty and candidates in the educative process of becoming a teacher far surpasses that of any assessment/measure of candidates' readiness to teach (standardized or performance-based). For example, there are over 200 faculty and SCALE-developed resources that support EPPs in implementing edTPA. There are trainings and workshops offered by a national academy of faculty who support the educative use of edTPA. And, there are annual and regional conferences where faculty can convene to share their experiences and research (SCALE, 2019). No other assessment provides such extensive support in preparing teacher candidates.

Query Three Recommendations:

Connecticut EPPs utilize an inquiry approach and review program coursework and clinical experiences to determine how their program's current curriculum prepares candidates for what edTPA does and does not measure, and 2) CSDE and EPPs continue to emphasize and work with stakeholders (candidates, principals, superintendents, teachers) regarding how the constructs measured in edTPA directly align with the critical dimensions of teaching, and as such, how edTPA pre-service data can inform the induction years.

CSDE continues to monitor the literature regarding the validity of edTPA, and 2) EPPs continue to provide evidence of validity with stakeholders (faculty, candidates, school partners, etc.).

CSDE continues to monitor the literature regarding the reliability of edTPA, and 2) EPPs continue to educate stakeholders (faculty, candidates, school partners, etc.) as to how edTPA is scored and who does the scoring.

EPPs ensure that candidates understand that teaching is hard work and requires ongoing reflection and practice, 2) EPPs ensure and trust that their programs are well-designed to prepare candidates to be successful on edTPA without dismantling their curriculum, and 3) EPPs ensure that candidates receive adequate time to practice, with children, the skills needed in implementing the effective cycle of teaching (planning, instructing, assessing).

EPPs educate faculty and candidates on the rubric level progressions and the constructs measured by each rubric, 2) EPPs make visible to candidates, faculty, and school partners where the constructs that embody the effective cycle of teaching are covered in coursework and clinical experiences, and 3) EPPs engage faculty in examining candidate artifacts and mapping the evidence to rubric levels, thus identifying gaps in candidate learning which then informs program improvement.

EPPs employ a multiple measures assessment system that incorporates valid and reliable assessments (including EPP created assessments) which allow candidates to practice and master the content knowledge and pedagogical skills needed to implement the effective cycle of teaching (as defined in the literature) prior to entering the student teaching semester.

CSDE monitors performance based on all demographic variables with particular attention on performance by ethnicity, 2) CSDE use CT data that reflects CT populations to conduct further analyses and implications for CT, 3) EPPs approach edTPA with an "educative focus" as opposed to a compliance or testing requirement by utilizing the extensive resources available to support an inquiry approach, 4) EPPs work to provide candidates with opportunities to develop and practice constructs that make up the effective cycle of teaching prior to completing edTPA, 5) Avoid a "deficit" point of view when considering candidates of color and performance on edTPA, and 6) Consult with and learn from other EPPs that have utilized edTPA over time and have candidates of color who are performing well on edTPA.

Query Four: "whether other states are using such assessment as part of teacher preparation programs or requiring completion of such assessment for professional certification"

As of December 2019, the use of edTPA as a performance assessment for either educator preparation programs and/or educator licensure is required by 919 educator preparation programs across 41 states and the District of Columbia. For the purpose of this report, it is important to draw a distinction in the use of edTPA as either an education preparation program completion requirement, or as a requirement for obtaining teacher certification. While some states require the use of edTPA, or other similar performance assessments in both program completion and educator licensure, it is important to note that Connecticut requires the successful completion of edTPA as an educator preparation provider (EPP) program completion requirement <u>ONLY</u>. A 'Program Completer' is defined under Title II of the Higher Education Act as:

A person who has met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript or other written proof of having met the program's requirements.

The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) was intentional in this policy design for the implementation of edTPA as it holds each approved EPP accountable for supporting a candidate's success. Additionally, by identifying edTPA as a requirement for EPP program completion rather than licensure, it allows the CSDE to maintain Connecticut's participation in the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) Interstate Agreement (NIA). Under this agreement, Connecticut is able to facilitate the interstate flexibility of certified educators by waiving specific coursework requirements. As such, Connecticut may accept an

applicant's completion of a state-approved educator preparation program at a regionally accredited college or university from another US state regardless of a state's policies around the use of performance assessments, specifically, edTPA.

Nationally, educator preparation providers (EPPs) are required to show data from multiple measures for CAEP accreditation. SCALE has developed an extensive crosswalk to CAEP InTASC standards demonstrating alignment with edTPA commentary prompts and rubrics. CAEP recognizes edTPA as a critical source of information about teacher readiness to teach, which is why many states, including Connecticut, have integrated edTPA into their multiple measures assessment systems.

Theme 1. There are numerous states with statewide policies in place requiring a state-approved performance assessment as part of program completion or for state licensure and/or state program accreditation/review.

Table 1 provides detailed descriptions of how edTPA is being implemented and supported in 20 states, excluding Connecticut:

Table 1:

State	Program Completion Requirement	Educator Licensure Requirement	Consequential Cut Score
Alabama	Alabama State Board of Education (ALSDE) approved edTPA as a pedagogical assessment option for candidates seeking initial licensure.	Alabama candidates are required to obtain a qualified score on a teacher performance assessment for licensure; edTPA has been approved by the ALSDE for fulfilling this requirement.	YES
Arkansas	Arkansas Professional Pathway to Educator Licensure (APPEL) program uses edTPA as a program completion requirement.	N/A	YES

California	California Commission on Teacher Credential (CTC) approved (8/2014) and reapproved (8/2018), edTPA as one of three teacher performance assessments for program use.	N/A	YES
Delaware	Delaware has approved edTPA and PPAT for program use.	Delaware requires a qualifying score on an approved teacher-performance assessment (edTPA & PPAT) for initial licensure.	YES
Georgia	edTPA requirement is part of the Preparation Program Effectiveness Measure (PPEM) approved by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GaPSC).	Georgia requires a qualifying score on edTPA for initial licensure.	YES
Hawaii	Qualifying scores on edTPA or the PPAT are required for all program completers; or program must obtain continuing unit accreditation from the Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (CAEP) or its legacy organization (NCATE or TEAC).	N/A	NO

Illinois	The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) has approved edTPA for program use.	Illinois requires a qualifying score on an approved evidence-based assessment of teacher effectiveness for initial licensure. edTPA has been approved.	YES
Iowa	Education program candidates are required to pass either the appropriate Praxis II test of content and pedagogy or the appropriate edTPA assessment.	N/A	YES
Maryland	The Maryland State Board of Education (SBOE) approved a policy requiring performance assessment and approved edTPA to replace Praxis Principles for Learning and Teaching (PLT) assessment.	Maryland requires licensure applicants must provide evidence of completing a nationally scored edTPA assessment.	NO (7/2019-6/2025) YES (7/1/2025)
Minnesota	Minnesota's Board of Teaching approved edTPA as one measure of program effectiveness in the program approval process.	N/A	YES (Program Approval Only)

New Jersey	New Jersey selected edTPA as the approved performance assessment required for all candidates.	New Jersey requires a qualifying score on edTPA for all candidates seeking Certificate of Eligibility (CE) for a standard certificate, and a Certificate of Eligibility with Advanced Standing (CEAS).	YES
New York	New York selected edTPA as the approved performance assessment required for all candidates.	New York requires a qualifying score on edTPA for initial certification.	YES
North Carolina	North Carolina selected edTPA and PPAT as the approved performance assessments required for all candidates.	North Carolina requires a qualifying score on an approved teacher-performance assessment (edTPA & PPAT) for initial licensure.	YES
Ohio	The Ohio State Board of Education's Teaching, Leading, and Learning Committee (TLCC) adopted an approved performance assessment (edTPA or PPAT) as an alternative to a written examination which measures knowledge of the teaching profession.	N/A	YES

Oregon	Oregon requires edTPA as a program completion requirement for all candidates.	N/A	YES
South Carolina	South Carolina approved edTPA as an option for teacher candidates to meet the required pedagogy assessment for licensure.	edTPA is an option to meet the required pedagogy assessment for initial certification.	YES
Tennessee	Tennessee approved the use of edTPA to replace the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) Assessment.	Tennessee requires a qualifying score on edTPA for initial licensure.	YES
Washington	Washington requires edTPA as a program completion requirement for all candidates.	N/A	YES
West Virginia	West Virginia requires all teacher candidates to meet proficiency level on the preparation program's developed or adopted performance assessment for program completion. edTPA is an approved performance assessment.	N/A	NO

| Wisconsin | Wisconsin requires edTPA as a program completion requirement for all candidates. | N/A | YES |

Theme 2. There are numerous states with at least one teacher preparation provider (traditional/alternate route) using edTPA.

Currently, 919 educator preparation programs across 41 states and the District of Columbia use edTPA as a performance assessment within their program. Table 2 highlights by state the number of educator preparation programs, both traditional and/or alternate route, using edTPA within their programming.

Table 2:

STATE	TOTAL PROGRAMS	TRADITIONAL EPP	ALTERNATE ROUTE*
AL	47	47	
AK	1	1	
AZ	4	4	
AR	9	8	1
CA	49	42	7
CO	5	5	
CT	22	19	3

DE	5	4	1
FL	5	5	
GA	67	41	26
HI	6	5	1
ID	2	2	
IL	62	62	
IN	16	16	
IA	21	21	
KY	1	1	
LA	1	1	
MD	21	16	5
MI	7	7	
MN	32	32	

MS	4	4	
NE	2	2	
NJ	43	43	5
NY	109	89	20
NC	41	31	10
OH	53	53	
OK	8	8	
OR	17	17	
PA	18	18	
RI	2	2	
SC	2	2	
SD	2	2	
TN	41	37	4

TX	81	55	26
UT	4	4	
VT	1	1	
VA	5	5	
WA	29	24	5
WV	11	11	
WI	45	34	11
WY	1	1	

*This does not reflect the many IHE-based or partnered Alternate Route programs as they do not establish separate edTPA membership accounts or edTPA data reporting accounts.

Theme 3. There three states where a performance assessment and/or edTPA are being considered at the state level for program completion or as a licensure requirement.

As of January 2020, only one state is currently taking steps towards adopting edTPA as a requirement for either program completion and/or educator licensure. The Texas State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) approved a two-year edTPA pilot (2019 to 2020). Texas educator preparation programs may volunteer to participate and candidates may complete edTPA in lieu of Texas' Pedagogy and Professional Responsibility EC12 Exam. The implementation model being used by Texas mirrors Connecticut's approach to the implementation of edTPA which included voluntary pilots from 2014-2016 and 2016-2018. In addition to Texas, both Utah and Oklahoma are moving to require a teacher performance assessment (TPA) with Utah's requirement

beginning in July 2020. Both states will be allowing candidates to choose between PPAT and edTPA to satisfy the TPA requirement.

Theme 4. There are nine states that have not adopted, or have removed, a performance assessment and/or edTPA as a requirement program completion or as a licensure requirement.

As of December 2019, nine states have not adopted, nor have any education preparation programs using edTPA. These nine states include Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico and North Dakota. However, while these states are not using edTPA, several states including both Massachusetts and New Hampshire require a qualifying score on a performance assessment for program completion and/or initial licensure.

Massachusetts requires candidates to demonstrate proficiency during their education program through the use of the Candidate Assessment of Performance (CAP) portfolio. The CAP assesses a teacher candidate's readiness in relation to the Professional Standards for Teachers (PSTs). CAP measures teacher candidates' practice across a range of key indicators as outlined in the Guidelines for the Professional Standards for Teachers and supports them in improving their practice based on the results. Additionally, Massachusetts requires a qualifying score on the Massachusetts Tests for Educator Licensure (MTEL) for initial licensure. The MTEL assessments are designed to help ensure that Massachusetts educators can communicate adequately with students, parents/guardians, and other educators and that individuals are knowledgeable in the subject matter of the certification sought.

With regard to New Hampshire, all candidates complete the New Hampshire Teacher Candidate Assessment of Performance (NHTCAP) as part of the state's educator preparation program. The NHTCAP is a subject-specific, capstone project, designed around multiple measures and adopted from the Performance Assessment of California Teachers (PACT). The NHTCAP serves as a performance assessment within education preparation programs but qualifying scores are not required, nor reported for licensure.

In addition to the nine states who have not adopted, nor have any education preparation programs using edTPA, several states have taken steps to either remove or alter their policies around the use of edTPA. These changes and/or efforts are documented below:

State	State policy changes or efforts to change the use of performance assessments, including edTPA, in Program Completion Requirements and/or Educator Licensure Requirements
Arkansas	Removed the requirement for a qualifying score on an approved pedagogy assessment for licensure (03/2019).
Illinois	Illinois State House of Representatives adopted HR0010 on 2/27/2019 to encourage the State Board of Education to stop using edTPA. The bill died in the Illinois State Senate and on November 22, 2019 the Illinois State Board of Education approved maintaining the 9/1/18-8/31/19 edTPA cut scores.
Oregon	In June 2019, Oregon's Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC) approved alternative measures to the required performance assessment in addition to edTPA.
Vermont	Vermont developed their own licensure portfolio—the Vermont Licensure Portfolio (LVP)—that was collaboratively developed across all EPPs within the state; "The VLP was designed by a committee comprised of members of the Vermont Council of Teacher Educators (VCTE), the Vermont Standards Board for Professional Educators (VSBPE), and the Vermont Agency of Education (AOE)." The VLP "is aligned with the Core Teaching Standards in the Core Teaching and Leadership Standards for Vermont Educators and has three parts which can be completed over the course of a candidate's participation in a Vermont Educator Preparation Program." Scorers from different EPPs meet to review portfolios to calibrate across schools. Candidates who complete an alternate route to teaching also must complete this portfolio.

Query Four Recommendations:

Require the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) to report annually the performance of Connecticut candidates on edTPA through the Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) Data Dashboard.

Require the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education - Connecticut (AACTE CT) to provide a

joint annual report to the Connecticut General Assembly Education Committee which includes updates on the implementation of edTPA across Connecticut; edTPA pass rates by institution; updates on national edTPA landscape; and continuing policy recommendations.

Maintain an edTPA working group comprised of stakeholders within the CSDE and K-20 community as outlined by the original statue to monitor the implementation and impact of edTPA across IHEs, EPPs, and K-12 schools.

Query Five: "any effect on world languages instruction"

Theme 1. The purpose of the edTPA performance assessment is to measure novice teachers' readiness to teach world language in an authentic setting (World Language Handbook, 2015).

The edTPA World Language assessment is composed of three tasks: 1.) Planning for Instruction and Assessment; 2.) Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning; and 3.) Assessing Student Learning. Candidates must demonstrate knowledge and application consistent with the World Readiness Standards for Learning Languages developed by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) (2014) and the ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers. The performance assessment should include a learning segment that develops students' communicative proficiency in the target language within meaningful cultural context(s). The development of student communicative proficiency will include the promotion of five main goal areas in world language education: Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities. The assessment is completed for 3 - 5 days of the forty to fifty days of student teaching experience.

Theme 2. World Language student teachers may submit their respective edTPA portfolio in the target language of instruction OR in English.

This is a documented matter of edTPA policy. By allowing for world language teacher candidates to submit their edTPA in either the target language or English, the opportunity for writing bias against non-native speakers of English, who are presumably fluent writers in their native languages, is greatly diminished.

Theme 3. Professionals who score World Language edTPA portfolios are required to completed rigorous training and must be qualified in the target language under evaluation.

This is a documented matter of edTPA policy.

Theme 4. The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and Stanford Center on Assessment, Learning and Equity (SCALE) design team currently do not agree on all aspects of the edTPA assessment in world languages.

The performance of World Language teacher candidates, whose native language is not English, versus native English-speaking World Language teacher candidates has been questioned by World Language teacher educators, including some from Connecticut. It is important to note that the cut score on edTPA for World Language teacher candidates in Connecticut is currently set at 32. The range for passing scores recommended by SCALE, for states that have edTPA policy like Connecticut, is between 32-36. Connecticut's current cut score is at the lowest end of said range. The mean score for World Language handbooks, from 1/1/18 to 12/31/18, was 35.66 for all states that have policy. Connecticut's specific mean score on the World Language handbooks is not yet available, as the overall n of test takers in World Languages is still too low for a meaningful Connecticut-specific statistic to be generated. As such it is premature to determine if any difference exists between native and non-native English-speaking teacher candidates' performances on edTPA in World Languages in Connecticut. National data do not support such a conclusion and there is no evidence to support the assertion that edTPA in World Language has a disproportionate impact on minority Spanish speaking student teachers in Connecticut schools.

Theme 5. SCALE has demonstrated its willingness to better align the edTPA to ACTFL, at ACTFL's request. Alignment efforts are on-going.

Query Five Recommendations:
Require the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) to report annually the performance of Connecticut candidates on edTPA through the Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) Data Dashboard.

Require the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education - Connecticut (AACTE CT) to provide a joint annual report to the Connecticut General Assembly Education Committee which includes updates on the implementation of edTPA across Connecticut; edTPA pass rates by institution; updates on national edTPA landscape; and continuing policy recommendations.

Maintain an edTPA working group comprised of stakeholders within the CSDE and K-20 community as outlined by the original statue to monitor the implementation and impact of edTPA across IHEs, EPPs, and K-12 schools.

Limitations:
The work of the edTPA Working Group was limited in the following ways:

The edTPA Working Group was delayed in its formation by several months. As a result, the membership were granted an extension. The edTPA Working Group's deadline was changed from January 1, 2020 to January 31, 2020.

There was no representation of an in-service educator on the edTPA Working Group, as required under P.A. 19-139. Without an in-service educator perspective, the potential

utility of the edTPA, and its potential application to the preparation of teacher candidates for practice, was not represented adequately in the efforts of the edTPA Working Group. Nonetheless, the voice of the in-service educator population was captured, in part, in a statement provided by Ms. Frances Rabinowitz, Executive Director of the Connecticut Association of Public-School Superintendents (CAPSS):

> The edTPA is an excellent and reliable performance measure that allows teaching candidates (regardless of preparation program) to reflect on their strengths and deficits in the beginning stages of their career and commit to a plan of development…The edTPA performance assessment is directly aligned to the rubric for teacher evaluation. It encompasses the same competencies that we expect from all teachers. The results of the edTPA can be shared with the new teacher's administrator and will foster individualized support and development to the new teacher in the crucial first weeks of his/ her career. If the administrator knows, for instance, that student engagement is an area of need for the new teacher, he/ she can be given immediate support in this area, perhaps arranging observations of teachers who are masters in this area. Utilizing the edTPA as the new teacher begins his/ her career is proactive and allows the best, targeted supports to be available to new teachers at the time they need it most.

A second pre-service educator, as required under P.A. 19-139, was not appointed to the edTPA Working Group. It is possible that a second pre-service educator voice could have supported, or contradicted, data that emerged, as reported under Themes 7-9, presented under Query One.

The transferability of information generated through edTPA Working Group member surveys (K. Grant and A. Ayalon) and questionnaire (M. Alfano an M. Cavender) is significantly limited. All instrumentation used was nonscientific in nature. Only two of 14 EPPs teacher candidate and teacher preparation faculty populations were asked to respond to surveys. Response rates were extremely low. Thus, interpretation of the data, regarding response rate bias, is warranted. Additionally, only seven of 14 EPP dean/directors responded to a questionnaire tied directly to P.A. 19-139 queries. Here again, with only fifty percent of the target population responding, caution is warranted with regards to transferability of the data.

Conclusions:

edTPA was selected for implementation in Connecticut as an outcome of a rigorous and public process tied directly to the work of EPAC. edTPA is in the early stages of consequential implementation in Connecticut. Connecticut's EPPs are in the process of training their teacher preparation faculty and staff regarding the tool, as well as concurrently integrating it into their respective teacher preparation curricula. A portion of Connecticut's teacher preparation faculty question the established utility, reliability and validity of edTPA. A portion of Connecticut's EPP teacher candidates directly experience outcomes associated with uneven initial curricular integration, faculty and staff training and overt repudiation of edTPA as a high-stakes, preservice tool by some

teacher preparation faculty. Specifically, a portion of Connecticut's teacher candidates continue to not fully understand what edTPA is, why it is relevant to their teaching practice and how to complete it in a timely, less stressful and efficient manner. The fidelity of implementation of edTPA is ultimately the responsibility of each EPP. As such, Connecticut EPPs have a responsibility to support teacher candidates through the edTPA process.

Despite SCALE's efforts to be transparent in all aspects of edTPA development and revision, edTPA continues to be debated in professional communities of practice. For example, the performance of different groups on edTPA, though accounting for less than three percent of overall variability, continues to be discussed in the professional literature. Another example of professional discourse includes matters related to edTPA scoring validity and reliability. These matters were considered during the interrogation of edTPA by EPAC. Because these discussions continue, the CSDE, working collaboratively with the pre-service teacher preparation and in-service educator communities, is positioned to periodically monitor and report to the Education Committee regarding matters of potential edTPA racial bias and scoring validity and reliability.

edTPA implementation has consumed financial, human and physical resources at Connecticut EPPs. Relatedly, Connecticut preservice educators complete a fee-based testing regimen required for initial teacher licensure. edTPA implementation has added three hundred dollars of additional testing fees.   As a result, Connecticut is now positioned as the most expensive state in the region to become a licensed professional educator. EPAC, the post-pilot RTI evaluation and the current document all indicate that the fee associated with edTPA, when taken together with the existing licensure testing regimen fees, is a financial burden. This finding is especially noteworthy for teacher candidates with unmet financial need. The Connecticut State Legislature, working with the CSDE, is in a unique position to study the overall licensure testing regimen fee structure in Connecticut. Fees associated with Connecticut's teacher licensure testing regiment cannot serve as a barrier to access to entry into the teaching profession.

Executive Summary of edTPA Working Group Recommendations:

The Bureau of Educator Standards and Certification, working directly with Connecticut policy makers, enact legal changes to reduce educator certification fees by proposing statute changes to CGS Sec. 10-145b(I).

The Connecticut General Assembly should appropriate funds to offset the cost of educator certification, specifically providing funding for increased edTPA vouchers.

Re-examine the Praxis II for certification for elementary candidates.

EPP edTPA coordinators, in collaboration with CSDE, should create a shared resource on how EPPs across the state are supporting candidates with the costs associated with the testing regimen required for initial licensure in Connecticut, which now includes the edTPA.

Connecticut EPPs should utilize an inquiry approach and review program coursework and clinical experiences to determine how their program's current curriculum prepares candidates for what edTPA does and does not measure, and 2) CSDE and EPPs continue to emphasize and work with stakeholders (candidates, principals, superintendents, teachers) regarding how the constructs measured in edTPA directly align with the critical dimensions of teaching, and as such, how edTPA pre-service data can inform the induction years.

CSDE should continue to monitor the literature regarding the validity of edTPA, and 2) EPPs continue to provide evidence of validity with stakeholders (faculty, candidates, school partners, etc.).

CSDE should continue to monitor the literature regarding the reliability of edTPA, and 2) EPPs continue to educate stakeholders (faculty, candidates, school partners, etc.) as to how edTPA is scored and who does the scoring.

EPPs should ensure that candidates understand that teaching is hard work and requires ongoing reflection and practice, 2) EPPs should ensure and trust that their programs are well-designed to prepare candidates to be successful on edTPA without dismantling their curriculum, and 3) EPPs should ensure that candidates receive adequate time to practice, with children, the skills needed in implementing the effective cycle of teaching (planning, instructing, assessing).

EPPs should educate faculty and candidates on the rubric level progressions and the constructs measured by each rubric, 2) EPPs should make visible to candidates, faculty, and school partners where the constructs that embody the effective cycle of teaching are covered in coursework and clinical experiences, and 3) EPPs should engage faculty in examining candidate artifacts and mapping the evidence to rubric

levels, thus identifying gaps in candidate learning which then informs program improvement.

EPPs should employ a multiple measures assessment system that incorporates valid and reliable assessments (including EPP created assessments) which allow candidates to practice and master the content knowledge and pedagogical skills needed to implement the effective cycle of teaching (as defined in the literature) prior to entering the student teaching semester.

CSDE should monitor performance based on all demographic variables with particular attention on performance by ethnicity, 2) CSDE should use CT data that reflect CT populations to conduct further analyses and implications for CT, 3) EPPs should approach edTPA with an "educative focus" as opposed to a compliance or testing requirement by utilizing the extensive resources available to support an inquiry approach, 4) EPPs should work to provide candidates with opportunities to develop and practice constructs that make up the effective cycle of teaching prior to completing edTPA, 5) Avoid a "deficit" point of view when considering candidates of color and performance on edTPA, and 6) Consult with and learn from other EPPs that have utilized edTPA over time and have candidates of color who are performing well on edTPA.

Require the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) to report annually the performance of Connecticut candidates on edTPA through the Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) Data Dashboard.

Require the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education - Connecticut (AACTE CT) to provide a joint annual report to the Connecticut General Assembly Education Committee which includes updates on the implementation of edTPA across Connecticut; edTPA pass rates by institution; updates on national edTPA landscape; and continuing policy recommendations.

Works Consulted- General

Lynn, Marvin (2014). Making Culturally Relevant Pedagogy Relevant to Aspiring Teachers. Retrieved from https://diverseeducation.com/article/61280/

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) and Pearson Education, Inc. (2019). *Affirming the Validity and Reliability of edTPA.* Stanford, CA: SCALE.

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) (2015). *Review of Research on Teacher Education: edTPA Task Dimensions and Rubric Constructs.* Stanford, CA: SCALE.

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) (2019). State edTPA Policy Overview. Retrieved from: http://edtpa.aacte.org.

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) and Pearson Education, Inc. (2018). *Educative Assessment and Meaningful Support: 2018 edTPA Administrative Report.* Stanford, CA: SCALE.

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) and Pearson Education, Inc. (2018). *Educative Assessment and Meaningful Support: edTPA by the Numbers.* Stanford, CA: SCALE.

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) (2017). Educator success through edTPA: The Georgia experience. Retrieved from: http://edtpa.aacte.org/.

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) (2017). edTPA Case Study: The University of Maryland Expands the Use of edTPA for Students and Faculty. Retrieved from: http://edtpa.aacte.org/.

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) (2017). edTPA Case Study: University of Colorado Boulder Using edTPA To Improve on Candidate Assessment Process. Retrieved from: http://edtpa.aacte.org/.

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) (2017). edTPA Case Study: Minnesota's Performance Assessment Requirement Puts Student Learning Front and Center for New Teachers. Retrieved from: http://edtpa.aacte.org/.

Wetherington, Pamela (2014). Georgia Campus Learns From 2013 edTPA Pilot In Preparation for Broader Implementation. Retrieved from: http://edtpa.aacte.org/.

Whittaker, A., Pecheone, R., & Stansbury, K. (2018). Fulfilling our educative mission: A response to edTPA critique. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 26*(30).

Works Consulted for Query One

CSDE data provided in narrative submitted by C. Todd, edTPA Working Group member.

Nonscientific student and faculty surveys administered by K. Grant and A. Ayalon, edTPA Working Group members at Central Connecticut State University and University of Connecticut, fall 2019.

Questionnaire sent by M. Alfano, edTPA Working Group member, to all American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education-CT education dean/director membership (i.e., Central Connecticut State University, Southern Connecticut State University, Western Connecticut State University, Eastern Connecticut State University, Quinnipiac University, Sacred Heart University, Fairfield University, University of Hartford, Saint Joseph University, Albertus Magnus College, University of Bridgeport, Mitchell College, University of Connecticut, Connecticut College).

Questionnaire sent by M. Cavender, edTPA Working Group member, to all Connecticut EPP edTPA Coordinators.

Works Consulted for Query Two

Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE). (2019). Educator Licensure Fees Landscape Comparison.

edTPA. (2020). Retrieved from http://edtpa.aacte.org/

Leake, J (2020). CEA President. edTPA Statement letter.

Works Consulted for Query Three

American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, National Council on Measurement in Education. (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Alloway, M. & Lesh, J. (2019). Compliance, Affirmation, alignment, or Learning: Influencing the edTPA Process through One's Stance. In L. Barron (Ed.), *A practical guide for edTPA implementation: Lessons from the field* (pp. 25-45). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Au, W. (2013). What's a nice test like you doing in a place like this?: The edTPA and corporate education "reform." *Rethinking Schools*, 22-27.

Bastian, K. C. & Lys, D. (2016, September). *Initial Findings from edTPA Implementation in North Carolina.*   Education Policy Initiative at Carolina: The University of North Carolina. http://publicpolicy.unc.edu/epic-home/

Bernard, C., Kaufman, D., Kohan, M., & Mitoma, G. (2019). *Confronting the edTPA in Connecticut: Recommendations for Teacher Candidate Quality, Sustainability, and Empowerment*. Thomas Dodd Research Center: University of Connecticut.

Behizadeh, N., Neely, A. (2018). Testing injustice: Examining the consequential validity of edTPA. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 51(3-4), 242-264.

Choppin, J., Meuwissn, K. (2017). Threats to validity in the edTPA video component. *Action in Teacher Education*, 39(1), 39-53.

Cochran-Smith, M., Piazza, P., & Power, C. (2013). The politics of accountability: Assessing teacher education in the United States. *The Education Forum,* 77(1), 6-27.

Cochran-Smith, M., Stern, R., Gabriel, J., Sánchez, A. M., Keefe, E. S., Fernández, M. B., Chang, W. C., Cummings, M., Carney, S. B., & Baker, M. (2016). *Holding teacher preparation accountable. Review of claims and evidence*. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. Retrieved from http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/teacher- prep.

Croft, S. J., Roberts, M. A., & Stenhouse, V. L. (2016). The perfect storm of education reform: High-stakes testing and teacher evaluation. *Social Justice, 42*(1), 70-92. Retrieved from http://www.socialjusticejournal.org/

Cronenberg, S., Harrison, D., Korson, S., Jones, A., Murray-Everett, N. C., Parrish, M., & Johnston-Parsons, M. (2016). Trouble with the edTPA: Lessons Learned from a Narrative Self-Study. *Journal of Inquiry and Action in Education, 8*(1), 109-134. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.buffalostate.edu/jiae/

Dover, A.G. & Schultz, B.D. (2016) Troubling the edTPA: Illusions of Objectivity and Rigor. *The Educational Forum*, 80(1), 95-106. DOI: 10.1080/00131725.2015.1102368

Gilbert, K. A., & Kuo, N-C. (2019). Ethical, legal, and pedagogical issues in edTPA. *Critical Education, 10*(8), 1-17. Retrieved from http://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/criticaled/article/view/186418

Gitomer, D. H., Martinez, J. F., Battey, D., & Hyland, N. E. (2019). Assessing the Assessment: Evidence of Reliability and Validity in the edTPA. *American Educational Research Journal*. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831219890608

Hutt, E. L., Gottlieb, J., Cohen, J. J. (2018). Diffusion in a vacuum: edTPA, legitimacy, and the rhetoric of teacher professionalization. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 69*, 52-61.

Kim, S. J. & Sato, M. (2019). A Consequential Validity Framework for Performance. Assessment Implementation Based on a Statewide Adoption of edTPA. In L. Barron (Ed.), *A practical guide for edTPA implementation: Lessons from the field* (pp. 3-23). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Kuranishi, A. & Oyler, C. (2017). I failed the edTPA. *Teacher Education and Special Education* 40(4) 299–313.

Lalley, J. (2017). Reliability and validity of edTPA. *Teacher Performance Assessment and Accountability Reforms: the Impact of edTPA on Teaching and Schools*, 47-78.

Margolis, J., & Doring, A. (2013). National assessments for student teachers: Documenting teaching readiness to the tipping point. *Action in Teacher Education*, *35*(4), 272-285. doi:10.1080/01626620.2013.827602

Miller, M., Carroll, D., Jancic, M. & Markworth, K. (2015). Developing a culture of learning around the edTPA: One university's journey. *The New Educator, 11*(1), 37-59.

O'Brien, L., & Robb, S. N. (2017). Rage against the machine: Teacher educators try to throw a wrench in the (edTPA) Works. *Critical Education*, *8*(7). 1-23. Retrieved from http://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/criticaled/article/view/186172

Parks, K.A., & Powel, S.R. (2015). Is the edTPA the right choice for evaluating teacher readiness? *Arts Education Policy Review*, 116, 103-113.

Peck, C. A., Singer-Gabella, M., Sloan, T., & Lin, S. (2014). Driving blind: Why we need standardized performance assessment in teacher education. *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction, 8*(1), 8-30.

Pecheone, R. L. & Whittaker, A. (2016). Well prepared teachers inspire student learning. *Kappan, 97*(7), 8-13.

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) (2015, version 2). *Review of Research on Teacher Education: edTPA Task Dimensions and Rubric Constructs.* Palo Alto, CA: Author.

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) and Pearson Education, Inc. (2019). *Affirming the Validity and Reliability of edTPA.* Stanford, CA: SCALE and Amherst, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity (SCALE). (2019). *Educative assessment and meaningful support: 2018 edTPA administrative report*. Palo Alto, CA: Author. Retrieved from:https://secure.aacte.org/apps/rl/res_get.php?fid+4769&ref+edtpa

Sugelder, B. S., L'Esperance, M., Conetta, P. J., & Watts, T. (2019). Use of edTPA Rubric Constructs in Teacher Induction. In L. Barron (Ed.), *A practical guide for edTPA implementation: Lessons from the field* (pp. 415-433). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Wetherington, P., Overby, S., & Battle, C. (2019). The Journey from Teacher Preparation to Induction. In L. Barron (Ed.), *A practical guide for edTPA implementation: Lessons from the field* (pp. 395 - 413). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Whittaker, A., Pecheone, R., & Stansbury, K. (2018). Fulfilling our educative mission: A response to edTPA critique. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 26*(30), 1-20.

https://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2016-04-04/will-new-teacher-tests-make-the-profession-more-overwhelmingly-white

https://www.nea.org/assets/docs/Minority%20Teacher%20Candiadtes%20and%20High-Stakes%20Assessments.%20NBI%2016%202017.pdf

https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/ETS-NEA-2011-01.pdf

http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/teacherbeat/2019/02/aspiring_elementary_teachers_licensing_test_failure.html

Works Consulted for Query Four

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) (2020). edTPA Participation. Retrieved from http://edtpa.aacte.org/state-policy#.

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) (2019). State edTPA Policy Overview. Retrieved from: http://edtpa.aacte.org

Works Consulted for Query Five

Kissau, S. & Algozzine, B. (2017). Effective foreign language teaching: Broadening the concept of content knowledge. *Foreign Language Annals*, 50(1), 114-134.

Kleyn, T., López, D., & Makar, C. (2015). What About Bilingualism? A Critical Reflection on the edTPA With Teachers of Emergent Bilinguals. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *38*(1), 88–106.

Okraski, C. V., & Kissau, S. P. (2018). Impact of Content-Specific Seminars on Candidate EdTPA Preparation and Performance. *Foreign Language Annals*, *51*(3), 685–705.

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) and Pearson
        Education, Inc. (2015). *World Language Handbook.* Stanford, CA: SCALE and
        Amherst, MA: Pearson Education

Swanson, P. & Hildenbrandt, S.A. (2017). Communicative learning outcomes and world
        language edTPA: characteristics of high-scoring portfolios. *Hispania*, 100.3
        331-347.