

**ATTACHMENT VI**  
**Update on Exploring edTPA Alternatives**

| <b>Date</b>   | <b>Action</b>   |
|---------------|---|
| May 23, 2019  | TEA staff invited members from Sam Houston State and Texas State Universities to meet about an edTPA alternative  |
| June 13, 2019 | TEA staff sent members from Sam Houston State and Texas State Universities draft performance assessment design standards for purposes of licensure (draft below)  |
| June 17, 2019 | <p>TEA staff met with members from Sam Houston State and Texas State Universities about an edTPA alternative</p> <p>Both groups reviewed the design standards and agreed that steps need to be taken for T-TESS to be recast as an assessment that can be used for licensure state-wide.</p>  |
| Next Steps    | <p>Sam Houston and Texas State University agreed to reach out to TEA if design requirements clarification was needed.</p> <p>Sam Houston and Texas State University agreed to communicate with TEA about steps moving forward as they work to develop a T-TESS alternative.</p> <p>TEA agreed to communicate edTPA pilot updates with Sam Houston and Texas State University.</p> |

## Texas Performance Assessment Design Standards (Draft, June 13, 2019)

### Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Design for Validity and Fairness

A teaching performance assessment seeking approval for use in Texas in which complex pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring scales are linked to and assess the Texas educator standards. must be grade band and subject-specific. Performance assessments must be available for all initial certifications currently offered in Texas.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The sponsor of the performance assessment requests approval of an assessment that will yield, in relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the Texas educator standards, enough collective evidence of each candidate's pedagogical and content pedagogical performance to serve as a valid basis to judge the candidate's general pedagogical competence for a Standard certification. The model sponsor carefully

monitors assessment development to ensure consistency with this stated purpose of the assessment. The performance assessment includes a comprehensive program to train, calibrate and maintain assessor calibration over time. The model sponsor periodically evaluates the assessment system to ensure equitable treatment of candidates. The assessment system and its implementation contribute to local and statewide consistency in the assessment of teaching competence.

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

2(a) In relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the Texas educator standards, the pedagogical assessment tasks, rubrics, and the associated directions to candidates are designed to yield enough valid evidence for an overall judgment of each candidate's pedagogical and content pedagogical qualifications for a Standard certification as one part of the requirements for the certification.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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