



## edTPA National Development and Review Processes

June 2014

Since its launch in 2009, edTPA has been developed by the profession and for the profession with substantive input from teachers, teacher educators, national subject matter organization representatives, candidates, state licensure boards, national policy advisors, and technical advisory committees (TAC) of nationally recognized psychometricians. This document describes the systemic analysis and review processes for edTPA modifications/changes to the overall architecture, handbooks and rubrics by field, and/or scoring/reporting processes during operational use (2013-2014 onward). The document is organized by source of input and how that input informs SCALE, AACTE and Pearson to make changes.

<b>Source</b>	<b>Types of Input and Process</b>
Teacher educators and candidates via the Online Community and/or email communication with SCALE, AACTE and Pearson staff	SCALE archives and responds to questions and comments about handbook directions, prompts and rubrics and incorporates changes that improve clarity and support educative implementation of edTPA.
National User Group/Design Team	SCALE has convened a national user group/ design team on four occasions since 2009, with a 5 <sup>th</sup> event upcoming in August 2014. The user group of teacher educators provides input on the common architecture of edTPA, including types of artifacts and core concepts addressed in commentary prompts and in rubric guiding questions. The user group also reviews and informs potential changes in scoring or scoring training.
Subject Specific Design/Review participants	Subject specific design teams were first convened in 2010 (and more recently for lower incidence fields). Participants were recruited from California programs using the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT), content validation participants, and national subject matter organizations associated with NCATE (and now CAEP) Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs). Design team members reviewed the common architecture of edTPA and determined how their subject specific standards for student learning would be addressed in the central focus for edTPA and how key subject specific pedagogical practices (associated with their standards) would be addressed in prompts, artifacts and rubric language. As handbooks are revised, subject specific changes are vetted with the design team lead and/or SPA representatives.

<p>Systematic monitoring and analyses of inter-rater reliability</p>	<p>SCALE and Pearson staff review scoring consistency data produced from double-scored portfolios to identify differences or trends by rubric and field. When differences emerge, SCALE staff discusses potential edits for clarity and/or improvements to the training curriculum with subject specific scoring trainers and/or design team members.</p>
<p>Scoring supervisors, trainers and master coders of benchmarks* used in scoring training, and teacher educators and P-12 teachers serving as scorers</p>	<p>SCALE systematically solicits input from edTPA scoring trainers and scoring supervisors, and other skilled scorers who master code benchmark portfolios to develop training materials and to inform rubric and handbook clarifications. In addition, while training and supervising scoring, these individuals contact SCALE and Pearson with any queries or problem arising from handbook or rubric clarity. Scorers contact their scoring supervisors and trainers when engaged in scoring, and their questions and comments inform clarifications to prompts, rubrics and scoring training materials.</p> <p>*Benchmarks are exemplar portfolio used in scoring training that have been “master coded” with annotations or tagged evidence aligned with scoring rubric levels</p>
<p>Key State Leads (state agencies, standards boards and IHE representatives) convened monthly since early 2014</p>	<p>In addition to input from all sources above, representatives from each state with edTPA policy are convened by Jennifer Wallace, Director of the Washington Professional Educator Standards Board to discuss implementation support needs, inform the edTPA research agenda and to vet any potential changes to the overall architecture or scoring of edTPA. SCALE, Pearson and AACTE personnel join the meeting each month.</p>
<p>State advisory groups and edTPA coordinator calls</p>	<p>SCALE meets regularly (bimonthly, monthly or quarterly) with IHE representatives serving on state-level edTPA advisory groups, edTPA coordinator forums or other teacher educator groups wishing to provide input (e.g., the Illinois Latino Forum). Calls provide states with updates on edTPA development and provide opportunity for participants to pose questions and offer feedback on policy as well as handbooks, rubrics and implementation resources. The newly formed Task Force in NY could perform a similar function.</p>
<p>National Policy Advisory Committee convened bi-annually in person and as needed via webinar</p>	<p>The edTPA Advisory Board was appointed in April, 2013 to counsel edTPA partners on the edTPA design, implementation, policy and governance of the assessment. The board’s goal is to ensure that edTPA is a high-quality assessment that is well-used and effective in developing entering teachers, assessing their level of preparation and supporting teacher preparation programs. The board includes broad representation of members from state standards boards, a range of national education organizations</p>

	including NBPTS, NEA, AFT, CAEP, as well as higher education faculty from a variety of state university systems (CUNY, SUNY, UW) and private IHEs.
National Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) convened annually by Webex as a body with individual members consulted as needed	A 22-member technical advisory committee of nationally and internationally renowned psychometricians have reviewed the extensive technical report from the edTPA field test and have offered feedback as well as approval of edTPA as a licensure assessment that provides reliable and valid evidence that candidates are ready to teach. As changes to edTPA are proposed by the entities described above, all changes must be vetted and approved by the national TAC.
State specific Technical Advisory Committees (NY, OH, CA, and WA)	Existing technical advisory committees (TACs) and Psychometric Consultants convened by states have reviewed the extensive technical report from the edTPA field test and have offered feedback as well as approval of edTPA as a licensure assessment that provides reliable and valid evidence that candidates are ready to teach. As changes to edTPA are proposed by the entities described above, all changes must be vetted and approved by the state specific TACs.