

## Item 17:

# Discussion of the edTPA Pilot Updates

### DISCUSSION

**SUMMARY:** This item provides the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) with an opportunity to discuss the edTPA pilot, including the background and rationale for SBEC implementation of the edTPA pilot, implementation of the Year 1 and 2 edTPA pilots, including candidate participation and performance data for the Year 2 edTPA pilot, and Year 3 edTPA pilot activities and supports.

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

**FUTURE ACTION EXPECTED:** Texas Education Agency (TEA) staff anticipates presenting an edTPA pilot update to the Board at each SBEC meeting.

### BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND JUSTIFICATION:

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

At the July 2019 SBEC meeting, the Board adopted the edTPA performance assessment pilot to gather data on the impact of edTPA implementation on Texas candidates. The SBEC directed TEA staff to provide recurring updates of the edTPA pilot to keep the Board and all interested parties apprised of the status of the pilot along with any applicable data. This item provides both an overview and update on the pilot adopted by the Board. The overview will present background and rationale for SBEC implementation of the edTPA pilot, information on the implementation of the Year 1 and 2 edTPA pilots, including candidate participation and performance data for the Year 2 edTPA pilot, and an overview of Year 3 edTPA pilot activities and supports.

### Teacher Certification Redesign Background:

The SBEC's stated mission is to improve student achievement and ensure the safety and welfare of Texas school children by upholding the highest level of educator preparation, performance, continuing education, and standards of conduct.

With this mission in mind, beginning in 2015, the SBEC engaged in robust discussion about Texas student achievement performance trends and teacher placement and retention trends. In reviewing this data, the SBEC determined:

- Texas students were not achieving to their full potential, as evidenced by NAEP and STAAR results,

- Texas teachers who did not feel prepared, supported, or effective in their roles were leaving the classroom
- The least experienced teachers were most likely to teach in the highest needs schools
- The high demand for new teachers annually was connected to teacher attrition

In response to these trends, the SBEC reinforced its stance that students deserve strong, effective teachers, and educators deserve strong, effective preparation. With that in mind, the SBEC requested that TEA staff and stakeholders generate and recommend policy options to improve educator quality. The Board’s directive was to develop a set of policy recommendations that would ensure that Texas educators were ready to meet the needs of all Texas students from Day 1. In developing the set of policy recommendations, TEA staff and stakeholders had two primary directives in mind:

1. To define what success looked like for the educator entering their role, and
2. To implement the educator preparation program accountability structure that would effectively indicate that a program was on track.

In developing the set of policy recommendations, TEA staff and stakeholders grounded their approach in a set of core research-based concepts and practices.

1. Teacher quality impacts student outcomes more than any other aspect of schooling.
2. Teachers who feel unprepared, unsupported, or ineffective are more likely to leave the profession.
3. Content knowledge for teaching is the strongest teacher-level predictor of student achievement.
4. Teachers with more coursework on methods and pedagogy feel better prepared to teach and stay longer in the profession.
5. First year teachers who have practice teaching prior to their employment are three times less likely to leave the profession.

As an outcome of the directive and associated policy recommendations, the SBEC instituted significant and transformative rules in alignment with the Board’s mission over the past five years. A summary of some notable policies and results can be found below.

| Year | Policy  | Results   |
|------|---|---|
| 2016 | More training requirements prior to becoming a teacher of record. | Shift from:<br>Candidates serving as teachers of record for up to three years without demonstrating proficiency in content or teaching ability.<br><br>To:<br>Candidates demonstrating content knowledge as a requirement to become a teacher of record for one year.<br>Candidates demonstrating teaching ability as a requirement to continue as teacher of record for up to two years. |
| 2016 | Requiring candidates to receive more support.                     | Shift from:<br>Candidates receiving three formal observations from their EPP while serving as the teacher of record.<br><br>To:   |

|      |   |   |
|------|---|---|
|      |   | Candidates receiving five formal observations from their EPP while serving as the teacher of record.  |
| 2016 | Requiring more clinical teaching.   | Shift from:<br>Candidates only completing a minimum of 12 weeks of student teaching.<br><br>To:<br>Candidates completing a minimum of 14 weeks of student teaching.   |
| 2016 | Requiring EPPs to be accountable for all exams approved   | Shift from:<br>EPPs only being held accountable for the final test a candidate takes that leads to certification.<br><br>To:<br>EPPs being held accountable for a candidate's first two attempts on the test that the program has recommended the candidate for based on preparation by the program.  |
| 2018 | Adopting the EPP Commendations.   | Shift from:<br>The SBEC only assigning ASEP statuses based on minimum performance standards.<br><br>To:<br>The SBEC assigning commendations based on four categories of high-performing performance standards and innovation to recognize and reward EPPs that go beyond minimum standards in preparing educators.                                      |
| 2018 | Charging TEA staff to begin the ongoing process of redesigning the content pedagogy exams, in alignment with updated TEKS and educator standards. | Shift from:<br>Candidates taking multiple-choice only exams that were not aligned in rigor or relevance to the reality of Texas classrooms.<br><br>To:<br>Candidates beginning to take exams that include multiple-choice and constructed-response questions and are well aligned with updates to the TEKS, rigorous, and relevant to Texas classrooms. |
| 2019 | Adopting an updated definition of the Pre-Admission Content Test (PACT) requirement and associated PACT exams.                                    | Shift from:<br>EPPs having the option to require candidates to take their content exam for admission into the program.<br><br>To:<br>Candidates completing the content exam while being supported by a program and EPPs being held accountable for candidate exam performance.  |
| 2019 | Adopting the edTPA pilot, a performance-based portfolio assessment used for teacher certification, for a three-year pilot.                        | Shift from:<br>Candidates demonstrating the ability to teach by passing the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) certification exam, a multiple-choice only exam that is not content or grade specific.   |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>To:<br/>Candidates having the option to take the edTPA through the edTPA pilot, demonstrating their competence in a Texas classroom through the development of a performance-based portfolio that measures planning, instruction, and assessment while also receiving meaningful feedback on their strengths and areas for growth as an educator.</p> |
|--|--|--|

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

The portfolio-based performance assessment connected to the awarded contract, the edTPA, aligns with the SBEC's goals with specificity. The edTPA as a portfolio-based performance assessment for teacher certification:

- Meaningfully measures content knowledge for teaching through subject- and grade band-specific edTPA portfolios,
- Reinforces coursework on methods and pedagogy as teachers are required to demonstrate competency in planning, instruction, and assessment through the development of their edTPA portfolio,
- Encourages practice prior to teaching to ensure candidate readiness to demonstrate competency on the edTPA and readiness for Day 1 instruction, and
- Is aligned with and meaningfully measures the Texas educator standards and the competencies included in the T-TESS rubric.

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

| Tasks   | Objective  |
|---|--|
| Task 1: Planning for Instruction and Assessment       | Assesses a candidate's ability to develop and/or modify lesson plans and assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• build student content understanding,</li> <li>• support student learning needs,</li> <li>• use knowledge of students in lesson and assessment design and/or modification, and</li> <li>• monitor student learning.</li> </ul>                      |
| Task 2: Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning | Assesses a candidate's ability to facilitate instruction in a manner that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• establishes a supportive, productive learning environment,</li> <li>• engages all students in learning,</li> <li>• deepens student thinking, and</li> <li>• demonstrates the candidate's subject-specific pedagogical skill.</li> </ul>                            |
| Task 3: Assessing Students' Learning                  | Assesses a candidate's ability to analyze assessment results by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• analyzing student learning during instruction and through the assessment results,</li> <li>• providing targeted feedback to students on area of strength and areas for growth, and</li> <li>• supporting students in using teacher feedback for continued growth.</li> </ul> |

*A complete overview of the edTPA tasks, rubric concepts, and aligned sources of evidence can be found in Attachment I. At the meeting, TEA staff will provide the Board with additional context about the candidate's process in building an edTPA portfolio and how the process of completing the portfolio aligns with the Board's expectations for teachers to be ready to meet the needs of their students on their first day of instruction.*

The SBEC's intent in implementing the edTPA was to explore a more meaningful pedagogy assessment to gauge candidate readiness for the classroom and, therefore, standard teacher certification. The current pedagogy exam, the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) exam, is a multiple-choice exam that is not content-specific and covers all grade levels (Pre-Kindergarten through Grade 12). The SBEC implemented the edTPA pilot in Texas with the intent to raise the expectations of teacher candidates and educator preparation programs through the multi-year pilot of content and grade-band specific edTPA assessments for standard teacher certification in lieu of the current EC–12 PPR exam. The table below compares the candidate behaviors for each certification exam currently required for standard certification.

| Context                    | edTPA  | PPR   |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| <b>When it's Completed</b> | Completed during clinical teaching or internship <b>in a Texas classroom</b> | Can be taken anytime during preparation (including prior to practice in a classroom), with program approval, <b>in a testing center</b> |

|                                   |   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>How its Completed</b>          | Required to <b>demonstrate content-specific competencies</b> in practice  | Required to answer <b>multiple choice questions</b> focused on EC-12 pedagogy |
| <b>The Utility of the Results</b> | Results for each of the 15-18 rubrics with feedback<br><br><b>Provides insight</b> with specificity into areas of strength and areas for continuous improvement | <b>Number correct</b> by exam competency and an overall Pass/Fail status      |

In implementing the edTPA pilot, the SBEC sought to analyze the impact of edTPA implementation on Texas candidates, programs, and students. The edTPA pilot was originally approved by the SBEC for two years and was extended for a third year due to the impact of COVID-19. The sections below include an overview of the edTPA pilot actions and outcomes to date, as well as plans for future action.

### **Overview of the edTPA Pilot Years 1-2**

#### **edTPA Year 1 Pilot**

Throughout the first year of the edTPA pilot, TEA staff actively worked with 27 pilot programs, including 16 institutions of higher education (IHEs) and 11 alternative certification programs (ACPs), to implement the edTPA assessment. The full list of programs that participated in the first year of the edTPA pilot and a timeline of the Year 1 edTPA pilot activities and supports can be found in Attachment II. In total, 419 teacher candidates from 16 EPPs across Texas submitted edTPA portfolios during the 2019–2020 academic year.

#### **edTPA Year 2 Pilot**

Thirty-four EPPs, including 19 IHEs and 15 ACPs, participated in the second year of the pilot. The full list of programs that participated in the second year of the edTPA pilot and a timeline of the Year 2 edTPA pilot activities and supports can be found in Attachment III.

#### **edTPA Pilot Year 2 Summative Data Trends and Year 1 Comparison Data**

### **Descriptive Statistics by Handbook**

In total, 846 teacher candidates from 22 EPPs across Texas submitted edTPA portfolios during the 2020-2021 academic year. These portfolios are representative of 19 unique content areas with subject-specific handbooks that include the subject-specific rubrics for the given content area. SBEC rule in 19 TAC §230.21(e) indicates which edTPA handbooks may be used for certification in each teacher certification field. Depending upon the subject, the edTPA handbooks may range from 13 to 18 individual rubrics. For example, the portfolio for Elementary Literacy with Task 4 Mathematics, which is used for Core Subjects with the Science of Teaching Reading: EC–6 certification, includes 18 rubrics due to the assessment of both literacy and mathematics subject-specific pedagogy.

A candidate's score on the edTPA is determined by the total of their scores on each rubric within the edTPA handbook. A candidate may score between a 1 and a 5 on each rubric, with a

score of 3 representing the skills of an early beginning teacher. For example, a candidate who received 5s on each rubric for a 15-rubric handbook would receive a score of 75 and a candidate who received 3s on all rubrics, representing the skills of an early beginning teacher, would receive a score of 45. Overall, Texas candidates' mean score (the average of all candidate scores) of scorable portfolios for each subject area increased overall in 20-21 in comparison to scores in 19-20 but remain below the national mean. This is aligned with trends other states have experienced when piloting implementation of the edTPA and is to be expected as EPPs work with their faculty, staff, candidates, and LEA partners to engage in beginning implementation of the edTPA. Average scores during early pilot implementation tend to be lower than the national average, which is driven by states that have been implementing edTPA for years. As many EPPs have shared, the Texas edTPA pilot is an opportunity to learn lessons about edTPA implementation to support programmatic improvements and inform statewide continuous improvement supports as well. Many EPPs participating in the edTPA pilot saw growth in their candidates' performance from Year 1 to Year 2, also evidenced by the statewide trends, and credit this growth to continuous improvement actions they took based upon their analysis of their Year 1 edTPA data. In addition, when determining a performance threshold for teacher certification, each state establishes its own official cut scores.

The table below summarizes Texas candidates' mean scores by subject-specific handbook in Year 1 and Year 2 of the pilot as well as the 20-21 national mean scores. The Year 2 pilot data is highlighted in gray.

| <b>Subject-Specific Handbook</b>       | <b>Handbook Type</b> | <b>% of Texas Candidates in 2019-20 Pilot</b> | <b>2019-20 Texas Mean</b> | <b>% of Texas Candidates in 2020-21 Pilot</b> | <b>2020-21 Texas Mean</b> | <b>2020-21 National Mean</b> |
|--|----------------------|---|---------------------------|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Elem Ed: Lit/Math Task 4               | 18 Rubric Handbook   | 62.0%   | 42.6                      | 63.3%   | 44.9                      | 52                           |
| Middle Childhood Mathematics           | 15 Rubric Handbook   | 5.3%  | 38.4                      | 5.7%  | 40.1                      | 44.2                         |
| Secondary English-Language Arts        | 15 Rubric Handbook   | 6.0%  | 38.9                      | 4.3%  | 41.8                      | 45.9                         |
| Middle Childhood English-Language Arts | 15 Rubric Handbook   | 3.8%  | 35.2                      | 3.9%  | 44.2                      | 45.2                         |

| Subject-Specific Handbook                   | Handbook Type      | % of Texas Candidates in 2019-20 Pilot | 2019-20 Texas Mean | % of Texas Candidates in 2020-21 Pilot | 2020-21 Texas Mean | 2020-21 National Mean |
|---|--------------------|--|--------------------|--|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Secondary Science                           | 15 Rubric Handbook | 3.6%                                   | 36.5               | 2.9%                                   | 37.1               | 42.1                  |
| Secondary History/<br>Social Studies        | 15 Rubric Handbook | 3.1%                                   | 38.8               | 2.7%                                   | 41.7               | 44.7                  |
| Secondary Mathematics                       | 15 Rubric Handbook | 6.0%                                   | 34.4               | 2.3%                                   | 36.7               | 40                    |
| Agriculture Education                       | 15 Rubric Handbook | Low N                                  | Low N              | 2.2%                                   | 44.4               | 44.7                  |
| K-12 Performing Arts                        | 15 Rubric Handbook | Low N                                  | Low N              | 2.0%                                   | 41.1               | 44.3                  |
| Middle Childhood History/<br>Social Studies | 15 Rubric Handbook | Low N                                  | Low N              | 1.9%                                   | 42.4               | 44.2                  |
| Visual Arts                                 | 15 Rubric Handbook | N/A                                    | N/A                | 1.8%                                   | 42.6               | 49.3                  |
| Family and Consumer Science                 | 15 Rubric Handbook | Low N                                  | Low N              | 1.7%                                   | 38.6               | 43.9                  |
| Middle Childhood Science                    | 15 Rubric Handbook | 3.1%                                   | 39.2               | 1.3%                                   | 33.2               | 43.5                  |



| Subject-Specific Handbook         | Handbook Type      | % of Texas Candidates in 2019-20 Pilot | 2019-20 Texas Mean | % of Texas Candidates in 2020-21 Pilot | 2020-21 Texas Mean | 2020-21 National Mean |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--|--------------------|--|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Special Education                 | 15 Rubric Handbook | N/A                                    | N/A                | 1.3%                                   | 35.2               | 44.1                  |
| World Language                    | 13 Rubric Handbook | Low N                                  | Low N              | 1.3%                                   | 28.5               | 35.6                  |
| K-12 Physical Education           | 15 Rubric Handbook | Low N                                  | Low N              | Low N                                  | Low N              | 39.5                  |
| Business Education                | 15 Rubric Handbook | N/A                                    | N/A                | Low N                                  | Low N              | 44.6                  |
| Educational Technology Specialist | 15 Rubric Handbook | N/A                                    | N/A                | Low N                                  | Low N              | Low N                 |
| Health Education                  | 15 Rubric Handbook | N/A                                    | N/A                | Low N                                  | Low N              | 40.6                  |

*Low N indicates handbooks with less than 10 portfolio submissions. These portfolios are included in the descriptive statistics below.*

### Descriptive Statistics by Task

Texas candidates who completed edTPA during the second year of the edTPA pilot continued to demonstrate relative strength in Task 2: Instruction, with a Texas mean of 13.3, indicating that candidates received their highest rubric scores in this task. This was a 0.6 increase from 19-20, in which Task 2 was also the highest performing task. Task 2 focuses on a candidate's ability to demonstrate a positive learning environment, engage students in meaningful tasks and discussions, and elicit student responses. Task 2 requires candidates to submit video evidence of their instructional practice and provide instructional commentary, capturing their authentic practice in a Texas classroom.

Across all subject-specific handbooks, Texas candidates who completed edTPA during the second year of the edTPA pilot demonstrated a need for support in Task 3: Assessment, with a Texas mean of 12.7, indicating that candidates received their lowest rubric scores in this task.

Task 3 focuses on a candidate's ability to effectively design assessments aligned to the student learning outcomes, analyze assessment data to determine student academic strengths and needs, and design lessons that address those needs. Task 3 requires candidates to provide their assessment materials, student work samples, samples of teacher feedback, and candidate commentary on their assessment practices and results. While this remained the lowest performing task, Texas candidates made the most significant growth in Task 3 from Year 1 to Year 2, with a 0.9 increase. Task 3 supports were a particular area of focus for programs participating in the Year 2 pilot, given candidate performance trends in Year 1. This serves as an example of how programs have used the edTPA pilot data to engage in continuous improvement efforts that have resulted in stronger candidate performance in Year 2.

The table below provides an overview of Texas candidates' mean score by task in Years 1 and 2 of the pilot along with the 20-21 national mean score. Year 2 pilot data is highlighted in gray.

| <b>Candidate Performance by Task</b> |                         |                         |                            |                            |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Tasks</b>                         | <b>19-20 Texas Mean</b> | <b>20-21 Texas Mean</b> | <b>19-20 National Mean</b> | <b>20-21 National Mean</b> |
| <b>Task 1: Planning</b>              | 12.0                    | 12.8                    | 15.0                       | 14.5                       |
| <b>Task 2: Instruction</b>           | 12.7                    | 13.3                    | 14.6                       | 14.2                       |
| <b>Task 3: Assessment</b>            | 11.8                    | 12.7                    | 14.7                       | 14.5                       |

### **Descriptive Statistics by Group**

Teacher candidate participation and performance by gender and race/ethnicity is presented in the tables below. Year 2 data is highlighted in gray.

Candidate performance by gender and race/ethnicity increased for all groups from Year 1 to Year 2 of the pilot. In addition, Year 2 candidates performed near parity across race/ethnicity groups.

#### **Gender:**

| <b>Candidate Participation by Gender</b> |                                   |                                   |   |  |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Gender</b>                            | <b>19-20 Number of Candidates</b> | <b>20-21 Number of Candidates</b> | <b>20-21 Percentage of Texas' edTPA Pilot</b> | <b>19-20 Newly Certified Teachers in Texas</b> |
|  |                                   |                                   |   |  |

|        |     |     |       |     |
|--------|-----|-----|-------|-----|
| Male   | 63  | 98  | 12.6% | 23% |
| Female | 356 | 677 | 87.3% | 77% |

| <b>Candidate Performance by Gender</b> |                         |                         |                                       |                            |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Gender</b>                          | <b>19-20 Texas Mean</b> | <b>20-21 Texas Mean</b> | <b>20-21 Texas Standard Deviation</b> | <b>20-21 National Mean</b> |
| Male                                   | 35.3                    | 37.0                    | 6.0                                   | 42.1                       |
| Female                                 | 36.6                    | 39.0                    | 6.4                                   | 43.4                       |

**Race/Ethnicity:**

| <b>Candidate Participation by Race/Ethnicity</b> |                                   |                                   |   |  |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Group</b>                                     | <b>19-20 Number of Candidates</b> | <b>20-21 Number of Candidates</b> | <b>20-21 Percentage of Texas' edTPA Pilot</b> | <b>19-20 Newly Certified Teachers in Texas (19-20)</b> |
| Asian  | 17                                | Low N                             | Low N   | <5%  |
| Black  | 28                                | 53                                | 6.8%  | 13%  |
| Hispanic   | 104                               | 226                               | 29.1%   | 27%  |
| Multiracial                                      | 14                                | 24                                | 3.1%  | <5%  |
| Native American                                  | Low N                             | Low N                             | Low N   | <5%  |
| White  | 251                               | 454                               | 58.6%   | 56%  |

| <b>Candidate Performance by Race/Ethnicity</b> |                         |                         |                                       |                            |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Group</b>                                   | <b>19-20 Texas Mean</b> | <b>20-21 Texas Mean</b> | <b>20-21 Texas Standard Deviation</b> | <b>20-21 National Mean</b> |
| Asian  | 35.6                    | Low N                   | Low N                                 | 43.3                       |
| Black  | 34.5                    | 38.2                    | 7.0                                   | 40.9                       |
| Hispanic                                       | 36.9                    | 38.7                    | 6.4                                   | 43.3                       |
| Multiracial                                    | 35.5                    | 38.3                    | 7.3                                   | 42.9                       |
| Native American                                | Low N                   | Low N                   | Low N                                 | 43.6                       |
| White  | 36.6                    | 38.9                    | 6.3                                   | 43.4                       |

In addition to the quantitative Year 2 candidate participation and performance data provided in the tables above, TEA staff have distributed a survey to all edTPA pilot candidates, EPP faculty and staff, and LEA partners to gather qualitative data on the edTPA experience. In addition, TEA staff plans to conduct interviews with Texas edTPA candidates and mentor/cooperating teachers to gain further insight into benefits, challenges, and potential areas for further support in completing the edTPA for teacher certification. TEA staff plans to share this information with the SBEC during the December 2021 meeting.

edTPA Year 3 Pilot Update

In February 2021, the SBEC adopted the extension of the edTPA pilot for a third year. Forty EPPs, including 17 IHEs and 23 ACPs applied to join or continue participation in the Year 3 edTPA pilot. All programs that applied were accepted into the Year 3 pilot, with 15 new programs joining the pilot for the third year. The full list of programs participating in the edTPA Year 3 pilot can be found in Attachment IV.

**Supports Provided in Years 1-3:**Year 1 and 2 edTPA Pilot Supports:

Beginning in Year 1 of the edTPA pilot, TEA staff provided consistent training and support to programs, including monthly webinars for pilot programs. In addition, TEA staff offered reimbursements and stipends to teacher candidates.

In addition to the support structures provided in Year 1 of the edTPA pilot, TEA staff has identified three edTPA Regional Coordinators, through a competitive grant application, who have expertise in the edTPA. The edTPA Regional Coordinators have provided ongoing technical assistance and support to EPPs participating in the Year 2 pilot. These three regional coordinators are faculty members with Stephen F. Austin State University, Austin Community College, and INSPIRE Texas at Region 4 Education Service Center.

TEA also distributed grants to 9 EPPs, through a competitive grant application, which supported the establishment of a dedicated edTPA coordinator role within the EPP. A full overview of the programs that received grant funding to support their edTPA implementation in Year 2 can be found in Attachment III.

Across Years 1 and 2, the programs participating in the edTPA pilot have actively engaged and collaborated with each other, sharing resources, tools, and best practices. edTPA pilot participants have consistently remarked on the value of the collaborative community fostered by the pilot. edTPA coordinators across pilot programs have facilitated and/or contributed to many of the trainings offered to the Texas edTPA community throughout the first two years of the pilot, offering opportunities for programs to learn from one another.

Based on the analysis of edTPA Year 1 pilot data, TEA staff, in collaboration with the edTPA Regional Coordinators, provided additional support structures and resources to edTPA pilot programs throughout the Year 2 pilot during the 2020–2021 academic year. These included:

| Data-Informed Focus Areas  | Aligned Actions and Supports  |
|--|---|
| Support with edTPA data analysis to inform programmatic continuous improvement efforts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• edTPA Regional Coordinator Support</li> <li>• edTPA Community of Practice session</li> <li>• edTPA Monthly webinar focus</li> <li>• edTPA Curriculum Inquiry sessions</li> </ul> |
| Training and support focused on Task 3   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fall Virtual Regional Workshop series</li> <li>• edTPA Monthly webinar focus</li> </ul>  |
| Strengthened partnerships with LEA partners  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication resources and tools</li> <li>• edTPA Monthly webinar focus</li> </ul>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Focus on change management approaches     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication tools, exemplars, and sample timelines</li> <li>• edTPA Monthly webinar focus</li> <li>• edTPA Regional Coordinator Support</li> </ul> |
| Focus on equity features of edTPA rubrics | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• edTPA Monthly webinar focus</li> <li>• edTPA Community of Practice sessions</li> </ul>   |

Implementation of these data-informed focus areas are represented in the second year edTPA pilot implementation timeline in Attachment III.

*Year 3 edTPA Pilot Supports:*

During the Year 3 pilot, TEA staff and edTPA regional coordinators will provide targeted trainings and supports to all pilot programs. These supports will include monthly pilot webinars, monthly one-on-one check-ins between pilot program edTPA coordinators and their assigned regional coordinator, and resources and tools to support edTPA pilot implementation. In addition to the targeted trainings and supports, TEA staff will continue to offer reimbursements and stipends to candidates and mentor and cooperating teachers participating in the edTPA pilot and grant funding to support pilot program implementation. Eleven programs applied for and received grant funds to support their pilot implementation in Year 3. Attachment IV includes the list of all programs receiving grant funds and timeline of Year 3 activities and supports.

During the Year 3 pilot, TEA staff has also provided grant funding to extend the reach of the edTPA Regional Coordinators, with 5 edTPA Regional Coordinators selected to support the Year 3 pilot. The edTPA Regional Coordinators, current EPP faculty/staff members with edTPA expertise, include:

- Rebecca Hampton, INSPIRE Texas
- Karla Hamilton, Stephen F Austin University
- Lisa Brown, Austin Community College
- Amy Hickman, Texas Tech University
- Crystal Rose, Tarleton State University

TEA staff and the edTPA regional coordinators officially began Year 3 supports in September, hosting an edTPA Kick-Off Webinar focused on collaborative planning for the year across pilot programs.

In developing trainings and supports for the Year 3 pilot, TEA staff and the edTPA regional coordinators continue to develop trainings, resources, and tools to support edTPA pilot program implementation and continuous improvement aligned with trends from the edTPA pilot data. In addition, TEA staff have worked in close partnership with EPPs to support strategies addressing perceived challenged associate with implementation of edTPA.

| Perceived Challenges | Strategies to Address in Year 3   |
|----------------------|---|
| Cost                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stipends and reimbursements for candidates</li> <li>• Collaboration with EPPs and LEAs around potential funding options (including stipends for teacher candidates)</li> <li>• Reimbursements or vouchers from testing vendor</li> </ul>   |
| Equity               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resources and training regarding equity features of edTPA</li> <li>• Resources and training regarding academic language of the edTPA</li> <li>• Pilot program communities of practice regarding equity centered edTPA best practices</li> <li>• Close monitoring of formative and edTPA performance data and intentional planning for candidate and programmatic supports based on trends</li> </ul> |
| LEA Partnerships     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resources and communication tools to communicate about edTPA with LEAs</li> <li>• Pilot program communities of practice regarding P-12 partnership best practices</li> <li>• Mentor and Cooperating Teacher Training series</li> </ul>   |

### Training and Supports Provided to all Texas EPPs

In addition to the targeted training and supports provided to the edTPA pilot programs across all three years of the pilot, Pearson and TEA staff have also provided ongoing training and supports to all Texas EPPs interested in learning more about the edTPA and the edTPA implementation process. These have included:

- A four-part workshop series, including Handbook and Rubric Deep Dive, Academic Language, Local Evaluation, and Curriculum Inquiry Workshops (offered multiple times per year),
- Monthly edTPA 101 sessions,
- An edTPA Implementation, Support for the Change Process four-part webinar series,
- Monthly webinars focused on key edTPA topics, including Equity Features of edTPA, P-12 Partner Engagement and Support, Understanding Academic Language in edTPA, Supporting Teacher Candidates, and Tools for edTPA Data Analysis, and
- A Mentor/Cooperating Teacher training series.

These trainings and supports have been led by or have featured Texas EPPs and have showcased their best practice in edTPA implementation.

### **edTPA Next Steps:**

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

- gather data on Texas pilot implementation of the edTPA,
- support preparation programs and candidates who are participating in the pilot,
- provide ongoing trainings and resources for all Texas programs interested in learning about the edTPA,
- provide the SBEC with continual updates at SBEC meetings,

- provide external stakeholders opportunities to learn and provide input on Texas edTPA implementation, and
- provide an analysis of all three years of implementation in Fall 2022.

At the December 2021 SBEC meeting, TEA staff plan to bring to the Board draft rule text for discussion regarding plans for edTPA implementation at the conclusion of the edTPA pilot.

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

**Staff Members Responsible:**

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

**Attachments:**

- I. edTPA Tasks, Rubric Concepts, and Evidence Chart
- II. edTPA Pilot Year 1 Participants and Timeline
- III. edTPA Pilot Year 2 Participants and Timeline
- IV. edTPA Pilot Year 3 Participants and Timeline

**ATTACHMENT I**

edTPA Tasks, Rubric Concepts, and Evidence Chart

| Rubric Title  | Guiding Question   | Concept   | Evidence of Practice   |
|---|--|---|--|
| <b>Task 1: Planning for Instruction and Assessment</b>          |  |   |  |
| R1: Planning for Content Understandings                         | How do the candidate's plans build conceptual understanding?   | Candidate's plans consistently align standards, objectives, instructional strategies and learning tasks to address concepts and subject-specific elements, including thinking skills, in a progression that builds understanding. | Instructional and social context (Context for Learning)<br><br>Lesson plans<br><br>Instructional materials, student assignments<br><br>Student assessments |
| R2: Planning to Support Varied Learning Needs                   | How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her learners to target support for learners to develop an understanding of concepts and other subject-specific elements in the discipline? | Planned supports are tied to learning objectives or central focus with attention to characteristics of the whole class, specific individuals, or groups with similar needs, AND students with IEPs and 504 plans.                 | Planning<br>Commentary   |
| R3: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning | How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her learners to justify instructional plans?   | Candidate justifies why learning tasks (or adaptations) are appropriate using examples of students' personal/cultural/community assets and makes connections to research and/or theory about learning development.                |  |



| Rubric Title   | Guiding Question   | Concept   | Evidence of Practice                                 |
|--|--|---|--|
| R4: Identifying and Supporting Language Demands                  | How does the candidate identify and support language demands associated with a key subject-specific learning task?   | Candidate identifies language demand(s) (i.e. Language function, vocabulary, discourse, and/or syntax) associated with a learning task. Plans include general support for use of at least two language demands. Includes support for students at different levels of language learning. |  |
| R5: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning | How does the candidate plan to monitor and support student learning?   | Candidate plans for assessment(s) that provide evidence to monitor students' understanding of related subject-specific concepts, learning elements, and/or skill sets. Includes adaptations required by IEPs or 504 plans.  |  |
| <b>Task 2: Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning</b>     |  |   |  |
| R6: Learning Environment   | How does the candidate demonstrate a respectful learning environment that supports learners' engagement in learning? | Candidate demonstrates respect for and rapport with students, providing a positive and challenging learning environment that allows varied perspectives.  | Unedited Video Clips<br><br>Instructional Commentary |

| Rubric Title                          | Guiding Question   | Concept  | Evidence of Practice |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|----------------------|
| R7: Engaging Students in Learning     | How does the candidate actively engage students in developing content knowledge and understanding?   | Students are engaged in meaningful learning tasks that develop and deepen specific subject matter content understanding. The candidate links students' prior learning with new learning and new learning with students' personal, cultural, or community assets. |                      |
| R8: Deepening Student Learning        | How does the candidate elicit student responses to promote thinking and to develop an understanding of subject-specific elements of content? | Candidate elicits and builds on students' responses to promote thinking and develop content understanding while facilitating student interactions toward self-evaluation.  |                      |
| R9: Subject-Specific Pedagogy         | How does the candidate use subject-specific instructional strategies and materials to help students develop understanding of content?        | Candidate uses core or signature subject-specific strategies to develop and deepen student understanding and knowledge.  |                      |
| R10: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness | How does the candidate use evidence to evaluate and change teaching practice to meet students' varied learning needs?                        | Candidate examines the impact of teaching on learning. Changes in practices are justified with evidence to better address learners' needs and are connected to research and/or theory.   |                      |

| Rubric Title   | Guiding Question  | Concept   | Evidence of Practice  |
|--|---|---|---|
| <b>Task 3: Assessing Students' Learning</b>                |   |   |   |
| R11: Analysis of Student Learning                          | How does the candidate analyze evidence of student learning?  | Candidate's analysis of student learning focuses on strengths and needs of students supported by evidence from the work samples and a summary of performance across the class. Analysis includes differences and/or patterns of whole class learning. | <p>Analysis of whole class assessment</p> <p>Analysis of learning and feedback to selected focus students (2 or 3 depending on content area)</p> <p>Assessment Commentary</p> |
| R12: Providing Feedback to Guide Learning                  | What type of feedback does the candidate provide to focus students?   | Candidate provides feedback that is accurate and focuses on errors and/or strengths related to specific learning.   |   |
| R13: Student Use of Feedback                               | How does the candidate provide opportunities for focus learners to understand and use the feedback to guide their further learning? | Candidate explains how s/he will support focus students to use feedback to deepen understandings and skills related to learning objectives.   |   |
| R14: Analyzing Students' Language Use and Content Learning | How does the candidate analyze students' use of language to develop content understandings?   | Candidate explains and provides evidence of students' use of the language function and other language demands (vocabulary, discourse, syntax) to support the development of content understandings.   |   |

| Rubric Title                                | Guiding Question  | Concept  | Evidence of Practice |
|---|---|--|----------------------|
| R15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction | How does the candidate use the analysis of what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction? | Candidate plans next steps for instruction that improves student learning and justifies the next steps based on student needs as reflected in performance on an assessment as well as theory/research. |                      |

**ATTACHMENT II****edTPA Pilot Year 1 Programs and Timeline**

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

### edTPA Pilot Year 1 Timeline

| Date                      | Action   |
|---------------------------|--|
| May 3, 2019               | Notification of acceptance sent to participating EPPs  |
| May 10, 2019              | TEA Webinar: edTPA Orientation   |
| June 7, 2019              | TEA Webinar: Cycle of Effective Teaching and Role and Responsibilities   |
| July 15, 2019             | TEA Webinar: Task I Deep Dive—Planning for Instruction and Assessment  |
| Before August 1, 2019     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Onsite introductory sessions titled edTPA 101 provided by edTPA Program Managers at Pearson. These sessions will be open to faculty, supervisors, and P–12 partners designed to build an understanding of the purpose, development, and structure of the assessment.</li> <li>• Collect candidate demographic data and district partner data</li> <li>• Regional workshops provided by members of the edTPA National Academy. These sessions are intended for methods and foundations faculty, university supervisors, and mentor teachers who support or supervise candidates and will cover the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A close examination of edTPA tasks and rubrics, including what candidates are asked to think about, do, and write for each task as well as how portfolios will be evaluated</li> <li>○ Sharing of instrumental resources and best practices from successful implementation plans</li> <li>○ Guidelines and best practices for supporting candidates completing their edTPA portfolio</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| August 9 and 12, 2019     | TEA Webinar: Task II Deep Dive—Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning   |
| September 1, 2019         | TEA staff collect the following data from programs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demographic information</li> <li>• Faculty training documents</li> <li>• Curriculum alignment information</li> <li>• Materials used to determine which candidates are recommended for edTPA (versus PPR)</li> </ul>   |
| September 13 and 16, 2019 | TEA Webinar: Task III Deep Dive—Assessing Student Learning   |
| October 31, 2019          | Release of year 2 edTPA pilot applications   |
| October 11, 2019          | TEA Webinar: Task IV Deep Dive   |
| October 24, 2019          | First window closes for submission of edTPA portfolio  |
| November 10, 2019         | First window closes for pilot reimbursement  |
| November 15, 2019         | TEA Webinar: Submission Logistics and Results Analyzer   |

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

**ATTACHMENT III****edTPA Pilot Year 2 Program Participants and Timeline**

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



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

### edTPA Pilot Year 2 Timeline

| Date        | Event                                   |
|-------------|---|
| <b>2020</b> |   |
| February 14 | Notification sent to participating EPPs |
| March 16    | TEA edTPA orientation webinar           |

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

| Date              | Event   |
|-------------------|---|
| November 6        | edTPA Handbook and Rubric Deep Dive Virtual Workshop (LOI programs)   |
| November 13       | edTPA Academic Language Virtual Workshop  |
| November 10       | First reimbursement window<br>Monthly Pilot Webinar facilitated by Texas edTPA Regional Coordinators in collaboration with edTPA National Academy: “Task 4 Deep Dive”   |
| November–December | EPPs collect exemplar work representing planning, instruction, and assessment to share with faculty and candidates.   |
| December 4        | edTPA Local Evaluation Workshop (LOI programs)  |
| December 2020     | Proposed edTPA Pilot Year 3 Application launch  |
| December 10       | Monthly Pilot Webinar facilitated by Texas edTPA Regional Coordinators: “Looking Ahead: Spring Development Planning”  |
| December 11       | edTPA Local Evaluation Workshop (LOI programs)  |
| December 15       | EPP due date to have attended edTPA 101 and the following regional workshops: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Evaluation</li> <li>• Curriculum Inquiry</li> <li>• Academic Language</li> </ul> |
| December 30       | EPPs submit updated candidate information to TEA (all programs)<br>EPPs submit edTPA training log (LOI programs)  |
| <b>2021</b>       |   |
| January–May       | EPPs facilitate training to EPP faculty, staff, and/or candidates<br>EPPs facilitate training to district staff   |
| January 28        | Monthly Pilot Webinar facilitated by Texas edTPA Regional Coordinators: Analyzing edTPA data for Continuous Improvement   |
| February 25       | Monthly Pilot Webinar facilitated by Texas edTPA Regional Coordinators: TBD Based on EPP needs  |
| March 29–31       | Texas edTPA Pilot Institute   |
| April 22          | Monthly Pilot Webinar facilitated by Texas edTPA Regional Coordinators: TBD Based on EPP needs  |

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

**ATTACHMENT IV****edTPA Pilot Year 3 Program Participants and Timeline**

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

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

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

### Proposed edTPA Pilot Year 3 Timeline

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

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