

## Item 25:

# Discussion of edTPA as a Certification Exam for Standard Teacher Certification

### DISCUSSION

**SUMMARY:** This item provides the SBEC with an opportunity to discuss the implementation of the edTPA as the pedagogy exam requirement for standard teacher certification, including discussion of the SBEC’s statutory charge and rationale for implementation of the edTPA pilot, feedback on the edTPA gathered during the edTPA pilot, proposed plans for implementation of the edTPA as a replacement for the current pedagogy exam, the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) exam, and recent feedback regarding options for pedagogy certification exams for standard teacher certification.

**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 plan to bring this item for proposal at the February 2022 SBEC meeting.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND JUSTIFICATION:** This item provides an overview of the edTPA pilot, adopted by the SBEC in July 2019. The edTPA, as a portfolio-based performance assessment used for teacher certification, is a part of the broader teacher certification redesign plan that was originally discussed with the Board in 2018 to improve the quality and consistency of newly certified teachers. The teacher certification redesign plan stemmed from a broader SBEC focus on improving educator quality, beginning in 2015.

At the July 2019 SBEC meeting, the Board adopted the edTPA performance assessment pilot to gather data on the impact of edTPA implementation on Texas candidates in order to make an informed decision on implementation of the edTPA as the certification exam requirement for standard teacher certification. The SBEC directed TEA staff to provide recurring updates of the edTPA pilot to keep the Board and all interested parties apprised of the status of the pilot along with any applicable data.

This item provides the SBEC with an opportunity to discuss the implementation of the edTPA as the Pedagogy exam requirement for standard teacher certification at the conclusion of the edTPA pilot, feedback on the edTPA pilot, proposed plans for implementation of the edTPA as a replacement for the current pedagogy exam, the PPR exam, and recent feedback regarding options for pedagogy certification exams for standard teacher certification.

### Background and Context on edTPA Pilot Implementation:

In TEC, §21.031, Purpose, the Board’s stated purpose is to “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”.

In alignment with this statutory charge, the SBEC has implemented significant and transformative rules since 2015 focused on ensuring that Texas educators are ready to meet

the needs of all Texas students from Day 1 as a teacher of record, effectively demonstrating their knowledge and skills to improve the performance of the diverse student population of Texas. A summary of these SBEC policies and results can be found in Attachment I.

During this time of transformative policy making, TEA staff also sought to ensure that educators were supported in alignment with the SBEC’s charge. With this in mind, TEA staff included in the educator certification testing vendor contract proposal a request for a performance assessment for teacher certification. The contract was awarded to the vendor that most demonstrated alignment with the SBEC’s goals, demonstrating the ability to develop rigorous and relevant exams, provide high quality customer service and expanded testing sites, and a portfolio-based performance assessment for teacher certification. The portfolio-based performance assessment connected to the awarded contract was the edTPA.

The edTPA is a portfolio assessment comprised of three performance tasks that are designed to capture many of the real-life skills that teachers must effectively implement on a routine basis in order to meaningfully improve the performance of the diverse student population in Texas. To that end, the exam provides a foundation for new teachers by requiring them to practice and demonstrate those skills prior to receiving a standard certificate, allowing them to be adequately prepared on day one. The three authentic tasks outlined below require the educator to submit evidence from their classrooms throughout the standard planning, instruction, assessment, and reflection cycle. Planning, instruction, and assessment are core components of the Texas Educator Standards and should be an integral part of educator preparation program coursework and training. The edTPA, as a portfolio-based performance assessment for teacher certification, meaningfully measures a candidate’s readiness to demonstrate these practices in a Texas classroom.

Tasks	Objective
Task 1: Planning for Instruction and Assessment	Assesses a candidate’s ability to develop and/or modify lesson plans and assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• build student content understanding,</li> <li>• support student learning needs,</li> <li>• use knowledge of students in lesson and assessment design and/or modification, and</li> <li>• monitor student learning.</li> </ul>
Task 2: Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning	Assesses a candidate’s ability to facilitate instruction in a manner that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• establishes a supportive, productive learning environment,</li> <li>• engages all students in learning,</li> <li>• deepens student thinking, and</li> <li>• demonstrates the candidate’s subject-specific pedagogical skill.</li> </ul>

Task 3: Assessing Students' Learning	Assesses a candidate's ability to analyze assessment results by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>analyzing student learning during instruction and through the assessment results,</li> <li>providing targeted feedback to students on area of strength and areas for growth, and</li> <li>supporting students in using teacher feedback for continued growth.</li> </ul>
--------------------------------------	--

The SBEC's intent in implementing the edTPA pilot was to explore a more meaningful pedagogy assessment to gauge candidate readiness for the classroom and, therefore, standard teacher certification. The current pedagogy exam, the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) exam, is a multiple-choice exam that is not content-specific and covers all grade levels (Pre-Kindergarten through Grade 12). The SBEC implemented the edTPA pilot in Texas with the intent to increase the effectiveness of teacher candidates and educator preparation programs through the multi-year pilot of content and grade-band specific edTPA assessments for standard teacher certification in lieu of the current EC–12 PPR exam. In doing so, the SBEC recognized that the PPR exam did not effectively measure a teacher candidate's readiness in alignment with their statutory charge.

The table below compares the candidate behaviors for each certification exam currently required for standard certification.

Context	edTPA	PPR
<b>When it's Completed</b>	Completed during clinical teaching or internship <b>in a Texas classroom</b>	Can be taken anytime during preparation (including prior to practice in a classroom), with program approval, <b>in a testing center</b>
<b>How it's Completed</b>	Required to <b>demonstrate content-specific competencies</b> in practice	Required to answer <b>multiple choice questions</b> focused on EC-12 pedagogy
<b>The Utility of the Results</b>	Results for each of the 15-18 rubrics with feedback  <b>Provides insight</b> with specificity into areas of strength and areas for continuous improvement	<b>Number correct</b> by exam competency and an overall Pass/Fail status

In implementing the edTPA pilot, the SBEC sought to analyze the impact of edTPA implementation on Texas candidates, programs, and students. TEA staff have shared edTPA pilot candidate participation and performance data at the December 2020 and October 2021 SBEC meetings and plan to share additional data requested by the SBEC at the December 2021 meeting. In addition to candidate participation and performance data, TEA staff have collected perception information from candidates, programs, and LEA partners across all years of the pilot, including areas of perceived challenge regarding edTPA implementation. A summary of some perceived challenges and strategies to address them can be found below.

TEA staff plan to discuss these challenges further, along with additional questions regarding the edTPA, during the December 2021 meeting.

Perceived Challenges	Strategies to Address
Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stipends and reimbursements for candidates</li> <li>• Collaboration with EPPs and LEAs around potential funding options (including stipends for teacher candidates)</li> <li>• Reimbursements or vouchers from testing vendor</li> </ul>
Equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resources and training regarding equity features of edTPA</li> <li>• Resources and training regarding academic language of the edTPA</li> <li>• Pilot program communities of practice regarding equity centered edTPA best practices</li> <li>• Close monitoring of formative and edTPA performance data and intentional planning for candidate and programmatic supports based on trends</li> </ul>
LEA Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resources and communication tools to communicate about edTPA with LEAs</li> <li>• Pilot program communities of practice regarding P-12 partnership best practices</li> <li>• Mentor and Cooperating Teacher Training series</li> </ul>

### Discussion on Implementation of the edTPA to Replace the PPR Exam

At the October 2021 meeting, TEA staff shared that they planned to bring forward an item at the December 2021 meeting to discuss implementation of the edTPA to replace the current PPR exam at the conclusion of the pilot. TEA staff shared that the current certification exam for standard teacher certification, the PPR exam, does not set candidates and students up for success and that EPPs that have engaged in the edTPA pilot have seen growth in their candidates and improvement in their programs. Staff shared that rather than bringing this topic forward to the SBEC for discussion in October 2020, staff requested that the SBEC allow for an additional pilot year due to COVID-19. Staff shared that this additional time allowed for the collection of additional data and continued development of an edTPA knowledge base in the field. Staff reinforced that given Deputy Commissioner Oeser's comments on the current challenges Texas students face due to COVID-19, that the SBEC has the opportunity to be part of the solution by implementing an assessment that ensures that Texas teachers are able to demonstrate the necessary knowledge and skills to be ready to meet the needs of Texas's diverse student population.

Given this discussion, TEA staff has outlined a proposed implementation timeline and communication plan for the SBEC's discussion and input, which can be found in Attachment II.

### Discussion of Pedagogy Certification Exam Options for Standard Teacher Certification

#### Background on Discussions of Alternatives Performance Assessment Pilots

From the initial discussion of the edTPA pilot, the field has recognized the need for a meaningful, normed bar for issuance of a professional teaching license, i.e. a performance assessment. Some stakeholders asked at the start of the edTPA pilot if there were additional

options for portfolio-based performance assessments that could meet this bar, as an alternative to edTPA. To support the examination of alternative performance assessments for certification, the SBEC shared and reinforced their performance assessment design standards with the field in Summer 2019, which can be found in Attachment III. The SBEC held an open call for performance assessment pilots to run parallel to the edTPA pilot to analyze the impact of the given exams on Texas candidates. Since 2019, there have been opportunities for additional approved performance assessment pilots, but no entities responded to the call for SBEC approval as a parallel pilot. The SBEC closed the call in Summer 2020. To date, edTPA is the only SBEC-approved performance assessment pilot.

### **Recent Feedback Regarding Options for Pedagogy Certification Exams for Standard Teacher Certification**

Recently, TEA staff became aware that some stakeholders in the field wanted to discuss alternatives to the edTPA for standard teacher certification. Specifically, EPP faculty and staff attending the Consortium of State Organizations of Texas Teacher Education (CSOTTE) Annual Conference, held on October 10-12<sup>th</sup>, shared feedback with TEA staff and others that they had interest in there being options for certification exams used for standard teacher certification. To ensure that the SBEC received the full context from the field, TEA staff focused the October Educator Preparation Advisory Committee (EPAC) meeting on the edTPA, with two primary focuses:

1. Provide members of the EPAC the opportunity to discuss and provide feedback on the edTPA as a performance assessment for standard teacher certification
2. Provide the opportunity for members of the EPAC, who wanted to discuss pedagogy exam options for standard teacher certification, to present their options to the committee for feedback

EPAC members who spoke on alternative options were asked to address a series of questions that TEA staff consider when implementing any certification exam that leads to an SBEC-issued certificate. These questions included:

- What does the certification exam option explicitly entail (what is the structure of the assessment, how is it evaluated, etc)?
- How does the certification exam option meet the SBEC's statutory charge related to certification and accountability?
- Who would develop the certification exam option?
- What would be the timeline for the SBEC to consider approval of the certification exam option?
- How would the certification exam option be implemented and monitored?
- How would the SBEC ensure results of the certification exam option are normed for issuance of a professional license?

In discussion of pedagogy exam options for standard teacher certification, TEA staff also named that any option brought before the Board for discussion as an option at the same time as the edTPA would need to be fully aligned with the SBEC's performance assessment design standards, in Attachment III, and be operational on the same timeline as the edTPA.

Two individuals, Dr. Zach Rozell of iTeach and Dr. Elizabeth Ward of Texas Wesleyan University, presented other pedagogy exam options for standard teacher certification at the

EPAC meeting, addressing the questions listed above and fielding questions from other members of the committee.

Given the EPAC discussion, during which members did not speak as a unified voice on the certification exam options, members of the SBEC will be provided with the opportunity during the December 2021 meeting to hear from members of the EPAC and Sam Houston State University (SHSU) on their perspectives.

### **Next Steps in edTPA Discussion**

The SBEC approved the pilot of the edTPA to gather data on the impact of edTPA implementation on Texas candidates. The Board has directed TEA staff to collect and analyze data related to the implementation of the edTPA throughout the pilot to inform decisions grounded in Texas data related to edTPA implementation going forward. Throughout the Year 3 edTPA pilot, TEA staff will continue to:

- gather data on Texas pilot implementation of the edTPA,
- support preparation programs and candidates who are participating in the pilot,
- provide ongoing trainings and resources for all Texas programs interested in learning about the edTPA,
- provide the SBEC with continual updates at SBEC meetings,
- provide external stakeholders opportunities to learn and provide input on Texas edTPA implementation, and
- provide an analysis of all three years of implementation in Fall 2022.

At the February 2022 SBEC meeting, TEA staff plan to bring to the Board proposed rule text regarding edTPA implementation at the conclusion of the edTPA pilot based on SBEC member feedback at the December 2021 meeting.

**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:**

Jessica McLoughlin, Director, Educator Standards, Testing, and Preparation  
DeMarco Pitre, Educator Standards and Testing Specialist

### **Attachments:**

- I. Summary of SBEC Policy Decisions Focused on Ensuring Well-Prepared Beginning Teachers
- II. Draft edTPA Implementation and Communication Plan
- III. SBEC Performance Assessment Design Standards
- IV. edTPA Pilot Year 1-3 Information

**ATTACHMENT I**

**Summary of SBEC Policy Decisions Focused on Ensuring Well-Prepared Beginning Teachers**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Results</b>
2016	More training requirements prior to becoming a teacher of record.	Shift from: Candidates serving as teachers of record for up to three years without demonstrating proficiency in content or teaching ability.  To: Candidates demonstrating content knowledge as a requirement to become a teacher of record for one year. Candidates demonstrating teaching ability as a requirement to continue as teacher of record for up to two years.
2016	Requiring candidates to receive more support.	Shift from: Candidates receiving three formal observations from their EPP while serving as the teacher of record.  To: Candidates receiving five formal observations from their EPP while serving as the teacher of record.
2016	Requiring more clinical teaching.	Shift from: Candidates only completing a minimum of 12 weeks of student teaching.  To: Candidates completing a minimum of 14 weeks of student teaching.
2016	Requiring EPPs to be accountable for all exams approved	Shift from: EPPs only being held accountable for the final test a candidate takes that leads to certification.  To: EPPs being held accountable for a candidate's first two attempts on the test that the program has recommended the candidate for based on preparation by the program.
2018	Adopting the EPP Commendations.	Shift from: The SBEC only assigning ASEP statuses based on minimum performance standards.  To: The SBEC assigning commendations based on four categories of high-performing performance standards and innovation to recognize and reward EPPs that go beyond minimum standards in preparing educators.

<p>2018</p>	<p>Charging TEA staff to begin the ongoing process of redesigning the content pedagogy exams, in alignment with updated TEKS and educator standards.</p>	<p>Shift from: Candidates taking multiple-choice only exams that were not aligned in rigor or relevance to the reality of Texas classrooms.</p> <p>To: Candidates beginning to take exams that include multiple-choice and constructed-response questions and are well aligned with updates to the TEKS, rigorous, and relevant to Texas classrooms.</p>
<p>2019</p>	<p>Adopting an updated definition of the Pre-Admission Content Test (PACT) requirement and associated PACT exams.</p>	<p>Shift from: EPPs having the option to require candidates to take their content exam for admission into the program.</p> <p>To: Candidates completing the content exam while being supported by a program and EPPs being held accountable for candidate exam performance.</p>
<p>2019</p>	<p>Adopting the edTPA pilot, a performance-based portfolio assessment used for teacher certification, for a three-year pilot.</p>	<p>Shift from: Candidates demonstrating the ability to teach by passing the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) certification exam, a multiple-choice only exam that is not content or grade specific.</p> <p>To: Candidates having the option to take the edTPA through the edTPA pilot, demonstrating their competence in a Texas classroom through the development of a performance-based portfolio that measures planning, instruction, and assessment while also receiving meaningful feedback on their strengths and areas for growth as an educator.</p>

**ATTACHMENT II**

**Draft edTPA Implementation and Communication Plan**

<b>Draft Implementation Plan</b>		
<b>Implementation Year</b>	<b>Implementation Phase</b>	<b>Implementation Actions</b>
<b>2022-2023</b>	<p><b>Non-Consequential Implementation:</b> No official cut score would be implemented during this period. Candidates would “pass” the edTPA when they submit a complete edTPA portfolio.</p>	<p>edTPA would be required non-consequentially for all first-time test takers* as a data collection year beginning September 1, 2022.</p> <p>Candidates who take PPR before September 1, 2022 would be allowed to take the PPR as a re-tester after September 1, 2022 through the end of the academic year, August 31, 2023 to support the exam transition.</p> <p>Standard setting committee, comprised of Texas educators, would recommend a set of phased-in passing standard informed by the three years of edTPA pilot data and the first non-consequential implementation year data (Spring 2023).</p> <p>Commissioner rulemaking period to implement committee recommended passing standards would begin.</p> <p>Note: For the purpose of the non-consequential implementation period, a complete portfolio would be defined as a portfolio with less than two condition codes. This mirrors the requirements for teacher candidates during the edTPA pilot.</p>
<b>2023-2024</b>	<p><b>Non-Consequential Implementation:</b> No official cut score would be implemented during this period. Candidates would “pass” the edTPA when they submit a complete* edTPA portfolio.</p>	<p>edTPA would be required non-consequentially for all test takers* as a data collection year beginning September 1, 2023.</p> <p>edTPA phased-in passing standards would be adopted in Commissioner rules by January 2024, with an effective date of September 2024, in order to provide ample notice to the field.</p> <p>Note: For the purpose of the non-consequential implementation period, a complete portfolio would be defined as a portfolio with less than two condition codes. This mirrors the requirements for teacher candidates during the edTPA pilot.</p>
<b>2024-2025</b>	<p><b>Consequential Implementation:</b> An official cut score would be implemented during</p>	<p>edTPA would be required consequentially for all test takers* beginning September 1, 2024.</p> <p>edTPA phased-in passing standards would be effective as of September 1, 2024.</p>

	this period. Candidates would need to meet or exceed the given cut score to pass the exam.	
--	---	--

\*The requirement would exclude the Trade and Industrial Education: EC-12 certification category because the certificate has a separate pedagogy exam requirement.

<b>Draft Communication Plan</b>		
<b>Method</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Next Steps/Deliverables</b>
Informational One-Pagers and FAQ documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information that communicates the baseline what, how, when, and why of edTPA</li> <li>Provides answers/ responses to potential questions and concerns surfaced in the field</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EPP one-pager</li> <li>Teacher Candidate one-pager</li> <li>LEA one-pager</li> </ul>
Direct email communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Direct communication to EPPs and LEAs concerning edTPA and edTPA timelines</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided in the EPP weekly newsletter</li> <li>To the Administrator Addressed (TAA) letter to LEAs</li> <li>Direct candidate communication during transition period</li> </ul>
Informational webinar series	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide information regarding edTPA implementation</li> <li>Provide information regarding edTPA support for candidates, EPPs, and LEAs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>edTPA 101 series</li> <li>edTPA Deep Dive series</li> <li>edTPA Town Hall sessions</li> <li>Statewide edTPA Data Deep Dive</li> </ul>
Timely updates to edTPA website	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>edTPA webpage that includes timely edTPA information and updates for candidates, EPPs, and LEAs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>edTPA webpage established on TEA website</li> </ul>
Professional Organization updates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide information regarding edTPA implementation best practices</li> <li>Provide information regarding edTPA support for candidates, EPPs, and LEAs</li> <li>Provide timely updates on implementation timelines and submission windows</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EPP and LEA professional organization convenings</li> </ul>

LEA updates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide information regarding edTPA implementation, including appropriate candidate support and edTPA-district priority alignment</li> <li>• Provide updates regarding implementation timelines</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TAA Letters</li> <li>• edTPA webpage</li> <li>• LEA professional organization convenings</li> </ul>
SBEC Updates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide updates on edTPA implementation timelines and progress</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SBEC Agenda Items</li> </ul>
EPAC Updates and discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide updates regarding implementation timelines, EPP best practices, candidate support, and LEA collaboration</li> <li>• Seek feedback on edTPA implementation progress and areas for refinement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EPAC Agenda Items</li> </ul>

**ATTACHMENT III**

**SBEC’s Performance Assessment Design Standards**

**Performance Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness**

<b>Design Standard 1: Summary of Requirements</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade and subject-specific to all initial certifications offered in Texas</li> <li>• Addresses the teaching of English learners, students with special needs, and underserved populations</li> <li>• Includes video of teaching performance and candidate commentary describing rationale and impact of instructional decisions</li> <li>• Tasks and directions are fair and appropriate for candidates from diverse backgrounds</li> </ul>
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>*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.</i></p>
<b>Design Standard 1 Required Elements</b>
<p>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 <b>candidate-generated responses to each pedagogical task</b>, the assessment also <b>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.</b> 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.</p>
<p>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</p>

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 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.

<p>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.</p>
<p>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</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>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.</p>

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

Design Standard 2: Summary of Requirements
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The assessment tasks yield enough valid evidence to determine a candidate's qualification for a Standard certification</li> <li>• Assessment tasks and rubrics are extensively field tested in practice before being used for certification</li> <li>• There is a comprehensive process to select and train assessors who score candidate responses</li> </ul>
<p>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</p>

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.

### Design Standard 2

#### Required Elements

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

<p>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.</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>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.</p>

**Performance Assessment Design Standard 3: Performance Assessment Sponsor Support Responsibilities**

<p><b>Design Standard 3: Summary of Requirements</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear procedures and materials are in place to ensure implementation of the assessment as designed</li> <li>• On-site and regional training is provided at no cost to the participating programs</li> <li>• Clear retake policies are in place for candidates who fail one or more parts of the assessment</li> </ul>
<p>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.</p>
<p><b>Design Standard 3</b></p>
<p><b>Required Elements</b></p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>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.</p>

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 IV****edTPA Pilot Year 1-3 Information****edTPA Pilot Year 1 Programs and Timeline**

<b>Program</b>	<b>Candidate Submissions</b>
ACT-RGV	Yes
Concordia University	
Region 20 Education Service Center	Yes
Excellence in Teaching	
Houston ISD	
INSPIRE TEXAS	Yes
Our Lady of the Lake University	Yes
Region 10 Education Service Center	
Region 12 Education Service Center	
Relay Graduate School of Education	
Rice University	Yes
Southwestern Adventist University, Keene	
Stephen F Austin State University	Yes
Texas A&M University - Commerce	Yes
Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi	
Teacher Builder	
Teaching Excellence	Yes
Texas Tech	Yes
TNTP	Yes
Trinity University	Yes
University of North Texas - Dallas	
Urban Teachers	Yes
University of Texas - Tyler	Yes
University of Texas - Dallas	Yes
University of Texas – El Paso	Yes
University of Texas – San Antonio	Yes

**edTPA Pilot Year 1 Timeline**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Action</b>
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"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Collect candidate demographic data and district partner data</li> <li>• 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"> <li>○ 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</li> <li>○ Sharing of instrumental resources and best practices from successful implementation plans</li> <li>○ Guidelines and best practices for supporting candidates completing their edTPA portfolio</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
August 9 and 12, 2019	TEA Webinar: Task II Deep Dive—Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning
September 1, 2019	TEA staff collect the following data from programs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demographic information</li> <li>• Faculty training documents</li> <li>• Curriculum alignment information</li> <li>• Materials used to determine which candidates are recommended for edTPA (versus PPR)</li> </ul>
September 13 and 16, 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

Date	Action
January 10, 2020	TEA Monthly Webinar
February 13, 2020	TEA Monthly Webinar
February 2020	Announcement of year 2 edTPA pilot participants
March 2020	Analyze edTPA rubric scores from portfolios submitted October through March
March 13, 2020	TEA Monthly Webinar
April 10, 2020	TEA Monthly Webinar
May 8, 2020	TEA Monthly Webinar
June 30, 2020	Analyze edTPA rubric scores from portfolios submitted April through June
August 2020	Survey to collect perception data from EPPs, principals, and districts
Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyze edTPA rubric scores from portfolios submitted</li> <li>• Monthly implementation calls with edTPA Program Managers and/or members of the edTPA National Academy</li> <li>• Collect data during monthly calls about retention, perception, and additional costs related to edTPA</li> <li>• On-demand virtual supports from edTPA Program Managers and/or members of the edTPA National Academy</li> <li>• Academy to address questions and concerns and determine next steps</li> <li>• Statewide implementation support webinars for edTPA coordinators with edTPA Program Managers</li> </ul>

## edTPA Pilot Year 2 Program Participants and Timeline

Program	Implementation Year	Grant Recipient
ACT RGV	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	
Austin Community College District	1 <sup>st</sup> year	Regional Coordinator Grant
Excellence in Teaching	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	
Houston Baptist University	1 <sup>st</sup> year	edTPA Pilot Support Grant
Houston ISD	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	
Inspire Texas, Region 4 Education Service Center	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	Regional Coordinator Grant
iTeach	1 <sup>st</sup> year	
McLennan Community College	1 <sup>st</sup> year	
Our Lady of the Lake University	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	edTPA Pilot Support Grant
Region 10 Education Service Center	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	edTPA Pilot Support Grant
Region 19 Education Service Center	1 <sup>st</sup> year	edTPA Pilot Support Grant
Region 20 Education Service Center	1 <sup>st</sup> year	
Rice University	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	
Southwest Adventist University	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	
Stephen F. Austin State University	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	Regional Coordinator Grant
Tarleton State University	1 <sup>st</sup> year	edTPA Pilot Support Grant
Teacher Builder	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	
Teaching Excellence (Yes Prep)	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	
Teachworthy	1 <sup>st</sup> year	

Program	Implementation Year	Grant Recipient
Texas A&M University	1 <sup>st</sup> year	edTPA Pilot Support Grant
Texas A&M University – Commerce	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	edTPA Pilot Support Grant
Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	
Texas A&M International University	1 <sup>st</sup> year	edTPA Pilot Support Grant
Texas A&M University – San Antonio	1 <sup>st</sup> year	edTPA Pilot Support Grant
Texas Southern University	1 <sup>st</sup> year	
Texas Tech University	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	
TNTP Academy	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	
Trinity University	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	
University of Houston – Victoria	1 <sup>st</sup> year	
University of Mary Hardin-Baylor	1 <sup>st</sup> year	
University of Texas at Dallas	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	
University of Texas at El Paso	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	
University of Texas Rio Grande Valley	1 <sup>st</sup> year	
University of Texas at San Antonio	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	
Urban Teachers	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	

**edTPA Pilot Year 2 Timeline**

Date	Event
<b>2020</b>	
February 14	Notification sent to participating EPPs
March 16	TEA edTPA orientation webinar
June 4	TEA edTPA Year 2 Pilot Kick-off webinar

Date	Event
July 23	Monthly Pilot Webinar facilitated by Texas edTPA Regional Coordinators: "Task 1 – Supporting Candidates to Plan for Instruction"
Before August 1	EPPs select and communicate to candidates who will participate in the pilot EPPs communicate with participating districts regarding the pilot
August 4	Breakout Sessions facilitated by Texas edTPA Regional Coordinators: "Supporting edTPA Stakeholder Candidates, Mentor/Cooperating Teachers, and Faculty/Instructors" Year 1 Pilot Survey Window opens
August 25	Community of Practice (Pilot Cohort 1): Lessons Learned in Year 1 of the Pilot and Change Management Plans
August 27	Monthly Pilot Webinar facilitated by Texas edTPA Regional Coordinators: "Task 2 – Supporting Candidates to Instruct and Engage in Student Learning Assessments, Feedback, and Analysis" Community of Practice (Pilot Cohort 2): Lessons Learned in Year 1 of the Pilot and Change Management Plans
September 4	Year 1 Pilot Survey window closes
September 9	Texas edTPA Pilot Grant Updates and Support Meeting
September 24	Monthly Pilot Webinar facilitated by Texas edTPA Regional Coordinators: "Task 3 – Supporting Candidates to Instruct and Engage in Student Learning"
September 30	Submit fall candidate information to TEA
October 1	edTPA Pilot Reimbursement Processes Webinar
October 8	First submission window
October 12	Community of Practice (All Programs): District coordination and district partnerships
October 20	Community of Practice (Pilot Cohort 1): Technical, administrative, and buy-in challenges related to edTPA
October 29	Monthly Pilot Webinar facilitated by Texas edTPA Regional Coordinators: "edTPA Candidate Support: Registration and Submission Processes"
November 6	edTPA Handbook and Rubric Deep Dive Virtual Workshop (LOI programs)
November 13	edTPA Academic Language Virtual Workshop

Date	Event
November 10	First reimbursement window Monthly Pilot Webinar facilitated by Texas edTPA Regional Coordinators in collaboration with edTPA National Academy: “Task 4 Deep Dive”
November–December	EPPs collect exemplar work representing planning, instruction, and assessment to share with faculty and candidates.
December 4	edTPA Local Evaluation Workshop (LOI programs)
December 2020	Proposed edTPA Pilot Year 3 Application launch
December 10	Monthly Pilot Webinar facilitated by Texas edTPA Regional Coordinators: “Looking Ahead: Spring Development Planning”
December 11	edTPA Local Evaluation Workshop (LOI programs)
December 15	EPP due date to have attended edTPA 101 and the following regional workshops: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Evaluation</li> <li>• Curriculum Inquiry</li> <li>• Academic Language</li> </ul>
December 30	EPPs submit updated candidate information to TEA (all programs) EPPs submit edTPA training log (LOI programs)
<b>2021</b>	
January–May	EPPs facilitate training to EPP faculty, staff, and/or candidates EPPs facilitate training to district staff
January 28	Monthly Pilot Webinar facilitated by Texas edTPA Regional Coordinators: Analyzing edTPA data for Continuous Improvement
February 25	Monthly Pilot Webinar facilitated by Texas edTPA Regional Coordinators: TBD Based on EPP needs
March 29–31	Texas edTPA Pilot Institute
April 22	Monthly Pilot Webinar facilitated by Texas edTPA Regional Coordinators: TBD Based on EPP needs
April 30	Deadline for all candidates to have submitted edTPA portfolio
May–June	EPPs collect and analyze edTPA score data, and present to faculty for program improvement by June 30

Date	Event
June 30	EPPs submit reflections and any programmatic adjustments based on analysis of score reports
Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyze edTPA rubric scores from portfolios submitted</li> <li>• Monthly implementation calls with edTPA Regional Coordinators and/or members of the edTPA National Academy</li> <li>• Collect data during monthly calls about retention, perception, and additional costs related to edTPA</li> <li>• On-demand virtual supports from edTPA Regional Coordinators and/or members of the edTPA National Academy to address questions and concerns and determine next steps</li> <li>• On-demand training supports from edTPA Regional Coordinators and/or members of the edTPA National Academy, including Curriculum Inquiry sessions</li> </ul>

## edTPA Pilot Year 3 Program Participants and Timeline

Program	Implementation Year	Grant Recipient
ACT RGV	3 <sup>rd</sup> year	
Alamo College	1 <sup>st</sup> year	
Arlington Baptist University	1 <sup>st</sup> year	
Austin Community College District	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	Regional Coordinator Grant
Harris County Department of Education	1 <sup>st</sup> year	
Houston ISD	3 <sup>rd</sup> year	
Inspire Texas, Region 4 Education Service Center	3 <sup>rd</sup> year	Regional Coordinator Grant
iTeach	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	
McLennan Community College	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	
North American University	1 <sup>st</sup> year	
Our Lady of the Lake University	3 <sup>rd</sup> year	edTPA Pilot Support Grant
Prairie View A&M University	1 <sup>st</sup> year	edTPA Pilot Support Grant
Region 1 Education Service Center	1 <sup>st</sup> year	edTPA Pilot Support Grant
Region 2 Education Service Center	1 <sup>st</sup> year	
Region 10 Education Service Center	3 <sup>rd</sup> year	edTPA Pilot Support Grant
Region 19 Education Service Center	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	edTPA Pilot Support Grant
Region 20 Education Service Center	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	edTPA Pilot Support Grant
Rice University	3 <sup>rd</sup> year	

Stephen F. Austin State University	3 <sup>rd</sup> year	Regional Coordinator Grant
St. Mary's University	1 <sup>st</sup> year	edTPA Pilot Support Grant
Sul Ross University	1 <sup>st</sup> year	edTPA Pilot Support Grant
Tarleton State University	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	Regional Coordinator Grant
Teaching Excellence	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	
Texas A&M University	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	edTPA Pilot Support Grant
Texas A&M University – Commerce	3 <sup>rd</sup> year	edTPA Pilot Support Grant
Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi	3 <sup>rd</sup> year	
Texas A&M University – San Antonio	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	edTPA Pilot Support Grant
Texas A&M University – Texarkana	1 <sup>st</sup> year	
Texas Tech University	3 <sup>rd</sup> year	Regional Coordinator Grant
TNTP Academy	3 <sup>rd</sup> year	
Trinity University	3 <sup>rd</sup> year	
University of Houston	1 <sup>st</sup> year	
University of Houston – Victoria	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	
University of Texas at Dallas	3 <sup>rd</sup> year	
University of Texas at El Paso	3 <sup>rd</sup> year	
University of Texas Rio Grande Valley	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	
University of Texas at San Antonio	3 <sup>rd</sup> year	
Urban Teachers	3 <sup>rd</sup> year	
Wayland Baptist University	1 <sup>st</sup> year	

Web Centric Alternative Certification Program	1 <sup>st</sup> year	
---	----------------------	--

**Proposed edTPA Pilot Year 3 Timeline**

Date	Event
December 15	Year 3 Pilot application available
<b>2021</b>	
February 26	Year 3 application window closes and applications are due
March 5	Year 3 programs are announced
March 29–31	Texas edTPA Pilot Institute
July–December	EPPs select and communicate to candidates who will participate in the pilot. EPPs communicate with participating districts regarding the pilot EPPs facilitate initial edTPA training to EPP staff, faculty, candidates, and district staff
September 9	edTPA Pilot Year 3 Kick-Off
September 30	EPPs submit fall candidate information to TEA
November–December	EPPs collect exemplar work representing planning, instruction, and assessment to share with faculty and candidates.
December 30	EPPs submit updates made to candidate information to TEA
<b>2022</b>	
April 30	Deadline for candidates to submit portfolios Deadline for updates to program candidate information forms
May–June	EPPs collect and analyze edTPA score data and present to faculty for program improvement
June	edTPA Pilot Summer Institute
June 30	EPPs share reflections and any programmatic adjustments based on analysis of score reports
August 31	End of edTPA pilot
Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analyze edTPA rubric scores from portfolios submitted</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Monthly differentiated edTPA Pilot Support webinars facilitated by the edTPA Regional Coordinators</li><li>• Monthly implementation calls with edTPA Regional Coordinators</li><li>• Collect data during monthly calls about retention, perception, and additional costs related to edTPA</li><li>• On-demand virtual supports from edTPA Regional Coordinators and/or members of the edTPA National Academy to address questions and concerns and determine next steps</li><li>• On-demand training supports from edTPA Regional Coordinators and/or members of the edTPA National Academy, including Curriculum Inquiry sessions</li><li>• Submit and process edTPA reimbursements and stipends for teacher candidates and mentor and cooperating teachers</li></ul>
--	--