

University of Portland Pilot Scholars

Graduate Theses and Dissertations

2019

A Study of the Impact of Participating in the edTPA Process on the Assessment Practices of Novice Teachers

Michelle C. York

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pilot scholars.up.edu/etd>

Part of the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

York, Michelle C., "A Study of the Impact of Participating in the edTPA Process on the Assessment Practices of Novice Teachers" (2019). *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 58.
<https://pilot scholars.up.edu/etd/58>

This Doctoral Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Pilot Scholars. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Pilot Scholars. For more information, please contact library@up.edu.

A Study of the Impact of Participating in the edTPA Process on the
Assessment Practices of Novice Teachers

by
Michelle C. York

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education
in
Learning and Leading

University of Portland
School of Education

2019

**A Study of the Impact of Participating in the edTPA Process on the
Assessment Practices of Novice Teachers**

by

Michelle C. York

This dissertation is completed as a partial requirement for the Doctor of Education (EdD) degree at the University of Portland in Portland, Oregon.

Approved:

REDACTED

Chairperson

REDACTED

3-18-19

Date

Committee Member

REDACTED

3-18-19

Date

Committee Member

3-18-19

Date

If applicable:

Additional Committee Member

Date

Additional Committee Member

Date

Approved:

REDACTED

Graduate Program Director

REDACTED

3-18-19

Date

Dean of the Unit

REDACTED

3/18/19

Date

Dean of the Graduate School

March 18, 2019

Date

Abstract

Oregon student achievement continues to linger in the bottom of state rankings for assessment scores and graduation rates. Recent literature suggests that formative assessment and feedback are the most effective practices for improving student outcomes. Oregon has adopted the educative teacher performance assessment, or the edTPA which measures, among other abilities, teacher use of assessment practices. This mixed methods study explores the impact of the edTPA on the development of assessment practices of novice teachers by collecting data in two phases: an online survey and a one-on-one interview. The sample included 41 graduates of Oregon educator preparation programs from 2016, 2017, and 2018, and seven of the survey participants also participated in a follow-up interview. Through the data analysis four themes emerged: 1) novice teachers perceive that completing the edTPA had little to no impact on their current assessment practices, 2) novice teachers perceive that the edTPA was a waste of time or hindered the learning process for preservice teachers, 3) novice teachers did learn assessment practices, but from other sources, and 4) novice teachers interviewed for this study self-report the use best practices in assessment. The findings of this study indicate implications for pre-service teachers, educator preparation programs, and policymakers in Oregon and the need to further explore how to support the development of pre-service teachers' assessment practices and effective implementation of the edTPA.

Acknowledgements

This has been an interesting journey supported by many people along the way. My chair, Dr. Nicole Ralston, has been as supportive as it is humanly possible to be and her encouragement kept me going strong to the end. Along with Dr. Ralston my committee members, Dr. Hillary Gaudio and Dr. Bruce Weitzel, contributed insightful comments and guiding questions that strengthened my research. The rest of the faculty and staff in the School of Education at the University of Portland offered pearls of wisdom along the way, and I especially want to thank Anne Rasmussen for always knowing what's what and answering any and all questions.

There have been others along the road that made an impact and whose voices I hear when I get discouraged. Dr. Claudia Raffaele, how far would I have gotten without our writing retreats? You have been an inspiration! Thank you to the colleagues who became my friends for your words of support and encouragement: especially Sara, the Dufii, and the Dead Mustangs!

My family has always supported my education and have been there through two master's degrees, National Board certification, and finally this degree. Though my Mom did not take this last journey with me, she taught me to be strong and persevere. My Dad told me what I needed to hear, when I needed to hear it. I also need to thank my sister, Lori, for coffee and shopping when I needed a break! My brother Steve provided his infinite nerd video collection when I needed a distraction.

Finally, I want Harry, Arthur, and Galen to know that I never would have considered this huge undertaking without their belief in me. I hope that you know how much you share this accomplishment and that I will be cheering you on as you pursue your own big dreams.

Dedication

To the Millennials for challenging the rules and asking, “Why?”

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Dedication	vi
List of Tables	x
List of Figures	xi
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Assessment to Improve Student Outcomes	2
Educator Preparation Programs	4
Teacher Performance Assessments	6
Oregon Education Policy	8
The edTPA	10
Purpose Statement	12
Significance	14
Theoretical Framework	15
Summary	19
Chapter 2: Literature Review	21
Assessment Practices	21
Formative assessment	22
The role of feedback	26
Reflective practice	27
Teacher Performance Assessments	29
National Board certification	30
Impact of National Board certification	31
Beginning Educator Support and Training	33
Impact of BEST	34
Teacher Work Sample Methodology and impact	35
Performance Assessment for California Teachers and impact	37

The Educative Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA)	38
Educator Preparation Programs	50
Research Gap	52
Summary	53
Chapter 3: Research Methods	55
Purpose of Study	55
Rationale for Methodology	56
Participants	58
Sampling	58
Survey participants	59
Interview participants	61
Instrumentation	61
Survey	62
Interview protocol	67
Procedures	68
Role of the Researcher	71
Issues of Trustworthiness	72
Ethical Procedures	74
Data Analysis	75
Quantitative survey analysis	75
Qualitative survey analysis	76
Interview data analysis	76
Triangulation	78
Summary	79
Chapter 4: Results	80
Theme 1: Completing the edTPA had Little Impact on Assessment Practices	81
Theme 2: The edTPA Process was a Hoop or a Negative Experience	86
Theme 3: There were Other Influences Impacting Assessment Practices	90
Field experience	91
Program	92
On the job	93
Theme 4: Novice Teachers Learned and Now Use Best Practices in Assessment ...	94

Assessment practices used by novice teachers.....	95
Positive impact of the edTPA process	99
Chapter 5: Discussion	104
Theme 1: Completing the edTPA had Little Impact on Assessment Practices	105
Theme 2: The edTPA Process was a “Hoop” or a Negative Experience	107
Theme 3: There were Other Influences Impacting Assessment Practices.....	108
Theme 4: Novice Teachers Learned and Now Use Best Practices in Assessment.	110
Limitations of the Study	112
Future Research	115
Implications	116
Conclusion	119
Appendix A	120
Appendix B.....	122
Appendix C.....	123
Appendix D	124
References	125

List of Tables

Table 1: State Policies on edTPA Implementation.....	43
Table 2: Participating Oregon Educator Preparation Program Characteristics	59
Table 3: Education Preparation Characteristics of Survey Participants	60
Table 4: Program and Perception Characteristics of Interviewees.....	62
Table 5: Alignment of edTPA Assessment with Standards and Survey Items	65
Table 6: Sample Interview Questions Compared to edTPA Proficiency Levels	69
Table 7: Data Collection Response Format and Analysis Type.....	75
Table 8: Responses to Survey Questions about Participating in the edTPA Process...	82
Table 9: Descriptive Statistics for Survey Responses	84
Table 10: Private and Public School Participants who Rated Items 3 and Above	85
Table 11: Number of Survey Participants Reporting Positive Program Influence	91
Table 12: Novice Teacher Assessment Practices from Interview Data	100

List of Figures

Figure 1. edTPA rubric topics	39
Figure 2. InTASC professional practice standards for teachers	40
Figure 3. Key concepts for instrument design.....	63

Chapter 1: Introduction

From 2013-2017 Oregon moved from 41st to 40th place among the 50 states in the Education Week Quality Counts survey for an overall grade of C- (Quality Counts, 2018), scoring below the national average in all areas. To rank K-12 Achievement, the report uses National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading and math scores, results of Advanced Placement exams, and high school graduation rates together with state progress in closing the achievement gap. For Oregon, NAEP results from 2017 (ODE, 2018) showed that 34% of Grade 4 students were proficient or advanced in math and 34% were proficient or advanced in reading. Students in Grade 8 were proficient or advanced in math and reading at rates of 33% and 36%, respectively. Students who have earned 25% of the required credits for high school graduation by the end of their freshman year are considered on-track for graduation; in Oregon, 85% of freshman were on track at the end of the 2017-2018 school year, but the four-year cohort graduation rate in 2017 for Oregon was 77% (ODE, 2018), one of the worst in the nation. For high school juniors who took the Smarter Balanced Assessment, used in Oregon to measure student achievement, 70% met benchmark in English/Language Arts and 33% met benchmark in math. Of the 34,141 AP tests taken by Oregon students in 2017, fewer than half of Oregon test takers obtained a passing score, although the average score of between 2.9 and 3.0 was slightly above the national average. Of the 14,631 Oregon students who took the ACT test in 2017, 32% met all four college readiness benchmarks (ODE, 2017). These statistics present a

snapshot of student achievement in Oregon and the inability of Oregon public schools to prepare P-12 students with the skills necessary for post-secondary college and career success. This is a clear call for change in what happens in classrooms across Oregon, which requires an understanding of what strategies are effective when it comes to improving student outcomes.

Assessment to Improve Student Outcomes

One strategy that is discussed in the literature as an effective strategy to improve student outcomes is formative assessment. Integrated with summative assessment, which is a cumulative assessment of progress toward goals, formative assessment is a process that provides feedback to move learners forward, activates students as owners of their own learning, and supports their active engagement in learning (Black, 2018; Black & William, 2008). For this study, assessment practices are the formative assessment practices of analyzing student work, providing feedback, and using data from student work to make decisions about the next steps for instruction. Each component of assessment practices requires reflection on the part of the teacher in the form of analyzing student work to understand how instruction supported student outcomes and how to respond to individual student needs through feedback and planning next steps for instruction. Feedback is an essential component of formative assessment that also supports student engagement in their learning (Shepard, 2000). John Hattie (1999), in a speech at Auckland University in New Zealand nearly 20 years ago declared, “The most powerful single moderator that enhances achievement is feedback” (p. 9). He came to this conclusion through analysis of 337 meta-analyses including more than 50 million students. Deeper exploration of

the concept defined feedback as, “information provided by an agent (teacher, peer, book, parent, self, experience) regarding aspects of one’s performance or understanding” (Hattie & Timperley, 2007, p. 81). There were 196 studies from the original analysis that were specifically about feedback, with an average effect size of 0.79, almost double the average effect size of 0.40 of schooling in general. Black and William’s (2008) seminal work included feedback as one of the five key strategies in their formative assessment theory. In an examination of 199 sources on assessment, learning, and motivation, Clark (2012) explored the role of feedback in the capacity of formative assessment to develop self-regulated learning strategies, which are predictive of improved academic outcomes and motivation. Self-regulated learning is the active participation and engagement of students in their own learning and is the result of the interactions of effective formative assessment, increasing self-efficacy, and increasing motivation. These skills are developed and reinforced through formative assessment practices such as feedback, especially when feedback is related to progress toward academic goals. Curry, Mwavita, Holter, and Harris (2014) conducted a qualitative case study to evaluate a teacher-centered approach to data use, which showed that using data to inform instruction positively impacted teachers and students. For teachers, using data to inform instruction positively impacted the practice of reflective teaching. The participants reported that using data encouraged them to evaluate their own instructional practices and eventually to assess and adjust within lessons rather than after-the-fact. They described the process of learning to use data in this way as being treated like professionals. The ability to teach in the moment by assessing and adjusting based on student needs is what Schon calls reflection-in-action

in his theory of reflective practice (Schön, 1987). The study showed that for the students, formative assessment supported student motivation and participation in setting increasingly challenging academic goals. Clearly, formative assessment is an essential part of the teaching and learning process; used effectively the data collected through formative assessment about student progress can provide information to teachers for reflection on the effectiveness of their practices.

Educator Preparation Programs

Formative assessment is a strong predictor of improved student outcomes. Providing novice teachers with a thorough understanding of and experience using formative assessment can be an effective way to impact student learning as soon as they enter the classroom. Pre-service teachers depend on the educator preparation program to provide the training and experiences that develop their skills in formative assessment. A study of the educator preparation program at the University of North Carolina, Charlotte (Haefner, McIntyre & Spooner, 2014) explored how linking clinical partnerships with the program impact requirements affects pre-service teachers, P-12 students, clinical educators, and program faculty. By co-constructing a clinical experience that met the needs for the development of pre-service teachers, P-12 students, clinical educators, and program faculty in partnership with the school, the clinical experience had a positive impact on pre-service teacher development.

Some of the current barriers to preparing teachers to use formative assessment effectively, however, are the educator preparation programs themselves. A review by the National Council on Teacher Quality (Greenberg & Walsh, 2012) examined what educator preparation programs teach about assessment. The report sampled 180

undergraduate and graduate programs in 98 different programs from 30 states. Courses required by the educator preparation programs were counted if the title or course description indicated assessment was a significant topic of instruction or practice. A significant limitation of this study is that if assessment is successfully embedded into all education courses, it would not necessarily appear in the title or course description or be included in the report. A deeper examination of coursework and course objectives may reveal that assessment is interwoven rather than taught as an add-on to teaching. Nonetheless, the courses were ranked on three domains: assessment literacy, analytical skills, and instructional decision-making. Only 21% of programs in the sample adequately taught assessment literacy by comprehensively covering both classroom and standardized assessments and included practice scoring assessments. Less than one percent of the institutions in the sample adequately prepared candidates with analytical skills that included instruction on analysis of data from both classroom and standardized assessments, and practice that included collaborative work and presentations. Fewer than two percent of the programs in the sample included instruction and practice using data from assessments to inform instructional decision-making. This study brings attention to a lack of assessment literacy development in educator preparation programs which means novice teachers enter the classroom with limited skills in analyzing student work, providing effective feedback and using data from formative assessments to justify next steps in instruction. Limited use of formative assessments means that the benefits to students such as self-regulated learning and motivation will also be limited. The analysis in this study, however, is based solely on program descriptions and not whether pre-service teachers utilize

effective formative assessment practices such as feedback in the classroom. Even with these limitations, however, the inconsistency of including information on assessment in educator preparation programs and the potential for vastly different student outcomes shows a need for a common set of standards for what it means to be prepared to assess student learning effectively.

Teacher Performance Assessments

One way to ensure the consistency of standards for educator preparation programs is a standardized teacher performance assessment, ideally also including components on formative assessment, given the research-base on its importance. Teacher performance assessments include an analysis component that requires using student evidence to reflect on student progress toward academic goals and subsequent instructional decisions. Hiebert, Morris, Berk, and Jansen (2007) proposed designing educator preparation programs around a framework that focused on analyzing teaching in terms of student learning, the purpose of which was to continue supporting teacher learning when they enter the profession. This framework, and how pre-service teacher experiences would be designed to accommodate it, are supported by the essential structure of teacher performance assessments. Teacher performance assessments are designed to elicit evidence of student learning and some common elements include documentation to show planning, implementation, and assessment with reflective commentary to explain and justify instructional decisions. Reflecting on the results of a teaching experience is necessary to understand what led to success for students or what the barriers to learning may be. In the profession of teaching, reflective practice is the at the core of how teachers know what to do with each unique learner in order to

move them forward in their learning. Teacher performance assessments require extensive reflection on lesson implementation and assessment decisions which helps develop reflection as an integral component of teaching practice, though over time reflective practice happens in the moment rather than after the fact. Reflective commentary is used to analyze student work with attention to progress or lack of progress toward learning goals and the next steps to address learning needs. Teacher performance assessments can measure teacher effectiveness and provide opportunities for further development for the teacher (Darling-Hammond, 2010).

Designing a teacher performance assessment that measures teacher effectiveness has been in progress for several decades. Multiple versions of teacher performance assessments and teacher portfolios have evolved at the national or state level since the early 1990's and evaluate teachers at different points in their careers from pre-service through novice and finally to accomplished teacher. The prestigious National Board Certification has been earned by over 120,000 teachers in the United States since 1994 through a rigorous teacher performance assessment developed by The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS, 2016). It includes a content-specific portfolio assessment designed for experienced teachers to demonstrate accomplished and effective teaching through analysis of video-taped lessons, student work, and instructional decisions. In addition to performance assessments for practicing teachers, some educator preparation programs included a performance assessment as a graduation component. Several institutions in California formed the Performance Assessment for California Teachers consortium. The assessment was designed to afford flexibility to unique institutions but meet

standardized expectations for pre-service teachers. It was modeled on previous teacher performance assessments and used the model core teaching standards developed by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, or InTASC (CCSS0, 2011). The design team was centered at Stanford University's Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity where the next iteration of a teacher performance assessment was the first to be designed for use on a national scale. The edTPA (educative teacher performance assessment) came from this work: created with input from teachers and teacher educators, tested across the country from 2009-2013, and became operational in 2013. The edTPA has been adopted as a national teacher performance assessment as is written into policy regarding teacher licensure in 18 states (Pechione, Whittaker, & Klesch, 2017). In Oregon, the edTPA replaces a work sample that was developed at a local university and pre-service teacher portfolios were evaluated by each educator preparation program. The edTPA is evaluated outside of the program and was developed outside of the state.

Oregon Education Policy

Changing the teacher performance assessment requirement for licensure is part of a larger policy shift in Oregon as recent initiatives have sought to address the concerns with low student performance and inadequate educator preparation. The Teacher Standards and Practices Commission executes policy regarding teacher licensure, following state laws enacted by the legislature, informed by the Oregon Education Investment Board (now called the Chief Education Office) and the Oregon Board of Education. Some decisions have recently been made that will affect all teachers entering teacher preparation programs and the programs themselves. On

January 26, 2016, Kate Brown, the governor of Oregon, created the Governor's Council on Educator Advancement (Executive Order No. 16-03, 2016), which includes 15 members appointed by the Governor charged to, "coordinate comprehensive support to deliver excellence in teaching and learning and enhance Oregon's ability to elevate the educator profession and advance teacher and school leadership" (p. 3). Oregon Administrative Rules state that pre-service teachers must pass a performance assessment as a program completion requirement (OAR 584.400.0120, 2018) Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS 342.147, 2017) gave the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC) the authority to determine which teacher performance assessment would be the requirement for teacher licensure. The TSPC implemented the policy that became consequential on September 1, 2018 which states that pre-service teachers will submit an edTPA portfolio to be scored by an external evaluator and must receive a passing score as a program completion requirement, which in turn is a requirement to become licensed (TSPC, 2014). Adopting a teacher performance assessment at the state level is a decision that affects all educator preparation programs and pre-service teachers as well as schools and P-12 students in Oregon that, based on the policy level decisions about teaching and teacher licensure, should make a substantial impact on student achievement.

Another factor impacting educator preparation programs in Oregon is the required accreditation level. Starting in 2025, educator preparation programs in Oregon must be nationally accredited (OAR 584.400.0015, 2018). The accrediting body is currently specified as the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). One of the requirements in the CAEP standards is that educator preparation

programs demonstrate the impact of graduates on student achievement. Standard 4 describes what is required in terms of program impact, “The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation,” (CAEP, 2013). Programs receive data regarding their students’ progress on the edTPA rubrics that can provide a baseline for monitoring growth and progress after program completion. With the concurrent adoption of the high-stakes educative Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) and the requirement for CAEP accreditation, educator preparation programs face a complex problem of revising programs to align with policy. There is potential for educator preparation programs in Oregon to align best practices for teacher education among institutions, cooperating teachers, and field experiences to meet the needs of increasingly diverse P-12 students and teacher candidates.

The edTPA

The teacher performance assessment adopted by Oregon, called the edTPA (educative Teacher Performance Assessment), is designed to assess pre-service teachers by evaluating the reflective process and intentional decision-making involved in the planning, instruction, and assessment for P-12 students. The edTPA is based on 15 conceptual elements within the three-task format of planning, instruction, and assessment with academic language and analysis of teaching threaded throughout. There are 27 content-specific certification areas and, depending on the certification area, there are between 13 and 17 constructs, each with its own 5-point rubric. Candidate portfolios consist of a lesson cycle of three to five lessons that capture the

three tasks of planning, instruction, and assessment through evidence such as lesson plans, instructional materials, student work, feedback on student work, and video.

Candidates are assessed on their ability to develop P-12 students' academic language, justify their decisions, and analyze their own practices through reflective writing that is submitted along with the evidence (Pechione, Whittaker, & Klesch, 2017).

Teacher performance assessments, in concert with the standard exams of knowledge and skills and preparation in an educator preparation program, can present a more holistic picture of readiness to teach or, in the case of experienced teachers, change their practices to be more focused on student learning. Teacher Work Sample Methodology was an early version of a teacher performance assessment but showed promise in evaluating pre-service teachers' effectiveness for improving student outcomes (Fenster & Judd, 2008; McConney, Schalock, & Schalock, 1998). Multiple efforts to design teacher performance assessments were happening in different states and educator preparation programs were making changes to meet the more rigorous demands. An analysis of the effects of educator preparation program graduates from the Stanford Teacher Education Programme on student outcomes was inconclusive about the potential of the specific program, but an analysis of different preparation programs and Performance Assessment for California Teachers outcomes suggested that analyzing teacher performance at the end of a preparation program may be a predictor of future effectiveness in the classroom (Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2010). For practicing teachers, scores on the Beginning Educator Support and Training portfolio have also been shown to have positive associations with teacher effectiveness and student gains (Wilson, Hallam, Pechione, & Moss, 2014). The study

examined the relationship among portfolio scores, Praxis exam scores, and student gains in reading. Hierarchical linear modeling showed that portfolio scores were a predictor of student gains. Further, other research has shown the process of completing the assessment for National Boards is a professional development activity that improves teacher practices and changes how they approach teaching (Sato, Wei, & Darling-Hammond, 2008; Tracz, Daughtry, Henderson-Sparks, Newman, & Sienty, 2005). The process itself requires teachers to make a shift from assessing for grades to using assessment to support student learning (Sato, Wei, & Darling-Hammond, 2008), and refocuses the practice of teaching on the interaction of students, standards, and teaching (Tracz et al., 2005).

Teaching practices such as using formative assessment to improve student outcomes have the potential to support student achievement in Oregon, and the adoption of the edTPA as a licensing requirement, which includes specific requirements for assessment practices, is an attempt to ensure that Oregon educator preparation programs are sending the best prepared candidates to the classroom. Although previous teacher performance assessments such as National Boards and PACT include assessment components and have been shown to have a positive impact on teacher practices and student outcomes, additional research is needed to understand if completion of the edTPA process has the same effect.

Purpose Statement

There is a rapid expansion of state level adoptions of the edTPA as a consequential gatekeeper for teacher licensure. The edTPA is an approved assessment for all 18 states that have policies in place that require a teacher performance

assessment for teacher licensure. While there is research on the perceptions of edTPA from program and candidate perspectives, there is a gap in the literature on the effect of completing the edTPA assessment on future instructional activities, such as formative assessment that has the potential to positively impact student outcomes. The purpose of this study was to explore the impact of the edTPA process on the assessment practices of novice teachers. By collecting data from novice teachers at the beginning of their first, second, or third year of teaching, this study will examine the following research question:

- To what extent, if at all, are the current assessment practices of novice teachers impacted by the process of completing the edTPA?

For this study, assessment practices include analyzing student work, providing effective feedback, and using data from student formative assessments to inform next steps in instruction. Novice teachers are in-service teachers who completed educator preparation programs within the last three years, and are in their first, second, or third year of teaching. The process of completing the edTPA includes the planning, implementation, and assessment of the teaching sequence used to meet the requirements of the three tasks of the edTPA and application of knowledge and skills required to complete the edTPA commentary

This question was explored through a mixed methods study that followed an explanatory sequential design which used qualitative data to explain quantitative data in more depth (Creswell & Clark, 2018). Participants were selected from a population of novice teachers who completed an educator preparation program in Oregon in 2016, 2017, or 2018. Phase 1 consisted of a survey that asked novice teachers their opinion

about the level of influence completing the edTPA has had on their current assessment practices. Novice teachers were also asked open-ended response questions about their current assessment practices. In Phase 2 of the study, 7 respondents were selected to participate in one-on-one semi-structured interviews. Quantitative data collected from the participants was analyzed for frequency which indicated the level of influence the edTPA had on the assessment practices measured by the edTPA rubrics. Open-ended responses were coded for topics using descriptive coding and further categorized using structured coding (Saldaña, 2016), surfacing themes of how the edTPA influenced current assessment practices of novice teachers.

Significance

The state of Oregon has adopted the edTPA as the independently verified assessment that, in addition to completing an educator preparation program, determines whether the state grants a teaching license to a candidate. Starting on September 1, 2018, candidates who do not achieve a passing score will not be granted a license, though with time permitting and an additional fee they can re-submit a portfolio. This summative, high-stakes assessment has impacted educator preparation programs across the state, which must align curriculum and the student teaching experience to meet the rigorous demands of the edTPA in order to remain relevant for preparing the future teachers of Oregon.

The edTPA is aligned to standards that indicate strong teacher preparedness for the demands of teaching and educator preparation programs are revising curriculum and program design to meet the demands of this assessment. Reflecting on practices is embedded in the edTPA structure and provides guidance for candidates to use

assessment to improve student progress and improve instruction. The edTPA is a fairly recent development in teacher performance assessments and there is a gap in the literature about the impact of completing the edTPA process on the future assessment practices of novice teachers which this study is designed to address. Educator preparation programs may consider the results of this study as they review and design program experiences to effectively develop pre-service teachers and the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission can use this study as they review the effectiveness of using the edTPA as a high-stakes licensing assessment.

Theoretical Framework

The edTPA was created as an assessment that measures a pre-service teacher's readiness to teach and partly in response to the lack of a common assessment that measures both the skills and knowledge that form the foundation of teaching and the soft skills that go into the decision-making and continuous learning that are an essential component of the practice of teaching. This study will use the lens of reflective practice as the theoretical framework for understanding the less tangible skills required in the profession of teaching. Donald Schön (1983) defined reflective practice as, "a dialogue of thinking and doing through which I become more skillful" (p. 31). In teaching, reflective practice supports the decision-making that facilitates student learning and guides next steps in instruction. Analyzing student work is a form of reflecting-on-action that shows the teacher where students are on the learning continuum and offers the opportunity to adjust instruction in the future.

At the core of professional knowledge is the systematic and technical knowledge that form the core competencies that provide the foundational knowledge

for most situations and many problems that arise. Schön (1987) called this spontaneous and skilled response to a problem *knowing-in-action*. For the many issues that a professional will face, this foundational knowledge can be applied, and the problem is solved. For a teacher, the strategies learned in a methods or content class will work for many learning situations. Providing feedback is a form of knowing-in-action whereby a teacher provides the essential mix of what the student is doing correctly and incorrectly to give the student a path forward in their learning. The pace and quantity of this feedback in an instructional setting requires a level of automaticity that happens when a teacher has a thorough knowledge of different types of feedback and how to use them.

For those situations that present a level of uncertainty, uniqueness, and/or conflict, a more common occurrence when working in a classroom – reflective practice is required (Schön, 1987). The theory of reflective practice describes the skills that are needed when a problem is not well-defined and cannot be solved with only technical knowledge or theory, and there is no clear path to the solution. The types of problems that cannot be solved through knowing-in-action are a daily occurrence in a classroom. Students struggle with language, learning skills, behavior, and many other issues that make each learner a unique puzzle for the teacher. For example, if a student incorrectly solves a math equation a reflective practitioner looks for a common misconception that could easily be remedied through knowing-in-action. For a more complex misconception, the reflective practitioner takes a deeper look at path the student took to the answer and examines the instruction for what could have led to the

misunderstanding, correcting the misconception with the student as part of the learning process.

In facing the unknown, Schön (1987) writes that a practitioner has several responses. First, it can be brushed aside, viewed as not in their realm of responsibility. If the practitioner chooses to respond to the unknown, it can either be reflection on the action – thinking back about what could have been done differently or what contributed to the unexpected outcome – or *reflection-in-action*. Similar to *knowing-in-action*, the response happens during the situation; as the response unfolds the practitioner reflects on action as it happens and adjusts.

In a professional school, reflective practice is built from a thorough grounding in the basic and applied knowledge of the profession. What distinguishes a profession is the practicum experience which introduces the candidate to the traditions of the community and leads to recognition of what it means to be a competent practitioner (Schön, 1987). This day-to-day practice allows for the application of knowledge in a supported environment and provides even more opportunities for reflection-in-action, using knowledge in new ways.

In a teaching practicum, pre-service teachers apply their knowledge to both known and unknown situations. Using tests of basic skills and knowledge without a window into a pre-service teachers' instruction as a measure of readiness to teach discounts the nuanced decision-making and adjustments that occur during a lesson. Particular tasks within edTPA offer the opportunity to showcase their reflective practice and strengths in knowledge that allow them to solve problems that are unique to each classroom and student. Assessment results are analyzed in the edTPA

commentary which shows how pre-service teachers use data to identify the unique learning needs of each student and propose instructional strategies that will address these needs. Teachers who are reflective when analyzing student data, providing feedback, and planning next steps for instruction are able to frame issues around deficiencies in their instruction rather than deficiencies in the learner, a theoretical framework that is embedded in the edTPA assessment rubrics. In some cases, meeting student needs are straightforward, but for many cases, the ability to reflect and devise a unique solution will provide a better outcome. Increasing a pre-service teacher's capacity for reflection-in-action, especially in the effective use of formative assessment practices, increases the capacity to meet individual needs in the classroom and has the potential to lead to increased student outcomes. Reflection-on-action is built into the edTPA and has the potential to significantly impact the assessment practices of novice teachers as they analyze student work, provide feedback, and plan next steps for instruction with a student deficit mind-set or a reflective practice approach. Incorporating reflection into teaching practice has the potential to evolve into knowing-in-action, or having enough practical knowledge and skills to respond to learners needs. As a teacher gains more experience dealing with both known and unknown learning situations, the practice of reflection-in-action supports meeting learner needs as they occur in the classroom. A unique approach to the learning needs of each student requires using what is known in new ways through reflection-in-action – a theory that supports all students in the classroom to achieve improved outcomes. Novice teachers entering the classroom with the habit of reflecting-on-action have the potential to reach higher levels of accomplishment in their teaching when the practice

of reflection-in-action becomes embedded in their formative assessment practices, leading to increased student outcomes, self-regulated learning, and increased motivation.

Summary

Data about student achievement in Oregon shows a need to improve teaching and learning, but the question of how to improve student outcomes rests on what happens in the classroom. To ensure that teachers entering the profession are ready to use effective practices in their teaching, especially the effective use of assessment, teacher performance assessments have shown promise in improving student outcomes and teacher practices. For practicing teachers, the process of completing a teacher performance assessment, such as the Beginning Educator Support and Training portfolio or National Board Certification, has been shown to impact teaching practices and student progress (Sato, Wei, & Darling-Hammond, 2008; Tracz et al., 2005; Wilson et al., 2014). The Teacher Work Sample Methodology, an earlier version of a teacher performance assessment used to evaluate pre-service teachers, also showed promise in increasing teacher effectiveness and therefore improving student outcomes (Fenster & Judd, 2008; McConney, Schalock, & Schalock, 1998). A study on the effectiveness of PACT showed that analyzing teacher performance at the end of educator preparation may predict future effectiveness in the classroom (Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2010). The edTPA is the most recent entry in teacher performance assessments and is a high-stakes assessment that determines whether a candidate is licensed to teach. As such, the process of completing the edTPA and its impact on assessment practices once candidates are practicing teachers needs to be

explored. The purpose of this study is to explore the impact of completing the edTPA on the assessment practices of novice teachers.

The remainder of this study will explore to what extent, if at all, the current assessment practices of novice teachers were impacted by the process of completing the edTPA. Chapter 2 will review the literature on the development of teacher performance assessments and their ability to predict future performance and student outcomes. The development of assessment, specifically formative assessment, is reviewed along with the more nuanced distinctions that show evidence of being effective in instructional practice. Chapter 3 will describe the methodology of this study examining the impact of the edTPA process on novice teacher assessment practices through a mixed methods study using an explanatory sequential design. Participants who have completed the edTPA in 2016 or 2017 will respond to a survey about their perception of the influence completing the edTPA has on their current assessment practices and some participants will be selected for a follow-up interview. Chapter 4 will integrate the data from the survey and interview to paint a more detailed picture of whether the process impacted practices and, specifically how the process impacted assessment practices by aligning current assessment practices with the edTPA scoring rubrics. Chapter 5 will review these findings in light of the literature and provide recommendations.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

To explore the problem of student achievement in Oregon, this review of the literature discusses effective practices for increasing positive student outcomes, how to evaluate teacher use of effective assessment practices, and the development of the teacher performance assessment for pre-service teachers, the edTPA. The first section will review the specific assessment practices of formative assessment, feedback, and the role of reflective practice in the development of effective assessment practices. The following section will review the development of an assessment tool to measure effective use of assessment practices. The use of teacher performance assessments started with National Board certification for in-service teachers and participation in the assessment processes showed promise in improving student outcomes. The development of teacher performance assessments for pre-service teachers is also discussed in relation to the edTPA which is designed to be a national model.

Assessment Practices

Assessment is the tool used by educators to evaluate student progress toward educational goals, but multiple methods are used to make this determination. Functionally, assessments are summative or formative. Summative assessments are cumulative, high-stakes, and encompass comprehensive curriculum standards. They are often viewed as coming from outside of the pedagogy which explains the historical lack of emphasis in educator preparation programs. Formative assessments occur during instruction and can inform the teacher about next steps in instruction.

Formative assessment. Formative assessment serves the purpose of checking in with students and informing teacher decisions about next steps in instruction for both the group and for individual students. Black and William (2008) set out to develop their theory of formative assessment and, among other goals, link it to other learning interactions to improve instructional practices. In the study, five key strategies of formative assessment emerged:

- Clarifying and sharing learning intentions and criteria for success
- Engineering effective classroom discussions and other learning tasks that elicit evidence of student understanding
- Providing feedback that moves learners forward
- Activating students as instructional resources for one another
- Activating students as owners of their own learning.

These strategies become more specific with the teacher's responsibility to support student-student interactions in formative assessment structures that support learning.

Planning and instruction are learning stages that interact with assessment through a cycle of dialogue and feedback. Black (2015) suggests that the term 'assessment for learning' challenges the view of assessment as outside of the domain of teaching yet clarifies these interactions among formative and summative assessment and other instructional practices. Assessment for learning is further clarified as happening in the classroom and involving students in their own data-driven decision-making as they focus on learning targets derived from standards (Stiggins & Chappuis, 2006). Further exploration of assessment practices by Black (2018) argues for teachers to prepare students for learning beyond school by actively involving them in learning

design through teacher-student and student-student interaction. The dialectic nature of these interactions is the focus of what it would mean to reconceptualize assessment as ‘assessment for learning.’

Formative assessment can be an effective strategy for improving student outcomes as shown in a study that examined the relationship between formative assessment and student achievement on the PISA 2009 exam (Li, 2016). Data was collected in the PISA questionnaire that asked P-12 students to rate the frequency their teachers performed certain structuring and scaffolding strategies that align to formative assessment practices and reading achievement data also came from the PISA exam. Using a structural equation modeling (SEM) analysis, the path coefficient from formative assessment to reading achievement was .085 ($p < .001$), indicating when increases in formative assessment occurred, increases in reading achievement also occurred.

The interaction between teacher and student through the process of formative assessment can lead to a deeper learning experience for students and teachers. In a study that examined the influence of professional development on teachers’ perceptions of a formative assessment tool, the participants took a pre- and post-survey as part of a week-long professional development workshop (Martin, Polly, Want, Lambert, & Pugalee, 2016). Independent samples *t*-tests indicated that teachers were more student-centered in their practice after the professional development that focused on differentiation, questioning strategies, and student-centered pedagogy. An instrumental case study of 21 academics and students at an Australian university explored staying focused on the learner to support learning (McLean, 2018). Several

themes emerged from the semi-structured interviews aimed at discovering insights of their experiences. Woven throughout the themes of empowering dialogue, trust of teachers, motivation of academics, learning for social change, and the integration of learning and assessment, was the development of trusting relationships between academics and students.

The use of formative assessment can also lead to outcomes that indirectly support academic outcomes. A case study involving 529 teachers working with over 10,000 P-12 students explored how the use of formative data influenced teaching and learning, specifically examining teacher motivation and student outcomes (Curry et al., 2014). Of the seven categories that emerged from the data analysis on the effects of a teacher-centered approach to data use, only one focused on student outcomes, which was related to student motivation. The use of formative assessment has as much of an impact on the teacher as the student, leading to increased motivation for the teacher and student to meet increasingly challenging academic goals. The study concluded that when data is used to inform instruction, rather than evaluate, teachers become more reflective practitioners.

Practicing teachers utilize formative assessment as part of their instructional practices, a skill which can be acquired through the experiences in an educator preparation program such as courses and field experience. An investigation of teachers' understanding of the connection between formative assessment practices and metacognition surfaced themes that indicate understanding of the role of assessment in metacognitive thinking (Braund & DeLuca, 2017). The sequential explanatory mixed methods research study involved a survey of 44 elementary teachers, 5 of whom were

also interviewed. The data analysis showed that the teachers identified student reflection, assessment for teacher learning, and assessment as learning techniques. Formative assessment can also be learned in preparation to teach. A qualitative study of 27 pre-service teachers in a New Zealand Master of Teaching degree one-year program used pre- and post-surveys, course content analysis, and focus group interviews to explore how pre-service teachers learn to use evidence to improve their teaching and scaffold learning with their students study (Hill et al., 2017). The Master of Teaching degree program was designed to incorporate assessment learning within all courses and integrate it with coursework, observations, and teaching practice as an approach to increase educational equity. With this focus on assessment practices, most pre-service teachers moved from viewing assessment in summative terms to understanding the role of assessment in learning. Another approach to increasing the ability of pre-service teachers to design, analyze, and utilize data from assessments, examined the pedagogical conditions that supported learning about assessment (DeLuca, Chavez, Bellara, & Cao, 2013). The qualitative study invited 97 pre-service teachers enrolled in an assessment education course to participate in a series of three open-ended surveys. Between 41 and 55 pre-service teachers participated in each survey. Using inductive thematic analysis, four pedagogical constructs emerged that contributed to learning about assessment, including critical reflection and planning for learning. Assessment practices are a critical element of the learning process when effectively implemented and reflective practice is a process that is necessary to reach a level of accomplished teaching and learning. That process is embedded in educator

preparation programs and is a requirement for successful completion of teacher performance assessments such as the edTPA.

The role of feedback. Feedback is integral to formative assessment and is a straightforward interaction between teacher and a student or between one student and another student. Feedback is an effective strategy to improve student outcomes with the additional benefit of developing motivated learners. Hattie and Clark (2019) address the power of feedback and define the essential components that make it effective. Feedback comes from an attitude of being stuck or having a misconception, as opposed to a lack of understanding, and it creates a link to new learning by focusing on where to go next. It is necessary to clarify what types of feedback hold the most promise for improving student outcomes and Shepard (2000) articulates two conditions for appropriate assessment: the form and content must represent ideas and practices, and the processes and purposes must support learning. Feedback must be focused on the task, not the person. In a meta-analysis on the typical effects of schooling (Hattie, 1999), “the most powerful single moderator that enhances achievement is feedback” (p. 9). In a follow-up to Hattie’s (1999) meta-analysis, Hattie and Timperly (2007) focused on 74 meta-analyses about feedback. Their analysis showed that the highest effect sizes involved students receiving information about how to do a task more effectively, the lower effect sizes were feedback focused on praise, rewards, and punishment. Clark (2012) analyzed 199 sources on assessment, learning, and motivation with the objective of decomposing the values, theories, and goals of formative assessment. In the analysis, self-regulated learning emerged as a predictive behavior for improved academic outcomes. Self-regulated learning, or the

active participation and engagement of students in their own learning, is developed through formative assessment practices, for which feedback is a critical element. An interim evaluation of a professional development initiative in a large rural school district (Brookhart, Moss, & Long, 2009) showed that integrating formative assessment, teacher-student communication, and student ownership of learning impacted achievement, student ownership of learning, motivation, and active engagement. An empirical study on the possible mediators of feedback effects on performance (Vollmeyer & Rheinberg, 2005) collected data from 211 university students, half of whom were told they would receive feedback during the learning and half who did not get this information. Although the analysis did not support the effects of feedback on motivation during learning, the learners who were expecting feedback used better strategies from the beginning. When students participate in formative assessments for which they expect to receive feedback it helps them move forward in their learning and there is a positive impact on their learning experiences.

Reflective practice. The role of reflection in teaching practice is to evaluate the success of a lesson for the learners and make decisions about how to move the learner forward. Schön (1987) explores reflective practice in the context of the practices that go beyond the technical knowledge learned in the professions. He describes that the authority of, and respect for, professions was based on the technical expertise of the practitioners and the intuitive application of knowledge to serve clients. In teaching, this technical expertise consisted of a repertoire of experiences and appropriate responses that was built over time. Within the bureaucracy of an institution such as a school, much of what comprises the actions of a teacher are

determined by schedules, curriculum requirements and other outside forces. Situations that do not have a proscribed response, however, require reflective practice, or reflecting-in-action to construct a new response to a unique situation. In the context of education, this is a learner who does not respond to traditional instruction or corrections and requires a new approach. Schön (1987, Chapter 10) describes the dispositions of a reflective practitioner as one who does not see themselves as the only source of knowledge and seeks connections to the learners who can discover for themselves how to make use of the practitioner's expertise to learn. This builds a compelling case to include reflective practice in the assessment practices of teachers. Another way to consider the role of reflective practice is to view the teacher as a decision-maker ("Cultivating reflective practice," 1999). Most of the decisions of a teacher are routine and reactive, but when the process is more complex, such as a struggling learner, decision-making must consider what is happening and critically analyze options. When reflecting-on-action comes into play after each decision, this builds the repertoire described by Schön (1987) which leads to knowing-in-action.

Reflective practice is built into teacher performance assessments and educator preparation programs but can face barriers from bureaucracies that view the teacher as the expert and view learning to teach as wisdom passed from teacher educator to pre-service teacher. Reflective practice is hindered by institutions that view teaching practices as fixed, do not support innovation or reflection, and view teachers as trained experts no matter their experience. Building reflection into teacher performance assessments and educator preparation programs starts pre-service teachers on the path

to reflective practice, a critical component of assessment practices that support positive student outcomes.

The components of assessment practices include formative assessments that create opportunities for feedback among students and teachers, focus on how to move forward in learning, and help teachers develop as reflective practitioners. The effectiveness of these practices impacts students' achievement and the mind-sets that support engagement, motivation, and self-directed learning. Learning these assessment practices increases teacher effectiveness and can come from educator preparation programs or from professional development. There current trend in teacher performance assessments for both practicing and novice teachers attempts to evaluate teacher assessment practices as they relate to improved student outcomes.

Teacher Performance Assessments

While serving as the president and CEO of the NBPTS, Ronald Thorpe worked to develop teaching into a true profession by applying the standards as the measure of accomplished teaching and mapping backwards to determine the trajectory from pre-service through National Board Certification (Thorpe, 2014). Thorpe describes groups of practitioners who intentionally developed the standards of practice for their professions and regulated and standardized how credentials were awarded and looks to teachers to accomplish the same. Thorpe specifically looked at the professionalization of medicine in America in the late nineteenth century and the development of the American Medical Association as a model. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) established a national teacher performance assessment for practicing teachers that has served as a model for future teacher performance

assessments at different points in a teaching career at both the state and national level. The rapid development and adoption of the edTPA as a measure of teacher competency upon entering the profession indicate a trend at the national level to use teacher performance assessments, which were previously used for early to mid-career evaluation.

National Board certification. NBPTS was created in 1987 with the purpose of defining and recognizing accomplished teaching (NBPTS, 2016). There are over 112,000 National Board certified teachers from all 50 states which represents just over 3% of all teachers in the United States (NBPTS, 2016 & NCER, 2015). Achievement of National Board certification represents accomplishment measured by a proficiency rubric designed and assessed by fellow teachers. The standards are framed around Five Core Propositions:

Proposition 1: Teachers are committed to students and their learning.

Proposition 2: Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects.

Proposition 3: Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.

Proposition 4: Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience.

Proposition 5: Teachers are members of learning communities. (NBPTS, 2018, pp. 8-9)

There are 25 certificate areas that span content and developmental levels, and each has its own set of standards that articulate how the Five Core Propositions manifest within

each subject. To become a National Board certified teacher is a voluntary process that involves submitting a portfolio of teaching videos, student work, and analysis as well as reflections on teacher impact. Portfolios are scored by practicing educators and must meet rigorous standards to show evidence of meeting the core propositions. To achieve National Board certification, candidates must demonstrate proficiency in all aspects of the portfolio against standards and core propositions.

Impact of National Board certification. National Board certification shows promise as verification of accomplished teaching and as a predictor of improved student outcomes. Studies show that National Board certified teachers have a positive impact on student learning and this impact is even greater for low-income students and students of color (Goldhaber & Anthony, 2007; Cavalluzzo, 2004; Betts, Zau & Rice, 2003).

In a three-year longitudinal comparison group design study of nine National Board candidates and seven non-National Board candidates, Sato, Wei, and Darling-Hammond (2008) measured six dimensions of formative assessment before, during, and after submitting National Boards. Data was collected from video-taped lessons, commentary and student work from the lessons, teacher interviews and student and teacher surveys and analyzed using the six dimensions of formative assessment. The study found significantly greater gains in formative assessment practices among the National Board candidates and that there was a shift in assessment practices away from grading and discrete facts to formative measures of conceptual understanding aligned to learning goals. Similarly, Tracz et al., (2005) conducted 25 qualitative interviews with National Board certified teachers and found that the areas of greatest

effect reflected a focus on the interaction of students, teaching practice, and standards. The effect was teachers being more aware of student needs and differences, focusing more on assessments of individual students' progress, a wider variety of assessment techniques, and a renewed commitment to responding to student needs by modifying teaching.

In addition to research showing the benefits for P-12 students of having National Board certified teachers, teachers themselves describe the process of completing the National Board certification as the best professional development they have experienced, and they show substantial learning as a result (Hunzicker, 2008). The process also positively impacts teachers and their professional growth. Lustick and Sykes (2006) investigated the process of National Board Certification by studying 120 candidates for Adolescent and Young Adult Science in a longitudinal study over a two-year period. Using a quasi-experimental methodology, they analyzed transcripts of interviews with the teachers that were scored against the NBPTS standards for science. The quantitative data analysis shows a moderate indication that there was teacher learning during the process. They identified three types of learning that occurred during the process: (a) dynamic learning lead to changes in teaching practice, (b) technical learning utilized new strategies for the purpose of attaining certification, and (c) deferred learning was the possibility that the process will lead to changes in the future. Teacher learning occurs when the dynamics of rigor, reward, and risk interact, a model described by Hunzicker (2008, 2011) as learning leverage. Using three case studies as examples, Hunzicker (2011) illustrates how the degree of each component varies according to the individual motivation for pursuing National Board certification

and can change over time as different types of learning become dominant. The National Board certification process provides the circumstances for learning leverage because of the rigorous standards and complex tasks, the status and incentives for achievement, and the public nature and risk of failure of the process. As a process, completing the requirements for National Board certification is effective as a learning experience that changes instructional practices to the benefit of teachers and P-12 students.

Completion of the National Board certification portfolio impacts the learning of experienced teachers and their students. These positive results for National Board certified teachers and the call for more accountability has led to teacher performance assessments of beginning and pre-service teachers as a requirement of program completion and state licensure in some states. Important examples of such programs are found in Connecticut, Oregon, and California.

Beginning Educator Support and Training. While National Board certification was open to teachers with experience, there was not a teacher performance assessment that was designed for novice teachers. The Connecticut State Department of Education modeled the Beginning Educator Support and Training (BEST) program on the NBPTS certification system to be used as the induction program for new teachers (CGA, 2007). It is a portfolio assessment that emphasizes the importance of student learning and is considered one component on the continuum of effective teaching.

At the beginning of the teaching continuum in Connecticut, teachers must pass the Praxis I and Praxis II Tests of basic skills and knowledge and to continue teaching,

a teacher must pass the BEST portfolio assessment within the first few years of teaching (CGA, 2007). The portfolio consists of documentation of five to eight hours of instruction that includes lesson plans, video segments, student work and reflective commentary and is evaluated in four areas: instructional design, instructional implementation, assessment of learning and analyzing teaching and learning. The assessment is scored by trained teachers on a 4-point scale based on 17 guiding questions.

Impact of BEST. To determine whether the portfolio assessment impacted teacher effectiveness Wilson et al., (2014) examined the relationship between the BEST portfolio assessment and student achievement to evaluate the validity of portfolio assessments as an indicator of teaching quality. A correlational analysis showed small and statistically non-significant relationships between the portfolio assessment and the teacher skills and knowledge tests, indicating that teacher performance on a knowledge exam does not predict performance on a more comprehensive portfolio assessment. Hierarchical linear modeling showed that performance scores on the more comprehensive BEST portfolio assessment were predictors of contribution to improvement in student scores in reading, indicating the potential for using a portfolio assessment for a summative purpose, namely licensure (Wilson et al., 2014). The potential also exists to utilize the portfolio assessment standards in educator preparation programs to align pre-service training with the state evaluation system for educative purposes. Wilson et al., (2014) examined the validity of using portfolio assessments as an indicator of teacher quality when making

licensure decisions, finding that portfolio scores on the BEST portfolio assessment were predictors of contributions to student gains in reading.

Teacher Work Sample Methodology and impact. Prior to the development of teacher performance assessments, several institutions and consortia were developing teacher work samples for pre-service teachers that provided evidence of teaching practices to be included with licensure documentation about content knowledge and skills. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) compiled a collection of assessments being used to connect teaching and learning that were developing at local and regional levels in response to standards-based education (Summary of Assessments, 2008). The Renaissance Teacher Work Sample was developed by 11 state universities across the country and evolved out of the teacher work sample developed at Western Oregon University, which required candidates to demonstrate strategies that achieve growth with all P-12 students. The Performance Assessment for California Teachers was developed around a Teaching Event that required candidates to show instructional strategies that support student learning. This movement in teacher assessment kept student learning at the center and used an evidence-based approach to evaluate candidate effectiveness in the classroom.

As the Oregon teacher licensing agency, the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC), was adapting its policies to meet the demands of the standards-based outcome movement, Western Oregon University was already well into the development of what came to be known as the Teacher Work Sample Methodology (TWSM). When TSPC adopted an outcome-driven evidence-based policy for the preparation and licensure of teachers, the TWSM had already been in development at

Western Oregon University (Schalock & Schalock, 2011). Driving its development was the core principle that student learning is the main outcome of educator preparation. Data was collected over decades to support the validity and reliability of the TWSM and after a rigorous national review, the National Advisory Panel, formed to guide the work of a consortia of national institutions and educator preparation programs, determined that the TWSM could be used for high-stakes licensure decisions if five conditions were met:

1. Performance tasks within the work sample must be valid,
2. Program structure provides student teachers with knowledge and skills necessary to carry out the task and document that performance in ways amenable to valid and reliable scoring,
3. Program structure must allow practice and feedback on knowledge and skills prior to final independent effort,
4. Scoring rubrics must be designed to provide valid scores on the domains of the assessed teaching tasks, and
5. A training program must be developed and implemented to ensure scores are reliable enough to use in high-stakes licensure decisions.

These conditions put educator preparation programs in the position of supporting pre-service teachers in their development by providing the structure and intentional instruction that supported success on the work sample. The TWSM was local and responsive to candidate and community needs, yet was a rigorous process required of candidates before obtaining a license to teach.

Teacher Work Sample Methodology was in use by Oregon educator preparation programs until it was replaced by the edTPA. A study at one university analyzed the mean percentage gains between the pre- and post-tests given by pre-service teachers as part of this process for over 19,000 students over 5 years (Waggoner, Carroll, Merk, & Weitzel, 2015). While there were statistically significant differences among some demographic groups the mean percentage increases between tests was positive for every demographic group. The TWSM provided pre-service teachers the opportunity to learn about assessments by creating assessments aligned to learning goals and state standards, interpret assessment data from standardized and teacher-created assessments, and using assessment results to inform future instruction (Green & Waggonner, 2008). The effectiveness of the TWSM was also as an educative tool for educator preparation programs. Green and Waggoner describe using evidence of student growth to validate their program design, yet the data also indicate the need to continue revising the program to address questions such as why some students did not make growth, whether the pre-service teachers varied their assessments enough, and what could account for the differences in growth from early elementary to high school. The TWSM met the needs of the educator preparation program by influencing program design for pre-service teachers to experience the planning, implementation, and assessment of a student learning experience and it served as an educative tool for program improvement.

Performance Assessment for California Teachers and impact. A consortia of schools with educator preparation programs in California responded to legislation that teachers pass a performance assessment for licensure by developing the PACT, a

subject-specific portfolio that assesses pre-service teachers' planning, instruction, and assessment via a lesson sequence that is documented through lesson plans, student work, video and reflection. Chung (2008) studied the impact of PACT on learning experiences and practice during early implementation and found that the process supported gaps in the university program that created a more consistent experience for candidates, and that candidates who participated in the PACT developed stronger assessment and reflection skills. The Stanford Teacher Education Programme is a Master's Degree program that uses the PACT to evaluate candidates' planning, instruction, and assessment which informs continuous program improvement such as changes in pedagogy and support (Darling-Hammond, Newton, Wei, 2010). The education program at San José State University was one of the early partners in the development and use of the PACT in their candidate assessment system (Whittaker & Nelson, 2013). With a high-quality educator preparation program as the goal, the PACT supported a coherent program that utilized the structure to assess pre-service teacher development and learning and the feedback for program improvement. The impact of candidate participation in early implementation of PACT shows consistent growth in planning and reflection with a pilot group showing stronger growth in assessment and reflection than a control group (Chung, 2008).

The Educative Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA). The next step in the development of teacher assessments for pre-service teachers was at a national level. Building on the structure of PACT, the edTPA was developed as a way to evaluate readiness for teaching by defining the critical knowledge, skills and abilities for teaching and creating rubrics to evaluate each of the constructs. The edTPA

consists of 15 core constructs that were identified during the development process as the knowledge, skills and abilities that are critically important to teaching. Each construct defined in a rubric which is situated in one of three tasks: planning, instruction, or assessment. The classification of these rubric topics can be seen in Figure 1.

Planning Rubrics	Instruction Rubrics	Assessment Rubrics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning for content understanding • Planning to support varied student needs • Using knowledge of students to inform teaching and learning • Identifying and supporting language demands • Planning assessment to monitor and support student learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning environment • Engaging students in learning • Deepening student learning • Subject-specific pedagogy • Analyzing teaching effectiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of student learning • Providing feedback to guide learning • Student use of feedback • Analyzing students' language use and content learning • Using assessment to inform instruction

Figure 1. edTPA rubric topics

Candidate portfolios consist of a lesson cycle of three to five lessons that capture the three tasks of planning, instruction, and assessment through evidence such as lesson plans, instructional materials, student work, feedback on student work, and a video clip of teaching. Candidates are scored by raters that are practicing educators who have undergone training and the portfolios are assessed on the candidate's ability to develop students' academic language, justify their decisions, and analyze their own practices (Pechione, Whittaker, & Klesch, 2017).

The design of the edTPA constructs was informed by previously established standards for the teaching profession. The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) released the first Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards for beginning teachers in 1992 and updated the standards to be professional practice standards that included indicators for performance over the career of a teacher in 2011 (see Figure 2). The 10 standards are grouped in 4 categories: the learner and learning, content, instructional practice, and professional responsibility. The topics within each category address similar topics to the edTPA rubrics, though the organizational structure separates learning and content from instructional practice and includes the professional responsibility category.



Figure 2. InTASC professional practice standards for teachers

Each standard is described in further detail through performances, essential knowledge, and critical dispositions. The standards were designed to outline the

foundations of teaching that apply across K-12 subject areas and grade-level settings that lead to engaged learners and improved student achievement (CCSSO, 2013).

The three tasks of the edTPA are planning, instruction, and assessment, and the focus of this study is the assessment task. Assessment in the edTPA rubrics is further clarified to include: analyzing student work, providing feedback, supporting student use of feedback, attending to content language use, and using assessment data to inform instruction. Each of these sub-categories of the assessment task of the edTPA draw on best practices in assessment as previously discussed which include formative assessment, feedback, and reflective practice. While all three tasks are essential teaching practices, effective assessment practices have been shown to have a positive impact on student outcomes. In the field test for the edTPA (SCALE, 2013) the average scores for the assessment rubrics were lower than the other two tasks of planning and instruction, indicating that the task of learning to use assessment practices is more challenging.

Validity of the edTPA. The edTPA is designed to measure a pre-service teacher's readiness to teach, which is based on a structure first used by NBPTS and standards developed by InTASC. As has been discussed previously, NBPTS established its first teaching standards during the 1990s with the intent of creating an educative, professional development process that evaluates both the habits of mind and the skills that accomplished professionals have developed. The standards form the core of a continuum of the professionalization of teaching from pre-service teaching through accomplished teaching and teacher leadership (NBPTS, 2016). InTASC standards were developed to define the foundational skills and practices of teaching

and evolved into professional practice standards that outline a career trajectory in teaching. The edTPA constructs were informed by both the InTASC standards and the NBPTS core propositions and validated through a confirmatory job analysis study in 2013, which generated refinements to the design of edTPA so that the tasks and scoring instruments align with the fifteen core constructs, which were confirmed to represent the knowledge, skills, and abilities that are critical to perform the job of teaching (Peccheone, Whittaker, & Klesch, 2017). The content of the edTPA standards is further verified by the design process which included input from licensed, practicing educators and teacher educators from a variety of educational settings across 29 states and the District of Columbia (Sato, 2014). The data from field testing in 2013 was analyzed using an exploratory factor analysis which provided construct validity support for the structure of edTPA, specifically the three-task structure of planning, instruction and assessment, and the alignment of the rubrics to those tasks (Peccheone, Whittaker, & Klesch, 2017). Confirmatory factor analysis is conducted each year and the models have confirmed that the three tasks are appropriately assessed by the construct rubrics and that the composite score summarizes a candidates' performance (Peccheone, Whittaker, & Klesch, 2017). Sato (2014) confirms that candidate scores in the field test support the three-task structure of the edTPA and the alignment to the rubrics, but argues that additional work needs to be done in establishing construct validity through additional measure that could be correlated to edTPA scores. The edTPA has a development history that is rooted in national standards and measures progress toward accomplished teaching in the areas of planning, instruction, and assessment.

Implementation of edTPA. Since becoming operational in 2013, the edTPA is in use in 750 educator preparation programs in 41 states. In all, 18 states have policies in place that require or will require passing a teacher performance assessment to be granted a teaching license (see Table 1). The edTPA is an approved assessment in 17 of the states and the required assessment in over half of those states, which includes Oregon (Pechone, Whittaker, & Klesch, 2017). Hutt, Gottlieb, and Cohen (2016) examined the mechanism that led to the adoption of edTPA by so many institutions in such a short length of time and noted the key role played by organizations such as the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE), the American Federation of Teachers, and the National Education Association, and advocates such as Linda Darling-Hammond, a well-known educational leader and researcher from Stanford University. The narrative put forward by proponents of the edTPA balanced the need for increased accountability in terms of educator preparation programs and the use of a national assessment developed in collaboration with practicing educators as a means to professionalize teaching.

In states where teacher performance assessments are state policy, teacher education programs are addressing the shift in expectations for pre-service teachers with program redesign and revision. Ledwell and Oyler (2016) used an inquiry as stance approach to study the implementation of edTPA during a pilot year to examine any subsequent program changes and observed different levels of program change that ranged from superficial to repurposing a student teaching seminar to focus on edTPA portfolio development. The issues that surfaced with edTPA implementation were the concerns about using edTPA as a standardized assessment when the administration of

Table 1

State Policies on edTPA Implementation

State	Policy Description	Effective Date
Alabama	Piloting edTPA	September 2018
Arkansas	Pedagogy assessment required by state*	March 2016
California	Teacher performance assessment required*	Fall 2014
Connecticut	Passing edTPA required for fall 2019 pre-service teachers	Fall 2019
Delaware	Passing score on teacher performance assessment required for initial licensure*	July 2016
Georgia	edTPA required for initial teacher certification	September 2015
Hawaii	EPPs required to submit official scores from edTPA or obtain accreditation from CAEP	July 2019
Illinois	Passing an evidence-based assessment of teacher effectiveness required for licensure*	Fall 2019
Iowa	Subject-area specific assessment required*	June 2014
Minnesota	edTPA is one measurement of EPP effectiveness	Fall 2014
New Jersey	edTPA is the approved performance assessment for candidates seeking certificates	Fall 2019
New York	Passing edTPA required for initial licensure	May 2014
North Carolina	Passing score on teacher performance assessment required for initial licensure	Fall 2019
Oregon	edTPA is required for program completion	September 2018
South Carolina	Performance-based assessment required for licensure	January 2018
Tennessee	edTPA required for licensure	January 2019
Washington	edTPA is program completion requirement	Fall 2017
West Virginia	Proficiency on EPP developed or adopted performance assessment*	July 2017

*edTPA is an approved option

the assessment was not consistent, and the conflicts between the edTPA and program expectations (Ledwell & Oyler, 2016). Ratner and Kolman (2016) showed that implementing edTPA has made some positive changes in the cohesiveness of programs, and provides more detailed information about candidates' understanding and ability to plan, instruct and assess, but also raised some concerns about the integrity of a high-stakes test that candidates complete with little oversight and the unintended consequence of changing admission standards in response to the rigor of the assessment which has the potential to create additional barriers for English language learners and students of color.

Validity issues with edTPA. Despite a rigorous process of development, there are several key validity issues that have been associated with the edTPA. First, the lesson design that is favored by the edTPA rubrics and criteria comes into conflict with some licensure areas such as special education, world language, and visual and performance arts. Pugach (2017) discusses how the divide between special education and general education is reinforced by the edTPA but suggests that the edTPA can also support a dialogue between the teacher educators from both disciplines through discussion of assessment data and the elements that are shared across special education and general education: language demands, monitoring student learning, respectful classroom environment and drawing on students' cultural and community assets. The disconnect between edTPA expectations and university instructional models in special education highlights the disconnect between edTPA and the reality of the classroom (Kuranishi & Oyler, 2017; Othman, Robinson & Molfenter, 2017). The writing demands for edTPA on pre-service teachers for world languages are

biased in favor of native English speakers and the short video clips may not be able to capture world language teaching proficiency (Russell & Davidson Devall, 2016). Luna (2016) found that the language demand influenced admission decisions for English language learners, contributing to the lack of diversity in teaching and, specifically world language teachers. Hildebrandt and Swanson (2014) evaluated edTPA composite scores for world language teachers in teaching programs at two universities in different states and found that, based on the cut scores in states that had consequential cut scores, all the candidates would have passed the exam in Washington where the cut score is 30 (out of 65) and 84% would have passed in New York with a cut score of 35. Hildebrandt and Swanson (2014) discuss the current program courses that support the planning and instruction components, but note the lack of specific classes for assessment, which were the constructs for which the pre-service teachers performed the lowest. Music teachers face limitations on creativity and individualization when preparing the lessons and portfolio elements (Heil & Berg, 2017).

The implications for licensure in the areas of special education, world language, and the arts should be seriously considered in discussions around changes to educator preparation programs and policy decisions about cut scores and licensure. The disconnect between teacher program design and edTPA requirements in terms of lesson design in special education is an opportunity for finding common ground between special education and general education (Pugach, 2017). Discussion about program change can also address issues for students struggling with the financial

demands of edTPA, and the language demands for immigrant and linguistically diverse candidates (Luna, 2016).

Research that supports the use of PACT is also used to support the edTPA because of their similarities in structure and content, even though some of the differences can cause a challenge to the validity of the edTPA. Hébert (2017) reviews the development of the PACT as created by the PACT consortium in response to legislation requiring teacher performance assessments for licensure in California. It is a regional assessment, locally scored and specifically aligned to California teaching standards. The edTPA is scored by nationally recruited scorers who can come from any region. The edTPA is aligned to both InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and NBPTS core propositions but neither are adopted national standards for teaching which means the edTPA does not necessarily align with state teaching standards and could therefore not organically integrate with existing educator preparation programs.

Candidate experience. The experience of the candidate through the process and the influence on the development of teacher identity is another indicator of the impact of the edTPA on the profession. Candidates perceived the positive features to be related to the structure of the assessment such as using an entire teaching cycle, the focus on including academic language development, and the required reflections, while negative features focused on the standardized nature of the assessment that conflicted with their need for feedback and support (Heil & Berg, 2017). Additional studies (i.e., Bacon & Blachman, 2017; Kuranishi & Oyler, 2017) report that candidates perceive a disconnect between the preparation for student teaching from the university and the experience of completing the edTPA. The edTPA requirement for

differentiation does not align with university coursework in Universal Design for Learning (UDL) for teachers pursuing certification in special education (Kuranishi & Oyler, 2017). Candidates did not feel that their courses or field experiences prepared them for the academic language development expectations and that the edTPA requirement to focus on planning for one learner conflicted with what they were taught in their courses (Bacon & Blachman, 2017). There was also concern among candidates that the context of teaching in an urban, high-needs environment would not be considered when viewing video and reviewing student work (Bacon & Blachman, 2017; Kuranishi & Oyler, 2017).

Some candidates in particular content areas experienced a disconnect between the structure of the edTPA portfolio expectations and authentic teaching as learned in their programs and in their practicum placements. Meuwissen and Choppin (2015) conducted a qualitative study of teaching candidates' experiences with the edTPA during the first year of consequential use in New York State. Twenty-four candidates representing diverse institutions and geographic regions participated in semi-structured interviews that were designed based on a larger survey of pre-service teachers that focused on four themes: knowledge of the edTPA; perceptions of edTPA's positioning in their program; viewpoints about fairness, credibility, and process; and experiences constructing the edTPA portfolio. Inductive analysis revealed an underlying theme of tensions of managing the demands of the assessment with authentic teaching practice. Support tensions came from the high-stakes, summative nature of the assessment and the lack of clarity about what kind of support from cooperating teachers and supervisors was allowed. Candidates also voiced

concern that the limitations of the edTPA format were not consistent with the realities of a classroom, especially in high-needs urban settings, and that candidates' lack of control at placement sites, the shift in practice required by the edTPA, and videotaping led to tensions with multiple stakeholders. Meuwissen and Choppin (2015) concluded that the edTPA influences practices because candidates are required to mediate these tensions, but additional study is required to determine whether the process fundamentally changes candidates' assessment practices when they become teachers.

The process of completing the edTPA can also have a positive effect of preparing candidates with a stronger foundation in planning that integrates learners and standards. Bacon and Blachman (2017) collected data from pre-service teachers at the end of a semester, after they had submitted edTPA portfolios, through anonymous surveys that included open-ended questions about their experiences with the edTPA along with data from candidate journals, edTPA policy documents, and the edTPA handbook. Through a qualitative coding process, they found themes that showed candidates improved their practice in the areas of reflection, planning, assessment, planning for a focus learner, and alignment to standards. Heil and Berg (2017) conducted an intrinsic case study focused on the activity of edTPA completion of seven undergraduate music education majors. They used an inductive analysis approach to analyze data collected from focus group interviews, email exchanges, field notes, an alternative capstone project and a survey given two weeks after candidates submitted edTPA portfolios. In relation to their development as teachers, the data revealed that candidates felt that the edTPA process oriented their learning toward the future and prepared them for the profession by impacting their ability to

reflect on their teaching decisions and it helped them become more aware of the socio-political context of the state of education.

Educator Preparation Programs

Educator preparation programs have the responsibility of preparing candidates for the student teaching experience and for providing support and feedback along the way. University supervisors observe the candidates over time and understand the context of the student teaching experience. One argument against using performance assessment scores as consequential to obtaining teacher licensure is the lack of context and knowledge of the pre-service teacher and their performance over time. A pair of studies by Sandholtz and Shea (2012, 2015) examined the actual scores of 337 candidates on the PACT over a two-year period and compared them to the scores predicted by candidates' university supervisors. In the first study (Sandholtz & Shea, 2012) the university supervisors were able to predict candidates' scores on the PACT within 5 points of the actual score 43% of the time. The inaccurate predictions were split between over- and under-predicting the actual scores. Further examination of the over- and under-predicted scores, and high- and low-performers (Sandholtz & Shea, 2015) showed that out of the 27 candidates that supervisors predicted to be high or low, six were high- or low-performers. Of the 43 candidates that were actually high- and low-performers, the supervisors predicted that six would be. The majority of candidates that were predicted to fail by university supervisors actually passed, and the majority of candidates that failed, were predicted to pass. With their role being to observe candidates over time and guide them to improvement through observation and formative assessment, supervisors contribute to the decision about whether a candidate

is prepared to teach. This points to a misalignment between the expectations and evaluation from educator preparation program expectations and teacher performance assessment.

The elements that make up the educator preparation program include courses and coursework, instructors, field experience supervisors and mentor teachers, and the field experience itself. The impact of the educator preparation program plays a role in the candidate experience of completing a teacher performance assessment. A study that examined results from the first two pilot years of PACT implementation in conjunction with a pre-service teacher survey (Pechione & Chung, 2006) found that candidate reports of learning were positively associated with the levels of support and preparation from the educator preparation program, and candidates who strongly agreed that their coursework prepared them for the assessment scored significantly higher on the PACT. The results of the PACT also provided data about candidate performance that could be examined across programs and it provided feedback that guided collaboration across programs and institutions. Another study reviewed the impact of developing and implementing the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) at California State University, Fresno (Torgerson, Macy, Beare, & Tanner, 2009). Although the FAST was locally developed and implemented, the data collected about candidate performance was used to inform the program about the instrument reliability and was used to guide program improvement. An example of program improvement occurred when candidate performance in the English Learners section was minimally acceptable so the department offered seminars, professional learning

and implemented English Learner strategies in methods courses. The results were that the mean scores for the English Learners section went from 2.32 to 3.42 in one year.

As demonstrated by the faculty at California State University Fresno, using the results of a teacher performance assessment can inform the revision and further development of an educator preparation program which enhances the learning experience for pre-service teachers. A study that examined what pre-service teachers make visible about their practices and understanding in constructing their performance assessments through discourse analysis (Stewart, Scalzo, Merino, & Nilsen, 2015) found that the differences between the commentary of the highest scoring candidates were about adjustments to instruction, strategies, and students demonstrating learning. The commentary of the lowest scoring candidates on the PACT were discussions about time management and student task completion. What the candidates made visible through their performance assessments was whether or not they had an understanding of effective teaching practices, data that can be utilized by the educator preparation program to further revise and develop their program.

Research Gap

The assessment standards in the edTPA focus on practices that engage students and support them in their own learning. The standards specifically address analyzing student work, providing feedback and supporting students in using feedback to improve their understanding, and using assessments to inform instruction. There is evidence in the literature that effective assessment practices lead to improved student outcomes, and the impact of teacher performance assessments, such as National Boards, on student achievement is positive though more research is needed to show

gains in achievement and shifts in teacher practices that lead to student growth. What is not clear from the literature is whether the process of completing the edTPA impacted candidates' instructional practices and their alignment with the constructs once they entered the profession and had a classroom of their own. The purpose of this study is to explore the impact of the edTPA process on the assessment practices of novice teachers. By collecting data from novice teachers at the beginning of their first or second year of teaching, this study will examine the following research question:

- To what extent, if at all, are the current assessment practices of novice teachers impacted by the process of completing the edTPA?

Summary

There is evidence in the literature to support the value and importance of formative assessment in supporting P-12 students with learning via reflection, feedback, and self-regulated learning. Teachers develop this skill with experience and practice, and its importance is embedded in teacher performance assessments for novice and experienced teachers. Teacher performance assessments have evolved over the decades since a set of national standards for teaching were introduced by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and the process of completing a teacher performance assessment serves as a professional development experience that helps teachers focus more on meeting the needs of P-12 students for improved outcomes. Teacher performance assessments that are designed for pre-service teachers for licensure have developed from the teacher performance assessments for practicing teachers and have shown improved outcomes for novice teachers. With improved teaching leading to improved student outcomes, the edTPA was developed as a

national evaluation tool for putting the best candidates into the classroom. The edTPA was influenced by teacher performance assessments such as National Board certification and PACT, and research that shows promise for improved student and teacher outcomes from these teacher assessments is used as evidence of the effectiveness of the edTPA. The use of these similar, yet different teacher performance assessments presents some validity issues with the edTPA and current research addresses the disconnect for licensure in world languages and performing arts as well as special education. Candidate perception of the edTPA process has been both positive and negative in terms of the edTPA as a learning experience, but there is little research on whether completing the edTPA portfolio has an effect once a teacher enters the classroom. Assessment is the most challenging of the three tasks and also the most effective practice for improving student outcomes. This study explores the impact of completing the edTPA on current assessment practices of novice teachers in an attempt to fill the research gap.

Chapter 3: Research Methods

This mixed methods study used an explanatory sequential design to collect and analyze data from novice teachers regarding the impact of the edTPA on their use of assessment. Initial surveys were sent through educator preparation programs and a school district-level collective bargaining unit in Oregon targeting graduates from 2016, 2017, and 2018. A quantitative analysis of the survey responses informed the interview participant selection and the questions used in one-on-one follow-up semi-structured interviews, which were used to gain a deeper understanding of the current assessment practices of novice teachers and understanding how these practices developed in the context of completing the edTPA while completing an educator preparation program. This chapter details the methodology used in this study to collect data from recent graduates from educator preparation programs in Oregon regarding their current assessment practices and explore the impact of their completion of the edTPA on those practices.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the impact of the edTPA process on the assessment practices of novice teachers. By collecting data from novice teachers at the beginning of their first, second, or third year of teaching, this study examined the following research question:

- To what extent, if at all, are the current assessment practices of novice teachers impacted by the process of completing the edTPA?

Rationale for Methodology

This mixed methods study used an explanatory sequential design to determine the impact of the edTPA process on current assessment practices of novice teachers. Mixed methods research allows for the presence of different views in the survey results and uses the in-depth interview process to gain a deeper understanding of these views. This deeper understanding can support the inferences in the conclusion and implications of the research and guide future study. Explanatory sequential design occurs in two phases, starting with collecting quantitative data and followed by collecting qualitative data. As the name implies, an explanatory sequential design attempts to use qualitative data to provide an explanation for the results of the quantitative phase (Creswell & Clark, 2018). Quantitative data was collected first through an online survey which provided participant data and guided the purposeful sampling for the qualitative phase. The qualitative phase consisted of seven semi-structured interviews that provided data to deepen the explanation of the results of the quantitative phase. The online survey had three types of questions: (a) background items regarding the participants' educator preparation programs, (b) Likert scale questions asking about the level of influence completing the edTPA has had on current assessment practices, and (c) follow-up open-ended items that provided space for participants to explain their ratings with more detail. Participants for the survey were a convenience sample, solicited through institutions that were willing and able to send the survey link to recent educator preparation program graduates. Participants for the interviews were purposefully selected using maximal variation sampling to gather responses that represented as many multiple perspectives as possible with regard to

their perceptions about the edTPA and the different preparation experiences (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 98). The interviews followed-up on topics from the surveys to better understand how assessment practices had been influenced by the edTPA process and to gain more data about the current assessment practices used by novice teachers. The study was designed with two phases so that initial data could be more deeply explored to understand not only whether or not practices were influenced by the edTPA process, but *how* practices were influenced by the process.

Qualitative research incorporating interviews can be used to find out things we cannot directly observe (Patton, 2002). Participants answered quantitative survey questions about their perception of the level of influence the edTPA process has had on their current assessment practices, but follow-up interviews provided insight into the participants' perception of how the edTPA process impacted their current understandings of and practices in assessment. The qualitative interview phase provided a deeper understanding of what was reported in the quantitative data. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) describe that the circumstances are appropriate to utilize an interview protocol when, among other concerns, events occurred in the past such as learning about assessment practices. Interviews are also appropriate when direct observations are not possible which is the case for this study because several of the interview participants teach in other states. It was also important to gain multiple perspectives and not limit interview participants based on proximity. To understand the learning behind assessment design and decisions of novice teachers, it was necessary to use an interview protocol to collect data about how they interpret and respond to student work samples and the decisions they make for next steps in

instruction. Themes emerged during the data analysis that offer some insight into participant perceptions of the edTPA process and how it was situated within the larger context of learning to become a teacher, along with descriptions of how they learned about and currently utilize assessment practices. These themes offer a response to the research question.

Participants

This study explored the impact of the edTPA on assessment practices of novice teachers, specifically novice teachers who had completed an educator preparation program in Oregon. It was critical to this study that the perspectives of graduates from the many different programs in Oregon be represented in the survey sample. From a sample that included graduates with different experiences such as degree, level, and year of graduation it was possible to select interview participants who also represented multiple perspectives of recent graduates from the participating institutions.

Sampling. There are currently 16 educator preparation programs in Oregon that offer a combination of undergraduate and graduate programs in education that meet the state standards for teacher licensure. Since the 2016-17 academic year, all pre-service teachers have been required to submit the edTPA portfolio. Contact names, emails, and phone numbers were researched, and attempts were made to contact the entire population, all 16 institutions, at least one time via a voice mail or email message. The original sampling frame was the entire population of Oregon educator preparation program completers, but the final pool was a result of convenience sampling based on the agreement of institutions to forward the survey link, the availability of alumni contact information for graduates from Oregon educator

preparation programs, and the recipients' willingness to participate. Table 2 shows the diverse characteristics of the four institutions which agreed to send the survey to program graduates, reaching teachers who completed educator preparation programs at all levels (graduate and undergraduate) and all types of institutions (public, private, college, university) that exist in Oregon. The most recent data available for enrollment and completion of educator preparation programs is from the 2015-2016 school year. Total enrollment for Oregon, meaning students accepted into an educator preparation program during the school year who had not yet completed a program, was 2,290 people and Oregon completers, students who have met all state requirements for teacher licensure, was 1,452 people (USDE, 2017). The four institutions that participated represent approximately 30% of the educator preparation program completers in Oregon. The link was also shared through a website managed by a collective bargaining unit that represents the largest school district in Oregon.

Table 2

Oregon Educator Preparation Program Participant Characteristics

Institution	Levels offered	CAEP (2013)	Top ranked	Setting	2015-16	
					Total enrollment ^a	TPP completers ^a
Private University	U, G			Urban	230	192
Private College	U				48	16
Public University	U, G	X	X		163	131
Private University	U,G	X		Urban	118	93

Survey participants. During the time period the survey was open, 80 respondents used the link to start the survey. Of these, 28% ($n = 22$) of the responses

were excluded because the respondent had not completed the edTPA in 2016, 2017, or 2018 and 19% ($n = 15$) were excluded because the respondent was not currently employed as a teacher. Of the remaining 43 responses, 5% ($n = 2$) were incomplete and not used for this study. Forty-one complete survey responses were collected during Phase I of this study from working teachers who completed the edTPA as part of an educator preparation program in Oregon from 2016 to 2018. Using the number of completers for all Oregon institutions in 2016 to estimate the number of completers in 2017 and 2018, the participants for the survey represent 1% of the students who completed educator preparation programs in Oregon in 2016, 2017, and 2018. Most of the participants completed a Master's degree program at a private institution, two-thirds completed an elementary edTPA portfolio, and half completed their programs in 2018 (see Table 3).

Table 3

Survey Participant Characteristics (N = 41)

Characteristic	<i>n</i>	Percent of sample
Institution		
Public	8	20%
Private	33	80%
Degree		
Bachelor's	11	27%
Master's	30	73%
Handbook level		
Elementary	27	66%
Secondary	14	34%
Year of completion		
2016	8	20%
2017	12	29%
2018	21	51%

Interview participants. After the quantitative phase of this study was completed, seven participants from the survey who volunteered were selected for a follow-up interview. At the end of the survey, participants were asked to volunteer for a follow-up interview and 19 responded in the affirmative. Purposeful was used to select participants for the interview from the 19 in order to have as many educator preparation program characteristics represented as possible (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). To select participants that represented maximal variation in terms of the influence of the edTPA process on their assessment practices, responses to the survey were reassigned a numeric value: 1 for Not at all, 2 for A little, 3 for A moderate amount, 4 for A lot and 5 for A great deal. These values were used to calculate the average response for each participant. Therefore, potential interviewees had one average score, ranging from Not at all to A lot, on whether completing the edTPA process increased their ability to use assessment practices in their own classrooms which facilitated gathering in-depth interview data from multiple perspectives. Table 4 shows that these seven participants were representative of the types of institutions, certification levels, and years of completion of the educator preparation programs in Oregon, as well as the different levels of influence the participants believed edTPA had on their assessment practices. This resulted in an interview sample of seven teachers, five from private institutions and two from public institutions, five of whom had graduated in 2018.

Instrumentation

Two instruments were used in this study. Following the explanatory sequential design, a survey was used in Phase 1, and an interview protocol was used in Phase 2

Table 4

Interview Participant Characteristics

Pseudonym	edTPA Level	Level/Subject	Year	Institution	Median Response
Joseph	Secondary	HS Algebra 1-2	2017	Private	Not at all
Kurt	Secondary	HS Algebra 1-2	2018	Private	Not at all
Claudia	Elementary	1/2 Blend	2016	Public	A Little
Jessica	Secondary	MS ELA/SS, Librarian	2018	Public	A Little
Danielle	Elementary	1st grade DLI Spanish	2018	Private	Moderate
Tasha	Elementary	3rd grade	2018	Private	Moderate
Tony	Secondary	7th grade SS	2018	Private	Moderate

(see Appendices A and B for survey and interview questions). The survey was designed to collect data about the perceived influence of the edTPA process on assessment practices and the interview was designed to collect data that could offer some explanation and deeper understanding for the results of the survey.

Survey. A survey was used in Phase 1 of the study to collect data about the perceived influence of the edTPA process on current assessment practices. Surveys are a tool that can be used to gather the same data from every participant quickly and objectively. This data can then be used to refine the sample and surface themes that can be utilized in a follow-up survey or interview. The first step in developing survey and interview questions is to identify the key concepts (see Figure 3) along with domains and subdomains (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2014). Domains associated



Figure 3. Key concepts for instrument design.

with the key concepts for this research included using assessment as evidence of learning, analyzing evidence, providing feedback, supporting student use of feedback, attending to language use in the content area, and using data for instructional decisions, which are aligned with the edTPA scoring rubrics.

The initial work in instrument development is around planning, which includes determining the purpose of the test and target groups, defining the domain and construct of the test, writing objectives, and selecting item formats (Benson & Clark, 1982), as well as developing test specifications (AERA, 2014). Based on the research questions for this study, the domain is assessment practices and the construct is influence on assessment practices. The exact wording for getting to the level of influence was determined after pilot testing with academic colleagues in a dissertation course and then with two practicing teachers. For example, there is an edTPA rubric with the title, “Providing feedback to guide learning.” The expectations for proficiency for this rubric are that, “Feedback is specific and addresses either needs OR strengths related to the learning objectives,” and for the highest proficiency it is that, “Feedback is specific and addresses both strengths AND needs related to the learning objectives.” The survey questions were written to include the language from the edTPA assessment rubrics and directly ask about the impact of the edTPA on specific assessment practices. Each Likert response item started with the phrase, “To

what extent did participating in the edTPA process increase your ability to..." and then indicated a specific assessment skill articulated in the edTPA rubrics. Using feedback as an example, the proficiency levels indicate that pre-service teachers should be able to address strengths and needs of P-12 students and should be able to provide feedback related to the learning objective.

Although the focus of the survey questions was the assessment skills described in the edTPA assessment rubrics, there is a connection to the standards of InTASC and NBPTS. For example, the edTPA rubric language for providing feedback aligns to the InTASC Standards requiring teachers to, "Understand the positive impact of effective descriptive feedback for learners and know a variety of strategies for communicating this feedback," (CCSSO, 2011) and the edTPA rubric is also aligned with the NBPTS Standards which is to, "Effectively monitor student learning during the lessons, make instructional adjustments, and provide regular constructive feedback to students," (NBPTS, 2016). An alignment of all five edTPA assessment rubrics to the national standards with sample questions from the survey can be seen in Table 5.

The language from the edTPA rubrics was turned into questions for the survey by analyzing the expectations at the proficient and highly proficient levels (proficiency language for all rubrics can be seen in Table 6). The rubrics for analyzing student work and providing feedback were both broken into two questions for the survey. The two rubrics on feedback (providing and supporting use of) were combined into one section. To indicate the impact that the edTPA had on feedback, there were three questions that addressed all components of feedback: providing feedback about strengths and needs, providing feedback that relates to learning objectives, and

Table 5

Alignment of edTPA Assessment Constructs with Standards and Survey Items

edTPA assessment constructs	Sample survey item	InTASC Model Core Teaching (CCSS0, 2011)	National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (2016)
Analysis of student learning	To what extent did participating in the edTPA process increase your ability to analyze student work samples to identify what students do right and wrong?	6(l) Know how to analyze assessment data to understand patterns and gaps in learning, to guide planning and instruction, and to provide meaningful feedback to all learners	C2: Accurately and thoughtfully describe and analyze student work in ways that recognize students' progress and offer means for students to build on their accomplishment
Providing feedback to guide learning	To what extent did participating in the edTPA process increase your ability to provide specific feedback that addresses strengths and needs?	6(n) Understand the positive impact of effective descriptive feedback for learners and know a variety of strategies for communicating this feedback	C3: Effectively monitor student learning during the lessons, make instructional adjustments, and provide regular constructive feedback to students
Student understanding and use of feedback	To what extent did participating in the edTPA process increase your ability to support specific students to understand and use feedback?	6(m) Know when and how to engage learners in analyzing their own assessment results and in helping to set goals for their own learning	C4: Help students effectively apply feedback from assessments in ways that positively impact the students' learning, skillfully enabling students to use assessment as a tool to take responsibility for their own learning
Analyzing students' language use and content learning	To what extent did participating in the edTPA process increase your ability to support content- specific language use?	6(q) Committed to engaging learners actively in assessment process and to developing each learner's capacity to review and communicate about their own progress and learning	C3: Effectively support students in developing the dispositions and proficiencies necessary to explore significant content topics and skills
Using assessment to inform instruction	To what extent did participating in the edTPA process increase your ability to identify next steps that support individuals and groups?	6(g) Effectively use multiple and appropriate types of assessment data to identify each student's learning needs and to develop differentiated learning experiences	C3: Communicate persuasively about your pedagogical decisions and reflect insightfully on your practice and implications for future teaching

supporting student use of feedback. The first two questions were, “To what extent did participating in the edTPA increase your ability to provide specific feedback that addresses strengths and needs?” and, “To what extent did participating in the edTPA increase your ability to provide specific feedback that relates to learning objectives?” support specific students to understand and use feedback.” Participants were offered an opportunity to add clarifying information or explanation after the questions related to each edTPA rubric with the statement, “Please add any clarifying or explanatory information about [assessment topic] as part of the edTPA process.” Additional open-ended questions were included to elicit more detailed information about current assessment practices such as, “What else would you like to share about the impact of the edTPA on your assessment practices?” and “Please describe any of your current methods for assessment that were impacted by completing the edTPA portfolio.”

Once the survey content was developed, the survey was built in Qualtrics. The survey had three main sections: background information and filter questions, survey questions, and contact information for interview volunteers. The opening page included written information about informed consent and the closing page directed participants to a link to enter a drawing for a gift card. There were two filter questions in the survey:

- Did you complete and submit an edTPA portfolio as part of your educator preparation program?
- Are you currently employed at a teacher in a K-12 school?

Respondents who did not meet these criteria were routed to the end of the survey. In the survey itself, there were three types of questions: 1) Likert scale response

questions which asked participants to evaluate, “To what extent did participating in the edTPA process increase your ability to [assessment topic],” 2) prompts following each section (analyzing student work, providing feedback, supporting student use of feedback, attending to language use, and planning next steps for instruction) to add clarifying information to the Likert responses, and 3) open-ended prompts to add any additional information about the edTPA. A final, fourth section asked for contact information of respondents willing to participate in a follow-up interview.

The first draft of the survey questions were reviewed by academic peers and were revised a second time after review by practicing teachers. For the Likert scale questions, the Cronbach’s alpha of 0.928 indicates an excellent level of internal consistency for the scale in this study. The item-total statistics analysis indicates that the removal of all but one of the items would decrease the Cronbach’s alpha.

Interview protocol. The interviews were designed using guidance from Merriam and Tisdell (2014) for the type, orientation, question development and sequence, and considerations for the interviewer and respondent interaction. After initial item development, pilot testing was utilized to build validity (AERA, 2014; Benson & Clark, 1982). After peer review, some content from the edTPA rubrics was combined to avoid repetitive questions. The question about language was embedded in the analyzing student work section, and there was one feedback section for both rubrics. Analysis of language use was included as a follow-up question in the section about analyzing student work. Supporting student use of feedback was included as a probing question in the feedback section. After the first revisions were completed, a final pilot test was conducted with recent educator preparation program graduates and

questions were revised to remove evaluative language and written with less formality so that the questions would elicit meaningful and appropriate data. For example, the original question about analyzing student work was, “Can you describe an example of how you use assess student work?” and that was changed to, “Can you describe the process you use to assess student work?” The final questions were compared to the proficiencies in the edTPA assessment rubrics to ensure the questions aligned to the edTPA expectations. A sample of the questions can be seen in Table 6. For the final protocol, participants were asked to consider a recent lesson sequence and focus on the use of assessment practices to analyze student work, give and support use of feedback, and how they used student work to inform next steps in instruction. The interview was designed to elicit responses about novice teacher knowledge and understanding about best practices in assessment and to probe for whether or not this was influenced by going through the process of edTPA completion and their educator preparation programs.

Procedures

After this study received IRB approval, initial data was collected using a Qualtrics survey that included basic information about the educator preparation program and items the participants evaluated using a Likert scale as well as follow-up prompts to provide clarifying information about their responses. Participants were invited to volunteer for a follow-up interview and interviewees were selected to represent different educator preparation experiences and multiple perspectives on the process of completing the edTPA.

Table 6

Sample Interview Questions Compared to edTPA Proficiency Levels

Rubric Title	Sample interview questions	Level 3	Level 4
Analysis of Student Learning	Can you describe the process you use to assess student work?	The analysis focuses on what students did right AND wrong. AND Analysis includes some differences in whole class learning.	Analysis uses specific examples from work samples to demonstrate patterns of learning consistent with the summary. AND Patterns of learning are described for whole class.
Analyzing Students' Language Use	Can you describe how you use assessment to evaluate how students use language?	Candidate explains and provides evidence of students' use of -the language function AND -one or more additional language demands.	Candidate explains and provides evidence of students' use of -the language function -vocabulary and/or symbols, AND -additional language demand(s) in ways that develop content understandings.
Providing Feedback to Guide Learning	What types of feedback would you give to students? How do you adjust feedback for different student needs?	Feedback is specific and addresses either needs OR strengths related to the learning objectives.	Feedback is specific and addresses both strengths AND needs related to the learning objectives.
Student Understanding and Use of Feedback	What are some of the ways you might help students use the feedback you provide?	Candidate describes how focus students will understand or use feedback related to the learning objective.	Candidate describes how s/he will support focus students to understand and use feedback on their strengths OR weaknesses related to the learning objectives.
Using Assessment to Inform Instruction	How would you use information from formative assessments to plan what to do next in a typical unit?	Next steps propose general support that improves student learning related to assessed learning objectives. Next steps are loosely connected with research and/or theory.	Next steps provide targeted support to individuals or groups to improve their learning. Next steps are connected with research and/or theory.

The survey was sent through institutions to recent educator preparation program graduates. Program managers were identified through their position titles in a search of institutional organization structures. Once identified, they were contacted first by phone or voice mail, and the contact was confirmed through email. Through this administrator, graduates from educator preparation programs from 2016, 2017 and 2018 received the survey link through an email from their institutions. Additional responses were solicited through a posting on a closed group Facebook page for the collective bargaining unit of a large school district in Oregon, and through personal contacts in the administrative structure of the same district. The email text included explanatory information about the background and purpose of the survey along with a link to the Qualtrics survey.

The survey was active via Qualtrics from September 20, 2018 through December 31, 2018. Eighty responses were collected and after filtering there were 41 responses completed that were used for analysis. Purposeful sampling was used to select volunteers for interviews. The volunteers represented all institution types, certification levels, and years of completion. Seven interviews were conducted between October 15, 2018 and December 21, 2018. Of the seven interviews, two were conducted in person and five were conducted over the phone (distance made in person interviews impractical) and all were recorded and transcribed. Preliminary jottings were used to identify relevant phrases and connections to the research questions. Interview quotes were copied from the transcripts to an Excel spreadsheet to facilitate structured coding.

Role of the Researcher

The researcher is a career educator with 20 years of experience in the classroom. Having experienced the process of National Board Certification, a teacher performance assessment (NBPTS, 2016, conclusion), the researcher feels strongly that the process of completing the portfolio is an effective form of professional development that changes teaching to a more reflective practice that considers student needs and student growth. As elements of the edTPA are modeled on National Board Certification, I hypothesize that the edTPA supports pre-service teacher development as reflective practitioners at the beginning of their teaching careers and that the edTPA has the potential to be an effective method for preparing pre-service teachers to use assessment practices such as feedback to support positive student outcomes.

The literature review indicated that the student perspective of going through the edTPA process varies among candidates, but there are some concerning issues regarding the edTPA process. The researcher will honor these potential different perspectives by structuring survey and interview questions from a neutral stance and limiting off-script discussion with the participants. All data collected through the survey and interviews was included in analysis of the data.

The researcher participated in the Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission Standard Setting Conference in September 2017, a conference that closely examined portfolio submissions and involved deep discussion about what constitutes readiness to teach in relation to the edTPA rubrics and scoring system. The researcher corresponded with a member of the team from SCALE regarding resources for dissertation research about the edTPA.

The purpose of this study is to explore the impact that participation in the edTPA process has on future assessment practices of novice teachers, through analysis of survey and interview data from novice teachers about their current assessment practices. With its similarities to the well-known National Board Certification which is also considered teacher professional development process, the edTPA process has the potential to support new teacher development that positively impacts the learners in Oregon.

Issues of Trustworthiness

The research study was designed to gather quantitative data and qualitative data that could be analyzed to understand the impact of the edTPA process on beginning teacher assessment practices. To minimize researcher bias in the collection of data, survey and interview questions were written from a neutral stance and reviewed in consultation with a colleague to check for bias prior to pilot testing. Participants came from different institutions in the state of Oregon that represent different geographic locations, types of institutions, and degrees offered. Following Phase 1 of the study, interview participants were selected to represent different perspectives on the levels of influence of the edTPA process and to represent the different characteristics of educator preparation programs. The credibility of this study is supported because the data collected represented many different perspectives (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Participants in the interview phase were invited to participate in member checks to review the initial analysis of their survey responses and interview transcripts via email and reply with notes about any issues with the analysis that need to be resolved, but there were none. This initial review of the

findings supports the validity of this study in that the data were not misinterpreted or influenced by researcher bias (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Analytic memos were used to reflect on how biases could enter into data collection and analysis and how to minimize their effect. Consultation with a colleague was used in reference to the analytic memos to check for bias in data analysis and interpretation which also supports validity of this study by ensuring research biases are not influencing interpretation of the data.

Reliability of the study was supported through an audit trail and peer examination. An audit trail is essentially a journal in which the researcher records the explanation and justification for decisions made while conducting data collection and analysis (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, chapter 9). Since some of the design decisions in this study, such as interview participant selection and interview topic questions, were informed by the data collected during the survey, an audit trail was used to justify decisions about data collection, analysis, and participants. In addition, bracketing was used to review survey and interview questions prior to coding sessions. Also called *epoche*, bracketing is used to refrain from judgment and set aside biases while coding the data and record how the process may have been influenced by assumptions and biases with regard to certain responses (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 27). Each work session concluded with an analytic memo to record the process of conducting the research and included reflection, questions, and the justification for decisions when there were problems, issues, or ideas that occurred during the data collection phase (Saldaña, 2016, p. 44). The analytic memos also included a running record of data analysis decisions and interpretations of the data (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

Ethical Procedures

A request to the Institutional Review Board was approved on September 12, 2018 that outlined the permissions and protection of confidentiality for the participants. Prior to taking the survey, participants were provided with a written information sheet about consent and confidentiality and explicit language that completion of the survey constitutes consent (see Appendix C). The survey could be completed anonymously, with survey results summarized in the final study to protect any identifying information about individual participants. An option to include contact information was completed by the participant if he or she was willing to be interviewed as part of the research study. Unique identification numbers were assigned to each response and identifying information provided by interview volunteers was cut and copied to a separate spreadsheet on a password protected computer. Individuals who participated in the interviews signed an informed consent form (see Appendix D) and data collected through interviews was identified in the analysis only by identification number. Pseudonyms were created for each interview participant for the analysis and discussion.

There were no perceived risks to the subjects and the participants did not experience the edTPA as consequential to obtaining a teaching license, although since the purpose of the edTPA is to evaluate teaching, some may have felt anxious in thinking about the process. The graduates themselves may benefit by viewing edTPA from a different lens, and the findings may provide an increased understanding of the impact on their assessment practices. Identifying information will be destroyed after publication of this dissertation.

Data Analysis

Survey data were collected using an anonymous link to a survey in Qualtrics and exported to an Excel spreadsheet. Each row represented a participant with responses to each question aligned by columns. Each participant was given a unique identifying number and identifying information provided by volunteers for interviewing was kept in a separate spreadsheet. The data was also imported to SPSS for analysis. Interviews were recorded so transcripts could be typed. Quotes were copied into an excel spreadsheet for analysis using structured and pattern coding. A summary of the data analysis method is shown in Table 7.

Table 7

Data Collection Response Format and Analysis Type

Instrument	Response format	Data analysis
Survey	Likert scale: specific practices	Descriptive and inferential statistics
	Open-ended: specific practices	Structured coding
	Open-ended: general edTPA	Pattern coding
Interview	Open-ended: specific practices	Pattern coding
	Open-ended: general edTPA	Structured coding

Quantitative survey analysis. Data collected via the survey provided scale responses about the level of influence of the edTPA on current assessment practices. These responses were analyzed using frequency tables and descriptive statistics in SPSS. The scale responses were analyzed using frequency counts for each response. To further analyze the responses, they were re-coded in SPSS as new variables with

numerical values: Not at All was coded as a 1, A Little was coded as a 2, A Moderate Amount was coded as a 3, A Lot was coded as a 4, and A Great Deal was coded as a 5. Data were analyzed for mean, median, and mode and the frequency of higher-end responses. Analysis of differences disaggregated by institution type, degree earned, certification level, and year earned was examined using chi-square analysis. An analysis comparing different items was conducted with a repeated measures ANOVA.

Qualitative survey analysis. The clarifying and explanatory information provided in open-ended responses, if provided, was analyzed using structured coding, which uses short words or phrases to summarize the content in the transcripts and is an appropriate coding strategy for surveys with open-ended responses when the purpose is to categorize responses by topic (Saldaña, 2016). Text from the responses was copied to an Excel spreadsheet and key words were identified and added to subsequent columns. Key words were categorized in two rounds until the final categories were determined. Categories were confirmed by a peer review of the quotes compared to the final categories. Comments were reviewed a second time and grouped by edTPA assessment topic: analyzing student work, providing feedback, supporting use of feedback, language use, and identifying next steps. The number of participants who included commentary for each assessment topic was recorded and the commentary grouped by category.

Interview data analysis. The interviews elicited more detail about the influences of the edTPA process on current assessment practices by probing for examples and elaboration. The open-ended nature of the questions allowed for a wide variety of perspectives about best practices in assessment due to different teaching

circumstances of the beginning teachers yet provided insight into practices and whether they were influenced by participation in the edTPA process. Typed transcripts were analyzed and entered into an Excel spreadsheet in three column format with transcript lines in the first column, preliminary jottings and key words in the second column, and final categories in the third column. Preliminary jottings were aligned with the structured coding categories from the survey analysis. Structural coding was used to organize the data into categories, an appropriate strategy for semi-structured interview transcripts (Saldaña, 2016). Structural coding involves structuring the data into the five categories of the edTPA assessment rubrics: analysis of student learning, providing feedback to guide learning, student understanding and use of feedback, analyzing students' language use and content learning, and using assessment to inform instruction.

The assessment practices discussed in the interview were aligned to the edTPA rubrics, InTASC Beginning Teacher Standards, and National Board standards to analyze the depth and breadth of assessment practices. Each practice described by the interview participants in response to questions about how assessment practices were used in the classroom was compared to the standards. For example, Tony described using rubrics, written, and verbal feedback. This aligns with the InTASC standards 6(n) which is to, "understand the positive impact of effective descriptive feedback for learners and know a variety of strategies for communicating this feedback." (CCSSO, 2011). Tony's use of feedback also aligns to learning objectives via a rubric, as described in the edTPA assessment rubric on providing feedback to guide learning,

“feedback is specific and addresses both strengths and needs related to the learning objectives.” (SCALE, 2018).

The explanatory sequential design study includes a second coding cycle, which used pattern coding to develop inferences and identify any emergent themes (Saldaña, 2016). Second cycle coding integrated topics and categories from the data to develop inferences and themes to be used for analysis.

Triangulation. Data for this study was collected from participants using three different sources. Quantitative data was collected using questions that had a Likert scale response via an online survey. The online survey also included open-ended questions that asked for information about specific assessment practices and about the process of completing the edTPA and any perceived impact it may or may not have had on current assessment practices. Finally, a one-on-one semi-structured interview provided in-depth data about what assessment practices participants currently use and how they learned about them. The interview also asked for general information about the process of completing the edTPA. These sources provided rich data to answer the research question about the impact of the edTPA process on current assessment practices. First, participants reported the perceived level of impact of the edTPA process through quantitative data. Second, participants added qualitative data to clarify any responses to the Likert scale questions about the level of impact of the edTPA. Third, the interview data provided an in-depth understanding of how participants actually use assessment in the current practice and collected data about *how* they learned their current practices.

Summary

This mixed methods research study used an explanatory sequential design to collect data from participants using both a survey and, for a smaller sample, an interview. The survey provided background data about each teachers' preparation programs and current teaching positions, data about the influence of edTPA completion on current assessment practices and clarifying information about responses on Likert scale responses. Analysis of this data surfaced patterns, themes, and trends in assessment practices that were incorporated into the interviews with candidates that were a diverse representation of the sample. Interviews probed for examples of best practices in assessment and looked for alignment to edTPA rubrics. Analysis of survey and interview data lead to inferences that represent a wide variety of perspectives regarding the influence of edTPA completion on current assessment practices of beginning teachers that can inform the implications of this research and future study.

Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to explore the impact of the edTPA process on the assessment practices of novice teachers. The study followed an explanatory sequential design to collect quantitative and qualitative data on the impact of completing the edTPA on the assessment practices of novice teachers. The scale responses from the survey were quantitatively analyzed using descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Open-ended responses were structurally coded, and topics identified to inform the interview design and analysis. Structural coding was also used to surface themes in the interviews and the themes were aligned to the research questions.

The results of this study are presented through the following four themes that emerged during the data analysis and coding cycles described in the previous chapter:

- Novice teachers perceived that the process of completing the edTPA had little impact on their current assessment practices;
- Novice teachers regarded the process of completing the edTPA as a “hoop” to jump through and in some cases had a negative impact on learning to teach;
- Novice teachers gave credit for their assessment practices to their programs with specific references to courses, cooperating teachers, and field experiences; and
- Novice teacher learned best practices in assessment and include them in their current classroom practices.

Theme 1: Completing the edTPA had Little Impact on Assessment Practices

Each phase of the study explored the influence of the edTPA on current assessment practices and, with few exceptions, the participants perceived that completing the process of the edTPA had little or no impact. This theme emerged in the quantitative data from Phase 1 and from the categories that surfaced during coding analysis of the qualitative data gathered in Phase 1 and Phase 2.

Participants responded to eight statements on the survey about the level of influence completing the edTPA had on their assessment practices by rating them on a Likert scale with the choices of: “not at all,” “a little,” “a moderate amount,” “a lot,” or “a great deal.” Table 8 shows that more than 60% of the participants indicated the edTPA had little to no impact on their ability to perform assessment practices as defined in the edTPA assessment rubrics. Fewer than 10% of participants rated the impact as “a lot,” or “a great deal,” in most areas of assessment practices, except for providing specific feedback related to the learning objectives for which 12% of respondents rated it “a lot.”

Overall responses indicated that the survey participants believed participating in the edTPA process had little to no influence on their classroom assessment practices, with the distribution for assessment topics being positively skewed. The exception to this was, “Providing specific feedback that addresses strengths and needs,” for which 12 responses, or 29%, rated it as having “A moderate amount” of impact on assessment practices. Increasing ability to “Provide specific feedback that addresses strengths and needs” also received the highest number of responses ($n = 18$) for increasing ability “Not at all,” and the lowest number of responses ($n = 8$) for

Table 8

Responses to Survey Questions about Participating in the edTPA Process

To what extent did the edTPA process impact your ability to...	Percent of Responses for each Level (<i>n</i>)				
	Not at all	A little	A moderate amount	A lot	A great deal
Analyze student work samples to identify what students do right and wrong	27% (11)	37% (15)	29% (12)	7% (3)	0% (0)
Analyze student work samples to identify patterns of learning for the whole class	27 (11)	42 (17)	22 (9)	10 (4)	0 (0)
Provide specific feedback that addresses strengths and needs	44 (18)	20 (8)	29 (12)	7 (3)	0 (0)
Provide specific feedback related to the learning objectives	29 (12)	44 (18)	15 (6)	12 (5)	0 (0)
Support specific students to understand and use feedback	39 (16)	39 (16)	15 (6)	5 (2)	2 (1)
Support content specific language use	34 (14)	34 (14)	24 (10)	5 (2)	2 (1)
Identify next steps for instruction that support individuals and groups	27 (11)	39 (16)	24 (10)	10 (4)	0 (0)
Justify next steps for instruction with principles from research and/or theory	27 (11)	44 (18)	22 (9)	5 (2)	2 (1)

Note. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding. *N* = 41.

increasing ability to provide specific feedback “A little.” This indicates the strongest negative perception of the level to which their ability to provide feedback was impacted by the edTPA process.

Descriptive statistics, presented in Table 9, showed few differences between assessment topics for each measure (median, mode, mean, and percent rated 3 or higher) and indicate that the data for most items was clustered at the lower end of the scale. One statistic that stands out in the data is that, while all other assessment topics had a mode of 2, “Providing specific feedback that addresses strengths and needs” had a mode of 1, supporting the strong negative perception of the impact of the edTPA on this assessment topic. “Supporting specific students to understand and use feedback” had the lowest mean ($M = 1.93$) and the lowest percent rating 3 or higher (22%), indicating respondents perceived that participating in the edTPA had little to no impact on their ability to support students in their understanding and use of feedback.

An analysis of differences in the data based on institution type, degree, edTPA level and year of completion was accomplished using chi-square analysis in SPSS. There were no statistically significant differences for the educator preparation programs between private and public institutions except for “justifying next steps for instruction with principles from research and/or theory,” $\chi^2(4, N = 41), p = .045$, indicating a higher than expected number of participants from public institutions perceived that their ability to justify next steps for instruction with principles from research and/or theory was impacted by completing the edTPA. Table 10 shows a comparison of the percentages at each level for private and public institutions with significantly higher percentages of respondents from public institutions rating the

impact of the edTPA as “a moderate amount” or higher on four of the assessment practices compared to the percentage of participants from private institutions.

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics for Survey Responses (N = 41)

Assessment Topic from edTPA	Median	Mode	Mean (SD)	Percent rated 3 or higher (n)
Analyze student work samples to identify what students do right and wrong	2	2	2.17 (.92)	37 (15)
Analyze student work samples to identify patterns of learning for the whole class	2	2	2.15 (.94)	32 (13)
Provide specific feedback that addresses strengths and needs	2	1	2.00 (1.02)	37 (15)
Provide specific feedback related to the learning objectives	2	2	2.10 (.97)	27 (11)
Support specific students to understand and use feedback	2	2	1.93 (.98)	22 (9)
Support content specific language use	2	2	2.07 (1.01)	32 (13)
Identify next steps for instruction that support individuals and groups	2	2	2.17 (.95)	34 (14)
Justify next steps for instruction with principles from research and/or theory	2	2	2.12 (.95)	29 (12)

Table 10

Private and Public School Participants who Rated Items 3 and Above

Assessment topic from edTPA	Private (<i>n</i> = 33)		Public (<i>n</i> = 8)	
	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>
Analyze student work samples to identify what students do right and wrong	36	12	38	3
Analyze student work samples to identify patterns of learning for the whole class	27	9	50	4
Provide specific feedback that addresses strengths and needs	33	11	50	4
Provide specific feedback related to the learning objectives	24	8	38	3
Support specific students to understand and use feedback	18	6	38	3
Support content specific language use	30	10	38	3
Identify next steps for instruction that support individuals and groups	33	11	38	3
Justify next steps for instruction with principles from research and/or theory	27*	9	38*	3

Note. * $p < .05$.

A repeated measures ANOVA was also conducted to compare the effect of completing the edTPA process on assessment topics from the edTPA rubrics. There was not a significant effect ($p = .548$) which indicates that there were no significant differences of effects of completing the edTPA on the different components of assessment practice specified in the edTPA assessment rubrics.

Theme 2: The edTPA Process was a Hoop or a Negative Experience

While the rating scale questions from the survey showed that participants perceived little to no impact of the edTPA on their assessment practices, the responses of clarifying information and to the general prompts at the end of the survey show that the lack of impact complements the perception that the edTPA was a “hoop” to jump through, “edTPA didn't teach me anything. It was a hoop to jump through and I did not find it useful, unfortunately.” Of the 25 participants who added commentary on the survey, 15 discussed the edTPA as a waste of time, a means to an end, and four described it as a “hoop” to jump through. The participants perceived the edTPA as an activity disconnected from the process of learning how to teach, that it was a process to complete or a hoop to jump through, and that it was not a means to learn assessment practices. The data indicated that for many participants, completing the edTPA felt like it had no relation to what teaching is like in the real world. One survey participant described the process as follows:

There is a severe disconnect between edTPA and what happens in the classroom. For the most part, edTPA uses confusing, convoluted phrasing throughout its tasks, and the expectations of best practice don't seem to reconcile with the actual workload of edTPA. Even in retrospect, as a working teacher, I find it difficult to remember the value in anything I did related to edTPA, or anything specific that has helped me in my practice (*Secondary social studies educator, Master's from a public school in 2018*).

Respondents also described how participating in the edTPA hindered learning because courses were devoted to technicalities of the portfolio instead of teaching practices,

with comments such as, “I found myself just trying to figure out the technicalities of submitting and making sure that ‘I did it right.’ This made it so that I couldn't really focus on learning teaching strategies,” made by an elementary educator.

The process was even more overwhelming and disconnected to participants who completed an edTPA portfolio for world language (1 participant), performance arts (1 participant), or PE and Health (4 participants). These participants indicated that the portfolio expectations did not align with how their subjects are taught and the edTPA expectations were disconnected from learning to teach their subjects. The survey participant who completed a performing arts portfolio wrote:

Again, edTPA is not an educational tool for assessment in performing arts. It is a process that is meant to certify teachers through a rigorous analysis and writing. Music professionals, like me, are not trained to have a nuanced use of language. I found the process frustratingly convoluted and unhelpful to the art and science of teaching. We can do better (*Performing arts educator, Master's from a private school in 2018*).

The survey participant who completed the edTPA world language portfolio explained the disconnect between the assessment expectations of the edTPA and the learning process for a second language:

edTPA seemed to require too much assessment. To clarify, teaching a language is not an overnight process, nor is it a process that can be scripted down to a quiz every week. Learning language is an organic process and should be treated as such edTPA wanted to see too many types of assessments that were simply unrealistic for high school students who only had one or two years of

second language learning under their belt (*World language educator, Bachelor's from a private school in 2018*).

The feedback from the participants who completed the secondary health and physical education edTPA portfolio perceived that the process did not support their learning about assessment and was disconnected from their work with students. One participant who is a physical education and health educator wrote, "It took so much time that my ability didn't really increase and I ended up unable to provide as much feedback to students." Another educator wrote, "The program probably works more for core subjects, but the Physical Education edTPA was not helpful in improving my teaching. It was more of me doing things that I would not do in my current classroom."

Further, many of the participants perceived that the demand of time for the level of reflection required was unrealistic considering the demands of teaching and that the edTPA process was a waste of time. A secondary math educator wrote, "The edTPA was an absolute waste of my time. It did not impact the way I do anything." The edTPA seemed to cause anxiety for the participants because of the high demands for writing,

The edTPA was a stressful month or so worth of collecting and teaching and collecting and planning, but ultimately, it was just a month. The edTPA was nothing compared to having a master-teacher to guide me, and especially nothing compared to having a year's experience. All I remember about the edTPA is being really worried that things - goals, research, and student products - aligned the same way to other people as to me (*Secondary English language arts educator, Master's from a public school in 2016*).

These comments indicated the lack of impact the edTPA had on assessment practices and the perception that it is a hoop to jump through, but some comments indicated that participating in the edTPA process actually hindered their own learning about teaching. For one participant, a physical education a health educator, the “edTPA demolished and destroyed my schooling process. All the time spent in classes designed to teach me planning, instruction, and assessment was hijacked in order to explain painstaking details of edTPA.” This was echoed by another participant who is an elementary educator, “Honestly, having to do the edTPA took me away from learning to be a teacher,” indicating that pre-service learning was not impacted by the edTPA process, unless as a detriment to learning during their field experiences.

This perception was supported by the general comments in the interview data. The edTPA was viewed as a distraction to teaching, as stated by Joseph, a secondary math teacher the, “logistics of edTPA became more of a stress than learning how to become a good teacher,” and Tasha, a third grade teacher, “the assessments that I did, to me felt like it was specific to just passing edTPA.” Of the emphasis on the edTPA in his educator preparation program, Joseph observed, “...it was like, ‘all right, this is going to be on the edTPA, you got to know this.’ Then lost track of the fact that, ‘This is good teaching practice. You should know this.’” The over-emphasis on the process of completing the edTPA was perceived as time and energy that could have been used elsewhere.

Several responses from the survey ($n = 5$) focused on the evaluative nature of the edTPA, or its use as a summative assessment regarding readiness to teach. Although the edTPA does serve this purpose, it is also designed to be educative and

support pre-service teacher development through formative feedback and score reports. The edTPA was perceived as a summative assessment, but not as an educative experience as stated by one respondent, “edTPA was a way to asses my teaching. I do not feel it helped me become a better teacher.” Another participant commented on the lack of focus on teaching, “it seemed like the focus was on writing as a professional, not so much focusing and reflecting on your teaching practices and assessments.” One interview participant shared this perspective on the evaluative nature of the edTPA. Tasha, a third-grade teacher, shared that the edTPA, because of the evaluative nature, was preparation for being evaluated in the classroom, which she clarified was not necessarily aligned to meeting student needs. In this sense, her perception was that the edTPA is not aligned to what teaching is really like and did not provide preparation she needed for the field. The focus on how edTPA is evaluative overlapped with the low level of impact in that participants were putting so much effort into the portfolio that it took away from their teaching experience.

Theme 3: There were Other Influences Impacting Assessment Practices

While the participants did not view the experience of completing the edTPA as impacting their assessment practices, it appears that experiences within their educator preparation programs such as courses, cooperating teachers, and field experiences were what truly mattered. Of the 25 participants who provided commentary, 9 (36%) described the positive influence of their educator preparation programs. Table 11 shows the categories for the positive comments: the field experience, which included cooperating teachers, collaborative teams, and real-world experiences in the

classroom; and the program, which included courses, assignments, and access to mentor teachers. These will each be discussed separately next.

Table 11

Number of Survey Participants Reporting Positive Program Influence (n = 9)

edTPA assessment practices	Field Experience	Program
Analyze student work	1	4
Provide feedback	2	3
Support feedback use	1	1
Support language use	2	1
Planning next steps	0	3
General comments	4	3

Note. Responses may include more than one category or multiple categories in one response.

Field experience. Participants perceived field experiences, more so than edTPA, as directly impacting their knowledge of assessment. For example, there were comments about the positive impact of the cooperating teacher on their understanding of assessment such as:

It wasn't edTPA that impacted my assessment practices; it was the day to day interaction with my cooperating teacher who coached me in best practices. edTPA was just an avenue to put those into practice (*Elementary educator, Master's from a private school in 2017*)

Interview participants shared comments in agreement with the perception that what they learned about assessment came from field experiences. When asked the

question, “Can you recall how you learned to assess student work?” three of the participants specifically stated they learned from the cooperating teacher or student teaching. In response to a similar question about providing feedback, four participants described how they learned from observing their cooperating teacher, with comments such as, “...my cooperative teacher, she was really good at helping the kids, if they said something incorrect, giving them the correct feedback and then setting goals.” Two of the participants stated that learning how to plan for next steps happened with the cooperating teacher with comments such as, “my cooperating teacher for high school...anytime we would get informal stuff back...we would talk about what we needed to do to change our lessons for the next day.”

Program. Participants also attributed their assessment practices to the positive influence of their educator preparation program classes and professors. One survey participant summarized the influence of the program over the edTPA by stating:

I have accessed my coursework as resources but have not accessed edTPA notes. In a way, I wish we could have spent the edTPA time on training to use DRA [Developmental Reading Assessment] results to become a better instructor and meet the needs of students. I do use data and reflect on instruction and student progress, but I feel that I was prepared by the excellent staff at [my university] (*Elementary educator, Master's from a public school in 2016*).

In response to the interview questions that asked them to recall how they learned assessment practices, several participants mentioned that they learned from a class in their program. Three learned about assessing student work and four learned about

providing feedback from a class. When asked how they learned to plan for next steps, none of the interview participants indicated that they learned about planning next steps from their educator preparation program courses.

Several survey participants ($n = 5$) clarified that, although the edTPA was the roadmap for what good teaching looks like, completing the edTPA successfully was a result of what they learned from courses and classwork and from cooperating teachers and the field experience (as described in the previous section). A typical response regarding the impact of their program was from an elementary educator who graduated in 2016, “I learned everything I know from my professors in class and from the experienced teachers I was placed with for field experience and student teaching.” Another elementary educator who graduated in 2018 emphasized the lack of impact of the edTPA process compared to the impact of the educator preparation program by stating, “edTPA had little to no real impact on my assessment practices in the classroom. My training in my program was more impactful.”

On the job. Although it did not come up in the survey, interview participants indicated that their learning about assessment continues as they learn on the job. For Tasha, she was told to collect and use particular data to inform her teaching, and for Jessica, most of her learning about assessment has happened on the job – it is a series of trial and error to learn what works. Danielle views learning to use assessment as an ongoing process that started with a cooperating teacher and continues through collaboration with her current colleagues. Kurt is in a school that uses proficiency grading and has learned about that style of grading on the job. Within the comments

about learning assessment on the job is the perception that learning to assess is an ongoing process.

The participants perceived that the edTPA itself is not a tool for teaching and believe most of what they learned was from other experiences in their educator preparation programs. This is a shared perception regardless of graduation year, level, or subject taught. Responses from the surveys and interviews also supported the perspective that learning about assessment came from the program or field experience and continues as teachers work in the field, not from completing the edTPA.

Theme 4: Novice Teachers Learned and Now Use Best Practices in Assessment

Exploration of the previous themes indicate that participants perceive that completing the edTPA portfolio did not impact their learning of assessment, with participants instead crediting their programs and field experiences with teaching the assessment practices they currently use. Closer examination of the self-reported assessment practices, however, indicate that candidates *are* using best practices in formative assessment to some extent and the practices they described can be aligned with the assessment rubrics in the edTPA. Although the process of completing the edTPA is not perceived as directly influencing their assessment practices, the data collected from the participants show that what they are learning about assessment through other means supports their success on the edTPA. The perceived impact of the educator preparation program on current assessment practices may be an indirect result of the edTPA process, but regardless, novice teachers are learning best practices in assessment and using them in their classrooms to support improved student outcomes.

Assessment practices used by novice teachers. During the interviews, participants were asked to describe the assessment practices they currently use and their responses indicated that they learned the purpose and structure of various assessment practices for analyzing student work, providing and supporting student use of feedback, and planning next steps for instruction. Their perception that assessment practices are part of the learning cycle is also evident from their responses. For example, Tony uses written and oral feedback to guide student learning and then he reflects on the success of a lesson to guide his instruction. This informs the need for additional opportunities for students to demonstrate understanding, which provide additional feedback, and the learning cycle continues. Jessica uses data from observations and exit tickets to provide guidance for students to take the next steps and incorporates student reflection on learning as an additional form of feedback. Although she starts at a high level, she uses the data from formative assessments to see where students are and adjust her instruction as it is needed. As discussed in the literature review, formative assessment practices are effective for improving student outcomes. Formative assessment includes sharing the criteria for success such as with rubrics, providing feedback that moves a learner forward, and activating students as owners of their own learning (Black & William, 2008). The participants describe using rubrics, monitoring student progress against those rubrics, providing feedback that is specific to the learner with the purpose of providing guidance to the next level, and utilizing student reflection.

In Phase 1 of this study, participants responded to survey questions about the level of influence the edTPA had on the assessment practices that are measured by the

edTPA assessment rubrics. While the data showed that the perception of the participants was that the edTPA had little or no influence on their current assessment practices, there were some practices that were more influenced than others. Practices that were identified as having been influenced at higher levels by the edTPA process were analyzing student work, providing feedback, and identifying next steps for instruction. The highest number of survey participants ($n = 15$) rated the level of influence of the edTPA process as “a moderate amount” or higher for increasing ability to analyze student work samples to identify what students do right and wrong and providing specific feedback that addresses strengths and needs. Analysis of the open-ended responses to follow-up questions within the survey surfaced a category focused on assessment practices. In Phase 2, the interview data provided a deeper look at these practices and revealed understandings of assessment aligned with best practices. For example, Jessica, Kurt, and Tasha all described analyzing student work to understand where students are and to monitor the progress. They demonstrate understanding of, “how to analyze assessment data to understand patterns and gaps in learning,” (CCSSO, 2011), that they need to, “analyze student work in ways that recognize student’s progress,” (NBPTS, 2016), and that analyzing student work is to, “identify what students do right and wrong.” (SCALE, 2014). There is a clear and common understanding that assessment plays an important role in determining where students are in terms of learning and that data is necessary for providing feedback to students and for determining next steps for instruction. Specific assessment practices used by the interview participants are described in the section that follows. A

summary of interview participant self-reported assessment practices can be seen in Table 12.

Analyzing student work. The InTASC standard for analyzing student work is, “Know how to analyze assessment data to understand patterns and gaps in learning, to guide planning and instruction, and to provide meaningful feedback to all learners,” (CCSSO, 2011, p. 15). The NBPTS standard is, “Accurately and thoughtfully describe and analyze student work in ways that recognize students' progress and offer means for students to build on their accomplishment” (NBPTS, 2018, p. 21). Interview data indicate that novice teachers have an understanding of the purpose of looking at student work to guide their instruction, though implementation may be inconsistent. Danielle and Kurt analyze student work to determine successes and look for struggling students, while Tasha, Tony, and Jessica use assessment to determine where students are in a learning progression. Joseph and Claudia use a variety of assessments to look for student explanation and understandings. They are worded differently, but all of the interview participants were able to articulate best practices in analyzing student work, emphasizing that they need to know where students are and that they are looking for progress.

Feedback. InTASC standards include, “Understand the positive impact of effective descriptive feedback for learners and know a variety of strategies for communicating this feedback,” (CCSSO, 2011, p. 15). NBPTS states, “Effectively monitor student learning during the lessons, make instructional adjustments, and provide regular constructive feedback to students” (NBPTS, 2018, p. 21). Claudia uses feedback to correct misconceptions and to show students their progress. Joseph and

Jessica use feedback to guide their students' next steps, but also support students to use feedback for their own reflection and to revise their work. Danielle uses feedback as positive reinforcement. Tony and Kurt provide written and verbal questions and feedback to guide students to the next level. The participants use a variety of strategies to provide feedback to students and it varies depending on the context. They teach in a variety of settings from elementary, dual-language immersion, and high school math, but emphasized the importance of providing feedback that moves students forward in their learning.

Planning next steps. This standard for planning next steps in InTASC is, “Effectively use multiple and appropriate types of assessment data to identify each student's learning needs and to develop differentiated learning experiences” (CCSSO, 2011, p. 15). In NBPTS, the standard is, “Communicate persuasively about your pedagogical decisions and reflect insightfully on your practice and implications for future teaching” (NBPTS, 2018, p. 21). The responses from participants varied for this topic and did not show the same level of understanding as analysis and feedback. Claudia stated that she uses formative assessment to guide and direct her teaching and Danielle uses assessment data to justify her instructional decisions for next steps. Joseph and Jessica both used assessment data to adjust subsequent lessons and pacing, and Joseph clarified that although reflecting on lessons is how to figure out next steps, the level of reflection required for edTPA is not the level in his current practice. Kurt changes lesson plans based on student work, and Tony uses reflection to evaluate the success of a lesson and will reteach if it is needed. Tasha has little control over adjusting the pacing of instruction due to state and district expectations for instruction.

The data from interviews regarding next steps for instruction indicate different levels of understanding and implementation of best practices in this area. This is an area of teaching that appears to be incorporated into educator preparation programs with different levels of success and seems to have a more open-ended outcome.

The practices described by the interview participants were compared to the standards of the edTPA assessment rubrics, the InTASC Beginning Teacher Standards and the NBPTS standards. Although not all practices are aligned with the standards, participants identified several assessment practices that incorporated formative assessment, feedback, and reflection. A summary of these practices can be seen in Table 12.

Positive impact of the edTPA process. The edTPA evaluates pre-service teacher against a rubric of teaching practices and participants indicated that they utilize many of these practices in current practice. Although the participants indicated that assessment practices were not impacted by the process of completing the edTPA there were some positive impacts from the experience. For example, some participants perceived that edTPA rubrics push pre-service teachers toward best practices in assessment and developed an understanding of the importance of reflecting on lessons. Three participants added commentary that explained what they learned by completing the edTPA process. Another participant commented on the value of providing feedback, “I think it was helpful and beneficial in terms of providing feedback.” Another participant indicated that the edTPA showed the need for, “providing both positive and needs to work on feedback, the importance of rubrics and showing students them and providing several small formative assessments.”

Table 12

Novice Teacher Assessment Practices from Interview Data

Participant	Analyzing student work	Providing and supporting use of feedback	Planning next steps for instruction
Danielle	Identifies struggling students ^{a,b}	Uses positive reinforcement ^{b,c}	Justifies instructional decisions ^{b,c}
Tasha	Monitors student progress ^b	Uses quick checks and discussion ^a	Identifies which standards students are struggling with and directs intervention ^{a,b,c}
Tony	Provides multiple opportunities to demonstrate understanding ^b	Uses rubrics, written, and verbal feedback ^{a,c}	Reflects on lesson success, reteaches if needed, determines when to move on ^{b,c}
Kurt	Monitors student progress ^b	Guides students to the next level ^{a,b}	Adjusts plans based on student work ^{a,c}
Jessica	Identifies where students are ^{a,b,c}	Uses observations and exit tickets and guide students to their next steps through student reflection ^{a,b}	Starts at a high level and walk it back based on formative assessments ^b
Joseph	Uses a variety of formative assessments ^a	Adjusts feedback and student reflection for different student needs ^{a,c}	Looks for understanding, adjusts pacing, and reflects on lessons to figure out next steps ^a
Claudia	Uses formative assessments to guide teaching ^a	Shows students what is correct and incorrect, correct misconceptions, and show individual student progress ^{a,b,c}	Uses student work to identify language barriers ^{a,c}

^a CCSSO, 2011; ^b NBPTS, 2016; ^c SCALE, 2014

Several interview participants were able to share some learning that occurred while completing the edTPA, regardless of their perceived level of impact on their assessment practices. In the survey, Tony indicated that completing the edTPA, on average, had “a moderate amount” of impact on his ability to use assessment practices. From his perspective, the edTPA required reflection on lesson success and the decision to move on, though it did not emphasize assessment enough and did not address what good assessments look like. Claudia, on average, indicated that completing the edTPA had “a little” impact on her assessment practices. For her, the edTPA helped her understand the value of data collection. Joseph perceived that the edTPA process impacted his assessment practices at an average level of “not at all.” He believed that the edTPA process was about completing the edTPA when, in his opinion, it could have been framed as good teaching. His understanding of the importance of reflecting on lessons to figure out the next steps in instruction came from the emphasis in the edTPA, but the level of reflection required for the edTPA is not realistic in practice.

Participants had the option to add clarifying or explanatory information about their responses in each category of the scale response items. For each edTPA assessment rubric, participants offered additional information that addressed assessment practices. Specific practices that the participants identified were providing feedback that addresses a specific standard, looking for common misconceptions, using pre- and post-assessments, providing immediate feedback electronically, and designing units that are structured to help students progress. One participant stated that the process really emphasized the importance of reflection and another stated, “the

process showed me the true value of having your assessments form how you are teaching. Using the assessments to not only assess your students, but to assess your teaching strategies.”

Summary

Four themes related to the impact of the edTPA process on assessment practices emerged through data analysis of survey and interview data. The first theme is that novice teachers perceived that the process of completing the edTPA had little impact on their current assessment practices. The data show that the survey and interview participants perceived that learning about assessment practices happened through their field experiences and program participation, as well as on the job, more than from the process of completing the edTPA. In some cases, the process of completing the edTPA had a negative effect on their own experience of learning to teach. The second theme is that completing the edTPA was a hoop to jump through, reinforcing the perception that it had little to no impact on assessment practices and in some ways hindered the process of learning to teach. The evaluative nature of the edTPA emerged in the coding process as the perception that the edTPA had little to do with real-world teaching and was an artificial process used to assess teaching. The third theme emerged as participants discussed how they learned about assessment practices through their programs and field experiences. They attribute their learning to the courses, coursework, and cooperating teachers they worked with while completing an educator preparation program. Finally, the fourth theme is that it appears the novice teachers who participated in this study are using best practices in assessment. The assessment practices shared by participants in relation to standards from edTPA,

InTASC, and NBPTS show that candidate learning about assessment, however it occurs, translates to best practices for supporting student learning. It seems there may have been an educative element to the edTPA in which the process taught the value of certain teaching practices. Participants are clear that their perception is that the edTPA had no impact on learning these practices, but it is unclear whether the learning that occurred in their programs was a result of the program adapting to the demands of the edTPA. Chapter 5 will discuss these findings and the implications for further research.

Each of the survey participants brought a different perspective to their understanding of the edTPA process and how it may or may not have impacted their current assessment practices. Categories that emerged from the structural coding, in addition to identifying assessment practices, included the experiences related to the edTPA process such as university classes, field experiences, and the practical task of completing the edTPA along with the disconnect between what was expected on the edTPA and what happens in their current classrooms. Participants articulated that they learned how to use assessment in classes, and from mentor teachers. As with the survey data, the interview data support that the edTPA was not necessarily a learning experience for the participants. The negative perceptions of the edTPA reflect the disconnect between the demands of the edTPA process and the reality of the classroom experience.

Chapter 5: Discussion

The purpose of this study was to explore the impact of participating in the edTPA process on the assessment practices of novice teachers. The perception of the participants was that completing the edTPA process had little to no impact on their current assessment practices and some participants perceived that it was a waste of their time or had a negative impact on their learning. The research revealed that there were other factors, such as courses and cooperating teachers that positively impacted candidate learning about assessment practices and the survey and interview data also revealed that the assessment practices identified and described by novice teachers align with the language of the edTPA assessment rubrics.

This study addressed the gap in the literature regarding the impact of the edTPA on classroom practices and focused on assessment practices of novice teachers who completed an educator preparation program in Oregon by asking: to what extent, if at all, are the current assessment practices of novice teachers impacted by the process of completing the edTPA? Using a mixed method, explanatory sequential design, this study collected survey and interview data from 41 recent program graduates and analyzed the data using descriptive statistics, structural and pattern coding. In addition to the survey, 7 participants were selected using purposeful sampling to participate in a follow-up interview. The transcripts of the interviews were analyzed using structural and pattern coding. Following data analysis of both the survey and interview data, four themes emerged:

- Novice teachers perceived that the process of completing the edTPA had little impact on their current assessment practices;
- Novice teachers regarded the process of completing the edTPA as a “hoop” to jump through and in some cases had a negative impact on learning to teach;
- Novice teachers gave credit for their assessment practices to their programs with specific references to courses, cooperating teachers, and field experiences; and
- Novice teachers’ current assessment practices include best practices in assessment.

This chapter will discuss the findings from Chapter 4 in relation to the literature review through each of the four themes. After the discussion of the findings, there will be a review of the limitations of the study and recommendations for future research which will be followed by the conclusion. These themes are discussed below in light of the literature and highlight the need for further study in the area of the impact on classroom practices.

Theme 1: Completing the edTPA had Little Impact on Assessment Practices

The survey and interview participants shared their perceptions that completing the edTPA had little or no impact on their current assessment practices. Teacher performance assessments for practicing teachers, such as National Board certification, have been shown to improve formative assessment practices for certification candidates (Sato, Wei, & Darling-Hammong, 2008). In addition to experienced teacher performance assessment having a positive impact on teacher practices, teacher performance assessments for pre-service teachers such as PACT have been shown to

positively impact growth in skills such as using assessment to modify lessons and attending to content standards, or outcomes (Chung, 2008; Whittaker & Nelson, 2013). Modifying lessons based on student assessment incorporates the elements of reflective practice that respond to the needs of the class as a whole and to individual learners, the expectations outlined in the edTPA assessment rubric on analyzing student work. Research on perceptions of the edTPA also indicates that pre-service teachers improved their practice in the areas of reflection, planning, and assessment (Bacon & Blachman, 2017). For assessment practices, in-service teachers reflected that they aligned goals to lessons, a practice that was specifically assessed by the edTPA.

Although the overall findings of this research study indicate that the participants perceived that completing the edTPA had little to no impact on their current assessment practices, there were some indicators in the survey commentary and interview transcripts that indicate some perceived benefit. There were very few positive comments about the edTPA from the survey, but one survey participant, a secondary English language arts educator, made the general comment that, “I think [the edTPA] was helpful and beneficial in terms of providing feedback.” Another survey participant who is an elementary educator indicated, “It helped me to deliver feedback that reflects a specific standard,” which is an expectation of the edTPA assessment rubric about providing feedback. These two comments from the survey are in agreement with the literature, but they represent only two participants’ opinions. The interview participants had little positive to say about impact of the edTPA process on their assessment practices, with the exception of Tony, who said it was helpful with

reflection. The overall findings in this study about the perceived level of impact the edTPA process had on current practices is not in agreement with the literature, but exploring the different perspectives for the process of completing the edTPA may offer some insight into this disconnect between candidate perception of the process and impact of the process on their assessment practices.

Theme 2: The edTPA Process was a “Hoop” or a Negative Experience

The open-ended questions from the survey and the interviews provided data about the perspectives of the participants regarding the edTPA process and its impact on their current practices. The literature concerning the experience of completing a teacher performance assessment range from being positive learning experiences to being disconnected from the reality of teaching (Pecheone & Chung, 2006; Sandholtz & Shea, 2012, 2015; Stewart et al., 2015; Torgerson et al., 2009). The specific concerns about the disconnect between the expectations of the edTPA and the reality of teaching are similar to findings in the literature. The literature explored the disconnect between the lesson design required by a university and the expectations of the edTPA in the area of special education (Kuranishi & Oyler, 2017), and the artificial teaching environment required to complete the edTPA in world language (Russell & Davidson Devall, 2016; Luna, 2016), which is similar to the disconnect for performing arts, world language, and physical education and health reported by the participants in this study. The negative experiences of the participants are also connected to the tensions that arise with a lack of consistent support from cooperating teachers and the demands of the edTPA that conflict with the field experience placement expectations (Meuwissen & Choppin, 2015; Othman et al., 2017). The

findings in this study support the perception that for many participants, completing the edTPA process did not support their teaching or learning and they reported a disconnect between what they were required to do for the edTPA and the reality of teaching.

Theme 3: There were Other Influences Impacting Assessment Practices

The data clearly showed that participants perceived that their current practices in assessment were strongly influenced by their programs and field experiences. This perception was across all groups in the study regardless of graduation year, level or subject taught. The review of literature did not surface research that indicated programs had a negative impact on candidate assessment practices and this theme agrees with the findings of Pecheone and Chung (2006) in a review of pre-service teacher learning while completing the PACT. Pre-service teachers completed a survey about their perceptions of their PACT experience. Of the participants who reported feeling prepared by their coursework and field experiences, approximately 85% believed that the PACT assessed knowledge and skills that were important to teaching. In the second year of the pilot of PACT, a revised survey asked about the learning value of the experience. The results of the survey of 590 pre-service teachers showed: 60% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they learned important skills through the process of completing the PACT, 72% agreed that the PACT improved their ability to reflect on their teaching, and 64% agreed that PACT improved their assessment practices. Pre-service teacher reports of learning were positively associated (significance at .001) with reported levels of support and preparation from the courses in their educator preparation program field experiences. Pre-service teachers who

strongly agreed that they learned important skills through the PACT or that their coursework prepared them for the assessment scored significantly higher on the PACT than pre-service teachers who strongly disagreed that they learned from completing the PACT or felt prepared.

Although participants from this study credit their learning and use of assessment practices to the components of their educator preparation programs, some participants also indicated they were learning on the job. Literature that explores the decline of the impact of an educator preparation program on in-service teachers' practices in favor of the impact of their teaching environment indicates the difficulty of determining at what point teacher practices can still be credited to the educator preparation program. This surfaces in the research about linking student performance to educator preparation programs and the difficulty of deriving a value-added model that accurately connects student learning to specific attributes or experiences of in-service teachers. A study by Goldhaber, Liddle, and Theobald (2013) used a value-added model to study the impact of educator preparation on student achievement using four components: the individual teaching ability, the match between teachers and their environment, their experience in the labor market, and the quality of their educator preparation program. The study used data from state databases that link teacher education, test scores, and credentials to student assessment and demographics. Of interest is the decay of program effects over time, which indicated the influence of the educator preparation program decayed to 78% in the first five years, with a 'half-life' for educator preparation program effects between 12.9 and 13.7 years for math and between 11.3 and 15.5 years in reading. Another value-added model developed by

Meyer, Pyatigorsky, and Rice (2014) discussed the effect of time since graduation which translates into job experience. Of interest to this study is the reasons that experience, or years since graduation, should be accounted for in a value-added model: first year performance is unlikely to provide a true measure and measures of teacher performance will fluctuate from year to year which requires measurement over several years.

The participants of this study were in their first three years of teaching and perceived that their learning about assessment practices did not come from completing the edTPA but from the educator preparation programs which includes their coursework and field experiences. There is research on value-added models that attempt to account for time since graduation when determining effects of the educator preparation program, yet the participants in this study were clear that they did learn assessment practices in their educator preparation programs and they use these practices in their classrooms.

Theme 4: Novice Teachers Learned and Now Use Best Practices in Assessment

The interview participants provided information about their current assessment practices that indicate alignment with national teacher standards for assessment practices. Teaching assessment to pre-service teachers should be a deliberate practice that leads to using assessment in the classroom to guide teaching, a specific disposition in the assessment rubrics of the edTPA in which candidates analyze students work and should include next steps that propose support related to learning objectives. In a study that explored how a one-year Master's program that fully integrated assessment learning in coursework observations, and teaching practices

(Hill et al., 2017), most candidates moved from viewing assessment in summative terms to understanding the role of assessment in learning. During the course of the study at a New Zealand University, assessment learning was incorporated within all courses, interwoven through coursework, observations of classroom teaching and learning, and teaching practice. The focus of the study was to incorporate assessment practices that support equity, specifically using evidence to scaffold learning and improve teaching. One of the data sources was a pre- and post-survey that used Likert-type items to measure confidence using assessment practices on a scale of 1 being not at all confident and 6 being very highly confident. In the pre-survey, pre-service teachers were slightly confident about collecting and using multiple sources of information to assess learning and in the post-survey, most reported being highly or very highly confident. Confidence also increased to highly confident in the areas of establishing and articulating learning goals with individual learners, supporting learners to reflect upon and assess their own learning, and using assessment practices and other evidence to inform teaching.

Although the participants in this study did not describe a direct link between the process of completing the edTPA and their assessment practices, the practices described by some of the interview participants included using assessment to guide teaching and reflective practice. The reported activities were aligned with best practices in assessment as described by national teaching standards. Many survey and interview participants did attribute their understanding of assessment practices to their program, their mentor teachers, or both. Another qualitative study examined the pedagogical conditions that supported learning about assessment (DeLuca et al., &

Cao, 2013) which included critical reflection and planning for learning, both of which are emphasized in the process of completing the edTPA and although not a theme of the findings, the development of reflective practice was mentioned by survey and interview participants as a positive of the edTPA process.

Regardless of graduation year, subject, or grade level taught, participants clearly perceived that what they learned about assessment came more through student teaching and coursework than the edTPA process, but it is difficult to determine whether they are learning these practices because programs were already teaching in this manner, or that the requirements of the edTPA shifted course structure to incorporate the knowledge and skills necessary to successfully complete the edTPA process.

Limitations of the Study

To collect data that represented multiple perspectives on the process of completing the edTPA, this study aimed to collect data from participants that represented the variety of educator preparation programs available in Oregon, different levels of certification completed, and completion during each of the three years that the edTPA has been used for certification. Of the 16 educator preparation programs in Oregon, 4 agreed to send information about the research study with a link to the survey, which had the possibility of reaching approximately 30% of the statewide program graduates from that time period. The reach of the survey included graduates who attended private and public institutions in both urban and rural settings, and those who received both graduate and undergraduate degrees. The sample for this study was 41 participants, which represents fewer than 1% of all program completers from 2016-

2018, and it was a convenience sample. The majority of survey participants were Master's students from private institutions who completed an elementary edTPA portfolio in 2018. The overwhelming perception of the impact of the edTPA on current assessment practices was that it had little to no impact. Just under 30% ($n = 12$) of the survey participants indicated a level of impact of "a lot" or "a great deal" on one or more of the eight assessment topics and 7% ($n = 3$) indicated an impact of "a lot" or "a great deal" on three or more assessment topics. This limits the generalizability of this study because the sample did not include the perspective of participants who perceived that the edTPA process had a positive impact on their assessment practices and the sample was not large enough to ensure saturation of different perspectives (Merriam, & Tisdell, 2016).

Exploring how to increase the response surfaced research on why participants respond to surveys. Dillman (2014, chapter 2) suggests methods to increase response rates that includes increasing the benefits of survey participation, decreasing the cost of participation, and establishing trust. These factors were considered in the design of the survey, the outreach email, and the incentive offered for participating in the hope of increasing the response rate. Of concern however, is the bias that may have motivated some participants to respond, specifically an interest in the edTPA because interest in the subject influences the choice to respond to a survey. In a survey of 454 graduate student discussion list subscribers of the American Educational Research Association, Saleh and Bista (2017) found that 88.2% of the participants agreed with the statement, "I am more inclined to complete the survey if I have a vested interest in the topic." Although the participants in this study indicated that the edTPA had little to

no impact on their assessment practices, the perception that the edTPA was a waste of time or had a negative impact on assessment practices may have been a strong enough interest in the topic of the edTPA to respond to the survey, though it was a negative interest.

The data collected for this survey was self-reported by the participants in three opportunities: responses to Likert-scale prompts on a survey, open-ended responses to prompts on a survey, and responses to one-on-one semi-structured interview questions. Additional evidence such as edTPA portfolio scores, coursework, and the perspectives of professors and cooperating teachers that could link their edTPA experiences to current assessment practices and student outcomes would increase the reliability of this study. Multiple layers of triangulations strengthen reliability of qualitative studies (Merriam, & Tisdell, 2016).

This study is also limited by the design of the survey because themes that surfaced in the analysis were not anticipated and the responses did not include data indicating the role of reflective practice in assessment practices. Multiple survey and interview participants spontaneously called out their professors, courses, and cooperating teachers and a main source of how they learned assessment practices even when the questions did not specifically ask about educator preparation programs. Without knowing whether educator preparation programs are designing programs specifically to meet the demands of the edTPA it is difficult to disentangle learning from the program from learning through the process of completing the edTPA. The instruments also did not capture the level of reflective practice embedded in novice teacher assessment practices. The survey and interview did not capture what I had

intended which indicates a need for further field testing and validation of the instruments (Benson, & Clark, 1982; Merriam, & Tisdell, 2016).

This study explored the impact of completing the edTPA process on the assessment practices of novice teachers, but the limitations indicate any findings should be interpreted with caution. The themes that emerged through the survey comments and interview transcripts, however, indicate that further research is needed to explore any connections between the assessment practices that novice teachers use in their classrooms, the edTPA process, and the contributions of the educator preparation programs in Oregon.

Future Research

Future research on this topic would require addressing the limitations of the study to increase validity and reliability. First of all, the limitations of the sampling strategy and the triangulation of the data would need to be addressed as well as additional testing and revision of the instruments to increase reliability and validity of the data collected. This could be alleviated by collecting data about the impact of the edTPA process on the assessment practices of novice teachers from additional sources such as teaching artifacts, supervisor observations and evaluations, and collecting data at different time periods through the edTPA process and into the first years of teaching.

One theme that emerged from the study was that novice teachers gave credit for their assessment practices to their programs with specific references to courses, cooperating teachers, and field experiences. This theme emerged due to the quantity of comments from survey participants and interview transcripts that mentioned these

elements of the educator preparation program. While further research is needed to disentangle what students learned from programs and what they learned through the edTPA process, a third influence should be considered, which is learning that happens in the teaching environments such as collaboration with peers and professional development.

There is still a need for studies that explore the impact of the edTPA process on novice teacher assessment practices, which includes how the edTPA requirements are implemented in the educator preparation program and the field experience, as well as exploring how candidates and programs utilize edTPA data to reflect on their practices. Further research would need to include an examination of any connections between student outcomes and edTPA performance to explore the validity of the edTPA as an educative experience that supports effective assessment practices and therefore improved student outcomes.

Implications

There are multiple stakeholders that could be impacted by the findings in this study. Pre-service teachers are clearly impacted by their program and field experiences and changes made to accommodate the edTPA requirements should consider their perspectives. There are implications for the educator preparation programs in consideration of the practices that graduates report and the influence of the program and cooperating teachers on those practices. For the state of Oregon, policymakers should consider the implications of implementing a teacher performance assessment that has not been linked to improved teacher practices or improved student outcomes.

This study brings to light the differences in candidate perceptions of the edTPA process and their learning about assessment practices. Participants generally believed that the edTPA process was not a good use of their time or that the process of assembling the portfolio had little or no impact on their learning about assessment practices. Participants were able to acknowledge the role that the educator preparation program played in their learning with regard to both coursework and the field experience placement, and there was awareness that learning about assessment continues into practice. As the program plays such an important role in the development of pre-service teachers, there is a clear need to coordinate and collaborate across programs to standardize best practices and ensure the field experience placements support candidate growth and development. Georgia teacher educators started looking at the edTPA after the state began exploring content-specific teacher performance assessments for pre-service teachers (Fenton, & Wetherington). Seven educator preparation programs in the state participated in a national field test in 2012 and the experience was shared at a summit which led to an organic process of adoption of the edTPA as a statewide assessment. This allowed for time to collaborate across institutions that included the 59 educator preparation programs in the state, the Georgia Professional Standards Commission, and the P-12 systems and include these institutions in the process. Pre-service teachers enter the teaching profession prepared to discuss where they need support and administrators are ready to provide the support novice teachers need to be successful. Data from the edTPA rubrics can guide discussions within and among programs to highlight strengths and areas for improvement. Oregon educator preparation programs have started this process with a

statewide edTPA conference that was held in November 2018. With a coordinated effort, Oregon programs have the potential to influence legislation that takes control away from local programs and bring the decisions about teacher licensure back to the state and the educator preparation programs.

Novice teachers use assessment to guide their instruction and it is a set of dispositions and skills that must be learned. The edTPA is structured to elicit evidence that pre-service teachers utilize assessment practices to understand their student needs and use reflective practice to adjust instruction accordingly, which is challenging to evaluate in a snapshot of the entire student teaching experience. Further research on the best practices at the educator preparation program level for teaching about assessment could offer valuable insight that would support teacher candidate development in the area of assessment, that could then support candidates prior to creating the portfolio for the edTPA. CAEP requires programs to, “demonstrate that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve” (CCSSO, 2011). Assessment is challenging to learn and intentionality of instruction in this area supports pre-service and in-service teachers, their P-12 students, and also supports the continued development of best practices in the educator preparation program. The data collected from the edTPA portfolio scores would guide the discussions at the educator preparation program level and lead to better prepared teachers entering the classroom. The data analysis from this study did not support the educative nature of the edTPA for candidates but could be educative for programs that support the growth and development of teacher candidates for successful completion of the edTPA.

Conclusion

This study examined the level of impact that completing the edTPA process had on the assessment practices of novice teachers. The data showed that novice teacher perception of the impact is little or not at all and in some cases, the impact was detrimental to learning about assessment. Deeper examination of how survey and interview participants learned about assessment practices showed that the educator preparation program had a larger impact on current assessment practices than the edTPA. The participants self-reported their current assessment practices and the descriptions align with what is best practices for assessment, which highlights the efforts of the educator preparation programs. These outcomes are not surprising and show that educator preparation programs are meeting the needs of teacher candidates, yet the lack of language in the commentary that is reflective in nature shows there is still room to grow. The standardization of expectations for candidates to become teachers by using the edTPA for licensure decisions has impacted educator preparation programs and teacher candidates and further research is needed to determine the longer-term consequences.

Appendix A

Survey Questions

Introduction:

1. Did you complete the edTPA as part of your Educator Preparation Program?
(filter question, no response ends survey)
 - a. What was the area and level?
2. Are you currently employed as a teacher in a K-12 school? (filter question, no response ends survey)
 - a. What grade/subject do you currently teach?

Section 1:

3. What year did you complete your EPP? (2016, 2017, 2018, other)
4. What degree did you complete? (Master's, Bachelor's)
5. Was your EPP institution public or private? (Public, Private)

Section 2:

The following questions are about the process of completing the edTPA, specifically the assessment portion. For each statement, indicate your level of agreement. Each section will provide an opportunity for you to add clarifying or explanatory information about your response.

Not at all a little a moderate amount a lot a great deal

Analyzing Student Work

6. To what extent did participating in the edTPA process increase your ability to analyze student work samples to identify what students do right and wrong? (1-5)
7. To what extent did participating in the edTPA process increase your ability to analyze student work samples to identify patterns of learning for the whole class? (1-5)
8. *Please add any clarifying or explanatory information about analyzing student works samples as part of the edTPA process. (open-ended)*

Feedback

9. To what extent did participating in the edTPA process increase your ability to provide specific feedback that addresses strengths and needs? (1-5)
10. To what extent did participating in the edTPA process increase your ability to provide specific feedback that relates to the learning objectives? (1-5)
11. *Please add any clarifying or explanatory information about providing feedback as part of the edTPA process. (open-ended)*

12. To what extent did participating in the edTPA process increase your ability to support specific students to understand and use feedback? (1-5)
13. *Please add any clarifying or explanatory information about supporting specific students as part of the edTPA process. (open-ended)*

Language

14. To what extent did participating in the edTPA process increase your ability to support content-specific language use? (1-5)
15. *Please add any clarifying or explanatory information about attending to language use as part of the edTPA process. (open-ended)*

Next Steps for Instruction

16. To what extent did participating in the edTPA process increase your ability to identify next steps that support individuals and groups? (1-5)
17. To what extent did participating in the edTPA process increase your ability to justify next steps with principles from research and/or theory? (1-5)
18. *Please add any clarifying or explanatory information about identifying next steps as part of the edTPA process. (open-ended)*

Section 3:

19. What else would you like to share about the impact of the edTPA on your assessment practices? (open-ended)
20. Please describe any of your current methods for assessment that were impacted by completing the edTPA portfolio? (open-ended)

Section 4:

Would you be willing to participate in an interview as a follow-up to this survey?

Your Name:

Email:

Phone:

Preferred method of contact (email, phone message, text message)

End of Survey:

Thank you for participating in the survey. If you would like to be entered in a drawing for a \$20 gift card, please enter your name and email below. This information will only be used to randomly select and notify winners. Winners will be notified by January 1, 2019.

Appendix B

Interview Questions

1. How do you generally use formative assessment in your teaching?
2. What are a few examples of formative assessment that you regularly use?
3. Think about the types of assessment that you use within a typical unit; can you describe the process you use to assess student work?
 - a. One of the edTPA rubrics focuses on language use. Do any of the assessments have to do with how the student uses language?

Can you describe how you use assessment to evaluate how students use language?
 - b. Can you recall how you learned to assess student work?
4. In that same typical unit of study, what types of feedback would you give to students?
 - a. How do you adjust the feedback for different student needs?
 - b. What are some of the ways you might help students use the feedback you provide?
 - c. Can you recall how you learned to use feedback as a practice?
5. How would you use information from formative assessments to plan what to do next in a typical unit?
 - a. How do you incorporate different student needs in your planning process?
 - b. Can you recall how you learned to plan next steps for instruction?
6. How are your current practices, if at all, informed by having completed the edTPA?
7. What effect, if any, did the edTPA have on your understanding and use of assessment?
8. Do you have any closing thoughts about the edTPA process or assessment in general that you would like to share? Is there anything I didn't ask that I need to know?

Appendix C

Written Information Sheet for Survey

THANK YOU for taking this survey exploring the impact of the edTPA process on the assessment practices of new teachers! Please review the information below regarding your consent to participate.

If this survey seems familiar, you may have already received a request from a different institution. To preserve the integrity of the data, please take the survey ONE time.

Click the next arrow when you are ready to start.

There are no perceived risks to the subjects, although because the portfolio itself is high-stakes, some may feel anxious about thinking about the process. You may personally benefit by viewing the edTPA from a different lens, and the findings may provide an increased understanding of the potential impact on classroom practices. However, I cannot guarantee that you personally will receive any benefits from this research.

The survey can be completed anonymously. If you would like to participate in a follow-up interview, you will be asked to supply contact information at the end of the survey. Regardless, survey results will be summarized in the final study and any individual data will be assigned an identifying number. No individual names or identifying information will be revealed.

Your participation is voluntary and if you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time without penalty. You can choose not to answer any particular question(s). If you have questions about the study, please feel free to contact me at york16@up.edu or my advisor Nicole Ralston at ralston@up.edu. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, please contact the UP Institutional Research Board at irb@up.edu.

Submission of your survey responses indicates that you have read and understand the information provided above, that you willingly agree to participate, that you may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue your participation without penalty, and that you are not waiving any legal claims. If you choose not to participate, simply do not complete the questionnaire.

Appendix D

Informed Consent for Interview

Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed as part of the research study for Michelle York, a doctoral candidate at the University of Portland. I am conducting this interview to collect data about the level of influence completing the edTPA may or may not have had on your current classroom practices in assessment.

If you decide to participate, the interview should take no more than 30 minutes to complete. The interview will be recorded to ensure accuracy. There are no perceived risks to the subjects, although because the portfolio itself is high-stakes, some may feel anxious about thinking about the process. You may personally benefit by viewing the edTPA from a different lens, and the findings may provide an increased understanding of the potential impact on classroom practices. However, I cannot guarantee that you personally will receive any benefits from this research. Participants will receive a \$20 gift card for participation in the interview.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. Subject identities will be kept confidential. No individual names or identifying information will be revealed in the study. Each interview participant will be assigned an identifying number, which will be kept in a separate spreadsheet on a password protected computer.

Your participation is voluntary and if you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time without penalty. You can choose not to answer any particular question(s).

If you have questions about the study, please feel free to contact me at york16@up.edu or my advisor Nicole Ralston at ralston@up.edu. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, please contact the UP Institutional Research Board at irb@up.edu.

Your signature indicates that you have read and understand the information provided above, that you willingly agree to participate, that you may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty, that you will receive a copy of this form, and that you are not waiving any legal claims.

Printed Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

References

- American Educational Research Association (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington, D.C.: AERA.
- Bacon, J., & Blachman, S. (2017). A disability studies in education analysis of the edTPA through teacher candidate perspectives. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 40*(4). 278-286. doi: 10.1177/0888406417730110.
- Benson, J., & Clark, F. (1982). A guide for instrument development and validation. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 36*(12), 789-800. Retrieved from: <http://ajot.aota.org/> on 07/23/2018 Terms of Use: <http://AOTA.org/terms>.
- Betts, J.R., Zau, A.C., & Rice, L.A. (2003). Determinants of Student Achievement: New evidence from San Diego. San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California.
- Black, P. (2015). Formative assessment: An optimistic but incomplete vision. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 22*(1), 161-177. doi:10.1080/0969594X.2014.999643.
- Black, P. (2018). Helping students to become capable learners. *European Journal of Education, 53*, 144–159. doi:10.1111/ejed.12273.

- Black, P., & William, D. (2008). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Accountability*, 21, 5–31.
doi:10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5.
- Braund, H., & DeLuca, C. (2017). Elementary students as active agents in their learning: An empirical study of the connections between assessment practices and student metacognition. *Australian Educational Research*, 45, 65-85.
doi:10.1007/s13384-018-0265-z.
- Brookhart, S. M., Moss, C. M., & Long, B. A. (2009). Promoting student ownership of learning through high-impact formative assessment practices. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Education*, 6(12), 52-67.
- Calderhead, J. (1992). The role of reflection in learning to teach. In L. Valli (Ed.), *Reflective teacher education* (pp. 143-145). New York: SUNY.
- Cavalluzo, L., Barrow, L., Henderson, S., Mokher, C., & Sartain, L. (2014). *National Board certification as professional development: an empirical study of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards process*. The CNA Corporation.
- Chung, R. R. (2008). Beyond assessment: Performance assessment in teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 35(1). 7-28.
- Clark, I. (2012). Formative assessment: Assessment is for self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychology Review*, 24, 205–249. doi:10.1007/s10648-011-9191-6.
- Connecticut General Assembly, Legislative Program Review and Investigations Committee. (2007, December 18). *Beginning Educator Support and Training*

Program. Retrieved from

https://www.cga.ct.gov/2007/pridata/Studies/BEST_Final_Report_Executive_Summary.htm.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2013). *CAEP 2013 standards for accreditation of educator preparation*. Washington, D. C.: Author.

Retrieved from <http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/final-board-amended-20150612.pdf>.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2011). *InTASC model core teaching standards: A resource for state dialogue*. Washington, D. C.: Author.

Retrieved from https://www.ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-11/InTASC_Model_Core_Teaching_Standards_2011.pdf.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage. Chapter 3: Core mixed methods designs.

Cultivating reflective practice and inquiry. (1999). In K. A. Norlander-Case, T. G. Reagan, & C. W. Case (Eds.), *The professional teacher: The preparation and nurturance of the reflective practitioner* (pp. 25-36). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Curry, C. A., Mwavita, M., Holter, A., & Harrie, E. (2014). Getting assessment right at the classroom level: Using formative assessment for decision-making. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Accountability*, 28, 89-104. doi:10.1007/s11092-015-9226-5.

- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *Evaluating teacher effectiveness: How teacher performance assessments can measure and improve teaching*. Retrieved from Center for American Progress website:
<https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education-k-12/reports/2010/10/19/8502/evaluating-teacher-effectiveness/>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Newton, X., & Wei, R. C. (2010). Evaluating teacher education outcomes: A study of the Stanford Teacher Education Programme. *Journal of Education for Teaching* 36(4). 369-388. doi: 10.1080/02607476.2010.513844.
- DeLuca, C., Chavez, T., Bellara, A., & Cao, C. (2013). Pedagogies for preservice assessment education: Supporting teacher candidates' assessment literacy development. *The Teacher Educator*, 48, 128–142.
doi:10.1080/08878730.2012.760024.
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method (4th ed.). Hoboken: Wiley.
Chapter 4: The fundamentals of writing questions.
- Executive Order No. 16-03, Office of the Governor, State of Oregon, 3 (2016).
- Fenster, M. J., & Judd, D. L. (2008). *Relating teacher candidate performance to their students' subject specific academic achievement using teacher work sample methodology*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.
- Fenton, A. M., & Wetherington, P. (2016, January). Georgia's teacher performance assessment. *National Association of State Boards of Education*, 26-29.

- Goldhaber, D., & Anthony, E. (2007). Can teacher quality be effectively assessed? *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 89(1), 134-150.
- Goldhaber, D., Liddle, S., & Theobald, R. (2013). The gateway to the profession: Assessing teacher preparation programs based on student achievement. *Economics of Education Review* 34(2013), 29-44.
- Green, T. & Waggonner, J. (2008). Teacher Work Sample Methodology. In A. Wise, P. Ehrenberg, & J. Liebbrand (Eds.), *It's all about student learning: Assessing teacher candidates' ability to impact P-12 students* (pp. 125-134). Washington, D. C.: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.
- Greenberg, J., & Walsh, K. (2012). *What teacher preparation programs teach about K-12 assessment: A review*. Retrieved from National Council on Teacher Quality website:
https://www.nctq.org/dmsView/What_Teacher_Prep_Programs_Teach_K-12_Assessment_NCTQ_Report.
- Haefner, T., McIntyre, E., & Spooner, M. (2014). The CAEP standards and research on educator preparation programs: Linking clinical partnerships with program impact. *Peabody Journal of Education* 89(4), 516-532. doi: 10.1080/0161956X.2014.938998.
- Hattie, J. A. (1999). *Influences on Student Learning*. Paper presented at the University of Auckland, Australia.
- Hattie, J. A. (2003, October). *Teachers make a difference: What is the research evidence?* Paper presented at the ACER Research Conference, Melbourne, Australia.

- Hattie, J. A., & Clarke, S., (2019). Visible Learning: Feedback. *What is feedback?* (pp. 1-7). Oxford, UK: Routledge.
- Hattie, J. A., & Clarke, S., (2019). Visible Learning: Feedback. *A feedback culture* (pp. 8-47). Oxford, UK: Routledge.
- Hattie, J. A., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. doi:10.3102/003465430298487.
- Hébert, C. (2017). What do we really know about the edTPA? Research, PACT, and packaging a local teacher performance assessment for national use. *The Educational Forum* 81(1). 68-82. doi: 10.1080/00131725.2016.1242680.
- Heil, L., & Berg, M. H. (2017). Something happened on the way to completing the edTPA: A case study of teacher candidates' perceptions of the edTPA. *Contributions to Music Education*, 42, 181-199.
- Hiebert, J., Annek, M., Berk, D., & Jansen, A. (2007). Preparing teachers to learn from teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(1), 47-61
doi:10.1177/0022487106295726.
- Hildebrandt, S. A., Swanson, P. (2014). World language teacher candidate performance on edTPA: An exploratory study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 47(4). 576-591. doi: 10.1111/flan.12117.
- Hill, M. F., Ell, F., Grudnoff, L., Haigh, M., Cochran-Smith, M., Chang, W., & Ludlow, L. (2017). Assessment for equity: Learning how to use evidence to scaffold learning and improve teaching. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 24(2), 185-204. doi:10.1080/0969594X.2016.1253541.

- Hunzicker, J. (2008). *The leverage of national board candidacy: An exploration of teacher learning*. ().Online Submission.
- Hunzicker, J. (2011). Teacher learning through national board candidacy: A conceptual model. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 38(3), 191-209.
- Hutt, E. L., Gottlieb, J., & Cohen, J. J. (2016). Diffusion in a vacuum: edTPA, legitimacy, and the rhetoric of teacher professionalization. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 69, 52-61.
- Kuranishi, A., & Oyler, C. (2017). I failed the edTPA. *Teacher Education and Special Education* 40(4). 299-313. doi: 10.1177/0888406417730111.
- Ledwell, K. & Oyler, C. (2016). Unstandardized responses to a “standardized” test: The edTPA as gatekeeper and curriculum change agent. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 67(2). 120-134. doi: 10.117.0022487115624739.
- Li, H. (2016). How is formative assessment related to students’ reading achievement? Findings from PISA 2009. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 23(4), 473-494. doi: 10.1080/0969594X.2016.1139543
- Luna, S. M. (2016). (Re)defining “good teaching”: Teacher performance assessments and critical race theory in early childhood teacher education. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 17(4). 442-446. doi: 10.1177/146399116677932.
- Lustick, D., & Sykes, G. (2006). National board certification as professional development: What are teachers learning? *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 14(5), 1-46.
- Martin, C. S., Polly, D., Wang, C., Lambert, R. G., & Pugalee, D. K. (2016). Perspectives and practices of elementary teachers using an internet-based

formative assessment tool: The case of Assessing Mathematics Concepts.

International Journal for Technology in Mathematics Education, 23(1), 3-12.

doi: 10.1564/tme_v23.1.01.

McConney, A. A., Schalock, M. D., & Schalock, H. D. (1998). Focusing improvement and quality assurance: Work samples as authentic performance measures of prospective teachers' effectiveness. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 11, 343-363.

McLean, H. (2018). This is the way to teach: Insights from academics and students that supports learning. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. doi:10.1080/02602938.2018.1446508.

Merriam, S., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). Qualitative research A guide to design and implementation (4th ed.). Hoboken: Wiley. Chapter 5: Conducting Effective Interviews.

Meuwissen, K. W., & Choppin, J. M. (2015). Preservices teachers' adaptations to tensions associated with the edTPA during its early implementation in New York and Washington states. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 23(103). doi: 10.14507/epaa.v23.2078.

Meyer, R., Pyatigorsky, M., & Rice, A. (2014). Evaluation of educators and educator preparation programs: Models and systems in theory and practice. (WCER working paper no. 2014-6). Retrieved from Wisconsin Center for Education Research website:
<http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/publications/workingPapers/papers.php>

- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2016) *What teachers should know and be able to do*. Retrieved from <http://accomplishedteacher.org/>
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2018) *Scoring guide*. Retrieved from <http://accomplishedteacher.org/>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). Table 208.20. Public and private elementary and secondary teachers, enrollment, pupil/teacher ratios, and new teacher hires: Selected years, fall 1955 through fall 2025. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/tables/dt15_208.20.asp?current=yes.
- Oregon Administrative Rules, 584.400 (2017). Transition to national accreditation. 0015 §§2,4 (2018).
- Oregon Administrative Rules, 584.400 (2017). Teacher candidate performance assessments. 0120 §§1,2 (2018).
- Oregon Department of Education (2017, November 30). *Statewide Report Card 2016-2017* (Office of the Deputy Superintendent). Retrieved from <https://www.oregon.gov/ode/schools-and-districts/reportcards/Documents/rptcard2017.pdf>
- Oregon Department of Education (2018, November 30). *Statewide Report Card 2017-2018* (Office of the Deputy Superintendent). Retrieved from <https://www.oregon.gov/ode/schools-and-districts/reportcards/Documents/rptcard2018.pdf>
- Oregon Revised Statutes, 342.147 (2017). Teacher Education Program Accreditation Account. 756 §§4,5 (2015).

- Othman, L. B., Robinson, R., & Molfenter, N. F. (2017). Emerging issues with consequential use of the edTPA: Overall the through a special education lens. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 40(4). 269-277. doi: 10.1177.0888406414418251.
- Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation method* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pechione, R. L., Chung, R. R. (2006, January/February). Evidence in teacher education: The performance assessment for California teachers (PACT). *Journal of Teacher Education* 57(1). 22-36. doi: 10.1177/0022487105284045.
- Pechione, R. L., Whittaker, A., & Klesch, H. (2017, November). *Educative assessment & meaningful support: 2016 edTPA administrative report*. (Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity).
- Pugach, M. C. (2017). The edTPA as an occasion for structuring faculty dialogue across the divide? A “Checklist Manifesto” for a more inclusive teacher education. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 40(4). 314-321. doi: 10.1177/0888406417705320.
- Quality counts 2018: Grading the states. (2018, January 17). *Education Week*. Retrieved from <https://www.edweek.org/ew/collections/quality-counts-2018-state-grades/index.html>
- Quality counts 2019: Grading the states. (2019, January 16). *Education Week*. Retrieved from <https://www.edweek.org/ew/collections/quality-counts-2019-state-grades/index.html>

- Ratner, A. R., & Kolman, J. S. (2016). Breakers, benders, and obeyers: Inquiring into teacher educators' mediation of edTPA. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24(35). doi: 10.14507/epaa.v24.2112.
- Rickenbrode, R., Drake, G., Pomerance, L., & Walsh, K. (2018). *2018 Teacher prep review*. National Council on Teacher Quality website: https://www.nctq.org/dmsView/2018_Teacher_Prep_Review_733174.
- Russell, V., & Davidson Devall, K. F. (2016). An examination of the edTPA portfolio assessment and other measures of teacher preparation and readiness. *Foreign Language Annals*, 49(3), 479-501. doi: 10.1111/flan.12209.
- Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Saleh, Al, & Bista, K. (2017). Examining factors impacting online survey response rates in educational research: Perceptions of graduate students. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation* 13(29). 63-74.
- Sandholtz, J. H., & Shea, L. M. (2012). Predicting performance: A comparison of university supervisors' predictions and teachers candidates' scores on a teaching performance assessment. *Journal of Teacher Education* 63(1). 39-50. doi: 10.1177.0022487111424475.
- Sandholtz, J. H., & Shea, L. M. (2015, Spring). Examining the extremes: High and low performance on a teaching performance assessment for licensure. *Teacher Education Quarterly*. 17-42.
- Sato, M. (2014). What is the underlying conception of teaching of the edTPA? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 65(5), 421-434. doi: 10.1177/0022487114542518.

- Sato, M., Wei, R. C., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2008). Improving teachers' assessment practices through professional development: The case of National Board Certification. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(3), 669-700 doi:10.3102/0002831208316955.
- Schalock, D., & Schalock, M. (2011). Teacher Work Sample Methodology at Western Oregon University. In H. Rosselli, M. Girod, & M. Brodsky (Eds.), *Connecting teaching and learning: History, evolution, and case studies of Teacher Work Sample Methodology* (pp. 24-42). Plymouth, UK: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions* (pp. 1-40). San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.
- Shepard, L. A. (2000). The role of classroom assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher*, 29(7), 4-14.
- Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity (SCALE). (2013). *edTPA field test: Summary report*. Retrieved from <https://scale.stanford.edu>.
- Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity (SCALE). (2014). *Evaluation rubric: Secondary mathematics*. Palo Alto, CA: Author.
- Stewart, A. R., Scalzo, J. N., Merino, N., & Nilsen, K. (2015, Summer). Beyond the criteria: Evidence of teacher learning in a performance assessment. *Teacher Education Quarterly*. 33-58.

Stiggins, R., & Chappuis, J. (2006). What a difference a word makes: Assessment

“for” learning rather than assessment “of” learning helps student success.

Journal of Staff Development, 27(1), 10-14.

Summary of Assessments. (2008). In A. E. Wise, P. Ehrenberg, & J. Leibbrand (Eds.),

It's all about student learning: Assessing teacher candidates' ability to impact

P-12 students. (pp. 19-26). Washington, DC. NCATE

Teacher Standards and Practices Commission. (2014, March 5–7). *Meeting agenda of*

the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission. Retrieved from

<https://www.oregon.gov/tspc/Pages/Commission/Meetings.aspx>

Thorpe, R. (2014). Sustaining the teaching profession. *New England Journal of Public*

Policy, 26(1). Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.umb.edu/nejpp/vol26/iss1/5>.

Torgerson, C. W., Macy, S. R., Beare, P., & Tanner, D. E. (2009). Fresno assessment

of student teachers: A teacher performance assessment that informs practice.

Issues in Teacher Education 18(1). 63-82.

Tracz, S. Daugherty J., Herderson-Sparks, J., Newman, C., & Sienty, S. (2005). The

impact of NBPTS participation on teacher practice: Learning from teacher

perspectives. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 28(3), 36-50.

United States Department of Education (2017). *Title II Reports: National Teacher*

Preparation Data. Retrieved from:

https://title2.ed.gov/Public/Report/FullReport/FullReport.aspx?p=3_01.

Vollmeyer, R. & Rheinberg, F. (2005). A surprising effect of feedback on learning.

Learning and Instruction, 15, 589-602.

- Waggoner, J., Carroll, J., Merk, H., & Weitzel, B. N. (2015) Critics and critical analysis: Lessons from 19,000 P-12 students in candidates' classrooms. *Education Faculty Publications and Presentations* 25. Retrieved from http://pilotscholars.up.edu/edu_facpubs/25.
- Whittaker, A., & Nelson, C. (2013). Assessment with an “End in View”, *The New Educator*, 9(1). 77-93. doi: 10.1080/1547688X.2013.751315.
- Wilson, M., Hallam, P. J., Pechione, R., & Moss, P. A. (2014). Evaluating the validity of portfolio assessments for licensure decisions. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 22(6). doi: 10.14507/epaa.v22n6.2014.