

A VOLUME IN **CONTEMPORARY LANGUAGE EDUCATION**

# Researching **edTPA** Promises and Problems

PERSPECTIVES FROM ENGLISH AS AN ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE,  
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS, AND WORLD LANGUAGE  
TEACHER EDUCATION

*edited by*

**Pete Swanson**

**Susan A. Hildebrandt**

---

# **Researching edTPA Promises and Problems**

---

A volume in  
*Contemporary Language Studies Series*  
Terry A. Osborn, *Series Editor*

This page intentionally left blank.

---

# **Researching edTPA Promises and Problems**

**Perspectives from English  
as an Additional Language,  
English Language Arts,  
and World Language  
Teacher Education**

---

*edited by*

**Pete Swanson**

*Georgia State University*

*United States Air Force Academy*

**Susan A. Hildebrandt**

*Illinois State University*



INFORMATION AGE PUBLISHING, INC.  
Charlotte, NC • [www.infoagepub.com](http://www.infoagepub.com)

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

A CIP record for this book is available from the Library of Congress  
<http://www.loc.gov>

ISBN: 978-1-64113-234-3 (Paperback)  
978-1-64113-235-0 (Hardcover)  
978-1-64113-236-7 (ebook)

Copyright © 2018 Information Age Publishing Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the publisher.

Printed in the United States of America

## **EDITORIAL REVIEW BOARD**

---

**Robin Huff**, PhD (Senior Reviewer)  
Georgia State University

**Kristin Lindahl**, PhD  
University of Texas–San Antonio

**Cathy Amanti**, PhD  
Georgia State University

**Charles James**, PhD  
University of Wisconsin

**Laura Hart**, PhD  
University of North Carolina–Charlotte

**John Storm**, PhD  
SUNY–Potsdam

**Karla Stone**, PhD  
University of Minnesota

**Carolyn Kaplan**, PhD  
The Ohio State University

**Judith Liskin-Gasparro**, PhD  
University of Iowa

**Krista Chambless**, PhD  
University of Alabama–Birmingham

**Amanda Kibler**, PhD  
University of Virginia

**Pamela Wesley**, PhD  
University of Iowa

**Gena Southall**, PhD  
Longwood University

This page intentionally left blank.

---

# CONTENTS

Acknowledgments .....	xi
<b>1</b> edTPA History, Promises, and Problems .....	1
<i>Pete Swanson and Susan A. Hildebrandt</i>	

## SECTION I

### MULTICULTURAL PERSPECTIVES

---

<b>2</b> Native and Non-Native English Speaker Perceptions of the World Language edTPA.....	23
<i>Victoria Russell and Kelly F. Davidson</i>	
<b>3</b> Multicultural Perspectives in Secondary English Language Arts edTPA Portfolios.....	49
<i>Sarah Cannon</i>	
<b>4</b> Native/Heritage Spanish Speakers and edTPA .....	67
<i>Sarah Jourdain</i>	
<b>5</b> Developing Linguistic and Cultural Awareness for Working With ELLs: Activities for Beginning Teacher Preparation .....	87
<i>Clara Vaz Bauler and Daryl M. Gordon</i>	



SECTION II

PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES

---

6	Revising and Creating Formative Assessments of Teacher Candidates in Preparation for the World Language edTPA.....	119
	<i>Pamela M. Wesely, Sarah Rissler, and Ann DeVault</i>	
7	Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Language Awareness as Evidenced in World Language edTPA.....	143
	<i>Susan A. Hildebrandt and Anne Cummings Hlas</i>	
8	Language Teaching and Language Learning: Supporting Candidates' Readiness for edTPA .....	163
	<i>Joan R. Lachance and Scott P. Kissau</i>	
9	Performance on the Instruction and Assessment Tasks of the World Language edTPA and Avenues for Further Research .....	187
	<i>Jennifer Behney</i>	
10	The Criticality of the Integrated Performance Assessment in the World Language edTPA .....	201
	<i>Pete Swanson and Elizabeth Goulette</i>	

SECTION III

EDTPA (IN)COMPATIBILITY

---

11	TESOL Teacher Candidate Evaluation: A Comparison of Evidence from edTPA and a Local Performance-Based Assessment .....	223
	<i>Tabitha Kidwell, Christina M. Budde, Natalia L. Guzman, Johanna M. Tigert, Megan DeStefano, and Megan Madigan Percy</i>	
12	Performance and Perceptions of World Language Teacher Candidates on edTPA: The Case of a Teacher Education Program in Georgia .....	249
	<i>Marcela T. Ruiz-Funes</i>	

**13** Specific Challenges Faced by World Language Student  
Teachers, Cooperating Teachers, and Program Coordinators  
in Development of edTPA Portfolios ..... 273  
*Michael K. Olsen and Tobias Barske*

About the Editors ..... 295

About the Contributors..... 297

This page intentionally left blank.

---

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to our institutions' language teacher candidates and the authors who chose to publish their work in this volume. edTPA has been a challenging endeavor for all those involved in teacher preparation, and we strongly believe many lessons can be learned through the research process. Also, we are indebted to Dr. Robin Huff (Georgia State University) for generously giving of his time and knowledge in proofreading this body of work. He is a tremendous colleague and genuinely interested in the success of language teacher candidates. We also thank Dr. Terry Osborn (University of South Florida-Sarasota Manatee) for serving as the editor for this volume. Over the years Terry has become a mentor and friend, as well as advocate for language teachers on a global scale. He leads by example and truly makes a positive difference in our profession. Finally, we thank our spouses, family, and friends in the field who have made this volume possible.

This page intentionally left blank.

## CHAPTER 1

---

# **edTPA HISTORY, PROMISES, AND PROBLEMS**

**Pete Swanson**  
***Georgia State University***  
***United States Air Force Academy***

**Susan A. Hildebrandt**  
***Illinois State University***

---

Language teaching is a unique endeavor, critical to K–12 education and beyond. Whether teaching English as an additional language, English language arts, or world language, language teachers help students connect to all other content areas and use language to communicate in the classroom and beyond. Addressing issues within and across these three language-related content areas, we hope, will elucidate shared problems and help edTPA live up to the promises made around its implementation. This volume's authors pose and answer questions relevant not only to language-related teacher education programs; rather, their investigations center around edTPA promises and problems raised across all content areas and throughout the United States. We also hope that the volume will provide models on which other additional content areas can draw for investigations of

their own edTPA assessments, teacher education programs and, ultimately, student learning. edTPA's historical context, content-specificity, and documented challenges combined with the uniqueness of language teaching prompted us to propose this book.

The sheer reach of edTPA also prompted us to compile this volume. edTPA has been implemented or is in the process of being implemented as part of teacher preparation programs or licensure/certification decisions in 760 educator preparation programs (EPPs) in 40 states and the District of Columbia at the time of the writing (American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education [AACTE], 2017a). edTPA implementation decisions continue to move at such a rapid pace at the state level that three versions of the *State edTPA Policy Overview* (AACTE 2017b) document have appeared thus far in 2017. It seems that every time we visit the *edTPA Participation Map* (AACTE, 2017a), more EPPs are taking part in edTPA. As an illustration of the swiftness of implementation, we reported in our book, *Understanding the World Language edTPA: Research-Based Policy and Practice* (Hildebrandt & Swanson, 2016), that edTPA was present in “more than 600 Educator Preparation Programs in 33 states and the District of Columbia” (Hildebrandt & Swanson, 2016, p. x). That number of programs has increased by more than 100 EPPs and seven states. We suspect the number of states and EPPs will continue to grow.

In this chapter, we explore the historical context of teacher education and evaluation in the U.S. context, leading up to the new teacher candidate assessment tool called edTPA. We also highlight how edTPA is used in state licensure and certification decisions, the roles of three professional associations that influence general and content-specific teacher education programs, and the expectations that teacher candidates are to meet. By creating their respective teacher education standards and accreditation processes, these organizations operationalize professional expectations for new teachers of a particular content area. We also address general promises and problems of edTPA. The chapter closes with a brief description of each of the chapters that follow.

## HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Teacher education has a rich history (Swanson, 2017) in terms of its origin, licensing and testing, and accountability. Its beginning can be documented back to the 15th century, when a parish priest in London, William Byngham, wrote a letter to the King of England, formally requesting the creation of a teacher preparation school (Johnson, Collins, Dupuis, & Johansen, 1985). Permission was granted in 1437, and the God's House College

was created in order to prepare teachers formally. It remains in existence today as Christ's College Cambridge.

Many of Byngham's ideas about the preparation of teachers existed in the United States during colonial and Revolutionary War times. For example, teachers were licensed by local authorities based on competence and character of the individual seeking to teach (LaBue, 1960). Licenses were valid for a year or less and "teachers had to submit to an annual re-examination" (LaBue, 1960, p. 150). Later, in 1826 in Massachusetts, for example, laws required school committees to examine teachers' literary qualifications as well as their capacity to govern a school. Such committees were also in charge of estimates of student learning and progress. LaBue (1960) found that, in general, the efforts of such committees were not favorably received by teachers or the public. Philbrick (1869, as cited in LaBue, 1960) recapped the lack of examining committees' effectiveness in the following excerpt:

A young man had been engaged to teach his first school and had already taught two weeks of the term when he was summoned before the committee for examination in compliance with the requirement of the law. At the time and place designated, he presented himself. It was a cold winter evening at a respectable farmer's house. On arriving he was soon conducted away from the family, including some of his pupils, gathered around the blazing hearth, to a fireless upper room dimly lighted with a tallow candle. Being seated at a table opposite the chairman of the committee, the interrogatories and answers proceeded as follows:

**Chairman:** How old are you?

**Candidate:** I was eighteen years old the 27th day of last May.

**Chairman:** Where did you last attend school?

**Candidate:** At the Academy of S.

**Chairman:** Do you think you can make our big youngsters mind?

**Candidate:** Yes, I think I can.

**Chairman:** Well, I am satisfied. I guess you will do for our school. I will send over the certificate by the children tomorrow (p. 113).

However, public dissatisfaction with such examinations soon became widespread, and standards of teacher quality became of interest. In an effort to improve teacher knowledge in the 19th century, state legislatures required teachers to pass locally administered certification exams (Ravitch, 2002). State examinations of teacher quality began to emerge, and in 1834, Pennsylvania became the first state to require teachers to pass a basic skills test (e.g., arithmetic, reading; Angus, 2001). Approximately 30 years later, states began to develop positions of administrative authority in order to create agencies for teacher certification. By 1861, most of the 34 states had state superintendents or chief state school officers (LaBue, 1960).



Following the Civil War, enrollments of school children began to increase dramatically as did the number of normal schools. As public school enrollments increased, attention to public education ushered in more teacher certification procedures and rules by school boards of education. It was during this time that a number of important trends emerged, of which many remain today:

1. a shift in authority for teacher certification from local administrative units to the state level,
2. the development of graded certificates,
3. the creation of lifetime certificates,
4. the shifting of exams for certificates from oral inquiry to locally prepared written examinations and then to state-prepared examinations that were locally administered,
5. a change in certification requirements from examinations to meeting degree and course requirements, and
6. an interest in teacher certificate reciprocity on an interstate basis (LaBue, 1960).

As the country continued to grow, the first half of the 20th century was fraught with turmoil, and several important developments in education took place. First, school enrollments dropped severely as the Great Depression set in. World War II was a period of extreme teacher shortages and emergency credentials were issued to unqualified individuals. Once the war ended, however, public school enrollments began to grow again as did interest and enrollment in higher education. Unfortunately, the teacher shortage has never been solved; it still exists today in several content areas, including world languages (Swanson, 2010, 2012, 2014).

## **QUESTIONS DRIVING POST-WORLD WAR II EDUCATIONAL REFORM**

Cochran-Smith (2001) suggested that U.S. teacher education reform following World War II could be categorized in terms of four major driving questions: the *attributes* question (1950s and 1960s), the *effectiveness* question (1960s to mid-1980s), the *knowledge* question (1980s through 1990s), and today's *outcomes* question. She stated that several factors (e.g., political climate, state and federal policies regarding funding) shaped each of the questions. The outcomes question asks "how we should conceptualize and define the outcomes of teacher education for teacher learning, professional practice, and student learning, as well as how, by whom, and for what purposes these outcomes should be documented, demonstrated, and/or

measured” (Cochran-Smith, 2001, p. 1). It also suggests that the focus of teacher education is placed on student learning, and that there should be common measures (e.g., edTPA, Common Core) that can be used to determine the degree of success or failure for teacher education candidates, students, teacher education programs, and institutions that prepare teachers.

Portfolios created by teachers and teacher candidates continue to be one means of measuring effectiveness in the classroom. They have been used to assess teacher candidate preparation and readiness for the classroom for decades as “teachers have been increasingly required to prove that they have demonstrable teaching competencies” (Hammadou-Sullivan, 2004, p. 390). While there is a substantial literature base on teaching and learning portfolios, Wright, Knight, and Pomerleau (1999) suggested at the turn of the century that there was a “lack of good research evidence about their impact” (p. 92). The literature suggests that there is a quandary as to what to include in a teaching portfolio, which can be particularly difficult for foreign language teachers (Hammadou-Sullivan, 2004) because administrators that hire these individuals have little to no experience in learning a second language. We theorize that it may be equally challenging in teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL), English language arts, and other content areas.

Created in the 1990s, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards initiated the use of portfolios as part of demonstrating an additional level of professionalism for in-service teachers. In their application for National Board Certification, teachers create detailed portfolios that showcase their content-specific teaching practices, along with other assessments of content and pedagogical knowledge. This performance assessment was created for teachers with 3 or more years of experience to pursue voluntarily advanced certification while remaining in the classroom (National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, 2017). Another example of a portfolio assessment for preservice teacher candidates to demonstrate their effectiveness is the Teacher Renaissance Group’s teacher work sample, in which teacher candidates outline their planning, teaching, and assessment practices (Renaissance Teacher Work Sample Group, 2014). It is used by a number of universities in-house to prepare teacher candidates for the classroom and to evaluate programmatic outcomes, walking teacher candidates through the necessary thought processes to document instructional decisions that were planned and carried out.

The outcomes question (Cochran-Smith, 2001) has driven a number of accountability measures as part of state licensure processes. Under the No Child Left Behind Act (2001), and subsequent state and federal legislation (e.g., *Race to the Top*), most states require new teachers to pass content tests created at the state level, commonly by for-profit corporations and companies. Those state and federal level policy decisions increase the

pressure for universities and colleges of education to demonstrate their success in preparing teacher candidates, as measured by external, standardized assessments like edTPA.

When Race to the Top funding was available, shortly after the last decade's economic meltdown, states were strapped for education funding and willing to carry out a variety of educational reforms to counter the effects of the Great Recession. States had to compete for Race to the Top funding, which came with certain conditions. Specifically, teacher evaluation practices needed to include value-added measures of teacher effectiveness. By accepting funding, states agreed to implement accountability measures that frequently begin with teacher candidates seeking licensure or certification in a given state. As value-added measures for K–12 teacher evaluations were incentivized by Race to the Top, they became embedded into new teacher evaluation practices. These value-added measurements are now integral to current federal- and state-level educational policy, despite concerns raised about them (Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, Haertel, & Rothstein, 2012).

New federal teacher preparation regulations (Office of Postsecondary Education, 2016), released at the end of the Obama administration, bring even greater focus to the teacher outcomes question, as they seek to bring more accountability to teacher preparation programs. Those regulations seek to

defin[e] the indicators of quality that a state must use to assess the performance of its teacher preparation programs, including more meaningful indicators of program inputs and program outcomes, such as the ability of the program's graduates to produce gains in student learning. (Office of Postsecondary Education, 2016, p. 5)

Those new regulations (Office of Postsecondary Education, 2016) promote competition among teacher education programs from different universities by providing the economic carrot of eligibility for federal TEACH grants that support teacher candidates who agree to teach in high-need areas. Teacher candidates from higher performing institutions of higher learning would be able to receive those TEACH grants, while those from low-performing programs would not. As fiscal constraints amplify throughout the United States, teacher education programs find themselves in competition with other programs to maintain state and federal funding, and standardized test scores are one way of distinguishing successful from unsuccessful teacher preparation programs. The regulations highlight the central role data plays in evaluating teacher education programs, and those regulations outline the state's role in choosing how to determine program effectiveness. The regulations further seek to have states implement data collection systems that connect K–12 student outcomes not only to their teachers, but to the preparation programs in which their teachers were prepared

for licensure or certification. Those K–12 student outcomes are frequently measured by standardized tests.

Over the years, several states have implemented legislation requiring teachers' impact on student learning to be demonstrated before awarding them state licensure. While edTPA is not generally named in legislation, it meets the requirements put in place in a number of states across the country to show impact on student learning. edTPA offers an enticing way for states to meet the requirements of new teacher regulations (Office of Postsecondary Education, 2016). Those regulations prompt states to

use additional indicators of academic content and teaching skills of its choosing, provided the state uses a consistent approach for all of its teacher preparation programs and these additional indicators provide information on how the graduates produced by the program perform in the classroom, (Office of Postsecondary Education, 2016, p. 288)

The document offers edTPA by name as one possible indicator. Teacher candidate scores on that content-specific portfolio assessment, often compiled in the last semester of undergraduate study, underlie licensure and certification decisions in many of the states in which it is used.

With that said, it remains to be seen how these federal regulations will be followed with the new administration. In all cases, however, edTPA will continue to be used by a number of stakeholders to determine teacher candidates' effectiveness in the classroom.

## **edTPA**

edTPA is a nationally available performance assessment of beginning teachers' readiness to teach. Developed by Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE), in collaboration with the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) and administered by Pearson Education Inc., edTPA measures novice teacher effectiveness in three areas: planning for instruction and assessment, instructing and engaging students in learning, and assessing student learning. At present, it is available in 27 different content areas (Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity [SCALE], 2013). Among its objectives, SCALE sought to create a national common performance assessment that can be administered across institutions and scored reliably (Sato, 2014). edTPA is typically carried out during a teacher candidates' final field experience—student teaching. As described in the *edTPA World Language Assessment Handbook* (SCALE, 2017), edTPA can be conceptualized as a cycle of effective teaching from planning (intended teaching) to instruction (enacted teaching) to assessment (impact of teaching on student learning). Each content area varies within these three areas.

For example, beginning teacher effectiveness in elementary education is measured using 18 Likert-scale rubrics, while world languages teacher candidate effectiveness is measured using 13 Likert-scale rubrics. With respect to the development of the world language edTPA handbook, SCALE decided that academic language was already an inherent part of language teaching, and therefore, the need to assess teacher candidates' ability to develop students' academic language was not needed.

## **STATES AND edTPA**

Federal educational policies often are the guiding framework by which states develop their own K–16 teacher education policies (Hildebrandt, Hlas, & Conroy, 2013). By doing so, such policies have fostered the current thinking about the measurement of teacher effectiveness in the country. While the Tenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution states that all issues not allotted to the federal government go to the states, federal legislators commonly use funding as an incentive to comply (Ryan, 2004). As noted in Hildebrandt and Swanson (2016), the U.S. teacher education system serves multiple masters (e.g., federal and state governments, accreditation agencies) in order to set requirements for teacher candidate evaluation. Thus, leaders in EPPs must remain aware of policy changes and strictly follow all requirements in order to recommend teacher candidates for licensure and certification. With respect to edTPA, individual states have the power to determine edTPA cut scores for their teacher candidates in each content area.

## **SPECIALIZED PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS AND STANDARDS**

As teacher education reform took place over the years, organizations that focused on education emerged such as the National Education Association, the AACTE, and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, which is known today as the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) following a merger with another accreditation body. CAEP promotes the notion of excellence in teacher preparation through evidence-based accreditation. The organization's standards are grounded in the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) principles and National Board of Professional Teaching Standards. In terms of accreditation, members include state departments of education, universities/colleges that prepare teachers, and specialized professional associations. The individual states determine the options it allows EPPs to use (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages [ACTFL], 2016).

Professional organizations create professional standards, and some of those standards require evidence that relies on standardized assessments. At the unit level, CAEP (2013) recommends edTPA as a source of evidence to meet Standard 1, Content and Pedagogical Knowledge, and allows for evidence from licensure measures (e.g., edTPA) to be used as evidence. Such evidence is intended to show that the teacher candidates from a given institution “develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards” (CAEP, 2013, p. 2). In particular, edTPA can be used as evidence to demonstrate that the EPP has met Standard 1.1, concerning an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards, and Standard 1.4, dealing with teacher candidates’ ability to create high levels of instruction based on content standards.

Collectively, teacher preparation programs seeking CAEP accreditation must prepare and undergo external peer reviews on a regular basis, typically every 7–10 years (CAEP, 2017). Submitting accreditation reports and waiting for unit, and even program approval, can be a stressful time for all involved because of the high-stakes nature of U.S. teacher education. Criticisms surrounding CAEP and the accreditation have been voiced by researchers and others since its inception. For example, in 2015, the board of directors of the AACTE cited “specific concerns related to the accreditation standards, process for accreditation, costs associated with accreditation, the capacity of CAEP to implement the accreditation system, and the representativeness of the CAEP governance structure” (Sawchuk, 2015, p. 1) and stated in a resolution that there is a *crisis of confidence* in CAEP. Citing the financial burdens of accreditation, Mark R. Ginsberg, then acting as chair of AACTE’s Board of Directors, aired concerns about its members lacking the financial resources to develop assessment systems in order to gather the required CAEP data given the ever-constricting higher education budgets (Sawchuk, 2015).

Regardless of concerns raised, CAEP continues to exist as the primary teacher preparation accreditation body in the country. Adopted by the interim board of directors in 2013, CAEP’s (2014) six strategic goals set out to

1. raise the bar in educator preparation,
2. promote continuous improvement,
3. advance research and innovation,
4. increase accreditation’s value,
5. be a model accrediting body, and
6. be a model learning organization (p. 3).

Content standards for individual teacher preparation programs have been created by specialized professional associations (CAEP, 2015), require evidence of teacher candidates' content knowledge (ACTFL, n.d.a; National Council of Teachers of English [NCTE], 2012; TESOL International Association, 2010). States, universities, and content-specific programs need an assessment that meets the needs of all of those levels. Content tests can be used at the state level to meet federal funding requirements under Race to the Top and NCLB. Scores from the content tests can also be used at the unit- and program levels for accreditation and state-reporting purposes. An interwoven system of accountability keeps these content tests in use.

edTPA scores provide a means of demonstrating evidence for content-specific accreditation efforts that take place through the specialty professional accreditation agencies. Standards created by specialized professional associations, such as ACTFL, TESOL, and NCTE, suggest that edTPA be used in other ways. In the area of world languages, edTPA is suggested as evidence to demonstrate that a teacher education program has met a standard.

Of the many organizations centered on teacher education, we focus on the three content areas represented in this book. In the context of world language learning, ACTFL was founded in 1966 to promote language teaching. Since its inception, ACTFL has continually examined the needs associated with the teaching and learning of foreign languages, developed policy, and continues to be a national voice for the importance of language teaching and learning (Terry, 2016). Of its many achievements, ACTFL has worked with other associations, such as CAEP and its predecessors, to develop the ACTFL/CAEP Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers (ACTFL, n.d.a). Approved in 2002 and revised in 2013, these standards were developed collaboratively by the standards revision writing team and members of the profession. The standards were open to comment via surveys, and presentations at regional and national conferences. The standards are based on performance and consist of a description of the expected performance, a narrative based on current research, and rubrics to guide programs in developing local assessments. Assessment 5 to be used in ACTFL CAEP reports concerns effects on student learning and must be an "[a]ssessment that demonstrates candidate effects on P-12 student learning" (ACTFL, 2016, p. 16). A crosswalk was created by ACTFL to demonstrate how edTPA meets the CAEP/ACTFL teacher preparation standards. That document, created by language teacher educators from across the nation, indicates that edTPA provides "strong and comprehensible evidence" (ACTFL, 2016, p. 1) for much of Standards 3 (Language Acquisition Theories and Knowledge of Students and Their Needs), 4 (Integration of Standards in Planning and Instruction), and 5 (Assessment of Languages and Cultures—Impact on Student Learning).



Much like world languages, English to speakers of other languages (ESOL) and English language arts both have specialized professional associations. Teachers of English to speakers of other languages (TESOL) have the professional organization named TESOL International Association (2017a), which is an “international association of professionals advancing the quality of English language teaching through professional development, research, standards, and advocacy” (p. 1). Its strategic plan identifies five areas—advocacy, governance, professional learning and engagement, research, and standards—each with specific objectives for the profession. TESOL was created out of a professional concern regarding the absence of a “single, all-inclusive professional organization that might bring together teachers and administrators at all educational levels with an interest in teaching English to speakers of other languages” (TESOL International Association, 2017b, p. 1). The *TESOL/CAEP P–12 Teacher Education Program Standards* outline the professional knowledge and skills that ESL educators need in order to educate language minority students. Revised in 2009, these standards are used to assess programs that prepare P–12 ESL educators for teacher licensure (TESOL International Association, 2010).

Another well-known language field organization is the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE). Founded in 1911 in Chicago, Illinois, NCTE is dedicated to “improving the teaching and learning of English and the language arts at all levels of education” (NCTE, 2017, p. 1) and promotes the “development of literacy, the use of language to construct personal and public worlds and to achieve full participation in society, through the learning and teaching of English and the related arts and sciences of language” (p. 1). In 2012, the NCATE/CAEP Specialty Areas Studies Board approved the NCTE/CAEP Standards for English Language Arts for immediate use.

## **edTPA PROMISES**

In California, 1998 legislation required that teacher candidates undergo a teacher performance assessment at the end of their preparation (Sato, 2014). To meet that new requirement, some institutions of higher education chose the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA), while others chose the Performance Assessment for California Teachers. The former was created by the Educational Testing Service and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, while the latter was created at Stanford University influenced by the NBPTS portfolio assessment. AACTE then began working with the developers of the Performance Assessment for California Teachers to create eventually edTPA, which can be used to assess



with a common metric teacher candidates from across the country. Pearson then joined edTPA as an administrative partner.

edTPA has been touted as a more robust evaluation of novice teacher abilities than many earlier attempts to measure teacher knowledge, performance, and ultimately, effectiveness (Hildebrandt & Swanson, 2016). As Au (2013) noted, “it is leagues better than any pencil-and-paper test could be” (p. 22). This nationally-standardized test of teacher abilities has aroused hopes for positive changes to the teaching profession. While in-house assessments of teacher effectiveness can be useful (Peck, Singer, Gabella, Sloan, & Lin, 2014), edTPA’s creators at SCALE sought to develop a common, national performance assessment that is administered across institutions and states and scored reliably by experts in teaching (Sato, 2014). By including independent, external reviewers in the process, edTPA’s developers suggest that teaching can reach a higher level of professionalization, similar to that of accountants, architects, and physicians (Darling-Hammond, 2010). Additionally, such standardization can also generate a shared vocabulary for teacher development (Peck et al., 2014), including a more “common and concrete language of practice” (p. 22). By doing so, the profession can achieve “deeper levels of communication, collaboration, and coherence, both within and across programs of teacher education” (p. 23). edTPA provides a means by which EPPs can provide evidence for various accountability measures at the program, institutional, state, and federal levels. edTPA meets requirements of CAEP by providing evidence of meeting standard at the unit level and of various specialty professional accreditation agencies at the program level. Various agencies require teacher education programs to demonstrate “impact on student learning” (ACTFL, 2016; NCTE, 2012; TESOL International Association, 2010).

### **edTPA PROBLEMS**

While edTPA certainly has its benefits and can provide helpful information for stakeholders, numerous problems remain. Previous critics have cautioned against outsourcing and subcontracting teacher evaluation to corporations that are more interested in financial gains than in helping develop highly effective educators (Au, 2013; Cochran-Smith, Piazza, & Power, 2013; Dover, Schultz, Smith, & Duggan, 2015; Winerip, 2012). Corporate encroachment into teacher education has gone on for years, and researchers have suggested that edTPA was “designed to answer questions posed by corporate education reformers instead of the questions of teacher educators” (Madeloni & Gorlewski, 2013, para. 16). Croft, Robbins, and Stenhouse (2013) cited a *testing industrial complex* that serves to promote “excessive high-stakes testing; false political narratives about improving

education; and transfer of curricular and financial governance from individual to local, local to state, and state to national/private entities” (p. 73); citing edTPA as an example.

edTPA creates a fiscal burden that has the potential to exacerbate the existing language teacher shortage. In 2014, the cost of becoming a language teacher in Georgia was \$817.50, if the teacher candidate passed edTPA on the first try (Hildebrandt & Swanson, 2014). If a teacher candidate does not meet the cut score as set forth by the State of Georgia, or any state that uses edTPA for licensure or certification decisions, there is an additional cost of \$100 per task for resubmission and evaluation (Pearson Education, 2017). It is problematic that costs borne by teacher candidates to meet additional graduation and state licensure requirements augment a business’ profit margin.

Another problem related to using edTPA is its potential to depersonalize teaching and teacher education (Cochran-Smith et al., 2013; Dover et al., 2015; Cody, 2012; Tuck & Gorlewski, 2016). As a result of standardized assessments, including edTPA, local decisions are being relied on less frequently in questions of teacher candidate qualifications. Sato (2014) described that change as an “ideological shift” (p. 2) from local assessments to the more standardized and objective ones. The decreased reliance on local expertise ignores teacher educators’ years of experience working with teacher candidates and diminishes the role of specific knowledge about language teaching.

edTPA’s flawed measurement of teacher candidate performance (Dover et al., 2015; Lewis & Young, 2013; Sato, 2014) have concerned some, while others caution that increased testing has multiple negative effects on children, teachers and administrators, and communities (Ahlquist, Gorski, & Montano 2011; Au & Tempel 2012; Farley, 2009; Kohn, 2000a, 2000b; Lipman, 2004; Swope & Miner, 2000). Speaking anecdotally, we have noticed an increase in teacher apprehension and concern about edTPA and fear that it can contribute to the already existing language teacher shortage. Student teaching placements are at risk of being impacted by edTPA requirements (Au, 2013; Dover et al., 2015), with student teachers needing to submit edTPA portfolios early enough for graduation decisions, despite having only completed approximately half a semester of student teaching (Hildebrandt & Swanson, 2016). How edTPA encounters multicultural education troubles others (Au, 2103; Tuck & Gorlewski, 2016) and occupies the first group of this book’s studies.

Our previous work (Hildebrandt & Swanson, 2016; Swanson & Hildebrandt, 2017) explored how World Language edTPA aligns and does not align with expectations for beginning language teachers, as established by the language teaching profession, teacher education programs, and accreditation agencies. We described misalignments between the demands of

those stakeholders and World Language edTPA rubrics, particularly in the areas of teacher candidate target language use, models needed to support program faculty and teacher candidates, definitions of meaningful cultural contexts, and credibility of the external scorers. For example, high-scoring edTPA portfolios do not consistently specify students' communicative outcomes (Swanson & Hildebrandt, 2017), despite being a focus across a number of rubrics. That and other misalignments between communicative language teaching practices and the World Language edTPA handbook concerned us and we wondered if scorers' qualifications and their unstated teaching philosophies may play a part (Swanson & Hildebrandt, 2017). As a result of that previous work, we wondered if the common framework across all content areas and rubrics challenged colleagues in other content areas. Surely, we thought, the above challenges are not unique to World Language edTPA. And we wondered how other language related content areas have encountered similar challenges.

## CONCLUSION

Given the brief history of teacher preparation in the United States presented earlier, it is easy to see that teacher accountability will continue to remain at the forefront of educational policy. A widespread and expanding culture of accountability in international, national, state, and local educational policy circles recognizes the central role teachers play in student learning and the role of teacher candidate portfolios. While such portfolios have been in existence for decades in a variety of different forms (e.g., Garrett & Jackson, 2006; Hammadou-Sullivan, 2004; Rawlings, 2016; Yancey, 1997), their use will most likely continue in the future as well in order to document teaching prowess and student learning via e-portfolios. Student portfolios are now commonplace in many fields such as computing (Marriott & Chomba, 2010) and veterinary science (Widdowson, 2010), and "teacher education has advanced the integration of EPs [e-portfolios] within preservice teacher education programs" (Rawlings, 2016, p. 54). Portfolios can be a tremendous tool to document teachers' abilities, knowledge, and skills, and we are in favor of teacher accountability and the preparation of highly effective teachers.

In 2012, Georgia and Illinois began pilot testing edTPA and since then, it has expanded rapidly throughout the United States to 40 states and the District of Columbia. However, such expansion was not driven by research, and there is a dearth of empirical research on its use and implications in every content area, especially in ESOL, English language arts, and world language, the three foci of this volume. These three critical content areas inform communication across disciplinary boundaries and teach K–12 students to express ideas in written and spoken forms. Thus, the research

contained in this volume can help serve as a guide for program directors who express angst about how to incorporate edTPA into existing teacher education programs, how to overcome obstacles to teacher candidate success, and how to support teacher candidates as they create portfolios.

Our goal for this volume is to broaden and deepen the edTPA discussion around language teacher preparation issues and the complexities of preparing highly effective language teachers that are able to bring students to higher levels of language learning. To that end, the editors solicited and invited papers that (a) explore critical issues in English language arts, ESOL, and world language teacher preparation and assessment at all levels (K–16) and (b) provide strategies for teacher educators inside and outside of higher education. It is our hope that such research will inform a wide variety of researchers, educationalists, and policymakers.

This book is, we believe, the first to include only empirical studies related to edTPA. With data from ten different states, one quarter of the states in which edTPA is currently used, this book offers a data-driven perspective of edTPA in three different content areas. All chapters are organized in a parallel fashion, as a study in the social sciences. Each includes a brief introduction, a literature review, a description of the methodology carried out, an analysis of data collected, and a discussion in which findings are compared to previous studies. Our hope is that others, both in language-related fields and other content areas, will replicate the findings in this volume.

The volume begins by exploring multicultural perspectives around edTPA. First, Drs. Russell and Davidson Devall (Valdosta State University) investigated native speakers and nonnative-speakers' perceptions and outcomes related to the world language edTPA via a longitudinal mixed methods study. In Chapter 3, Dr. Sarah Cannon (North Carolina State University) examined 48 English Language Arts edTPA portfolios using a qualitative content analysis approach to study how teacher candidates describe their students' personal, cultural, and community assets. Next, Dr. Sarah Jourdain (Stony Brook University) analyzed the edTPA portfolios of five cohorts of students from one world language teacher preparation program in New York. This section of the volume concludes with an action research study by Drs. Clara Vaz Bauler and Daryl Gordon (Adelphi University) of four formative activities on English language arts teacher candidates' awareness of English language learners' linguistic and cultural assets.

In the volume's second section, Pedagogical Practices, Dr. Pamela Wesley (University of Iowa) and two of her doctoral candidates, Sarah Rissler and Ann DeVault, discuss findings from a self-study of a world language teacher preparation program focusing on adapting and developing assignments that provide a more systematic set of formative assessments that prepare teacher candidates for edTPA. In Chapter 7, Dr. Susan A. Hildebrandt (Illinois State University), the co-editor of this volume, and Dr. Anne

Cummings Hlas (University of Wisconsin–Eau Claire) examined similarities and differences in language awareness between high- and low-scoring World Language edTPA portfolios' assessment practices by applying a world language pedagogical content knowledge framework. Afterward, Drs. Joan R. Lachance and Scott P. Kissau (The University of North Carolina at Charlotte) used a mixed methods approach to describe their university's multi-faceted approach to support English as an additional language and world languages teacher candidates during the implementation of edTPA. In Chapter 9, Dr. Jennifer Behney (Youngstown State University) combined datasets from six teacher preparation programs and investigated world language teacher candidates' edTPA task scores and the rubric sub-scores. To conclude the section, Dr. Pete Swanson (Georgia State University), co-editor of this volume, and Dr. Elizabeth Goulette (Georgia State University) compared high- and low-scoring teacher candidates' scores on the World Language edTPA and discussed what accounted for the differences in scores on the assessment task.

In the volume's third section, edTPA (In)compatibility, a team of researchers from the University of Maryland (Tabitha Kidwell, Christina Budde, Natalia Guzman, Dr. Johanna Tigert, Megan DeStefano, Dr. Megan Madigan Percy) compared how two cohorts of TESOL teacher candidates performed on both a local performance-based assessment and edTPA. Afterward, Dr. Marcela Ruiz-Funes (Georgia Southern University) analyzed program data about the performance and perceptions of MAT Spanish education world language teacher candidates on edTPA. In the final chapter, Drs. Michael K. Olsen and Tobias Barske (University of Wisconsin–Stevens Point) investigated specific challenges faced by world language teacher candidates, their cooperating teachers and the program coordinators as edTPA portfolios are developed. We are hopeful that this research will significantly add to the discussion of language teaching and edTPA.

## REFERENCES

- Ahlquist, R., Gorski, P., & Montano, T. (2011). *Assault on kids: How hyper-accountability, corporatization, deficit ideologies, and Ruby Payne are destroying our schools*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education. (2017a). *Participation map*. Retrieved from <http://edtpa.aacte.org/state-policy>
- American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education. (2017b). *State edTPA Policy Overview*. Retrieved from [https://secure.aacte.org/apps/rl/res\\_get.php?fid=1014&ref=edtpa](https://secure.aacte.org/apps/rl/res_get.php?fid=1014&ref=edtpa)
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (n.d.a). *ACTFL/CAEP program standards for the preparation of foreign language teachers*. Retrieved from

- [https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/CAEP/ACTFLCAEPStandards2013\\_v2015.pdf](https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/CAEP/ACTFLCAEPStandards2013_v2015.pdf)
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (n.d.b.). *edTPA mapping to ACTFL/CAEP program standards for initial licensure*. Retrieved from <https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/CAEP/ACTFL-edTPAcrosswalk.pdf>
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2014). *World-readiness standards for learning languages newly refreshed*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (2016). *Preparing the ACT-FL/CAEP report*. Retrieved from <https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/CAEP/PreparingACTFLCAEPProgramReportFeb2016.pdf>
- Angus, D. L. (2001). *A brief history of teacher education*. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation. ERIC Document Reproduction Service. (ED449149)
- Au, W. (2013). What's a nice test like you doing in a place like this? The edTPA and corporate education "reform." *Rethinking Schools*, 27(4), 22–27.
- Au, W., & Tempel, M. B. (2012). *Pencils down: Rethinking high-stakes testing and accountability in public schools*. Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2001). Constructing outcomes in teacher education: Policy, practice and pitfalls. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 9(11), 1–56.
- Cochran-Smith, M., Piazza, P., & Power, C. (2013). The politics of accountability: Assessing teacher education in the United States. *The Educational Forum*, 77(1), 6–27.
- Cody, A. (2012, December 14). Ann Schulte: Teacher performance assessment isn't the answer (Living in Dialogue) [Web log post]. *Education Week Teacher*. Retrieved from [http://blogs.edweek.org/teachers/living-in-dialogue/2012/12/ann\\_schulte\\_teacher\\_performanc.html](http://blogs.edweek.org/teachers/living-in-dialogue/2012/12/ann_schulte_teacher_performanc.html)
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2013). *CAEP accreditation standards*. Retrieved from <http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/caep-2013-accreditation-standards.pdf?la=en>
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2014). *Policy manual*. Retrieved from [caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/governance/caep-policymanual-v1214.pdf?la=en](http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/governance/caep-policymanual-v1214.pdf?la=en)
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2016). *CAEP accreditation handbook* (Version III). Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from [caepnet.org/~media/CAEP%20Accreditation%20Handbook\\_March%202016.pdf?la=en](http://caepnet.org/~media/CAEP%20Accreditation%20Handbook_March%202016.pdf?la=en)
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2015). *SPA program review policies and procedures*. Retrieved from <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-program-review-policies-and-procedure>
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2017). *What is accreditation*. Retrieved from <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/about-accreditation/what-is-accreditation>
- Croft, S. J., Robbins, M. A., & Stenhouse, V. L. (2013). The perfect storm of education reform: High-stakes testing and teacher evaluation. *Social Justice*, 42(1), 70–92.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *Evaluating teacher effectiveness: How teacher performance assessments can measure and improve teaching*. Center for American Progress. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED535859.pdf>

- Darling-Hammond, L., Amrein-Beardsley, A., Haertel, E., & Rothstein, J. (2012). Evaluating teacher evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 93(6), 8–15.
- Dover, A. G., Schultz, B. D., Smith, K., & Duggan, T. J. (2015, March 30). Who's preparing our candidates? edTPA, localized knowledge and the outsourcing of teacher evaluation. *Teachers College Record*. Retrieved from <http://www.tcrecord.org/content.asp?contentid=17914>
- Farley, T. (2009). *Making the grades: My misadventures in the standardized testing industry*. San Francisco, CA: Polipoint.
- Garrett, B. M., & Jackson, C. (2006). A mobile clinical e-portfolio for nursing and medical students, using wireless personal digital assistants (PDAs). *Nurse Education in Practice*, 6(6), 339–346. doi:10.1016/j.nepr.2006.07.015
- Hammadou-Sullivan, J. (2004). Identifying the best foreign language teachers: Teacher standards and professional portfolios. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(3), 390–402.
- Hildebrandt, S. A., Hlas, A., & Conroy, K. (2013.) Interpreting highly qualified: Views of world language teacher education from three states. *NECTFL Review*, 72, 15–44.
- Hildebrandt, S., & Swanson, P. (2014). World language teacher candidate performance on edTPA: An exploratory study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 47, 576–591.
- Hildebrandt, S., & Swanson, P. (2016). *Understanding the world language edTPA: Research-based policy and practice*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Johnson, J. A., Collins, H. W., Dupuis, V. L., & Johansen, J. H. (1985). *Introduction to the foundations of American education*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kohn, A. (2000a, September 27). Standardized testing and its victims. *Education Week*. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2000/09/27/04kohn.h20.html>
- Kohn, A. (2000b). *The case against standardized testing: Raising the scores. Ruining the schools*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- LaBue, A. C. (1960). Teacher certification in the United States: A brief history. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 11(2), 147–172.
- Lewis, W. D., & Young, T. V. (2013). The politics of accountability: Teacher education policy. *Educational Policy*, 27(2), 190–216.
- Lipman, P. (2004). *High stakes education: Inequality, globalization, and urban school reform*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Madeloni, B., & Gorlewski, J. (2013). Wrong answer to the wrong question: Why we need critical teacher education, not standardization. *Rethinking Schools*, 27, 4. Retrieved from [http://www.rethinkingschools.org/archive/27\\_04/27\\_04\\_madeloni-gorlewski.shtml](http://www.rethinkingschools.org/archive/27_04/27_04_madeloni-gorlewski.shtml)
- Marriott, A., & Chomba, F. (2010). Seoul accord iportfolio template for computing students. In *Proceedings of eportfolios Australia Conference 2010* (pp. 113–14). Retrieved from [http://eportfoliosaustralia.files.wordpress.com/2012/05/eac2010\\_abstracts\\_ebook\\_20101214.pdf](http://eportfoliosaustralia.files.wordpress.com/2012/05/eac2010_abstracts_ebook_20101214.pdf)
- National Board of Professional Teaching Standards. (2017). Mission & history. Retrieved from <http://www.nbpts.org/mission-history/>
- National Council of Teachers of English. (2012). *NCTE/NCATE standards for initial preparation of teachers of secondary English Language Arts*. Retrieved from



- [http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Groups/CEE/NCATE/Approved-Standards\\_111212.pdf](http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Groups/CEE/NCATE/Approved-Standards_111212.pdf)
- National Council of Teachers of English. (2017). *About us*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ncte.org/about/>
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, P.L. 107-110, 20 U.S.C. § 1119 (2002).
- Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education. (2016). Improving teacher preparation: Building on innovation. Retrieved from <https://www.ed.gov/teacherprep>
- Pearson Education. (2017). Retaking edTPA. Retrieved from [https://www.edtpa.com/pageview.aspx?f=gen\\_retakingedtpa.html](https://www.edtpa.com/pageview.aspx?f=gen_retakingedtpa.html)
- Peck, C. A., Singer-Gabella, M., Sloan, T., & Lin, S. (2014). Driving blind: Why we need standardized performance assessment in teacher education. *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 8(1), 8–30.
- Ravitch, D. (2002, March). *A brief history of teacher professionalism*. Paper presented at the White House Conference on Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Rawlings, J. (2016). The use of e-portfolios in music teacher education: 2003–2013. *Contributions to Music Education*, 41, 53–69.
- Renaissance Teacher Work Sample Group. (2014). Renaissance teacher work sample. Retrieved from <http://www.wku.edu/rtwsc/>
- Ryan, J. E. (2004). The Tenth Amendment and other paper tigers: The legal boundaries of education governance. In N. Epstein (Ed.), *Who's in charge here? The tangled web of school governance and policy* (pp. 42–74). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Sato, M. (2014). What is the underlying conception of teacher of the edTPA? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 65(5), 421–434.
- Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity. (2013). *2013 edTPA field test: Summary report*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University. Retrieved from [https://secure.aacte.org/apps/rl/res\\_get.php?fid=827&ref=edtpa](https://secure.aacte.org/apps/rl/res_get.php?fid=827&ref=edtpa)
- Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity. (2017). *edTPA world language assessment handbook*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.
- Sawchuk, S. (2015, March 17). Teacher education group airs criticism of new accreditor. *Education Week*. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2015/03/18/teacher-education-group-airs-criticism-of-new.html>
- Swanson, P. (2010). The shortage of America's foreign language teachers: A review of the literature. *Journal of Teacher Recruitment and Retention*, 1(1), 1–17.
- Swanson, P. (2012). Second/foreign language teacher efficacy: Multiple factors and their relation to professional attrition. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 68(1), 78–101.
- Swanson, P. (2014). The power of belief: Spanish teachers' sense of efficacy and student performance on the national Spanish exams. *Hispania*, 97(1), 5–20.
- Swanson, P. (2017). The future of k-12 teacher education: Spanish and Portuguese. *Hispania*, 100(5), 261–267.
- Swanson, P., & Hildebrandt, S. A. (2017). Communicative learning outcomes and world language edTPA Characteristics of high-scoring portfolios. *Hispania*, 100, 331–347.