

Item 21:

Discussion of edTPA Pilot and Test Development Updates

DISCUSSION

SUMMARY: This item provides the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) an update on the edTPA pilot and upcoming educator certification test development.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: The statutory authority for the classroom teacher class certificate structure is Texas Education Code (TEC), §§21.003(a), 21.031, and 21.041(b)(1), (2), and (4), 21.041(c), 21.044(a), 21.0441, 21.0418(a).

FUTURE ACTION EXPECTED: Texas Education Agency (TEA) staff anticipates presenting an edTPA pilot update to the Board at each SBEC meeting with an official review by the Board prior to September 1, 2021.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND JUSTIFICATION: This item provides an update on the edTPA pilot and test development dates. edTPA and updated assessments are a part of the teacher certification redesign plan that was discussed with the Board at the August 2018 work session and the October and December 2018 SBEC meetings to improve the quality and consistency of newly certified teachers. Staff received requests from the Board for recurring updates of edTPA and testing.

edTPA Pilot

TEA staff discussed the edTPA pilot with the Board during the October and December 2018 meetings as well as the February 2019 meeting. The Board voted to propose the edTPA pilot during the April 2019 meeting and voted to adopt the edTPA pilot during the July 2019 meeting, defining pilot as an examination that will be used for pilot purposes subject to Board review prior to September 2021.

Since the adoption of the edTPA pilot, TEA staff has actively worked with the 27 TEA-funded pilot programs to implement the edTPA assessment. As part of the 2019–2020 pilot timeline, pilot programs reported their fall pilot candidates in September. A summary of the pilot candidates by demographic group will be provided at the Board meeting. A timeline of the year 1 edTPA pilot can be found in Attachment II.

At the October 4, 2019 SBEC meeting, the Board requested an update on the T-TESS pilot that was mentioned to the Board by stakeholders at previous meetings. Attachment III provides a summary of the data to be reviewed related to the edTPA pilot as requested in October. Attachment IV includes an update along with the suggested criteria for a parallel pilot that staff presented to the SBEC at the July 2019 meeting. Staff recommended the criteria to ensure consistency in the technical and content requirements between possible alternative performance assessments and the edTPA and to inform the Board of what would be necessary for an accurate comparison. Attachment V includes an update from Dr. Stacey Edmonson, Sam Houston State University, on the status and timeline of the T-TESS pilot.

Test Development

Staff is actively working to update the current content pedagogy tests to increase their rigor and relevance and to ensure alignment with the current Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS). A summary of the anticipated first operational dates of the new assessments are in the table below.

Since published in October, the Health assessment has been delayed from a September 1, 2021 operational launch to ensure alignment with the revised TEKS, which are still under development by the State Board of Education (SBOE).

January 1, 2021	September 1, 2021	January 1, 2022	TBD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EC–3 Content (292) • Science of Teaching Reading (293) • Educational Diagnostician (253) • Early Childhood–Grade 6 Core Subjects (391) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical Education (257) • School Counselor (252) • Trade and Industrial Education PPR (370) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Language Arts and Reading 4–8 (217) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Language Arts and Reading 7–12 • ESL Supplemental • Bilingual Education Supplemental • BTLPT–Spanish • Special Education and related assessments • Health (258)

PUBLIC AND STUDENT BENEFIT: The public and student benefit anticipated as a result of the recommendations and assessments would be more rigorous, relevant, and reliable requirements for the preparation, certification, and testing of classroom teachers upon entry into the profession, and retention of these qualified professionals for years to come.

Staff Members Responsible:

Beth Burkhart, Program Specialist, Educator Standards
 Guiomar Andujar, Program Specialist, Educator Standards

Attachment:

- I. Statutory Citations
- II. edTPA Pilot Year 1 Timeline
- III. edTPA Pilot Data Analysis
- IV. Update on T-TESS Alternative and Assessment Criteria
- V. Update on T-TESS Alternative: Submitted by Dr. Stacey Edmonson, Dean, College of Education at Sam Houston State University

ATTACHMENT I**Statutory Citations Related to Classroom Teacher Certificate Structure****Texas Education Code, §21.003, Certification Required (excerpt):**

- (a) A person may not be employed as a teacher, teacher intern or teacher trainee, librarian, educational aide, administrator, educational diagnostician, or school counselor by a school district unless the person holds an appropriate certificate or permit issued as provided by Subchapter B.

Texas Education Code, §21.031, Purpose:

1. The State Board for Educator Certification is established to recognize public school educators as professionals and to grant educators the authority to govern the standards of their profession. The board shall regulate and oversee all aspects of the certification, continuing education, and standards of conduct of public school educators.
2. In proposing rules under this subchapter, the board shall ensure that all candidates for certification or renewal of certification demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to improve the performance of the diverse student population of this state.

Texas Education Code, §21.041. Rules; Fees (excerpts):

- (b) The board shall propose rules that:
- (1) provide for the regulation of educators and the general administration of this subchapter in a manner consistent with this subchapter;
 - (2) specify the classes of educator certificates to be issued, including emergency certificates;
 - (4) specify the requirements for the issuance and renewal of an educator certificate;
- (c) The board shall propose a rule adopting a fee for the issuance and maintenance of an educator certificate that, when combined with any fees imposed under Subsection (d), is adequate to cover the cost of administration of this subchapter.

Texas Education Code, §21.044, Educator Preparation (excerpts):

- (a) The board shall propose rules establishing the training requirements a person must accomplish to obtain a certificate, enter an internship, or enter an induction-year program. The board shall specify the minimum academic qualifications required for a certificate.

Texas Education Code, §21.0441, Admission Requirements for Educator Preparation Programs:

- (2) if the person is seeking initial certification:
 - (A) has successfully completed at least:

- (i) 15 semester credit hours in the subject-specific content area in which the person is seeking certification, if the person is seeking certification to teach mathematics or science at or above grade level seven; or
 - (ii) 12 semester credit hours in the subject-specific content area in which the person is seeking certification, if the person is not seeking certification to teach mathematics or science at or above grade level seven; or
- (B) has achieved a satisfactory level of performance on a content certification examination, which may be a content certification examination administered by a vendor approved by the commissioner for purposes of administering such an examination for the year for which the person is applying for admission to the program.

Texas Education Code, §21.048, Certification Examinations (excerpt):

- (a) The board shall propose rules prescribing comprehensive examinations for each class of certificate issued by the board.

ATTACHMENT II**edTPA Pilot Year 1 Timeline**

Date	Action
May 3, 2019	Notification of acceptance sent to participating EPPs
May 10, 2019	TEA Webinar: edTPA Orientation
June 7, 2019	TEA Webinar: Cycle of Effective Teaching and Role and Responsibilities
July 15, 2019	TEA Webinar: Task I Deep Dive—Planning for Instruction and Assessment
Before August 1, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Onsite introductory sessions titled edTPA 101 provided by edTPA Program Managers at Pearson. These sessions will be open to faculty, supervisors, and P–12 partners designed to build an understanding of the purpose, development, and structure of the assessment. • Collect candidate demographic data and district partner data • Regional workshops provided by members of the edTPA National Academy. These sessions are intended for methods and foundations faculty, university supervisors, and mentor teachers who support or supervise candidates and will cover the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A close examination of edTPA tasks and rubrics, including what candidates are asked to think about, do, and write for each task as well as how portfolios will be evaluated ○ Sharing of instrumental resources and best practices from successful implementation plans ○ Guidelines and best practices for supporting candidates completing their edTPA portfolio
August 9 th and 12 th , 2019	TEA Webinar: Task II Deep Dive—Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning
September 1, 2019	<p>TEA staff collect the following data from programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demographic information • Faculty training documents • Curriculum alignment information • Materials used to determine which candidates are recommended for edTPA (versus PPR)

Date	Action
September 13 th and 16 th , 2019	TEA Webinar: Task III Deep Dive—Assessing Student Learning
October 31, 2019	Release of year 2 edTPA pilot applications
October 11, 2019	TEA Webinar: Task IV Deep Dive
October 24, 2019	First window closes for submission of edTPA portfolio.
November 10, 2019	First window closes for pilot reimbursement.
November 15, 2019	TEA Webinar: Submission Logistics and Results Analyzer
January 10, 2020	TEA Webinar: TBD based on Program Needs
February 13, 2020	TEA Webinar: TBD based on Program Needs
February 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus group of teacher candidates who submitted the edTPA portfolio. • Survey to collect perception data from EPPs, principals, and districts • Analyze edTPA rubric scores from portfolios submitted October through March
February 2020	Tentative announcement of year 2 edTPA pilot participants
March 13, 2020	TEA Webinar: TBD based on Program Needs
April 10, 2020	TEA Webinar: TBD based on Program Needs
May 8, 2020	TEA Webinar: TBD based on Program Needs
May–June 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus group of teacher candidates who submitted the edTPA portfolio. • Survey to collect perception data from EPPs, principals, and districts
June 30, 2020	Analyze edTPA rubric scores from portfolios submitted April through June

Date	Action
Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Monthly implementation calls with edTPA Program Managers and/or members of the edTPA National Academy• Collect data during monthly calls about retention, perception, and additional costs related to edTPA• On-demand virtual supports from edTPA Program Managers and/or members of the edTPA National Academy• Academy to address questions and concerns and determine next steps• Statewide implementation support webinars for edTPA coordinators with edTPA Program Managers

As of December 2, 58 regional trainings, 49 edTPA 101 trainings, 7 TEA webinars, and 2 bimonthly webinars for non-pilot programs have been completed.

ATTACHMENT III edTPA Pilot Data Analysis

Implementation Question

How can Texas effectively implement edTPA as a certification requirement?

What data will the research and evaluation use?

- Candidate placement data
- Candidate retention data
- Principal appraisal of candidate preparation
- New teacher appraisal of their preparation
- Perception data collected via survey and focus groups from candidates, faculty members, and P–12 partners
- edTPA portfolio scores by rubric, program, and district
- Teacher effectiveness data (as applicable)
- Student achievement and growth data (as applicable)

What methods will be used to analyze the data collected?

To identify and develop best practices on implementation for edTPA by EPPs, TEA will summarize information about implementation at the EPP level. We will work with the collection of pilot EPPs to identify best practices collaboratively.

To measure early outcomes for candidates and EPPs who complete the edTPA process, TEA anticipates using propensity score matching or other similar quasi-experimental methodologies that allow for the comparison of candidates completing the edTPA with highly similar candidates completing the traditional PPR. These candidates will be compared on various dimensions, including employment, retention, appraisal, and efficacy in the classroom. TEA anticipates engaging external researchers for research and analysis related to the edTPA pilot, but those details are not finalized.

ATTACHMENT IV**Update on T-TESS Alternative and Assessment Criteria**

Date	Action
May 23, 2019	TEA staff invited members from Sam Houston State and Texas State Universities to meet about an edTPA alternative.
June 13, 2019	TEA staff sent members from Sam Houston State and Texas State Universities draft performance assessment design standards for purposes of licensure (draft below).
June 17, 2019	TEA staff met with members from Sam Houston State and Texas State Universities about an edTPA alternative Both groups reviewed the design standards and agreed that steps need to be taken for T-TESS to be recast as an assessment that can be used for licensure statewide.
October 23, 2019	TEA staff invited members from Sam Houston State University to participate in monthly calls to discuss data collection, timelines, and design standards for the proposed performance assessment based on T-TESS.
October 25 th and 28 th , 2019	TEA staff had further conversations with Sam Houston State University to learn more about the pilot involving the collection of T-TESS data and planned ongoing monthly calls beginning in December.

Texas Performance Assessment Design Standards (Acceptable Criteria)**Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Design for Validity and Fairness**

- Grade and subject-specific to all initial certifications offered in Texas
- Addresses the teaching of English learners, students with special needs, and underserved populations
- Includes video of teaching performance and candidate commentary describing rationale and impact of instructional decisions
- Tasks and directions are fair and appropriate for candidates from diverse backgrounds

A teaching performance assessment seeking approval for use in Texas in which complex pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring scales are linked to and assess the

Texas educator standards. must be grade band and subject-specific. Performance assessments must be available for all initial certifications currently offered in Texas. The model sponsor clearly describes the uses for which the assessment has been validated (i.e., to serve as a determination of a candidate's status with respect to the Texas educator standards and to provide an indication of preparation program quality and effectiveness), anticipates its potential misuses, and identifies appropriate uses consistent with the assessment's validation process. The model sponsor maximizes the fairness of the assessment design for all groups of candidates in the program. A passing standard is recommended by the model sponsor based on a standard setting study where educators have made a professional judgment about an appropriate performance standard for beginning teachers to meet prior to licensure.

**Note: the "model sponsor" refers to the entity that represents the assessment and is responsible to programs using that model and to the TEA. Model sponsors may be an individual institution, a group of institutions and/or partners, a private entity, and/or combinations of these.*

Required Elements for Performance Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness

1(a) The performance assessment includes complex pedagogical assessment tasks to prompt aspects of candidate performance that measure the Texas educator standards. Each task is substantively related to two or more major domains of the Texas educator standards. For use in judging candidate-generated responses to each pedagogical task, the assessment also includes multi-level scoring rubrics that are clearly related to the Texas educator standards that the task measures. Each task and its associated rubrics measure two or more Texas educator standards. Collectively, the tasks and rubrics in the assessment address key aspects of the five major domains of the Texas educator standards. The sponsor of the performance assessment documents the relationships between Texas educator standards, tasks, and rubrics.

1(b) The performance assessment must include a focus on content-specific pedagogy within the design of the performance assessment tasks and scoring scales to assess the candidate's ability to effectively teach the content area(s) authorized by the certification sought.

1(c) Consistent with the language of the Texas educator standards, the performance assessment defines scoring rubrics so candidates seeking certification can earn acceptable scores on the performance assessment with the use of different content-specific pedagogical practices that support implementation of the PK–12 content standards and curriculum frameworks. The model sponsor takes steps to plan and anticipate the appropriate scoring of candidates who use a wide range of pedagogical practices that are educationally effective and builds scoring protocols to take these variations into account.

1(d) The model sponsor must include within the design of the performance assessment candidate tasks a focus on addressing the teaching of English learners, all underserved education groups or groups that need to be served differently, and students with special needs in the general education classroom to adequately assess the candidate's ability to effectively teach all students.

1(e) For elementary candidates, the model sponsor must include assessments of the core content areas of at least Literacy and Mathematics. Programs use local program performance assessments for History/Social Science and Science if not already included as part of the performance assessment.

1(f) The model sponsor must include a focus on classroom teaching performance within the performance assessment, including a video of the candidate's classroom teaching performance with candidate commentary describing the lesson plan and rationale for teaching decisions shown and evidence of the effect of that teaching on student learning.

1(g) The model sponsor must provide materials appropriate for use by programs in helping faculty become familiar with the design of the performance assessment, the candidate tasks and the scoring rubrics so that faculty can effectively assist candidates to prepare for the assessment. The performance assessment must also provide candidate materials to assist candidates in understanding the nature of the assessment, the specific assessment tasks, the scoring rubrics, submission processes, and scoring processes.

1(h) The model sponsor develops scoring rubrics and assessor training procedures that focus primarily on teaching performance and that minimize the effects of candidate factors that are not clearly related to pedagogical competence, which may include (depending on the circumstances) factors such as personal attire, appearance, demeanor, speech patterns, and accents or any other bias that are not likely to affect job effectiveness and/or student learning.

1(i) The model sponsor provides a clear statement acknowledging the intended uses of the assessment. The statement demonstrates the model sponsor's clear understanding of the implications of the assessment for candidates, preparation programs, the public schools, and PK–12 students. The statement includes appropriate cautions about additional or alternative uses for which the assessment is not valid. All elements of assessment design and development are consistent with the intended uses of the assessment for determining the pedagogical competence of candidates for Standard certification in Texas and as information useful for determining program quality and effectiveness.

1(j) The model sponsor completes content review and editing procedures to ensure that pedagogical assessment tasks and directions to candidates are culturally and linguistically sensitive, fair, and appropriate for candidates from diverse backgrounds.

1(k) The model sponsor completes initial and periodic basic psychometric analyses to identify pedagogical assessment tasks and/or scoring rubrics that show differential effects in relation to candidates' race, ethnicity, language, gender, or disability. When group pass-rate differences are found, the model sponsor investigates the potential sources of differential performance and seeks to eliminate construct-irrelevant sources of variance.

1(l) In designing assessment administration procedures, the model sponsor includes administrative accommodations that preserve assessment validity while addressing issues of access for candidates with disabilities or learning needs.

1(m) In the course of determining a passing standard, the model sponsor secures and reflects on the considered judgments of teachers, supervisors of teachers, support providers of new teachers, and other preparers of teachers regarding necessary and acceptable levels of proficiency on the part of entry-level teachers. The model sponsor periodically reviews the reasonableness of the scoring scales and established passing standard, when and as directed by the TEA.

1(n) To preserve the validity and fairness of the assessment over time, the model sponsor may need to develop and field test new pedagogical and content pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring rubrics to replace or strengthen prior ones. Initially and periodically, the model sponsor analyzes the assessment tasks and scoring rubrics to ensure that they yield important evidence that represents candidate knowledge and skill related to the Texas educator standards, and serve as a basis for determining entry-level pedagogical competence to teach the curriculum and student population of Texas' PK–12 public schools. The model sponsor documents the basis and results of each analysis and modifies the tasks and rubrics as needed.

1(o) The model sponsor must make all performance assessment materials available to the TEA upon request for review and approval, including materials that are proprietary to the model sponsor. The TEA will maintain the confidentiality of all materials designated as proprietary by the model sponsor.

Performance Assessment Design Standard 2: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness

- The assessment tasks yield enough valid evidence to determine a candidate's qualification for a Standard certification
- Assessment tasks and rubrics are extensively field tested in practice before being used for certification
- There is a comprehensive process to select and train assessors who score candidate responses

The sponsor of the performance assessment requests approval of an assessment that will yield, in relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the Texas educator standards, enough collective evidence of each candidate's pedagogical and content pedagogical performance to serve as a valid basis to judge the candidate's general pedagogical competence for a Standard certification. The model sponsor carefully monitors assessment development to ensure consistency with this stated purpose of the assessment. The performance assessment includes a comprehensive program to train, calibrate and maintain assessor calibration over time. The model sponsor periodically evaluates the assessment system to ensure equitable treatment of candidates. The assessment system and its implementation contribute to local and statewide consistency in the assessment of teaching competence.

Required Elements for Performance Assessment Design Standard 2: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness

2(a) In relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the Texas educator standards, the pedagogical assessment tasks, rubrics, and the associated directions to

candidates are designed to yield enough valid evidence for an overall judgment of each candidate's pedagogical and content pedagogical qualifications for a Standard certification as one part of the requirements for the certification.

2(b) Pedagogical and content pedagogical assessment tasks and scoring rubrics are extensively field tested in practice before being used operationally for certification. The model sponsor evaluates the field test results thoroughly and documents the field test design, participation, methods, results and interpretation.

2(c) The performance assessment includes a comprehensive process to select and train assessors who score candidate responses to the pedagogical assessment tasks. An assessor training program demonstrates convincingly that prospective and continuing assessors gain a deep understanding of the Texas educator standards, the pedagogical and content-pedagogical assessment tasks and the multi-level scoring rubrics. The training program includes task-based scoring trials in which an assessment trainer evaluates and certifies each assessor's scoring accuracy and calibration in relation to the scoring rubrics associated with the task. The model sponsor establishes selection criteria for assessors of candidate responses to the performance assessment. The selection criteria include but are not limited to appropriate pedagogical expertise in the content areas assessed within the performance assessment. The model sponsor selects assessors who meet the established selection criteria and uses only assessors who successfully calibrate during the required performance assessment model assessor training sequence. When new pedagogical tasks and scoring rubrics are incorporated into the assessment, the model sponsor provides additional training to the assessors, as needed.

2(d) The model sponsor plans and implements periodic evaluations of the assessor training program, which include systematic feedback from assessors and assessment trainers and which lead to substantive improvements in the training as needed.

2(e) The model sponsor provides a consistent scoring process for all programs using that model. The scoring process conducted by the model sponsor to assure the reliability and validity of candidate outcomes on the assessment may include, for example, regular auditing, selective back reading, and double scoring of candidate responses near the cut score by the qualified, calibrated scorers trained by the model sponsor. The model sponsor provides a detailed plan for establishing and maintaining scorer accuracy and inter-rater reliability during field testing and operational administration of the assessment. The model sponsor demonstrates that the assessment procedures, taken as a whole, maximize the accurate determination of each candidate's overall pass-fail status on the assessment. The model sponsor must provide an annual audit process that documents that scoring outcomes are consistent and reliable within the model for candidates across the range of programs and informs the TEA where inconsistencies in outcomes are identified. If inconsistencies are identified, the sponsor must provide a plan to the TEA for how it will address and resolve the scoring inconsistencies both for the current scoring results and for future scoring of the performance assessment.

2(f) The model sponsor provides the option for candidates seeking elementary certification and LOTE certifications to submit all required components of the portfolio in Spanish or LOTE certification language without translation.

2(g) The model sponsor's performance assessment design includes a clear and easy to implement appeal procedure for candidates who do not pass the assessment, including an equitable process for rescoring of evidence already submitted by an appellant candidate in the program.

2(h) The model sponsor conducting scoring for the program provides results on the performance assessment to the individual candidate based on performance relative to the performance assessment's specific scoring rubrics within a maximum of three weeks following candidate submission of completed performance assessment portfolio. The model sponsor provides results to programs based on both individual and aggregated data relating to candidate performance relative to the rubrics.

2(i) The model sponsor provides program level aggregate results to the TEA, in a manner, format and time frame specified by the TEA, as one means of assessing program quality. It is expected that these results will be used within the TEA's ongoing accreditation and accountability systems.

Performance Assessment Design Standard 3: Performance Assessment Sponsor Support Responsibilities

- Clear procedures and materials are in place to ensure implementation of the assessment as designed
- On-site and regional training is provided at no cost to the participating programs
- Clear retake policies are in place for candidates who fail one or more parts of the assessment

The sponsor of the performance assessment provides technical support to teacher preparation programs using that model concerning fidelity of implementation of the model as designed. The model sponsor is responsible for conducting and/or moderating scoring for all programs, as applicable, within a national scorer approach. The model sponsor has ongoing responsibilities to interact with the TEA, to provide candidate and program outcomes data as requested and specified by the TEA, and to maintain the currency of the model over time.

Required Elements for Assessment Design Standard 3: Performance Assessment Sponsor Support Responsibilities

3(a) The model sponsor commits to providing on-site and regional training to programs utilizing the performance assessment at no cost to the participating programs.

3(b) The model sponsor provides technical assistance to programs utilizing the performance assessment to support fidelity of implementation of the model as designed. Clear implementation procedures and materials such as a candidate and a program handbook are provided by the model sponsor to programs using the model.

3(c) A model sponsor conducting scoring for programs is responsible for providing performance assessment outcomes data at the candidate and program level to the program within three weeks and to the TEA, as specified by the TEA.

3(d) The model sponsor is responsible for submitting at minimum an annual report to the TEA describing, among other data points, the programs using the performance assessment, the number of candidate submissions scored, the date(s) when responses were received for scoring, the date(s) when the results of the scoring were provided to the preparation programs, the number of candidate appeals, first and second time passing rates, candidate completion passing rates, and other operational details as specified by the TEA.

3(e) The model sponsor is responsible for maintaining the currency of the performance assessment, including making appropriate changes to the assessment tasks and/or to the scoring rubrics and associated program, candidate, and scoring materials, as directed by the TEA when necessitated by changes in the TEKS/ELPS and/or in the teacher educator standards.

3(f) The model sponsor must define the retake policies for candidates who fail one or more parts of the performance assessment which preserve the reliability and validity of the assessment results. The retake policies must include whether the task(s) on which the candidate was not successful must be retaken in whole or in part, with appropriate guidance for programs and candidates about which task and/or task components must be resubmitted for scoring by a second assessor and what the resubmitted response must include.

ATTACHMENT V

Update on T-TESS Alternative: Submitted by Dr. Stacey Edmonson, Dean, College of Education at Sam Houston State University

T-TESS Pilot Overview

Purpose: How can Texas effectively T-TESS as a consequential component of the teacher certification requirement? The pilot will offer EPPs the opportunity to participate during the spring 2020 academic semester and renew for the 2020–2021 school year, as well as two additional years beyond. The purpose of the pilot is twofold: (1) to identify and develop best practices on implementation of T-TESS by EPPs and (2) to measure early outcomes for candidates and EPPs who complete T-TESS as a performance-based indicator for certification and teacher readiness.

Who can participate? Any accredited educator preparation program may choose to be included in the T-TESS pilot. No added cost to candidates will be required. Candidates in programs selected for the formal pilot will be required to pass the corresponding TExES exam currently required for Texas teacher certification. Multiple EPPs have expressed interest and are anticipated to be included.

What data will be collected and used?

1. T-TESS evaluations at the candidate level, disaggregated by dimension (including all three required evaluations per candidate, inclusive of scores by the evaluator as well as an external reviewer)
2. EPP demographic data
3. TExES results (PPR, content areas) for each candidate
4. student demographic data (gender, ethnicity, GPA; to the extent possible)
5. Perception data collected via survey and focus groups from candidates, faculty members, and P–12 partners
6. Additional data, as applicable: (a) candidate retention data, (b) Principal appraisal of candidate preparation, (c) New teacher appraisal of candidate preparation, (d) Teacher effectiveness data, (e) Student achievement and growth data

Research Questions

1. How do scores on the T-TESS compare across EPPs?
2. To what degree are scores on TExES and T-TESS assessments correlated?
3. What is the most appropriate score threshold for T-TESS that would merit teacher certification?
4. To what degree are certification decisions based on the two assessments (i.e., T-TESS, TExES) correlated?
5. To what extent do T-TESS and TExES scores predict entry into the workforce in the first year after graduation?
6. To what extent do T-TESS and TExES scores predict first year teacher retention?
7. To what extent are pre-service T-TESS scores predictive of a first-year teacher's scores on the T-TESS?
8. To what degree are T-TESS scores of university supervisors (in-person) and expert reviewers (video) T-TESS observations correlated?

9. How educative is each assessment used in the pilot study for candidate and program improvement?
10. To what degree do scores on the two assessments help predict novice teachers' impact on student learning?