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Introduction and Background

In 2010 the Iowa Department of Education, in partnership with the University of Northern Iowa, Stanford University, and UCLA’s National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Teaching, received a Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) grant from the US Department of Education with the express purpose of improving teaching in Iowa and beyond. While UNI’s accomplishments have been extensive in terms of work on the TQP grant, one specific outcome has been the adoption of the edTPA (formally known as the Teacher Performance Assessment) as a central tool in UNI’s teacher preparation program. This paper will document the implementation of the edTPA into UNI’s teacher preparation program.

The edTPA is a nationally recognized authentic assessment tool for measuring teacher candidate performance. This summative assessment tool is the first nationally available, research- and standards-based performance tool specifically designed to serve as a common yet independent measure of candidate performance. The edTPA is intended to be used for teacher licensure, to support state and national program accreditation, and to guide improvement in preparation programs. Stanford University faculty in partnership with staff at the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) developed edTPA and have now partnered with the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education to infuse edTPA into teacher education programs across the nation. More recently Pearson has been engaged as a partner to help deliver edTPA to the wide educational audience requesting involvement. The edTPA is endorsed by the American Association of Teacher Educators (AACTE) and the Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium (TPAC) (edtpa.aaacte.org).

The edTPA provides teacher preparation programs access to a multiple-measure assessment system aligned to state and national standards – including Common Core State Standards and the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC Standards) with the ultimate goal of improving teacher effectiveness. The edTPA assessment process is typically administered at the end of the student teaching and requires candidates to submit a portfolio documenting teaching and learning in a 3- to 5-day learning segment with a class of students. The portfolio includes an unedited video of the candidate delivering instruction as well as examples of teaching materials demonstrating how the candidate planned instruction, adapted it for diverse learners, and assessed student learning. There is a simultaneous focus on content learning and the development of academic language. The tool is subject-specific with separate versions for Early Childhood, Elementary, Middle Childhood and Secondary with 27 different licensure fields from which to choose. The edTPA includes a review of a teacher candidate’s authentic teaching materials as the culmination of a teaching and learning process that documents and demonstrates each candidate’s ability to effectively teach subject matter to all students. The centerpiece of the edTPA is an electronic portfolio developed by the teacher candidate. This is supported by videotaped lessons and examples of teaching...
materials and student work. Together, these materials provide evidence demonstrating how the candidate planned instruction, adapted it for diverse leaders and how student work was assessed. Furthermore, this evidence must address both content and the development of academic language. (edTPA Fact Sheet). The evidence submitted in the edTPA is evaluated across the five components of teaching practice presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Main Components of the edTPA

In June 2012, more than 7,000 teacher candidates from 22 different states participated in an edTPA national field test, including UNI. Results of the field test revealed edTPA to be rigorous and valid and that it can be scored reliably (Changing teacher Preparation, page 12).

The edTPA is designed specifically for use at the student teaching level. However, in order to maximize success of the edTPA, there is need for a well-crafted, comprehensive system in which the components of the edTPA are woven throughout the span of all students teacher education program. Figure 2 provides a simple outline of the four major field experience components of UNI’s teacher preparation program, the culminating experience of which is student teaching.

Figure 2: UNI Teacher Education Field Experience Sequence
FALL 2010 - UNI’s Need for the edTPA

In the fall of 2010, as national interest in the edTPA was growing, UNI became interested in exploring the possibility of adopting edTPA as a replacement for the assessment system currently in place for student teaching – The Teacher Work Sample (TWS). While the TWS has served UNI well in terms of offering an authentic assessment closely aligned with the INTASC Standards and the Iowa Teaching Standards, there was a need for a nationally normed assessment that would have more broad support given the present state of accountability. The UNI Teacher Quality Partnership Team, headed by Dr. Herring and Dr. Davidson were key players in generating initial interest in adopting the edTPA at UNI. As a beginning step Rob Boody, as the Teacher Education Assessment Coordinator, Cherin Lee, as the Coordinator of Secondary Teacher Education, and the Elementary Coordinator of Teacher Education began discussions to explore the possibility of using edTPA to replace the Teacher Work Sample.

Fall 2011 First Implementation Student Teaching (Level IV)-

Student teaching Implementation and Scoring- Year 1 Pilot

The edTPA was first implemented in the Level IV, student teaching field experience in the fall semester of 2011 with a field test group of approximately 23 student teachers from the Marshalltown Student Teaching Center. Dwight Watson, dean of the College of Education advocated with the TQP grant to advance this process. Data from this pilot was shared with Dr. Barry Wilson, Assessment Coordinator for the College of Education and the TQP Over-site Committee. At this early phase of the program, only Dr. Diana Briggs, student teaching coordinator, had received official training in scoring edTPA. All of the completed edTPAs were sent to the national edTPA site in California to be scored. Since UNI was an official field test site for the edTPA, there was no charge for scoring this group of edTPAs.

Spring 2012

Student teaching Implementation and Scoring-Year 1 Pilot with SCALE

In the following semester, spring 2012, the pilot was expanded to include 62 student teachers. This involved the Waterloo, Cedar Falls, and Northwest Iowa student teaching centers, in addition to the Marshalltown site. Student teaching coordinators were in charge of explaining the edTPA to their student teachers and ensuring they completed their edTPA. Their edTPA was completed and turned into the Student Teaching Coordinators in hard copy and their video was uploaded onto a UNI special platform.

In April of this same semester, a training session hosted by TQP was held with the purpose of training UNI teacher education faculty as edTPA scorers. All teacher education faculty were invited to the session. Thirty-seven faculty members were subsequently selected to attend a 2-day training session in which the structure and content of the edTPA was introduced and the scoring process was explained. All participants were given a $100 stipend, funded by TQP, for attending the training session. In the end, participants scored edTPAs recently completed by UNI student teachers during the first half of their spring student teaching experiences. The workshop included an on-line portion delivered by Stanford University. In addition the session presented opportunities to develop some inter-rater reliability in that discussions and comparisons of individual ratings took place. The completed edTPAs were also sent to the edTPA Headquarters in California to be scored. Below you will find Figure 4 describing the process of edTPA implementation.
**Figure 4:** Implementation of edTPA into Student Teaching and the Projected Need for Trained Scorer

(Information derived from the edTPA Strategic Plan, Appendix B and Actual Implementation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Student Teachers Completing the edTPA</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th># of UNI faculty trained to locally rate</th>
<th>Embedded Signature Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>pilot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>pilot</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Locally scored – SHOW EVIDENCE</td>
<td>pilot</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Locally scored – SHOW EVIDENCE</td>
<td>pilot</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Locally scored – SHOW EVIDENCE</td>
<td>pilot</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Locally scored – SHOW EVIDENCE</td>
<td>implementation</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>All UNI Student Teachers (258)</td>
<td>implementation</td>
<td>68 UNI 33 PreK-12</td>
<td>EPA Stanford Forum New ESA developed ESA Level II &amp; Assessment Pilot continue, Academic Language and Leadership developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>All UNI Student Teachers (246)</td>
<td>implementation</td>
<td>68 UNI 33 PreK-12</td>
<td>Level II pilot approved by senate, all ESAs continue pilot, LEVELII Rubric Analysis Wksp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>All UNI Student Teachers (268)</td>
<td>Vote for high stakes assessment</td>
<td>68 UNI 33 PreK-12</td>
<td>Level II pilot approved by senate, all ESAs continue pilot, Academic language pilot starts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fall 2012

Student teaching Implementation and Scoring - Year 2 - Pilot with SCALE

In Year 2 of the edTPA implementation process, the edTPA was completed only by those student teachers in the Cedar Rapids Student Teaching Center. These approximately 23 student teachers were given training the objectives and requirements of the edTPA. The completed edTPA were then locally rated by the 37 UNI faculty members who had been trained to rate edTPAs the previous April. A stipend of $75 was given for each edTPA scores. None of these scores were sent to edTPA Headquarters for scoring. In all cases the edTPA student teachers received feedback from scorers on the strengths and any areas of concern regarding their completed edTPAs. Since this was still early in the process a minimum required score on the edTPA was not calculated or required, therefore no remediation was done based upon local rating of edTPAs. At this time the rest of the student teachers were still completing the Teacher Work Sample and were required to obtain an average score of 3 on this performance assessment.

Strategic Steering Committee Planning - Year 1 Pilot with SCALE

An edTPA strategic steering committee became fully functional during the Fall of 2012. This was separate from the Teacher Quality Partnership, which continued to support edTPA work. They developed a timeline designed to gradually introduce this new assessment system at all levels of the teacher education program and to all stakeholders. (see Appendix B). The faculty on this strategic planning committee were: Rob Boody -chair, J.D. Cryer -Coordinator for Elementary Teacher Education, Cherin Lee – Coordinator for Secondary Teacher Education, Lynne Ensowrth - Instructor Curriculum and Instruction, Gretta Berghammer – Department of Theatre, Secondary Education, Lyn Countryman – Coordinator of Student Teaching and Nadene Davidson – Department of Teaching (TQP Grant). This team worked throughout this year and created a plan and sub-committees for additional work (see Appendix A)

Spring 2013

Student teaching Implementation and Scoring - Year 2 Pilot with SCALE

During the second semester, Spring 2013, the edTPA was used in both the Cedar Rapids and Waterloo and Cedar Falls Student Teaching Centers and was completed by roughly 63 student teachers. These 63 edTPAs were then locally rated by thirty UNI teacher education faculty, many of whom were among the 37 previously trained faculty raters. In this instance, raters were provided a $100 stipend for each edTPA they rated. Once again, this stipend was provided through the TQP grant. This time period also marked the end of the TQP funding because of restructuring at the state level.

The edTPA Strategic Plan (Appendix B) stresses the importance of all UNI deans playing an active role in recruiting UNI teacher education faculty to become trained edTPA scorers. The current recommendation is that the Teacher Education Executive Council directly contacts each Dean asking him/her to strongly encourage their teacher education faculty to participate in edTPA Professional Development and expressing his/her support of the value of rating edTPAs and as a source of important feedback for ongoing program improvement. As summarized in Figure 3, the needed for trained scorers is expected to rise from 50 in the fall of 2013 to 100 by spring 2015, when all UNI student teachers will be expected to complete the edTPA as a requirement for successful completion of student teaching.
Backmapping Quality Teacher Assessment via edTPA into the Teacher Education Program--Developing Embedded Signature Assessments (ESA's) – Year 2 Pilot with SCALE

A Design Studio, presented by Cathy Zozakiewicz representing Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) for the purpose of developing UNI site-specific Embedded Signature Assessments (ESAs). ESAs to be developed and employed are to reflect the local teacher preparation priorities and as an added bonus, support the edTPA process of performance assessment. Below are proposed backmapping targets. The focus for this Design Studio was to be Level III methods instructors from across campus.

Figure 5: UNI edTPA Backmapping Targets

Prior to the Design Studio, attending UNI faculty were given a survey designed by SCALE and the Teacher Quality Partnership Grant (TQP). UNI Faculty responded that assessment practices and instructional strategies were the two areas UNI teacher education candidates struggled. These were also the two most highly valued aspects of the teacher education for students, according to the UNI faculty surveyed.

Twenty-four UNI faculty members teaching Level III methods, and the TQP staff attended the two day Design Studio, May 20-21, 2013 at UNI. Past edTPA data was discussed and analyzed, the purpose for ESAs were addressed and then UNI faculty address the areas where ESAs should focus to better strengthen the UNI Teacher Education Program or to fill in gaps. Five ESAs were identified: 1) Planning for Effective Student-Centered Instruction, 2) Assessment: Analyzing student work, 3) Assessment: Creating a Variety of Assessments for Eliciting Best Results, 4) Instruction and Reflection

Strategic Steering Committee Planning– Year 2 Pilot with SCALE

The edTPA Strategic Steering Committee developed a plan for edTPA implementation, including possible trainings, sub-committee work, scoring, and Embedded Signature Assessment implementation during July 2013. (See Appendix A)
Fall 2013

Student teaching Implementation and Scoring- Year 3 Pilot with SCALE

During the fall 2013 the following centers were incorporated into the edTPA: Davenport, Marshalltown, Northeast Iowa, Waterloo (2), and Cedar Rapids. This involved nearly 109 student teachers completing the edTPA and will necessitate having approximately 50 trained edTPA raters. Training sessions were conducted in Fall 2013 (September. 9, September 27, October 24) for UNI methods and field experience faculty whom volunteered. Approximately 55 faculty were trained for local scoring using the new platform SHOW EVIDENCE (see Appendix C). This platform was paid for by the TQP grant. In addition, initial training was implemented for Student Teaching Coordinators for them to introduce and/or re-enforce edTPA principles. Binders were prepared for all UNI Student Teaching Coordinators and a two day training session was held on the UNI campus for all coordinators during the second week of fall 2013 classes. All coordinators were provided with printed copies of the edTPA Assessment Handbook, including all scoring rubrics. This also included the content level handbook for all edTPA content areas. Other printed materials included “Guidelines for Supporting Candidates Completing edTPA,” “Academic Language Implementation Resource Briefs,” slides of the “Structure of the edTPA,” “Central Focus of the edTPA,” and “Central Focus of each Content Area.” In addition, copies of Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium (TPAC) Resource Series was also provided along with sign-in information for the “Show Evidence” system. In May 2013, UNI student teaching coordinators received training in local rating of the edTPA. While several coordinators had been previously trained to rate, this session was a new experience for many of those in attendance. The session was lead by the Coordinator for Student Teaching, Lyn Countryman and Student Teacher Coordinators Terri Lasswell and Mary Beth Rygh with assistance by Leasha Henriksen, all of whom had served on edTPA committees, previously received edTPA training and been responsible for hosting previous training sessions. At the completion of the session, all UNI student teacher coordinators had been trained in edTPA scoring.

One expectation of the student teacher coordinators is that they hold regular seminars throughout each semester for the student teachers in their respective areas. Each coordinator will develop their own plans for introducing their student teachers to the edTPA in a manner designed to ensure successful completion of the edTPA. This will occur at each student teaching center at which the edTPA is being implemented. In the case of international and out of state student teachers, the students will be trained in the seminar the semester BEFORE they student teach.

Developing Embedded Signature Assessments (ESA’s)

After the Design Studio in May, 2013, Cathy Zozakiewicz from SCALE with TQP and available UNI faculty from the Design Studio. SCALE had evaluated the shells of the four ESAs developed during the design studio and identified two with enough detail and specific outcomes such that they were viable for continued development. UNI faculty decided to move forward on these two ESAs: Assessment: Analyzing Student Work and Planning for Effective Student-Centered Instruction. In November SCALE personnel came to UNI four days to support UNI faculty teams development of these two ESA’s. The members of these teams included: Sara Boesdorfer – Science Education, Rob Boody – Assessment Coordinator of Teacher Education, Lyn Countryman, Coordinator of Student Teaching, Nadene Davidson, Department of Teaching, Scott Greenhalgh, Technology, Becky Hawbaker, Coordinator of Field Experiences, Amy Lockhart, Field Experience Coordinator, Catherine Miller, Mathematics, and Jody Stone, Science Education. The TQP grant paid for all the SCALE support. At the end of the development, the UNI faculty were asked what were the advantages of ESA development as part of the UNI Teacher Preparation Program. They responded:
• Prepare candidates for critical teacher practice
• Provide commonality across programs to create clear unified expectations for excellent teaching
• Provide feedback to programs on teaching practice to provide excellent pre-service preparation

Strategic Steering Committee transitions to the edTPA Strategic Planning Committee- Year 2 Pilot with SCALE

The Strategic Planning Committee met monthly. Lyn Countryman served as the temporary chair, calling the meeting and setting the agenda during this year. They addressed training issues, ESA development, designed a survey for Fall 2013 student teachers on Praxis II, vs edTPA vs TWS, and designed a survey for edTPA raters on the training process. Lyn Countryman made a presentation to the Teacher Education Executive Council on edTPA progress.

Spring 2014

Student teaching Implementation and Scoring- Year 3 Pilot with SCALE

In the Spring of 2014, NW Iowa and Out-of-State/International was added to the centers, bringing the total to eight centers (Waterloo [2], Davenport, NE Iowa, NW Iowa, Cedar Rapids, Marshalltown, Out-of-State/International) of the twelve centers that were having their student teachers complete the edTPA. This included 148 (66%) student teachers completing the edTPA assessment and 77 (34%) completing the TWS assessment. This semester there were 225 total student teachers. By this time 65 UNI faculty were trained to rate edTPA and used SHOW EVIDENCE to locally rate edTPA. The plan was to incorporate Cedar Falls and Mason City/Charles City Centers in Fall 2014, and Des Moines and Council Bluffs in the Spring of 2015. During the Spring 2014 student teaching coordinator meeting, this transition to additional centers were discussed. At that meeting all coordinators felt they would rather all transition to the edTPA during the Fall of 2014, as the centers that were still on the TWS were having a great difficulty getting the TWS scored in a timely manner, such that they could do remediation prior to the end of the 2nd student teaching placement.

Developing and Implementing Embedded Signature Assessments (ESA’s) – Year 3 Pilot with SCALE

Both the Planning and the Assessment ESA were completed during this semester. Plans were put into place to pilot each of these in Level III methods classes Fall 2014. Discussion and development began concerning a Level II ESA that would mirror a smaller edTPA. The Field Experience Coordinators teaching Level II were lead by Becky Hawbaker, Coordinator of Field Experience.

Strategic Steering Committee transitions to the edTPA Strategic Planning Committee- Year 3 Pilot with SCALE

A survey was given to all Fall 2013 student teachers asking them to compare Praxis II, TWS and edTPA at the end of the Fall 2013 semester. All 304 student teachers were surveyed, 50% responded. All student teachers were required to take the PRAXIS II, 109 students completed the edTPA in student teaching but completed the TWS in Level II, and 195 completed the TWS in student teaching. When the three
assessments were rated according to how well they assessed teaching. Over 70% of the responding student teachers rated edTPA the highest. When asked which they preferred for their licensure decision, edTPA was selected as their #1 selection.

Thank you letters were sent to faculty who rated edTPA of our UNI student teachers by Lyn Countryman. A follow-up letter was sent to Deans and Department Heads about the number of their faculty who volunteered to rate edTPAs. Faculty rated edTPAs in their respective disciplines. Therefore all students received an EXPERT rater for their edTPA.

When an accelerated plan to implement edTPA across all centers for Fall 2014, Rob Boody explained we could use the preK-12 educators that always came in to rate TWS, to train to rate edTPA’s locally and continue to pay them on a scale for the edTPA’s they rate. Rob Boody sent the email list to Lyn Countryman. Kathy East also suggested a “rater” update for the fall.

edTPA and ESA presentation was made to the joint Elementary & Secondary Teacher Education Senate by Lyn Countryman. At this senate meeting the joint senate approved the using of ESAs throughout the Teacher Education Program at UNI to document teacher candidate growth.

In March 2014 a presentation on edTPA was made to the COE Leadership Team.

**Fall 2014**

*Student teaching Implementation and Scoring- Year 4 Implementation with SCALE*

In the Fall 2014 all student teachers were completing the edTPA as their performance assessment. This included 253 student teachers. Due to TQP Funding, all students had the OPTION to also submit their edTPA through the SHOW EVIDENCE platform to PEARSON for national Scores. Only about 55 students selected this option. Additional local raters be trained to accommodate the large numbers. Thirty-three additional preK-12 teachers were trained in local rating and an additional 5 UNI faculty volunteered for training. In addition over 20 UNI faculty came to the “rater” update directed by Lyn Countryman. The purpose of local rating was not the same as national scores. Student teachers signed a release form (approved by the UNI lawyer) to allow UNI to use their edTPA in training. This release form described the differences purposes and structure of local rating vs. national rating (Appendix D). The state had determined the cut score for the edTPA and UNI selected this cut score in a letter (see Appendix E). Students not meeting this cut score were remediated much the same way that students were remediated on the old Teacher Work Sample (TWS). Student teaching coordinators responsible for the student teacher that did not meet the cut score on local rating required students to write and explanation about why they didn’t meet the standard and what they would do to meet the standard.

One of the excellent attributes of the edTPA was the requirement for student teachers to video a section of their teaching, describe what happened and point out the instances where the teacher candidate created a positive learning environment, engaged learners in the content and advanced the learning of all. This video had to be then uploaded to SHOW EVIDENCE. To ameliorate the technical difficulties of some teacher candidates the Teacher Quality Partnership Grant (TQP) purchased 10 sony camcorders with accompanying remote microphone systems, 10 tripods, and five high end Macbook Pro’s for each student teaching center. This ensured access to any UNI teacher education candidate. TQP also provided technical instruction to all student teaching coordinators and technical assistance to individual student teachers having difficulty during both semesters.
While familiarizing the cooperating teachers with the edTPA is not a necessity, there are factors about the edTPA requiring their understanding. The most significant of these is the importance of allowing and encouraging their assigned student teachers to teach in a pedagogically sound manner. The edTPA is designed to evaluate the ability of each candidate to effectively teach their respective subjects to each and every learner. Potential problems arise, for example, when the cooperating teacher is using scripted learning and therefore requires the student teacher to use this same pedagogy. Without allowing the student teacher to have some leniency in designing and implementing their own instruction, it may not be possible for the candidate to satisfactorily demonstrate mastery of sound pedagogy. In the area of science, for example, the successful candidate must show, through video and narrative, a thorough understanding of teaching using inquiry. So while the cooperating teachers will not be scoring the completed edTPAs, it is important they have some understanding of the critical components their student teachers must demonstrate in order to successfully complete student teaching. Student Teaching Coordinators were responsible for this update.

**Developing and Implementing Embedded Signature Assessments (ESA’s) – Year 4 Implementation with SCALE**

Because of its premier role in developing ESAs, UNI was selected to be part of the first Embedded Signature Assessment Forum sponsored by SCALE. Five faculty were selected to attend this forum, where the team worked to develop a NEW ESA on Analyzing Instruction to Engage Students through Questioning to Deepen Student Understanding. Initially SCALE shared the purpose of ESAs by highlighting UNI’s ESA on Assessment: Analyzing Student Work. Faculty attending included: Lyn Countryman, Coordinator for Student Teaching, Ashley Jorgensen, Level II Field Experience Coordinator, Elizabeth Hughes, Mathematics, Larry Escalada, Science Education, and Jody Stone, Elementary Science Methods. The Forum was August 10-13 at Stanford University, CA.

Field experience coordinators piloted ESA developed for Level II students in three sections. This ESA was Level II Performance Assessment with the emphasis on Planning.

Additional ESAs were being developed in Exploring Academic Language, Applying Academic Language, and Leadership.

**edTPA Strategic Planning Committee – Year 3 Pilot with SCALE**

The Strategic Planning Committee didn’t meet during the Fall semester due the increase meeting requirements of the Year Long Student Teaching Pilot. Lyn Countryman contacted the list of prior TWS raters and explained the student teachers were now all completing the edTPA. The differences in the two were explained and each was asked if they wanted to transition to rating edTPAs. Thirty-three preK-12 teachers volunteered. Each teacher attended two full day sessions where they learned about the edTPA performance assessment, they experienced the SHOW EVIDENCE platform and they rated their first edTPAs together in pairs so the faculty could discuss their rating scale and assessment. Teachers were offered two graduate credits at a reduced rate ($75/credit). The teachers were paid $75/edTPA rated for the first two edTPAs and then $50/edTPA after the first two. The first two edTPA done were paid at a higher rate because it took longer to score the first two than the rest. Teachers expressed enjoyment seeing the UNI teacher candidates teach and being able to provide notes and support for continued improvement. These training workshops & subsequent credits were supervised by Lyn Countryman, Student Teaching Coordinator and edTPA management coordinator. Lyn Countryman also conducted a rater update in the fall including 22 UNI faculty. TQP staff worked with Dr. Countryman on collecting the national scores & local rating.
Spring 2015

**Student teaching Implementation and Scoring- Year 4 Implementation with SCALE**

In the Spring of 2015, all student teachers (246) continued to do the edTPA. Due to TQP Funding, all students also submitted their edTPA through the SHOW EVIDENCE platform to PEARSON for **National Scores**. UNI faculty and 33 pre-K-12 faculty **locally rated edTPAs** for all students. To be able to rate the pre-K12 teachers attended one full day of training and scoring of one edTPA. They had the opportunity to sign up for one graduate credit at a reduced rate ($75/credit) for rating UNI edTPAs. Student teachers again signed a release form (approved by the UNI lawyer) to allow UNI to use their edTPA in training. This release form described the differences purposes and structure of local rating vs national rating (Appendix D). Student teaching coordinators responsible for the student teachers whom did not meet the cut score on local rating, required students to write and explanation about why they didn’t meet the standard and what they would do to meet the standard.

Student teaching coordinators worked during the Spring of 2015 to develop a website of resources for students, student teaching coordinators, and cooperating teachers on the edTPA. This work was supported by the Teacher Quality Partnership Grant. This was developed to ensure that coordinators were delivering similar training and support for the edTPA.

**Developing and Implementing Embedded Signature Assessments (ESA’s) - Year 4 Implementation with SCALE**

Larry Escalada piloted this Analyzing Instruction to Engage Students through Questioning to Deepen Student Understanding in his Teaching Physical Science Methods class. In addition this was used in the Physical Education Methods classroom also.

Spanish and TESOL tailored the Analyzing Student Work to fit into their respective methods classes piloting the ESA this semester.

The Level II pilot continued through this semester. In April, Cathy Zozakiewicz from SCALE brought faculty together from the College of Education in an ESA Analysis and Reliability Workshop to analyze the Level II ESA data, and rubric. Faculty collaborated on scoring several Level II ESAs and made alteration on the rubrics. Collaborating and talking about specific teacher performances honed the skills of all faculty participating in this analysis. The main point was to be trained in this process so it could be used to hone each of our ESAs.

**edTPA Strategic Planning Committee – Year 3 Pilot with SCALE**

The Strategic Planning Committee didn’t meet during the Spring semester due the increase meeting requirements of the Year Long Student Teaching Pilot and due to Lyn Countryman serving as the NW Iowa Student Teaching Coordinator for this semester. Two preK-12 teacher workshops were offered as a training update and teachers need to sign up for 1 day of training to rate UNI edTPA’s. This training and subsequent credits were offered by Lyn Countryman, Student Teaching Coordinator and edTPA manager.

A survey was developed and sent to all preK-12 administrators asking them, “Which, in your opinion would be a better measure of a teacher candidate’s readiness to received his/her initial Iowa license, a multiple choice/essay assessment or a performance assessment. Of the 343 administrators that replied, 95.6% felt a
performance assessment is a better measure of a candidates readiness of licensure. Only 4.9 % felt a multiple choice/essay assessment is a better measure.

Dr. Countryman worked with TQP staff to tabulate the national scores and the local rating. Dr. Countryman also worked with Nancy Heiter, TQP staff to develop and offer edTPA support presentations to all student teachers teaching in the Fall of 2015. The following presentations were developed: An edTPA Overview, Planning with Academic Language in Mind, Teaching for Student Engagement, Providing Feedback for Future Learning, and Tips for edTPA. (See Appendix F)

Lyn Countryman made a presentation to the Joint meeting of Teacher Education Senate on edTPA results and ESA development March 5, 2014.

**Fall 2015**

*Student teaching Implementation and Scoring- Year 5 Implementation with SCALE*

All student teachers (268) completed the edTPA performance assessment and submitted their work on SHOW EVIDENCE. The Department of Teaching Department Head, Terri Lasswell recommended to the Elementary and Secondary Senate that there be no local rating of edTPAs. The senators approved this recommendation. Many of the preK-12 faculty inquired into this and were disappointed in not being able to locally rate. They looked at this as a professional development opportunity. A few faculty still requested that they be able to locally rate students in their programs. Since there will be no local scores, students scoring below the state cut score on the National Scores will need to be remediated. Student teaching coordinators responsible for the student teacher that did not meet the cut score on edTPA National Scores required students to write and explanation about why they didn’t meet the standard and what they would do to meet the standard.

*Developing and Implementing Embedded Signature Assessments (ESA’s) - Year 5 Implementation with SCALE*

The level II ESA was approved by the senate. It will be piloted in all Level II’s in order to collect data on this ESA. The Assessment ESA continued to be used in all Elementary Science Methods Classes. Understanding Academic Language is being preliminarily piloted in Inquiry to Life Science – 1 section.

*Changes to the process*

Mary Beth Rygh was identified as the edTPA coordinator for the Department of Teaching. The Senates will vote on the use of edTPA for a licensure decision. If UNI decides not to use edTPA as our licensure test then UNI will not have the edTPA to use as a performance assessment for the teacher education program. Since the senates have made it clear that a performance assessment is needed as a culminating assessment for Teacher Education, it is unclear what that performance assessment would be. Should the Senates vote to utilize edTPA as the licensure exam then UNI would need to discuss various funding models for the national edTPA scoring. Several universities options for funding are included in Appendix H.
Steering Committee – Fall 2013 & Spring 2014 met monthly

**Members:** [Chair – Rob Boody]

- Rob Boody (Director of Teacher Education Assessment)
- J.D. Cryer (Coordinator, Elementary Teacher Education)
- Cherin Lee (Coordinator, Secondary Teacher Education) – replaced by Aug. 2, 2013 – Chad Christopher
- Lynne Ensworth, Instructor, Curriculum and Instruction, Elementary Ed.
- Gretta Berghammer, Dept. of Theatre, Secondary Ed.
- Lyn Countryman, Coordinator of Student Teaching – Called monthly meetings during Fall 2013 & Spring 2014
- Nadene Davidson, Dept. of Teaching (TQP Grant)

**Actions:**

- Oversee the integration of the edTPA into the entire Teacher Education program
- Monitor edTPA committee work and progress.
- Promote communication about edTPA implementation
- Report to the Executive Council with time lines and progress reports

Rubric Development Committee - Work completed Fall 2013 – Decision made to retain all 15 rubrics

**Members:** [Chair – Dianna Briggs]

- Dianna Briggs, Dept. Of Teaching
- Terry Lasswell, Dept. of Teaching, Student Teaching Coordinator (secondary)
- Mary-Beth Rygh (?), Dept. of Teaching, Student Teaching Coordinator (elementary)

**Actions:**

- Complete UNI version of scoring rubrics used in Student Teaching
- Create “short cuts” documents - Developed Tools to aid in Local Scoring Fall 2013
Professional Development Committee – Developed Trainings Fall 2013

Members: [Chair - Coordinator of Secondary Teacher Ed.]

Teacher Education Faculty Committee:

Elementary education programs - Sarah Vander Zander (Curriculum and Instruction)
Elementary education programs – Shelley McCumber (Field Experience Coordinator)
Secondary education programs - Joyce Milambiling (Languages and Literatures)
Appointee, secondary education programs – Matt Webb (Mathematics)
Coordinator Secondary Teacher Ed., Chair - Cherin Lee

Leasha Henricksen, TQP grant
Terry Lasswell, Dept. of Teaching, Student Teaching Coordinator (secondary)
Mary-Beth Rygh (?), Dept. of Teaching, Student Teaching Coordinator (elementary)
Lyn Countryman, Coordinator of Student Teaching

Actions:
Design professional development sessions for scoring edTPAs along the following lines:

- “New” sessions – for those with no experiences/exposure to the edTPA
- “Beginning” sessions – for those with 1 experience with edTPA (but have not officially scored)
- “Emerging” – attended introductory scoring session or scored edTPAs but without the full training session

Implementation Committee-

Teacher Education Assessment Committee

Elementary Senate Representative - Michelle Swanson
Secondary Senate Representative - Dianna Briggs

Actions:
Review time lines for professional development
Work with Professional Development committee to set dates for professional development
Communicate implementation expectations for Levels I, II, and III to faculty
Coordinate signature assignments between Levels I, II and III
Appendix B – Timeline for edTPA Implementation

4-23-2013 [RB]
edited 7-5-2013 [CL]
2nd edit 7-8-2013 [CL]
IMPLEMENTED [LLC]

Timeline for the edTPA Implementation

The edTPA Steering Committee proposes that a goal for full implementation of the edTPA into Student Teaching would be 2015-2016. Working back from this date we propose the following schedule.

Spring 2013

1. Each Dean communicates to his/her teacher education faculty encouraging their participation in edTPA Professional Development and expressing his/her support of the value of rating edTPAs and as a source of important feedback for ongoing program improvement [TE Executive Council]

2. Evaluator Training - IMPLEMENTED
   - Thursday, March 7  1-3 p.m.
   - Friday, March 8    9-11 a.m.
   - Friday, March 8    12-2 p.m.

3. Approximately 63 edTPAs scored (30-35 trained scorers)

4. Design Studio for creating Signature Assessments and back mapping edTPA into Level III Methods courses, May 20-21

Summer 2013

1. Organizational Meeting to establish committees and working groups (June 13)  [Rob Boody, J.D. Cryer, Cherin Lee]

2. Establish new cross-university edTPA Steering Committee-1st meeting July 8. Next meeting either end of July or 2nd week of classes in the fall (i.e. Sept. 3-6) [Rob Boody, J.D.Cryer, Cherin Lee, Lynne Ensworth, Greta Berghammer, Lyn Countryman, NadeneDavidson]

3. Establish the following work groups:
   (a) Professional Development group- convened by Chair of TE Faculty Committee (Coordinator of Secondary TE) Complete work Fall 2013 [TE Faculty Committee+ Leasha Henrickson, Lyn Countryman, Mary-Beth Rygh, Terri Lasswell] (b) UN! Scoring Rubric Development group [Dianna Briggs, Terri Lasswell, Mary-Beth Rygh]

   (c) Implementation group for logistics, etc.  [Rob Boody J.D.Cryer, Cherin Lee, Sarah Vander Zander, Shelley McCumber, Matt Webb, Joyce Milambiling]
4. Professional development on rubric use for (a) Student Teaching Coordinators (June). **Completed work Fall 2013**

5. Rubric group work- mostly done, need to finish "short cuts" by Sept. 1- **completed**

**Fall 2013**

1. Each Dean communicates to his/her teacher education faculty encouraging their participation in edTPA Professional Development and expressing his/her support of the value of rating edTPAs and as a source of important feedback for ongoing program improvement [TE Executive Council]

2. Add 2 more Student Teaching centers to the current 3 [Waterloo 2, Cedar Rapids, + NE Iowa and Davenport; International student teachers will have choice between TWS and edTPA]
   - approximately 112 edTPAs total (need estimated 50 trained scorers)- need 30 additional local scorers.

3. Finalize scoring rubrics and "short cuts" by Sept. 1- **completed**

4. Professional Development group- convened by Chair of TE Faculty Committee- Coordinator of Secondary TE [TE Faculty Committee, Leasha Henrickson, Lyn Countryman, Mary-Beth Rygh, Terri Lasswell] work completed

5. First week in Sept.- plan Professional Development session(s) for scoring; conduct session in early Oct.-by program (see Scorer needs for 2013-2014 documents

6. Steering Committee/Implementation Committee decides on internal Design Studio for Level II for spring

**Spring 2014**

1. Add 2 more Student Teaching centers NW Iowa and Marshalltown [coordinators are ready for scoring]
   - approximately 136 edTPAs total (need an estimated 65 trained scorers)- additional 15 scorers?

2. Begin work backmapping edTPA into Level II Field Experience, EDPSYCH 3148 and MEASRES 315. Create signature assignments to pilot in spring 2014

3. Professional Development Committee – plan May term PD for additional scorers plan May term PD for Level III methods signature assignments.
Summer 2014

1. More professional development on edTPA scoring [needed additional scorers for 2014-2015]
2. Review Signature Assignments – Level III methods
3. Professional Development for Level III methods on signature assignments
4. Steering Committee convene all subcommittees to review progress, identify need for change in time line, check articulation of Level II and Level III signature assignments, etc,

Fall 2014

1. Add 2 more Student Teaching centers – Cedar Falls, Mason City/Charles City
   - approximately 220 edTPAs total (need an estimated 80 scorers)
2. Incorporate signature assignments in all Level III methods courses
3. Pilot signature assignments in Level II courses; assess results; modify
4. Begin work backmapping edTPA into Level I, create signature assignments

Spring 2015

1. Add final 2 student teaching centers Des Moines, Council bluffs
   - Need an estimated 100 scorers
2. Initiate use of signature assignments in Level I courses
3. Level II and Level III methods fully incorporate signature assignments

Summer 2015

Steering Committee convene all subcommittees to review progress, identify need for change in time line, check articulation of Level II and Level III signature assignments, etc,

Fall 2015 - Spring 2016

1. Levels I-III fully using Embedded Signature Assignments that map to the edTPA???????
2. Assess overall edTPA results, evidence of programmatic inclusion of signature assignments and evidence of complete implementation of edTPA throughout TE program

NOTE: reconsideration of role of edTPA in UNI Teacher Ed. Program: a) (internal performance assessment or b) high-stakes performance assessment for licensure purposes with Pearson scoring
Appendix C

Evaluating Teacher Practice Based on Authentic Work Samples

Key Features

Author
Faculty can collaboratively create and share performance tasks and rubrics to evaluate student work.

Learn
Teacher candidates can access tasks from their browser without requiring special software to create their work and easily upload the work to be rated.

Rate
Faculty can evaluate work by tagging evidence against the rubric that automatically recommends scores. In addition to faculty member, raters can include the teacher candidate, peers, and other faculty or qualified scorers.

Analyze
Candidates can view their individual scores with tagged work to understand their areas of strength and weaknesses. Faculty and administrators can aggregate results by course and program to identify student needs and evaluate the curriculum.

Evaluating teacher effectiveness begins with ensuring that teacher candidates coming into the field are able to demonstrate their competencies in the areas of planning, instruction, and assessment. Therefore, evaluating how well teacher candidates are able to apply their content and pedagogical knowledge to authentic classroom experiences is the new measure of performance. As a result, many states have begun to adopt performance-based assessments for certification, which has led programs to embed signature assessments in their curriculum.

The challenge that teacher education programs face is that performance assessments are either largely paper-based or rely on portfolio technology systems that were not designed to meet the demands of a rigorous assessment process. Currently, faculty members have no evidence to justify their scores or provide meaningful feedback to teacher candidates except in the form of comments. And trying to calibrate scoring across a program involves in person training, which is costly and inefficient.

To address this challenge, ShowEvidence has developed a web-based solution that integrates the performance assessment life cycle from authoring tasks, submitting work products, assessing candidate performance, and analyzing and sharing results based on evidence.

We lead the field by enabling faculty to tag evidence on actual teacher work products to highlight what level the candidate is demonstrating against the rubric. By tagging to the criteria from the rubric (including misconceptions and strengths), we help programs reduce subjectivity and increase accuracy in scoring work. Most importantly, candidates not only receive their scores, but also the tagged work products to improve their teaching.
ShowEvidence in Higher Education

The Benefits

Our focus is on providing the most useful and efficient tools to evaluate performance that emphasizes the development of the individual, not just ranking people based on scores. By using ShowEvidence, programs can expect to:

Individualize Learning
• Assess critical teaching skills
• Identify areas of growth
• Target areas for improvement
• Use exemplars to guide learning

Improve Instruction
• Provide feedback and coaching to teachers to support their teaching
• Identify patterns of misconceptions to inform next steps in the instructional sequence

Inform Program Changes
• Identify models of instructional practice in the program
• Develop exemplars and resources to augment feedback to teachers

Working with Candidates

Performance Assessment. Performance assessments ask teachers to produce authentic work such as lesson plans, student work samples, and videos of their classroom instruction. By design, ShowEvidence seamlessly supports the uploading of work and the tagging of evidence to provide feedback and inform scoring.

Blended Learning and the Flip Classroom. The idea that faculty should be the "guide on the side, not the sage on the stage" flips the notion of instruction from a faculty-directed activity to a student-centered one. Through ShowEvidence, faculty can make lectures, mini-lessons, and resources available online prior to class and use class time to facilitate hands-on activities and meaningful discussion.

Working with Faculty

Scorer Training. The shift to performance-based assessment in teacher education programs hinges on reliable scoring. With ShowEvidence, programs can master code work samples and use them to automate the training and calibration of faculty scorers.

Looking at Teacher Practice. The practice of looking at teacher practice is an important aspect to preparing candidates for their work as teachers. ShowEvidence gives faculty the ability to evaluate teacher practice virtually and focus their discussions on areas of agreement and calibrate expectations across the program.

Coaching. One promising activity to improve instruction is for faculty to provide feedback to teachers as they teach in the field. Through ShowEvidence, teachers can submit videos of their instruction to their faculty or mentors and receive feedback without having to leave the building.
Appendix D
Educational Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA)
Assessment Tasks

Student Teacher Release Form

I am a teacher education candidate at the University of Northern Iowa completing an edTPA portfolio this school year. This consists of tasks for developed by Stanford University for a twenty-state consortium overseen by Stanford University, the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, and the Council of Chief State School Officers.

This project includes submissions of short video recordings of lessons I taught, and writing commentaries describing my teaching situation, the planning of the lessons, the lesson instruction and assessments I gave. I also submitted samples of student work as evidence of teaching practice. No student’s last name appear on any materials that are submitted and no identifying school district information is used on any materials. I attest that student video permissions were obtained.

I allow the University of Northern Iowa, at its sole discretion, to use and distribute my video recordings, my comments and my classroom materials for assessment development, professional development of novice teachers, professional development of local evaluators, research purposes, and any other purpose the University of Northern Iowa deems appropriate to further the mission of teacher education at the University of Northern Iowa. I understand that this distribution will be limited to the local area. The form below will be used to document your permission for these activities.

PERMISSION & ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Student Teacher Name ____________________________________________

Please print

Email: ____________________________________________________________

☐ I DO give permission for UNI teacher education to use and distribute my video recordings, my comments and my classroom materials for assessment development, professional development of novice teachers, professional development of local evaluators, research purposes, and any other purpose the University of Northern Iowa deems appropriate to further the mission of teacher education at the University of Northern Iowa. I understand that this distribution will be limited to the local area.

☐ I DO understand that my edTPA will undergo local scoring in order to provide me with feedback on my performance, provide feedback on the Teacher Education Program, and to fulfill the performance assessment requirements of VIEW MY PROGRESS. I understand if, according to local rating I need to improve, I will be required to redo part or the entire edTPA until I receive an acceptable score. I also understand there are no claims made that local scores have any relationship with national scores by Pearson™. Local scoring and national scoring use two separate processes, therefore there is NO relationship between these scores.

conducted at_____________________________ by __________________________

(Name of School) (Teacher’s Name)

Signature of Student Teacher : __________________________________________ Date: ____________
The Teacher Education Program Assessment Committee’s Recommendation for edTPA Cut Scores

The Teacher Education Program Assessment Committee has requested that the Teacher Education Senates discuss and vote on pass and remediation cut scores for the edTPA.

What Is Included in this Request
As with the TWS, the program needs a specific score for a pass and a process for remediation. Students will not have the edTPA showing on their UNITED record until we have an official position.

What Is Not Included in this Request
The decision we are asking for today has nothing to do with the bigger discussion about using the edTPA for licensure or not.

The Committee’s Recommendation
Our recommendation is that for the present the 15-rubric pass score be set at 41, the same score as the state has established for any programs that use edTPA for licensure. This score represents approximately a 2.7 average (on a 5-point scale). We furthermore recommend that any score below 30 (that is, below a 2.0 average) be required to do a "hard redo" of their edTPA, and that any score between 30 and 40 inclusive (2.0 to 2.67) be required to do a "soft redo" with their university supervisor.

The Committee’s Rationale
The Committee considered other configurations. For example, we considered a similar structure but using a 42 (2.8 avg.) as the pass score. This is the score arrived at by SCALE’s standards setting committee (with an acceptable range of ± 3 points).

We also considered either going substantially higher or lower. The argument for going higher is that as a program we don't want to just do the minimum. And, if a 3 on the scale is considered competent, then a 3.0 average, which equals a 45 total score, should be the minimum pass score. Our understanding is that in the absence of an official declaration, Student Teaching Supervisors have been using the 45/3.0 level as the pass score. The Committee considers using a higher score to be a good idea for the future, but during this time of transition while the edTPA is being worked backwards into the program and while ESAs are being created and piloted, the 41 level was thought to be more reasonable for students and for program accountability.

We also considered going substantially lower based on a similar argument that the program is still developing the infrastructure to support the edTPA. We rejected this thought on the grounds that we don’t want to be seen to be setting a lower bar, and that we do have a reasonable remediation process for students who fail to make 41 on the first attempt.

The Committee recognizes that as the edTPA is more fully worked into the program or if the edTPA is chosen as the licensure exam then all of this will need to be rethought and potentially changed.

Respectfully,

The Teacher Education Program Assessment Committee

Rob Boody, chair
J. D. Cryer, Elementary Coordinator
Chad Christopher, Secondary Coordinator
Dianna Briggs, Secondary Senate Representative
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iowa Endorsement Numbers and Areas</th>
<th>edTPA handbook match</th>
<th>Required Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 - Teacher--Prekindergarten through grade three, including special education</td>
<td>Elementary Literacy or Mathematics or Combination (see 102)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 - Teacher Elem Classroom-K-6</td>
<td>Elementary Literacy</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 - Teacher Elem Classroom-K-6</td>
<td>Elementary Mathematics</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 - Teacher Elem Classroom-K-6</td>
<td>Elementary Education (Literacy + math task)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 - Early Childhood Teacher-Pre K-K</td>
<td>Early Childhood (If stand-alone)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 - ESL Teacher-K-12</td>
<td>English as Additional Language</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106 - Pre-K to grade 3 Teacher-Pre K-3</td>
<td>Elementary Literacy or Mathematics or Combination (see 102)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 - Talented and Gifted-K-12</td>
<td>No Handbook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108 - Teacher Librarian-k-8</td>
<td>Library Media Specialist</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 - Teacher Librarian-5-12</td>
<td>Library Media Specialist</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 - Agriculture-5-12</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 - Art-k-8</td>
<td>Visual Art</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114 - Art-5-12</td>
<td>Visual Art</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 - Driver and Safety Ed-5-12</td>
<td>No Handbook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 - English/Language Arts-k-8</td>
<td>Middle Childhood English-Language Arts</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 - English/Language Arts-5-12</td>
<td>Secondary English Language Arts</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 - Chinese-k-8</td>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122 - Chinese-5-12</td>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 - French-k-8</td>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124 - French-5-12</td>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa Endorsement Numbers and Areas</td>
<td>edTPA handbook match</td>
<td>Required Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 - German-k-8</td>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 - German-5-12</td>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127 - Japanese-k-8</td>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 - Japanese-5-12</td>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129 - Latin-k-8</td>
<td>Classical Language</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 - Latin-5-12</td>
<td>Classical Language</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 - Russian-k-8</td>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 - Russian-5-12</td>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133 - Spanish-k-8</td>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134 - Spanish-5-12</td>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 - Language (other)-k-8</td>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 - Language (other)-5-12</td>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137 - Health-k-8</td>
<td>Health Education</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138 - Health-5-12</td>
<td>Health Education</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139 - Family and Consumer Science - General-5-12</td>
<td>Family Consumer Science</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 - Industrial Technology-5-12</td>
<td>Technology and Engineering Education</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141 - Journalism-5-12</td>
<td>Secondary English Language Arts</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142 - Mathematics-K-8</td>
<td>Middle Childhood Mathematics</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143 - Mathematics-5-12</td>
<td>Secondary Mathematics</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144 - Music-k-8</td>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145 - Music-5-12</td>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146 - Physical Education-k-8</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa Endorsement Numbers and Areas</td>
<td>edTPA handbook match</td>
<td>Required Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147 - Physical Education-5-12</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148 - Reading-k-8</td>
<td>Literacy Specialist</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149 - Reading-5-12</td>
<td>Literacy Specialist</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 - Science-Basic-K-8</td>
<td>Middle Childhood Science</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 - Biology-5-12</td>
<td>Secondary Science</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152 - Chemistry-5-12</td>
<td>Secondary Science</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153 - Earth Science-5-12</td>
<td>Secondary Science</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154 - General Science-5-12</td>
<td>Secondary Science</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155 - Physical Science-5-12</td>
<td>Secondary Science</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156 - Physics-5-12</td>
<td>Secondary Science</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157 - American Government-5-12</td>
<td>Secondary History Social Studies</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158 - American History-5-12</td>
<td>Secondary History Social Studies</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159 - Anthropology-5-12</td>
<td>Secondary History Social Studies</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 - Economics-5-12</td>
<td>Secondary History Social Studies</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161 - Geography-5-12</td>
<td>Secondary History Social Studies</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162 - History-K-8</td>
<td>Middle Childhood History/Social Studies</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163 - Psychology-5-12</td>
<td>Secondary History Social Studies</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 - Social Studies-k-8</td>
<td>Middle Childhood History/Social Studies</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165 - Sociology-5-12</td>
<td>Secondary History Social Studies</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166 - World History-5-12</td>
<td>Secondary History Social Studies</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167 - Speech Comm/Theatre-k-8</td>
<td>Not Yet Identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168 - Speech Comm/Theatre-5-12</td>
<td>Not Yet Identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa Endorsement Numbers and Areas</td>
<td>edTPA handbook match</td>
<td>Required Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174 - Teacher Librarian-K-12</td>
<td>Library Media Specialist</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176 - Reading Specialist-K-12</td>
<td>Literacy Specialist</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177 - Norwegian-k-8</td>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178 - Norwegian-5-12</td>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179 - Italian-k-8</td>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 - Italian-5-12</td>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185 - All Science-9-12</td>
<td>Secondary Science</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186 - All Social Studies-5-12</td>
<td>Secondary History Social Studies</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187 - Portuguese-k-8</td>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188 - Portuguese-5-12</td>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 - Agriscience/Agribusiness-5-12</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 - Marketing/Dist Education-5-12</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 - Office Education-5-12</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 - Consumer/Homemaking Ed-5-12</td>
<td>Family Consumer Science</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307 - Trade and Industrial-5-12</td>
<td>Technology and Engineering Education</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1171 - Business - All - 5-12</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201 - 5 - 12 Language Arts - All - 5-12</td>
<td>Secondary English Language Arts</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special Education: (these licensure areas can stand alone, but in most cases are added endorsements to another license area.)

<p>| 260: K-8 Instructional Strategist I: Mild/Moderate | Special Education | 41 |
| 261: 5-12 Instructional Strategist I: Mild/Moderate | Special Education | 41 |
| 262: Early childhood Special education            | Special Education | 41 |
| 263: K-12 Instructional Strategist II: BD/LD      | Special Education | 41 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iowa Endorsement Numbers</th>
<th>edTPA handbook match</th>
<th>Required Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>264: K-12 Instructional Strategist II: MD</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265: K-12 Instructional Strategist II: Physically Handicapped</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266: Birth-21 Deaf or Hard of Hearing</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267: Birth-21 Visually Impaired</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Educational Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) Managerial Responsibilities 2012-2015

- Provide professional development for Student Teaching Coordinators (STC) so they can support and educate student teachers in completing their edTPA portfolio.
- Maintain the Google website for resources for STUDENTS, STC, and Cooperating teachers on edTPA to help answer questions.
- Work with STC to obtain needed student information and edTPA discipline all student teachers will be completing at each site. Coordinate this with SHOW EVIDENCE to ensure students are able to register and be able to use the SHOW Evidence Platform to upload their videos and accompanying commentaries, student work and instructional materials as needed for their edTPA portfolios. Make changes as needed and requested in the beginning of the semester.
- Provide update training for teacher education faculty throughout the university on edTPA local rating.
- Meet with content/grade level specific faculty to go over local rating and/or national scores of student teachers in their programs to provide them with feedback on the preparation of their program for quality teacher candidates.
- Analyze the edTPA rating needs in each discipline each semester.
- Send emails out to edTPA discipline specific UNI faculty two weeks before the edTPA portfolios are due to request their willingness to locally rate X number of edTPA’s and assess returns each semester (Total of 500-600 edTPA’s rated/year.)
- Assign local raters for the 250-275 edTPAs that need locally rated two weeks before edTPA’s are due. (each semester)
- Send reminder emails the Wednesday before the edTPA’s are due. All local raters are given 2 weeks to locally rate. (each semester)
- Set dates to bring local teachers on the Saturday mornings, after the Friday the edTPA’s were due from student teachers in for a morning to start to locally rate and to fill out payment paper work. We require all trained local teachers to rate a minimum of 4 edTPA’s in their content discipline. For this we pay them $200 ($75 for first two and $50 for the last two). Provide training and let them score. Maintain records of all paperwork.
- Monitor the rating of the edTPA’s and reassign rates as needed to ensure that all edTPAS are rated.
- Problem-solve issues with student teachers on uploading, etc. (This often takes a significant amount of time for a period of 1 week each semester.)
- Provide training of prospective student teachers for the semester prior to their student teaching on 4 edTPA topics. These trainings are 1 ½ hours and are offered twice at different times on different days to allow students to access them. (This is done each semester)
- Tabulate edTPA score data and share with stakeholders in teacher education throughout the university.
- Serve as the UNI National edTPA score rep. Download edTPA national scores from the Pearson site, tabulate and share with stakeholders in teacher education throughout the university.
- Provide professional development for STC so they can support and educate student teachers in completing their edTPA portfolio.
• Maintain the Google website for resources for STUDENTS, STC, and Cooperating teachers on edTPA to help answer questions
• Work with STC to obtain needed student information and edTPA discipline all student teachers will be completing at each site. Coordinate this with SHOW EVIDENCE to ensure students are able to register and be able to use the SHOW Evidence Platform to upload their videos and accompanying commentaries, student work and instructional materials as needed for their edTPA portfolios. Make changes as needed and requested in the beginning of the semester. Fall 2015 UNI-COE technical personnel work with SHOW EVIDENCE to populate student teachers and students in Methods classes for ESA scoring from the Student Information Database.
• Provide update training for teacher education faculty throughout the university on edTPA local rating.
• Meet with content/grade level specific faculty to go over local rating and/or national scores of student teachers in their programs to provide them with feedback on the preparation of their program for quality teacher candidates.
• Analyze the edTPA rating needs in each discipline each semester.
• Send emails out to edTPA discipline specific UNI faculty two weeks before the edTPA portfolios are due to request their willingness to locally rate X number of edTPA’s and assess returns each semester (Total of 500-600 edTPA’s rated/year.)
• Assign local raters for the 250-275 edTPAs that need locally rated two weeks before edTPA’s are due. (each semester)
• Send reminder emails the Wednesday before the edTPA’s are due. All local raters are given 2 weeks to locally rate. (each semester)
• Set dates to bring local teachers on the Saturday mornings, after the Friday the edTPA’s were due from student teachers in for a morning to start to locally rate and to fill out payment paper work. We require all trained local teachers to rate a minimum of 4 edTPA’s in their content discipline. For this we pay them $200 ($75 for first two and $50 for the last two). Provide training and let them score. Maintain records of all paperwork. Work with continuing education to offer 1 graduate credit class for scoring.
• Monitor the rating of the edTPA’s and reassign rates as needed to ensure that all edTPAS are rated.
• Problem-solve issues with student teachers on uploading, etc. (This often takes a significant amount of time for a period of 1 week each semester.)
• Provide training of prospective student teachers for the semester prior to their student teaching on 4 edTPA topics. These trainings are 1 ½ hours and are offered twice at different times on different days to allow students to access them. (This is done each semester)
• Tabulate edTPA local rating & national score data and share with stakeholders in teacher education throughout the university.
• Serve as the UNI National edTPA score representative. Download edTPA national scores from the Pearson site, tabulate and share with stakeholders in teacher education throughout the university.
Appendix G: edTPA Workshops for Student Teachers

Placed for Fall 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Title</th>
<th>Date and Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An Overview of edTPA</td>
<td>April 23 4:00-5:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 24 1:00-2:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 24 3:00-4:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning with Academic Language in Mind</td>
<td>April 27 3:30-5:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 28 8:00-9:30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching for Student Engagement</td>
<td>May 4 11:00 am-12:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 4 3:30-5:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Feedback for Learning</td>
<td>May 5 8:00-9:30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 5 3:30-5:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tips for edTPA</td>
<td>May 7 8:00-9:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 7 3:30-4:30 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schindler 303

The UNI Department of Teaching extends an invitation to all Fall 2015 Student Teachers to attend optional information sessions focusing on strategies for completing your edTPA. You are invited to attend as many as you wish. Bring your edTPA handbook. (You may bring your handbook electronically.) Those signed up will be sent electronic edTPA handbook which will be used in each session.
Processes for Establishing a Student Fee for edTPA

May 2014

At the request of the edTPA community, SCALE has compiled descriptions of campus efforts to establish a student fee for edTPA. The eight descriptions are authored by program leaders and represent a cross-section of states and educator preparation program contexts (urban, suburban, private, public, undergraduate and post bac or master's programs. We offer these descriptions as a resource for other programs considering their own student fee.

1. Vanderbilt University and Ohio University

We sought approval from the Dean, and then worked with the Registrar's office and Student Accounts office to establish the equivalent of a lab fee attached to the student teaching seminar for all programs in which edTPA is required. When students register for the course, they are advised of the fee. Because it is charged as part of tuition and fees, students on financial aid end up paying a discounted fee or nothing at all (depending on their aid stipulations).

2. University of Tennessee, Knoxville

As we transitioned from the voluntary field testing phase of implementation of the edTPA to mandatory participation for most teacher candidates at UTK, we considered both student self-pay and lab fee options. Based on both student and faculty preferences, we opted to establish a lab fee to cover the cost of edTPA. Students preferred this approach because the fee would automatically fold into the financial aid system. Faculty did not want students facing the inability to pay the fee in the middle of the semester when submission of edTPA was due. The Departments of Theory and Practice in Teacher Education and Child and Family Studies submitted requests to the Dean of the College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences to assess a $300 lab fee with their internship courses. We had been using edTPA at no cost during the field testing and faculty unanimously supported adopting it as a program requirement. Faculty agreed that it was serving students well as a part of their preparation and was proving capable of providing insights needed for program improvements. The rationale for the lab fee also included the fact that, as approved by the Tennessee Board of Education, successful performance on edTPA would allow the teacher candidate to be exempt from taking the Praxis Knowing and Learning exam at a cost of $80. The Dean agreed to approve the lab fee request and advanced it to the Provost's Office where it received final approval. We then went through the process of verifying a sole source agreement (arranged with Pearson, UTK legal counsel and SCALE).

Our students complete a year-long internship, so we have attached the lab fee to the second semester of the internship. The lab fees are deposited into an income account uniquely associated with the specific internship course for which the fee is assessed and the Pearson invoice is paid from an associated expenditure account. We have just
successfully completed our first semester with the lab fee and invoicing from Pearson. We have affirmed that it is critical that students follow all the procedural steps and successfully complete the submission process within the assigned timeframe.

3. University of Cincinnati

We crafted language and submitted a proposal to the Dean, which was forwarded to the Provost. Our rationale to the administration included the fact that beginning with the Fall Semester of 2013, the Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) would be a program requirement for all candidates seeking an Ohio teaching license at the University of Cincinnati; the fee would not add to the School of Education budget but rather would be used to purchase vouchers from the vendor (Pearson); and that some of our licensure programs used these scores in their SPA reports. We explained that edTPA was being used by a number of states and, in some states, the costs were integrated into students’ course tuition, similar to a laboratory fee in the hard sciences. We explained that, in these settings, the fee was attached when a student enrolled in a course associated with student teaching. We indicated the specific student teaching numbers that we planned to use. The plan that we outlined in our proposal to the Dean and Provost was to set up an account within the School of Education to capture these fees. We would then pay Pearson the registration fees and Pearson would, in turn, provide us with registration vouchers to distribute to our student teachers. We explained that the assessment fee was consistent with fees for other performance-based assessments. Finally, using information provided by SCALE and Pearson, we explained that the fee supported the costs associated with developing, launching, maintaining, and managing the assessment. This rationale also seemed to be helpful as we talked to our colleagues and our candidates.

Once we received approval, we worked with the Registrar’s office and Office of Student Accounts to establish the equivalent of a laboratory fee attached to student teaching in each licensure program (Early Childhood Education, Middle Childhood Education, Special Education and Secondary Education). When our teaching candidates registered for student teaching, the fee was attached to their bill. Since the $300 fee was part of their tuition and fees, we received very few complaints from our teaching candidates and, like some of the teaching candidates at Vanderbilt, some of our students who were on financial aid paid less than the full amount.

We also developed some internal fee processing arrangements (e.g., collecting fees, checking the fees against class lists, processing the fees, establishing a timeline and a process for paying Pearson for vouchers, distributing vouchers to students). These initial arrangements have been refined as we moved along.
4. Medaille College Buffalo, NY

The teacher candidates who participated in field-testing received a voucher to pay for the cost of the exam. The School of Education was concerned that future teacher candidates would not have the funds to pay the edTPA fee during student teaching. Thus, the Dean of the School of Education met with representatives from the registrar, student accounts, and IT to setup an edTPA fee structure for teacher candidates in summer 2013. Teacher candidates would have the ability to use financial aid to cover the cost under this fee structure.

Teacher candidates at Medaille complete two student teaching placements. Exceptions may occur for candidates pursuing an advanced certification or candidates who need to complete an additional student placement because they did not complete all certification requirements and fall under the new regulations as of April 30, 2014. If teacher candidates register for one student teaching placement course a fee of $300 is attached to the single placement. If teacher candidates register for two student teaching placements a fee of $150 is attached to each individual student teaching placement. Each student teaching placement has an individual course number. Teacher candidates are automatically charged when they register for student teaching. Teacher candidates were notified of the fee structure at mandatory orientations at the beginning of each academic year or program start. The fees are deposited into a special account. The college purchases edPTA codes for all teacher candidates registered for student teaching. Teacher candidates receive the edTPA code during the mandatory meeting prior to student teaching. The fee was implemented for the first time spring 2014 when the edTPA became consequence-bearing in New York State.

5. Concordia University, Chicago

The Dean of the College of Education put a plan in place with the registrar and accounting office to establish a lab fee attached to the student teaching internship for all programs in which the edTPA is required. When students register for their student teaching internship, they are advised of the fee. Because the fee for the voucher is charged as part of tuition and fees the cost becomes part of the eligible financial aid package. Depending on a candidate’s package they may pay a discounted fee or nothing at all (depending on their aid stipulations). This provides equal support for funding all candidates' costs for the internship and edTPA assessment.


The American Museum of Natural History's MAT Program has a full scholarship model that includes the cost of one each of the certification exams, including edTPA, which is why we purchased vouchers from Pearson. We do not have student fees, so we didn’t have to work that into our model.
7. Wright State University, Ohio

After meeting with faculty and speaking with our dean, we completed the university required paperwork to establish a course fee attached to the student teaching seminar for all programs in which edTPA is required. When students are accepted into our programs, they are advised of the fee.

8. Crown College, Minnesota

We obtained approval from the Provost, and then worked with the Registrar’s office and Student Billing office to establish a fee that was attached to the first student teaching placement for each program. Students are advised of the fee in the Teacher Education handbook and it is included on their tuition and fees statement when they register for the class. Students who are on financial aid can use their aid to cover this cost depending on the aid they are awarded. The college purchased the vouchers depending on how many students are registered for the student-teaching course.