

Perspectives on Educative Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) from Teacher Candidates and College Supervisors

Jie Zhang* · Younkyeong Nam** · Carole Pelttari***

2016. 04. 20.(접수) / 2016. 06. 07.(1심통과)/2016. 06. 27.(최종통과)

<< 요약 >>

As a response to the need of systematic teacher performance assessment, recently the Educative Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) has been developed and implemented in over 600 teacher preparation programs across nearly 40 states in US (Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity, 2015). However, little research has been conducted investigating ways teacher preparation programs improve the quality of their programs while helping their teacher candidates be well prepared for the edTPA. This study investigated perspectives of student teachers and their college supervisors regarding (1) the effectiveness of the teacher preparation program in a middle-sized public college in relation to edTPA completion and (2) the perceived value of the edTPA as preparation for becoming an effective teacher when New York State began to require successful completion of the edTPA for initial certification. Ninety-nine student teachers in both inclusive elementary and adolescence education programs and fourteen student teaching supervisors participated in the study. A teacher perception survey data including Likert Scale items and open-ended questions was collected as a main data source. Mixed methods were utilized to analyzed both quantitative and qualitative data during the academic year of 2014-2015. Based on the results, suggestions are discussed to better prepare teacher candidates for edTPA and the teaching profession. Lastly, implications about assessment systems of teaching practice in the context of South Korea are discussed.

Key words : edTPA, teacher preparation, teacher candidates, perspectives

* The College at Brockport-SUNY

** 부산대학교(교신저자): ynam@pusan.ac.kr

*** Carole Pelttari (The College at Brockport-SUNY)

I . Introduction

The Educative Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA), developed by the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE), is a teacher evaluation system, designed to develop and measure the effectiveness of pre-service teacher candidates on student learning through authentic performance assessments (Darling-Hammond, 2012). The stated goal of the edTPA assessment is to provide evidence of how a teacher candidate demonstrates his/her ability to teach all students in an authentic learning environment. EdTPA also aims to answer, via data-driven decisions, the essential question of whether a new teacher is ready for the job (edtpa.aacte.org, 2014).

In the early 1990s, teacher performance assessment were first developed for the National Board's Certification of accomplished teachers and later it has been used in some states for beginning teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2012). However, edTPA is the first effort to make teacher performance assessment for pre-service teachers that is standardized and supported for nation wide implementation.

The implementation of edTPA requires teacher candidates to demonstrate their ability to plan, instruct, and assess selected learning segments of three to five lessons, which are aligned with Common Core State Standards. The edTPA asks teacher candidates to submit artifacts demonstrating their understanding of their students (e.g., context for learning); ability to plan (e.g., lesson plans, instructional and assessment materials); ability to teach (e.g., video clips); ability to assess (e.g., assessment with baseline data, daily assessment, and final assessment with feedback); and ability to reflect and improve (e.g., planning, instruction, and assessment commentaries). In particular, one of the most important purpose of edTPA is to measure pre-service teachers'ability to assess students'learning. Actually edTPA pilot studies show that pre-service teachers'lack of ability to assess students'learning is the most critical problem (SCALE, 2013). The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), identifying as a partner in edTPA implementation, suggests the goal of the assessment is to ensure "new teachers are able to teach each student effectively and improve student achievement" (AACTE, 2014).

By 2014, the edTPA was being required of teacher candidates in only two states, New York and Washington, as a performance assessment for initial teacher certification, with dozens of states gearing up for certification requirements to begin (AACTE, 2014). This research holds

significance for programs across the U. S. because, to date, edTPA has been implemented in more than 600 teacher preparation programs in nearly 40 states (SCALE, 2015). Still, despite the changes in assessment requirements, little independent study has yet been conducted to investigate the effects of using the edTPA results as a measure to determine teacher candidates' status as initially certified educators. We also found scant research concerning the effects of states changing requirements when teacher candidates were already halfway through their teacher education programs. Seeing a need for further research we, like Lindauer, Burns, and Henry (2013), examined the perspectives of teacher candidates, cooperating teachers, and college supervisors regarding their perspectives of this new assessment in relation to the program of study leading up to these supervisory aspects of the edTPA.

Thus, the purpose of this study was to learn perspectives of student teaching candidates and their college supervisors regarding their experiences during Fall 2013 and Spring 2014, New York State's first year of requiring passing scores on edTPA to earn initial teacher certification. Specifically, we wanted to know if respondents believed that completing the teacher preparation program at this institution had effectively prepared student teachers to successfully complete the edTPA and if the respondents believed completion of the edTPA enhanced the candidates' effectiveness as teachers. In addition, we wanted to investigate if there is any difference between the participants role in the program (college supervisor and teacher candidates) Furthermore, we wanted to evaluate that our program and current courses had effectively prepared student teachers to successfully complete the edTPA.

II. Literature Review

1. Benefits of Teacher Performance Assessments on Teacher Preparation Program

Darling-Hammond (2010), chief author of edTPA, states that structured teacher performance assessments directly evaluate what teachers do in authentic classroom settings. Compared to traditional paper-pencil tests, teacher performance assessments provide contextualized evidence of learning, and link teaching efforts to student growth (Darling-Hammond, 2010). Research

shows that performance assessments positively impact teacher preparation programs at programmatic levels (Peck & McDonald, 2013; Sloan, 2013). In California, teacher preparation programs receive aggregated data regarding their candidates' performance on PACT, by subject area and teaching dimensions of planning, instruction, assessment, reflection, and academic language; the data is used for curriculum and program improvement (Darling-Hammond, 2010).

In addition, a recently released study by Pecheone and Whittaker (2016) demonstrates case studies in different teacher preparation institution that implemented edTPA. The study describes how these teacher preparation program in different state modified their current courses and approaches based on edTPA and how their efforts positively impact teacher candidates' teaching performance not only for their content knowledge but also their practice of teaching in general. The results of this study imply that positive outcome of edTPA implementation is not only dependent on the edTPA assessment itself but also dependent on teacher educators efforts and willingness to make it more meaningful and contextualized to their students.

2. Benefits of Teacher Performance Assessments on Student Learning

Multiple studies indicate that teachers who engage in performance assessments are more effective in classrooms (Darling-Hammond, 2012). Teachers who have completed the process of National Board Certification, the Connecticut Beginning Educator Support and Training (BEST), or the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) report gaining content knowledge, paying more attention to standards-based and data-driven instruction and assessments, and focusing more on student learning (Athanasos, 1994; Sato, Wei, & Darling-Hammond, 2008; Darling-Hammond, Wei, & Johnson, 2009; Wei & Pecheone, 2010).

The results of various studies in different states, such as Florida, North Carolina, and California, have indicated that National Board Certified teachers produce positive impact on student learning (Clotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor, 2007; Cantrell, Fullerton, Kane, & Staiger, 2007; Bond, Smith, Baker, & Hattie, 2000). Likewise, studies of BEST and PACT show that both performance assessments serve as strong predictors of teachers' contribution to their students' achievement and learning growth (Wilson, Hallam, Pecheone, & Moss, 2007; Newton, 2010(a); Newton, 2010(b); Pecheone & Chung, 2006).

3. Concerns Related to Teacher Performance Assessments

The National Board assessments were developed for experienced veteran teachers (Guide, 2014), and the Connecticut BEST for second or third year teachers. Even though the edTPA follows the National Board assessments as its model, its use as a high-stakes assessment for new teachers' initial teaching licensure in some states, including New York State, is problematic. Several studies have investigated the dilemmas and tensions associated with the implementation of high-stakes performance assessments, such as PACT (Peck, Gallucci, & Sloan, 2010; Lit & Lotan, 2013) and edTPA (Meuwissen & Choppin, 2015). Peck, Gallucci, and Sloan (2010) discussed the tensions between state policy mandates and local program's integrity. Lit and Lotan (2013) discussed the dilemmas between the summative high-stakes assessment versus the formative nature of assessment, and the coherence of curricula and alignment of practice. Meuwissen and Choppin (2015) discussed the edTPA related tensions from preservice teachers' viewpoint.

Madeloni and Gorlewski (2013) label the edTPA as an imposition and invasion that "erases relationships, which are the fabric of teaching, and substitutes mechanization" (p. 19). The edTPA has begun to alter teacher preparation as "teacher educators discern the gaps between current programming and what this assessment measures" (Lewis & Morse, 2013, p. 67). Sandholtz and Shea (2012) found inconsistencies between teacher candidates' PACT scores and their college supervisors' prediction due to the different representations of instruction and assessments. Because of these concerns, the National Association of Multicultural Education (NAME) rejects the edTPA as a licensure exam (Sato, 2014; NAME, 2014; Meuwissen & Choppin, 2015).

While there has been increasing evidence of the positive impact about the edTPA in many aspects, teacher educators and students teachers still doubt about the effectiveness of the edTPA for teaching profession. Thus, the purpose of this study was to learn perspectives of student teaching candidates and their college supervisors regarding their experiences of edTPA preparation and examine the effectiveness of our teacher preparation program in terms of preparing edTPA. Furthermore, we wanted to evaluate that our program and current courses had effectively prepared student teachers to successfully complete the edTPA.

III. Method

This study employs case study method that the data was collected from one teacher preparation institution. This study also used mixed quantitative and qualitative methods to investigate participants' perspectives of (1) the effectiveness of the program in preparing teacher candidates to complete the edTPA, and (2) the value of edTPA for increasing a candidate's effectiveness as a teacher. We first report the context of the edTPA at the research site and the procedure of collecting and analyzing the data. The analyses and results of quantitative and qualitative data is presented respectively.

1. Context: edTPA at the Research Site

Teacher certificate exam has been administrated by individual state policy and process but is was guided by each state's *college and career readiness content standards* and the standard of *the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC)*. edTPA assessment is consistent with the state standards as well as the InTASE standards. However edTPA has been purposefully developed by the SCALE who partnered with the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) to deliver a support and assessment program for teacher candidates that can be used around the country. As a response, the New York state Board of Regents adopted the edTPA as a New York State performance assessment for initial teacher certification in February 2012; the exam has been required for teacher candidates graduating after May 1, 2014. Given the tight timeline, teacher preparation programs in New York needed to move quickly to align the existing curriculum to edTPA while continuing to prepare teacher candidates for teaching all children in authentic learning environments.

In order to respond to the changes related to the State's teacher certification examinations and to better prepare our teacher candidates, the faculty members in the inclusive education programs at the research site spared no effort for improvement. Based on the experiences of two faculty members and their 11 candidates during a Spring 2013 elementary education edTPA pilot, the department faculty and staff made several changes. The changes included (1) the creation of additional resources; (2) revision of the student teaching practicum and seminar; and (3) systematic curriculum mapping to embed edTPA tasks into content/methods courses and field experiences in three phases prior to student teaching.

Eight new resources were created to better prepare candidates for edTPA. First, a student teaching syllabus template with a recommended timeline was generated to facilitate candidates' completion of edTPA. A parent/student permission letter template was developed to assist candidates' seeking consent for video recording. Additional resources supplied to candidates included a checklist of required tasks and lesson plan templates based on the edTPA assessment handbooks; a list of resources on research/practice and academic language; technology support and tutorials for video recording, editing, compressing, and uploading; a brief introduction of edTPA to the cooperating teachers in the field; and an investment from the College of \$65,000 for 120 camera kits. Finally, an edTPA website was developed to provide convenient access for faculty and candidates to these edTPA-related resources.

In the student teaching phase, the student teaching seminar was switched to a co-teaching model. Led by a group of professors, the co-teaching model was enacted at both the elementary and adolescence levels to provide joint support to candidates. EdTPA related Questions and Answers became a part of the weekly student teaching seminar. Professional development workshops on edTPA were offered to the candidates before they started student teaching.

In addition to the actions related directly to the student teaching semester, all faculty members participated in a curriculum mapping across all courses in the inclusive programs at elementary and adolescence levels. Faculty created a matrix to map all the courses by core assignments and all the edTPA requirements by edTPA rubrics. Through the opportunity, faculty members realized that tasks such as practicing video recording and video analysis needed to be added into the phases prior to student teaching to better prepare the teacher candidates while they were already preparing candidates to develop main tasks of edTPA such as lesson plans and assessments.

2. Participants

Convenience samples were used to recruit participants. A total number of 99 student teaching candidates (87.6%) and 14 college supervisors (12.4%) at the research site participated in this survey voluntarily and anonymously during the school year of Fall 2013 to Spring 2014, contributing to a return rate of 75.3%.

<Table 1> Participant numbers by roles and programs in edTPA Task

Roles	Elementary	Secondary	Special Education	Total
Teacher Candidate	39	15	44	99
College Supervisor	6	5	3	14

3. Data Collection

The survey was developed by the first author and finalized by checking its face validity by two other authors. The survey questions were grouped into three categories: (1) participants' demographic information, including role (student teaching candidates or college supervisors), program (elementary or adolescence inclusive program), and the edTPA area they completed (edTPA elementary education, secondary education, or special education); (2) participants' evaluation of edTPA-related resources provided during student teaching; and (3) perspectives about edTPA preparation, completion, and its impact on teacher candidate preparation. After demographic information, each question sought participants' agreement level, measured by a 5-point Likert scale system (e.g., absolutely disagree = 1, disagree = 2, neutral = 3, agree = 4, and absolutely agree = 5).

In addition to the Likert scale questions, open-ended questions were included to increase the breadth of responses (Fontana & Frey, 2005; author, et al., 2014). We asked five short essay questions to gain more insight on the participants' perspectives: (1) In completing the edTPA, what have been the most useful or beneficial resources for you (or your student teaching candidates)? (2) What else can be done to improve the edTPA process for future student teaching candidates? (3) How does the completion of edTPA help prepare you (or your student teaching candidates) as a teacher? (4) What has been included in your methods courses and/or field experiences to help prepare future student teaching candidates to successfully complete the edTPA? (5) What else should be included in methods courses or field experiences to help prepare future student teaching candidates to successfully complete the edTPA?

During the professional development workshops in Fall 2013 and Spring 2014, teacher candidates and their college supervisors were introduced to an electronic link of the voluntary survey and consent form. The materials were presented via MachForm, a web-based software tool through the college website. Participants submitted the survey voluntarily and anonymously via the MachForm.

4. Data Analysis

4.1 Analysis of quantitative data

Likert scale survey data were analyzed by descriptive statistics, calculating both the frequency and percentage of the participants' demographic characteristics. Additionally, one-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted to see whether significant differences appeared between the participants' quantitative answers by their role (that is, student teaching candidates or college supervisors), the program the participant was in (that is, elementary or adolescence inclusive program), and the edTPA completed (that is, edTPA elementary education, secondary English education, secondary history education, secondary math education, secondary science education, world language, and special education). However, these results were cautiously interpreted due to the differing numbers of participants between the comparison groups. Furthermore, a one-way ANOVA was used to investigate differences by the content of the edTPA completed.

To check the interrater reliability We used a coding sheet in Excel to code and double-code the quantitative data independently. We then transferred the data to SPSS for analysis. Interrater reliability was calculated by dividing the number of agreements by the total number of agreements and disagreements and multiplying by 100. The interrater reliability across all coding categories was 97%.

4.2 Analysis of qualitative data

Qualitatively, we employed a formative evaluation design (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, & Worthen, 2004). To analyze qualitative data, an inductive thematic analysis using constant comparative method was utilized (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The qualitative data analysis proceeded with initial descriptive codes being assigned to survey responses. Related codes were then grouped and assigned as meaningful labels to identify common themes that ran across the essay answers (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; author, et al., 2014).

We read the answers to the short essay questions, highlighted particularly revealing phrases, coded and assigned meaningful labels to the data independently. We continued data analysis by comparing labels and phrases to determine whether to classify data segments separately or

within an existing code (Wolcott, 2001). Using pattern regularities, we determined the essential or invariant themes (van Manen, 1997). The authenticity of the findings was further supported as data saturation was reached, whereby repetition of the information and confirmation of previously collected data across participants occurred (Meadows & Morse, 2001). The words of the participants supported the themes identified (author, et al., 2014). Based on these initial coding themes, all of the qualitative data were analyzed by the three authors to discern emerging patterns. To support the reliability of the analysis, qualitative analysis results from open-ended question data were peer reviewed; inter-rater reliability was above 80% for all categories and themes.

5. Limitations

This study includes some limitations. The study was conducted within a academic year of 2013-2014 and the data was analyzed the following academic year of 2014-2014. Also the majority of the participants were pre-service teachers enrolled in inclusive teacher certification programs at one research site. Participation from different programs at different sites in more states for a longer period of time would permit the results of future studies to be generalized to a broader population. In addition, the statistical result of the group comparison for each question has less reliability than a group comparison based on a questionnaire including multiple questions.

IV. Results

1. Participants' Perspectives of edTPA Resources

When asked to rate the usefulness of edTPA resources provided by the research site, there were ten resources that more than 60% of the participants rated as "extremely beneficial" or "somewhat beneficial". <Table 2> lists the ten resources with participant numbers and frequency (%)

<Table 2> Ten Resource list that has more than 60% of participants rated as 'extremetly beneficial' or 'somewhat beneficial'

Resource Lists	Total Participant (N=113)	
	Frequency(N)	Percentage(%)
camera kits	101	89.4
edTPA handbook	86	76.1
edTPA task checklist	81	71.1
edTPA lesson plan template	80	70.7
Research and Practice Chart	78	69.0
video recording tutorials	76	67.3
Support from college supervisors	74	65.5
edTPA seminars during the professional development week	71	62.8
Support from peers	69	61.1
edTPA academic language resource	68	60.1

However, college supervisors and student teaching candidates responded significantly differently when evaluating the usefulness or benefits of six out of ten resources described above (see <Table 3>): edTPA handbook ($F=4.79, p<.05$), edTPA task checklist ($F=5.06, p<.05$), Research and Practice chart ($F=4.96, p<.05$), video recording tutorials ($F=4.31, p<.05$), edTPA seminars during the professional development week ($F=4.19, p<.05$), and edTPA academic language resources ($F=6.12, p<.05$). <Table 3> contains the F and p values regarding the participants' perspectives on edTPA resources by their roles in program and the completed edTPA. Considering the mean(M) value by roles(college supervisor and student teacher), this result implies that teacher candidates were less positive about the benefits of the six resources than college supervisors.

Furthermore, a one-way ANOVA was used to investigate differences by the content of the edTPA completed. Some significant differences of perspectives were identified when comparing edTPA resources between participants in the elementary education program and their peers in the adolescence program. The mean (M) value by each program shows that secondary teacher candidates were less positive about he benefits of the resources than elementary teacher candidates. However, there was no significant difference across secondary participants taking different disciplinary exams.

<Table 3> One-Way ANOVA Analyses by Role in Student Teaching and Program

By Role in Student Teaching	Supervisor		Student		<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Usefulness of edTPA academic language resources	4.31	0.63	3.50	1.15	6.12*	.015
Usefulness of edTPA task checklist	4.50	0.65	4.03	1.07	5.06*	.027
Usefulness of research/practice chart	4.54	0.52	3.80	1.18	4.96*	.028
Usefulness of edTPA handbook	4.69	0.48	4.03	1.07	4.79*	.031
Usefulness of video recording tutorials	4.38	0.77	3.66	1.22	4.31*	.040
Usefulness of seminars on edTPA in the professional development week	4.42	0.79	3.69	1.20	4.19*	.043

By Program	Secondary		Elementary		<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Usefulness of video recording tutorials	3.38	1.39	3.97	0.99	6.70*	.011
Usefulness of edTPA task checklist	3.59	1.24	4.05	1.02	4.71*	.032

Note: * indicates that there is a significant difference from each other within the category ($p < .05$)

To gather richer understanding about participants' responses about the question of edTPA resources, we gathered participants' written responses by asking the question, "Please comment on the most helpful/beneficial and least helpful/beneficial items." The written response analysis result does not completely echo the Likert scale analysis results in terms of the content. However, we found some interesting patterns by comparing what participants rated "Most Helpful (MH)" and "Least Helpful (LH)" items in the edTPA preparation process. For example, the most frequent answer on both MH and LH was related to supervisors' support and knowledge. This could show that whether it was helpful ($n = 14/39$, 35.9%) or not ($n = 23/48$, 47.9%), the participants perceived that the supervisors' support and knowledge about edTPA had a critical impact on the participants' preparation to complete the edTPA.

Participants also listed "edTPA handbook and materials" ($n = 14/39$, 35.9%) and "technology help including camera" ($n = 8/39$, 20.5%) as "Most Helpful" items in their edTPA preparation. Regarding the benefits of having well prepared edTPA materials, one participant stated,

The most beneficial item for me as a student teaching candidate with edTPA was the

edTPA handbook, with the different rubrics and information needed. I specifically followed word for word through the entire handbook. I also feel that the making good choices handbook was a crucial part. I also really enjoyed the professional development seminars in the very beginning of the student teaching process. It helped make me feel comfortable and confident to begin student teaching.

The camera kits provided by the college garnered the most appreciation from the candidates. One candidate reported, “Having the camera kit was great! This saved me from having to purchase one individually or coordinate sharing one with another candidate.” The overwhelming majority of candidates expressed similar sentiments regarding the cameras provided through college funds for candidates to borrow from the library.

Participants’ suggestions of needs listed with high frequency include “edTPA preparation in prior/earlier phases (semester)” ($n = 26/116$, 22.4%) and “more frequent workshops about edTPA during semester” ($n = 22/116$, 19%). The total numbers of participants who provided written answers to each of the open-ended questions were different, which led to the different n values reported in the qualitative results. For example, as reported earlier, 39 participants answered the question of “the most helpful resource,” 48 answered the question of “the least helpful resource,” while 116 provided written suggestions. The results of the open-ended questions are summarized in <Table 4>.

<Table 4> Participants comments on the edTPA resources (Frequency, Percent %)

Most Helpful (N=39)	Least Helpful (N=48)	Suggestions (N=116)
Most Helpful (N=39)	Least Helpful (N=48)	Suggestions (N=116)
Support from supervisors and peers 14 (35.9%)	Supervisors’ limited knowledge 23 (47.9%)	edTPA preparation in prior Phases 26 (22.4%)
edTPA handbook and materials – research guide 14 (35.9%)	(Un)preparedness of edTPA (not familiar with it at earlier phases) 12 (25%)	More frequent workshop during semester 22 (19%)
Technology help, camera kits 8 (20.5%)	Working with peers with different stages/content 7 (14.6%)	Clear guideline of how it is graded, examples 19 (16.4%)
Workshop time in PD week 3 (7.7%)	Unorganized materials, lesson plan template 7 (14.6%)	Explicit support on timeline, assessment, language 19 (16.4%)

2. Participants' Perspectives of edTPA Preparation for Becoming an Effective Teacher

When asked whether the edTPA helped prepare student teaching candidates to teach effectively, the majority of participants disagreed that edTPA would improve the status of the teaching profession or be useful for their future teaching practices. The majority of them disagreed that edTPA enhanced their teacher preparation experience or helped them to be more effective as a teacher. <Table 5> present participants disagreement rate on the questions about the effectiveness of the edTPA for their profession.

<Table 5> Disagreement rate on the questions about the effectiveness of the edTPA for preparing teaching profession

Resource Lists	Total Participant (N=113)	
	Frequency(N)	Percentage(%)
edTPA would improve the status of the teaching profession	77	68.1
edTPA enhanced their teacher preparation experience	76	67.3
helped them to be more effective as a teacher	74	65.5
edTPA would be useful for their future teaching practices	69	61.1
edTPA helped to improve their skills of assessing student learning	51	45.2
helped them reflect more carefully on their instructional decisions	39	34.5

The qualitative analysis of participants' written responses to the question, "What else did edTPA help you improve the edTPA process for future student teaching candidates?" echo the results described above. Out of 50 respondents, only three (6%) indicated that video analysis helped them reflect on their teaching, while only two (4%) indicated that edTPA improved their skill of assessing student learning. The majority of the respondents ($n = 45$, 90%) reported negative responses about edTPA itself and its impact on improving their teaching skills. One respondent stated, the edTPA "actually hindered my relationship and effectiveness as a teacher ... because I was and basically HAD (emphasis original) to be more focused and invested in fulfilling edTPA requirements rather than finding and organizing my own teaching style." Other participants commented similarly: "I feel that edTPA did not help prepare me for my future in the profession of teaching. In fact, I think it took away from my student teaching experience." Candidates negatively rated additional items about the edTPA: the tasks

were time consuming, taking away time needed to build relationships with students and teachers; too much pressure due to the high stakes nature of the assessment; tasks were too repetitive; and edTPA-specific criteria limited the variety of teacher candidates' teaching styles. As one participant commented:

It frustrates me that we are expected to complete this requirement without being fully prepared to do so. As a whole we have put so much effort into becoming a teacher. The fact that edTPA could prevent me from becoming certified terrifies me.

Significant differences were found when the student teaching candidates and college supervisors were asked if they agreed with the following descriptions: "The edTPA completion helped to improve my knowledge of the learning context, including my students, class, and school" ($F=14.60, p<.01$), "it helped to improve my instruction skills" ($F=13.47, p<.01$), "it helped me to be a more effective teacher" ($F=13.28, p<.01$), "it will be useful for my future teaching practice" ($F=11.26, p<.01$), "it helped to improve my skills of assessing student learning" ($F=9.97, p<.01$), "it helped to improve my lesson planning skills" ($F=9.74, p<.01$), "it helped me to reflect more carefully on my instructional decisions" ($F = 8.45, p<.01$), and "it enhanced my teacher preparation experience" ($F=4.43, p<.05$). Unlike their student teaching candidates, college supervisors may have had more time to digest the edTPA-related information without the pressure of having to complete the assessment as a high-stakes test, thus appreciating more the related resources. The supervisors, as experienced teachers, might also recognize more completely the instructional value of completing the edTPA.

Fewer items were found significantly different when comparing the participants in the Elementary Inclusive Education Program and their peers in the Adolescence Program: the usefulness or benefits of video recording tutorials ($F=6.70, p<.05$), the student teaching syllabus ($F=5.07, p<.05$), edTPA task checklist ($F=4.71, p<.05$). Similarly, fewer items were found significantly different between the two programs' participants when asked if they agreed with the descriptions of "the edTPA completion enhanced my teacher preparation experience" ($F=7.16, p<.01$), "it helped me to be a more effective teacher" ($F=5.01, p<.05$), "it will be useful for my future teaching practice" ($F=4.68, p<.05$), and "it helped to improve my knowledge of the learning context, including my students, class, and school" ($F=4.56, p<.05$).

Furthermore, a one-way ANOVA was used to investigate differences by the content of the edTPA completed. Some significant differences of perspectives were identified when considering impact on teaching between participants in the elementary education program and their peers in the adolescence program. However, there was no significant difference across secondary participants taking different disciplinary exams. <Table 6> contains the *F* and *p* values regarding the participants' perspectives on edTPA resources and teacher reparation by their roles in program and the completed edTPA.

<Table 6> One-Way ANOVA Analyses by Role in Student Teaching and Program

By Role in Student Teaching	Supervisor (N=14)		Student (N=99)		<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Variable						
"It helped to improve my knowledge of the learning context, including my students, class, and school."	3.50	1.17	2.23	1.07	14.60**	.000
"It helped to improve my instruction skills."	3.33	0.89	2.12	1.10	13.47**	.000
"It helped me to be a more effective teacher."	3.08	1.00	1.91	1.06	13.28**	.000
"It will be useful for my future teaching practice."	3.33	1.30	2.07	1.22	11.26**	.001
"It helped to improve my skills of assessing student learning."	3.67	1.15	2.48	1.23	9.97**	.002
"It helped to improve my lesson planning skills."	3.33	1.23	2.19	1.19	9.74**	.002
"It helped me to reflect more carefully on my instructional decisions."	3.92	0.67	2.80	1.31	8.45**	.004
"It enhanced my teacher preparation experience."	2.67	1.07	1.95	1.12	4.43*	.038

By Program	Secondary (N=44)		Elementary (N=69)		<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Variable						
"It enhanced my teacher preparation experience."	1.99	1.13	2.25	1.20	7.16**	.009
"It helped me to be a more effective teacher."	1.96	1.08	2.22	1.17	5.01*	.027
"It will be useful for my future teaching practice."	2.14	1.24	2.42	1.35	4.68*	.033
"It helped to improve my knowledge of the learning context, including my students, class, and school."	2.28	1.10	2.56	1.18	4.56*	.035

Note: * indicates that there is a significant difference from each other within the category ($p < .05$)

** indicates that there is a significant difference from each other within the category ($p < .01$).

3. Participants' Perspectives of edTPA Preparation Process at the Research Site

Finally, we gathered participants' opinions and suggestions regarding our programs in relation to edTPA requirements. Among 113 participants, 89 responded to these two questions (78.8%). The first part of the question was about helpful content existing in our methods courses and/or field experiences and the second part of the question was about requesting participants' suggestions about course content. <Table 7> present the descriptive analysis of the responses regarding these two questions.

<Table 7> Descriptive Analyses regarding Participants' Perspectives of edTPA Preparation Process in the Teacher Preparation Programs at the Research Site

Q: What has been included in your methods courses and/or field experiences to help prepare future student teaching candidates to successfully complete the edTPA?	
Statement	Rating (Total <i>N</i> = 89) (Frequency, Percent %)
Student learning assessment related assignment (e.g. method class, assessment class)	24 (27.0%)
Lesson plan writing (with/ without template, in each methods course)	23 (25.8%)
Nothing really	19 (21.3%)
Phase III methods courses/special education methods classes	14 (15.7%)
Workshop, seminars	5 (5.6%)
Q: What else should be included?	
Statement	Rating (Total <i>N</i> = 89) (Frequency, Percent %)
edTPA in earlier phases(e.g. edTPA language, more workshops, materials)	49 (55.1%)
Video practice	13 (14.6%)
Examples (exemplary and poor)	13 (14.6%)
Learning more about assessing student learning	7 (7.9%)
Academic language, language functions	6 (6.7%)
More lesson planning practice (standard based, separate commentary from edTPA template)	5 (5.6%)
More edTPA aligned support from SBTE and field experience	3 (3.4%)
More support for students in special education	2 (2.2%)

For the first part of the question about helpful content existing in our methods courses

and/or field experiences, 27% of the respondents ($n = 24$) indicated that content/practice related to assessing student learning was the most beneficial, and 25.8% ($n = 23$) mentioned that lesson plan writing in any methods course was helpful. Unfortunately, 21.3% ($n = 19$) responded negatively about the helpfulness of the methods courses for preparing candidates to complete the edTPA. Yet, since the exam was announced as a requirement for certification just one semester before that requirement was imposed by New York State officials, it does not seem surprising that 21.3% of respondents negatively responded that methods courses were not really helpful for candidates preparing edTPA materials. Teaching essentials did not change; planning, instruction and assessment were always part of the program, but edTPA introduced new vocabulary and tasks. Teacher educators could not introduce edTPA-specific vocabulary or tasks in previous semesters because the assessment had not been introduced to the teacher educators.

For the second part of the question requesting participants' suggestions about course content, more than half of the respondents (55.1%, $n = 49$) suggested introducing edTPA language and requirements earlier in their programs. Interestingly, if teacher candidates are expected to equate edTPA completion with learning to teach, these participants seem to have missed the connection. Instead of asking how to improve teaching practices, the participants requested earlier training about specifics of edTPA requirements. The participants specifically desired instruction regarding video training, academic language, and student learning assessment. The participants raised concerns regarding methods to assist them in successfully finishing edTPA without connecting the requested training to teaching practices. Even though their concerns regarding student learning assessment seem positive, their concerns were not centered in understanding students' learning as much as in the process of presenting data for the edTPA requirements.

V. Conclusion and Discussion

This study was conducted to examine student teaching candidates' and their college supervisors' perspectives of (1) the effectiveness of the program in preparing teacher candidates to complete the edTPA, and (2) the value of edTPA as valuable preparation for becoming an effective teacher.

This study provided both quantitative and qualitative evidence to determine the participants' perspectives. First, we found that teacher candidates reported the importance of particular resources for effective edTPA preparation. Both quantitative and qualitative data reveal that the candidates most appreciated two resources: edTPA-related materials (edTPA handbook, task checklist, lesson plan template) and technical help for preparing video clips of their teaching (camera kits and video tutorials). The edTPA handbook provides assessment criteria and scoring rubrics. However, we found candidates need more support to clarify terms in the handbook so they could interpret the criteria as it was originally intended by the developers. We also found that candidates often misunderstood the criteria based on their own knowledge and experience. Thus, supporting the candidate's efforts to clearly understand the assessment criteria in the edTPA handbook is critical for them to better understand the intended purposes of the edTPA assessment.

Technology support was also reported as one of the most important supports for effective edTPA preparation. In particular, the online video tutorials describing camera use and steps to upload video recordings earned praise from the candidates. Preparing video clips that could show the candidate's potential as an effective teacher is a critical component for preparing the edTPA. However, candidates without videotaping experience were, at first, overwhelmed by the technical difficulty of collecting video recordings of their teaching and editing the videos to meet the edTPA criteria. More importantly, spending extra time to learn and practice video editing skills exacts additional pressure that is beyond required teaching skills. In addition to technical skills related to videotaping, candidates expressed worries about financial difficulties involved in the processes of video recording and editing. At our institution, concerns about preparing video clips has been addressed through the College's \$65,000 investment for video equipment, but we know from colleagues at other institutions, that this issue is now a costly burden to many teacher education programs.

In addition to the resources addressed above, qualitative data analysis reveals that candidates consider the quality of supervisors as a critical factor that determines the effectiveness of the candidates' edTPA completion. This was evidenced by the candidates' contrasting responses about their supervisors, which reflected candidates' perception of the supervisor's knowledge and ability of required edTPA tasks and language. Also, considering the fact that candidates rated support from the supervisor more important than support from peers or school-based teacher educators (cooperating teachers), this result implies candidates

experienced high levels of dependency on supervisors' support while they prepared the edTPA. This final result suggests that the supervisor is a key support person who needs extensive training and professional development to increase his/her ability to guide candidates while they prepare the edTPA (Lindauer, et al, 2013). This support does not exceed boundaries set by edTPA guidelines, but the support does help candidates correctly define new tasks and vocabulary.

Regarding the second purpose of this research about candidates' perspectives of whether the edTPA helped prepare student teaching candidates to become effective teachers, the majority of the participants disagreed that edTPA would improve the status of the teaching profession. The majority of the candidates disagreed that edTPA enhanced their teacher preparation experience or would positively influence their future teaching practice. We observed that teacher candidates stopped asking "How do I teach..." and started asking "How do I pass this test?" This result does not conclusively indicate whether the edTPA is an effective or ineffective indicator of teacher candidates' effectiveness as teachers. Still, the candidates' responses clearly show that teacher candidates feel excessive pressure compared to the former certification exams.

This result echoes the dilemmas and concerns raised in the recent studies about edTPA that high-stakes performance assessment for pre-service teachers produce tensions and stress that would hinder their ability to implement effective teaching practice (Meuwissen & Choppin, 2015). As Madeloni and Gorlewski (2013) argued, the tension and pressure of high-stakes assessment would erases relationships between teacher candidates and their students in classroom. In addition this result imply that unprepared edTPA implementation at both local institution and state level would increase the distance between current programming in local institution and what edTPA assessment measure (Lewis & Morse, 2013) Candidates' negative responses about the effectiveness of the edTPA to prepare them to teach effectively point to the greatest shortcoming of the hasty implementation of edTPA in New York and the recent climate of educational standardization. In other words, the manner in which the edTPA was rolled out in New York State did not allow teacher candidates to deal with myriads of other teaching requirements while learning to take the test.

In the past two and half years, we and our colleagues have determined essential elements needed by candidates who are required to complete edTPA during student teaching. Collaboration among college supervisors is key. Step-by-step/task-by-task directions are

needed, guiding candidates as they complete edTPA requirements. However, certain issues still remain. Adjusting the student teaching placement to the edTPA timeline is an ongoing concern to provide time for candidates to complete the edTPA. Balancing edTPA requirements and other teaching responsibilities in the field continues to require attention.

Recommendations for programs currently adopting edTPA for accreditation or other purposes include introducing edTPA vocabulary and tasks early in the education program. Incorporating video-based self-reflections that assist teacher candidates to understand their actions and the relationship of their actions to their students' learning is highly recommended. Developing materials specific to edTPA requirements are suggested: an edTPA task checklist, Research and Practice chart, and lesson plan template that lead teacher candidates to understand the teaching tasks and behaviors that will meet the needs of K-12 learners. Providing professional development for college faculty, including but not limited to supervisors of student teachers, and informing school-based personnel of edTPA rigor and expectations is essential.

The necessity of performance based assessment for pre-service teaching profession has been argued for many years. The positive impacts of teacher performance assessment in various aspects has supported the argument of the necessity of teacher performance assessment for pre-service teachers (Athanasos, 1994; Sato, Wei, & Darling-Hammond, 2008; Darling-Hammond, Wei, & Johnson, 2009; Wei & Pecheone, 2010). As a result edTPA has been developed by SCALE based on national standards for teacher education (e.g. AACTE, InTASC). There has been increasing evidence that the edTPA is a reliable and valid tool to measure teachers' practical knowledge of teaching. However, implementing edTPA and preparing teacher candidates to pass this assessment in a teacher preparation program is not an easy task for teacher educators.

The experience of implementing edTPA and researching about teacher candidates' perceptions about it give us opportunities to think about the educational and political systems of measuring teachers' teaching profession in other countries including South Korea. The edTPA offers a standardized teacher performance assessment and support system to measure career-entry readiness of teaching profession. This is a requirement to be certified as a teacher but it does not guarantee a teaching position because in U.S beginning teachers are hired by local school districts or individual school after they pass the teacher certification exams administrated by state level. Compared to this, in South Korea, teaching certification is given

to teacher candidates upon their graduation of a teacher preparation program. Each program requires student teaching in a local school for about a month or so but the authority of assessing teacher candidates' teaching profession is given to the instructors or college professors who are teaching methods courses. In other words, there is no standardized system to measure pre-service teachers career-entry readiness before they get a teacher certification. Similar with the situation in US, teaching certification does not guarantee teacher candidates a teaching position. However, a teaching certificate through edTPA process guarantee a pre-service teacher's ability and knowledge for teaching profession. In South Korea, pre-service teachers need to pass national teacher employment test in which teacher performance test is included as a second screen. This performance assessment was a response to the issues and concerns raised by teacher educators about validity of the national teacher employment test for measuring teacher quality (e.g. Kim 2001, Lee, 2004). While this performance test guarantee public school teachers teaching skills and knowledge in some sense, the fundamental question remains of defining the quality of a beginning teachers in private schools and other educational settings (Im, Yoon, & Cha, 2016).

Practice assessment system like edTPA is an potential model to measure teachers' practical knowledge of teaching systematically. However, as we described above, developing and implementing this assessment systems takes a lot of efforts not only for developing the assessment but also implementing it in a teacher education programs such as professional development for faculty members and developing resources to help teacher candidates to prepare the assessments. The data and research results from edTPA will give us valuable ideas and suggestions to better prepare teacher candidates' teaching profession not only in US but also for other counties.

References

- Athanases, S. (1994). Teachers' reports of the effects of preparing portfolios of literacy instruction. *Elementary School Journal*, 94(4), 421-439.
- Author, et al. (2014). *Mountain Rise: the International Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 8(2), 1-18. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1234/mr.v8i2.250>. Retrieved from <http://mountainrise.wcu.edu/index.php/MtnRise/article/view/250>.
- Bond, L., Smith, T., Baker, W. K., & Hattie, J. A. (2000). *The certification system of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards: A construct and consequential validity study*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.
- Cantrell, S., Fullerton, J., Kane, T. J., & Staiger, D. O. (2007). *National Board Certification and teacher effectiveness: Evidence from a random assignment Experiment*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., & Vigdor, J. L. (2007). *How and why do teacher credentials matter for student achievement?* Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *Evaluating teacher effectiveness: How teacher performance assessments can measure and improve teaching*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). The right start: Creating a strong foundation for the teaching career. *Kappanmagazine.org*, 94(3), 8-13.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Wei, R. C., & Johnson, C. M. (2009). Teacher preparation and teacher learning: A changing policy landscape. In Sykes G. (ed.) *The Handbook of Education Policy Research* (p. 627). Washington, DC: American Education Research Association.
- AACTE. (2014). FAQ. Retrieved from <http://edtpa.aacte.org/faq#17>.
- AACTE. (2014). State policy FAQs. Retrieved from <http://edtpa.aacte.org/state-policy>.
- Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2004). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines* (3rd ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2005). Interviewing: The art of science. In Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 361-375). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. I. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Guide to National Board Certification. (2014). <http://boardcertifiedteachers.org/first-time->

- candidates.
- Kim, M. (2001). Critical review of national teacher employment test system. *Teacher Education, 17*, 1-21.
- Lee, I. (2004). Tasks for qualified teacher employment through national teacher employment test. *Teacher Education, 20*(1), 1-21.
- Im, S, Yoon, H.G., & Cha, J. (2016). Pre-service Science Teacher Education System in South Korea: Prospects and Challenges. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education, 12*(7), 1863-1880. doi: 10.12973/eurasia.2016.1533a
- Lewis, T. & Morse, M. (2013). The elementary edTPA and the “successful literacy teacher.” *Excelsior: Leadership in Teaching and Learning, 8*(1), 66-80.
- Lindauer, J. R., Burns, B. A., & Henry, J. J. (2013). Effective scaffolding for edTPA: Perspectives from teacher candidates, cooperating teachers and college supervisors. *Excelsior: Leadership in Teaching and Learning, 8*(1), 37-45.
- Lit, I. W., & Lotan, R. (2013). A balancing act: Dilemmas of implementing a high-stakes performance assessment. *The New Educator, 9*(1), 54-76.
- Madeloni, B. & Gorlewski, J. (2013). Wrong answer to the wrong question: Why we need critical teacher education, not standardization. *Rethinking Schools, 27*(4), 16-21.
- Meuwissen, K. W., & Choppin, J. M. (2015). Preservice teachers’ adaptations to tensions associated with the edTPA during its early implementation in New York and Washington States. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 23*(103), 1-25.
- National Association of Multicultural Education. (2014). *NAME Position Statement on edTPA*. Retrieved December 14, 2015 from <http://www.nameorg.org/docs/Statement-rr-edTPA-1-21-14.pdf>.
- Newton, S. P. (2010a). *Predictive validity of the Performance Assessment for California Teachers*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education.
- Newton, S. P. (2010b). *Preservice performance assessment and teacher early career effectiveness: Preliminary findings on the performance assessment for California teachers*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity.
- Pecheone, R., & Chung, R. (2006). Evidence in teacher education: The Performance Assessment for California Teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(1), 22-36.
- Pecheone, R. L., & Whittaker, A. (2016). Well-prepared teachers inspire student learning. *Phi Delta Kappan, 97*(7), 8-13.
- Peck, C. A., Gallucci, C., & Sloan, T. (2010). Negotiating implementation of high-stakes

- performance assessment policies in teacher education: From compliance to inquiry. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61, 451-463.
- Peck, C. A., & McDonald, M. (2013). Creating “cultures of evidence” in teacher education: Context, policy, and practice in three high-data-use programs. *The New Educator*, 9(1), 12-28.
- Sato, M. (2014). What is the underlying conception of teaching of the edTPA? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 65, 421 - 434.
- 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.
- Sloan, T. (2013). Distributed leadership and organizational change: Implementation of a teaching performance measure. *The New Educator*, 9(1), 29-53.
- Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) (2013). 2013 edTPA Field Test: Summary Report. Retrieved from https://secure.aacte.org/apps/rl/res_get.php?fid=827&ref=edtpa
- Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) (2015). edTPA provides support by the profession, for the profession. Retrieved from https://secure.aacte.org/apps/rl/res_get.php?fid=1621&ref=edtpa.
- van Manen, M. (1997). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. London, ON: The Althouse Press.
- Wei, R. C., & Pecheone, R. (2010). Teaching performance assessments at summative events and educative tools. In Kennedy M. (ed.) *Teacher Assessment and Teacher Quality: A Handbook*. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Wilson, M., Hallam, P., Pecheone, R., & Moss, P. (2007). *Using student achievement test scores as evidence of external validity for indicators of teacher quality: Connecticut’s Beginning Educator Support and Training Program*. Berkeley, CA: University of California at Berkeley.
- Wolcott, H. F. (2001). *Writing up qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

국문초록

미국 교사 수행 평가(edTPA)의 시행에 대한 예비교사와 대학 감독자들의 인식

Jie Zhang (The College at Brockport-SUNY)

남 윤 경 (부산대학교)

Carole Pelttari (The College at Brockport-SUNY)

교사의 수행의 체계적인 평가에 대한 요구의 결과 최근 미국 40개주 600개의 교사교육기관을 통해 교사 수행 평가 (edTPA) 체계가 시행되고 있다. 그러나 이 새로운 평가에 대비해서 교사 양성 기관에서 어떻게 교사 양성 프로그램의 질을 높이고 예비 교사를 준비시켜야 하는가에 대한 연구는 미흡한 실정이다. 본 연구에서는 미국의 한 교사 양성 기관을 대상으로 edTPA 준비를 위한 교사 양성 프로그램의 효율성과 edTPA 준비 자체가 얼마나 예비교사들의 교수 전문성 향상에 긍정적인 영향을 미치는지에 대한 예비교사들과 대학 감독관들의 인식을 조사한 것이다. 99명의 예비교사와 14명의 대학 감독관들이 이 연구에 참여하였다. 교사 인식 설문지가 주요 데이터로 수집되었으며, 기술 통계 분석 및 One-way ANOVA를 이용한 양적 연구 분석방법과 설문 문항 데이터에 대한 질적 연구 방법이 병행되었다. 연구의 결과에 근거하여 예비교사들의 edTPA 준비와 교수 전문성 향상을 위한 제안들이 기술되었다. 마지막으로 edTPA 준비와 시행과정의 경험을 바탕으로 한국 예비교사들의 교수 전문성 평가 체계에 대한 제고가 기술되었다.

주제어 : 미국 교사 수행 평가(edTPA), 교원 양성, 예비교사, 인식

<Appendix>

edTPA Project in Student Teaching Questionnaire

Please take some time to answer the following questions. All information is confidential and will only be used for the purpose of this study, which is to help better prepare student teaching candidates to fulfill edTPA requirements. To help reduce the risk of identification, do not include your name or the name of your school. Thank you for your participation!

1. What is your role in Student Teaching?
 - A. Student teaching candidate
 - B. College supervisor

2. Which program are you (or your student teaching candidates) in?
 - A. Childhood Inclusive program (Grades 1-6)
 - B. Adolescence Inclusive program (Grades 5-12) (please specify the content area: _____
_____)

3. Which edTPA did you (or your student teaching candidates) complete?
 - A. edTPA Elementary Education
 - B. edTPA Secondary English Education
 - C. edTPA Secondary History Education
 - D. edTPA Secondary Math Education
 - E. edTPA Secondary Science Education
 - F. edTPA World Language
 - G. edTPA Special Education
 - H. Other (please specify:)

4. How many parent/student permission forms did you (or your student teaching candidates) send out? _____
How many parent/student permission forms were returned? _____

5. In completing the edTPA, what have been the most useful or beneficial resources for you (or your student teaching candidates)? Please rate each item in the following Table by checking one number from the following five-point Likert Scale. Please check NA to indicate "Not Applicable."

Statement	Rating					
	1	2	3	4	5	NA
edTPA assessment handbook						
<i>Making Good Choices</i> handbook						
<i>Understanding Rubric Level Progressions</i> handbook						
Seminar sessions on the edTPA tasks during the Professional Development week						
Seminar session on academic language during the Professional Development week						
Seminar session on video recording, editing, compressing, and uploading in the Professional Development week						
Seminar sessions on classroom management						
College edTPA website						
Student teaching syllabus						
edTPA video parent/student permission letter						
edTPA task checklist (2 pages)						
edTPA lesson plan template						
Research/practice links via the College edTPA website						
edTPA academic language resources						
edTPA samples on Blackboard						
Video recording tutorials						
Camera kits						
Support from college supervisor						
Support from peer reviewing in the seminar sessions						
Support from school based teacher educators (SBTEs)						
Support from IT services						

6. What else? Comments on the most helpful/beneficial and least helpful/beneficial items: (To help us plan and better prepare future student teaching candidates for the edTPA, please be as specific as you can on “what have been the most and least helpful/beneficial resources for you (or your student teaching candidates)?”)

7. What else can be done to improve the edTPA process for future student teaching candidates? (Please be as specific as you can about what was confusing, what was missing, what we can do better next time.)

8. How does the completion of edTPA help prepare you (or your student teaching candidates) to be a teacher? Please rate each item in the following table by checking one number from the following five-point Likert Scale. Please check NA to indicate “Not Applicable.”

	1. Absolutely Disagree	2. Somewhat Disagree	3. Neutral	4. Somewhat Agree	5. Absolutely Agree	
	Rating					
	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Statement						
It helped to improve my knowledge of the learning context, including my students, class, and school.						
It helped to improve my lesson planning skills.						
It helped to improve my instruction skills.						
It helped to improve my skills of assessing student learning.						
It helped me to reflect more carefully on my instructional decisions.						
It enhanced my teacher preparation experience.						
It helped me to be a more effective teacher.						
It will be useful for my future teaching practice.						
The edTPA will improve the status of the teaching profession.						

9. What else? Comments on responses in this section: (Please be as specific as you can to help us plan and better prepare future student teaching candidates for the edTPA.)

10. For student teachers, what was included in your methods courses and/or field experiences to help prepare you to successfully complete the edTPA?

11. Based on your edTPA experience as a student teacher (or SBTE), what else would you suggest that should be included in methods courses or field experiences to help prepare future student teaching candidates to successfully complete the edTPA?