edTPA Informational Overview

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) presented a Teacher Certification Redesign to the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) at the October 5, 2018 meeting. Included in the redesign is a phase-in of the edTPA. The edTPA is a standardized performance-based portfolio assessment proposed for teacher licensure. SBEC responded to the proposed adoption of the edTPA by requesting TEA solicit opportunities for stakeholder engagement and feedback. Leaders in Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) have expressed concern regarding the edTPA assessment at the December 7, 2018 board meeting (item 11). The result of adopting the edTPA has the potential for significant impact on EPPs and school districts across the state. The TEA has requested time on the SBEC agenda over multiple meetings before asking the board to act. It is anticipated the board will vote on this item at the April 20, 2019 board meeting.

Background

The edTPA is presented as part of the 2021 goal pathway for teacher certification. “The goal pathway is focused on providing equitable access of candidates into educator preparation programs and aligning the day-to-day expectations of teachers to certification and assessment” (Item 11, p.1). The redesigned pathway focuses on pedagogical content knowledge, skill building, and pre-service practice. The edTPA will replace the current EC-12 PPR exam currently required for teacher certification. The state surmises the edTPA will raise the rigor and quality of teachers while extensive research has not supported this claim. If adopted, the edTPA will be fully implemented by the 2021-2022 school year and will be consequential for candidates in the 22-23 school year.

What is edTPA?

edTPA is a standardized, performance-based assessment designed to be used as a licensure exam. The assessment includes a video-recording of the candidate’s teaching, along with a series of lesson plans and commentary/reflection.

- The edTPA is comprised of three tasks:
  - Planning for Instruction and Assessment
  - Instructing and Engaging the Students in Learning, and
  - Assessing Student Learning.
- Teacher candidates complete and submit the following:
  - One or two video-recorded teaching segments totaling 15-20 minutes of instruction,
  - lesson plans covering 3-5 consecutive lessons,
  - artifacts,
  - student work,
  - assessment data,
  - the candidates’ written responses to questions provided by SCALE (Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity).
- Candidates submit their electronic portfolio to external graders who are hired and trained by Pearson.
- Cut scores to determine passing criteria are determined by the state education agency.
- Within 3-6 weeks after final submission of the portfolio, Pearson sends a report to the candidate, the EPP, and the state agency.

- The TEA-negotiated cost of the edTPA to teacher candidates is $270.00. A failed task can be resubmitted at the cost to the candidate of $100.00.
- Three studies provided by TEA suggest edTPA may have a small, significant impact on teacher quality and student achievement. Research and commentary from other states indicate edTPA may also have unintended consequences

*To learn more about the edTPA and concerns presented statewide, please watch the recorded item 11 SBEC board meeting: [http://www.adminmonitor.com/tx/tea/educator_certification/20181207/](
edTPA Concerns presented to SBEC

Prior to the December 2018 SBEC board meeting, 37 representatives of educator preparation at 30 universities, public and private, across Texas presented concerns to each of the SBEC board members. Twenty-three deans and five associate deans, along with other directors, faculty, and professional educator organization representatives collectively expressed concerns about the potential adoption of the edTPA.

1. **Decrease in Teacher Production.** edTPA may have a negative impact on teacher production. States that have implemented edTPA experienced both a decline in EPP teacher enrollment and a reduction in teacher certification roughly twice that of states who have not implemented edTPA.

2. **Reduction in diversity of teacher workforce and clinical experience.** Studies document potential negative scoring bias for Hispanic and Black candidates, evidenced by significant differences in edTPA pass rates. The high cost of edTPA may deter potential FTIC (First Time in College) students, those from HSIs (Hispanic-Serving Institutions), and/or HBCUs (Historically Black Colleges and Universities) from entering the profession. Clinical teaching placements may trend towards districts with more homogeneous or more affluent classrooms to boost edTPA results. A more diverse teaching force is linked to higher student achievement, fewer suspensions, and greater EC-12 student success.

3. **Increase in already burdensome regulatory costs for EPPs and candidates.** Previous adopters report start-up and ongoing costs including excessive testing fees, added personnel, EPP and district training and workshops, test preparation and coaching, video equipment, district consent for video recording, and purchasing secure digital storage space. TEA has recommended edTPA for many reasons: to level the playing field in terms of program accountability, to address contract abandonment, to raise teacher quality, to increase retention, and to raise EC-12 student achievement. In the absence of compelling evidence edTPA is an adequate solution to address these multiple concerns and assure gains in overall EPP quality and production, imposing costly regulatory burdens does not seem warranted.

4. **Implementation of edTPA as an inauthentic assessment.** edTPA is a set of three artifacts specifically created by the candidate and tailored to meet the standardized edTPA rubric requirements and the evaluators’ preferences. The videoed lessons may be captured during a controlled setting, and the lessons are reviewed and evaluated several weeks later, thus significantly delaying feedback. Many high quality EPPs already have robust, performance-based assessments built into their programs. These assessments occur across multiple semesters, provide both formative and summative feedback to the candidate and to the EPP, and culminate in a more thorough understanding of the candidate’s practice and preparation for teaching.

5. **Impact on district partnerships and teacher pipeline.** The video recording requirements that accompany the use of edTPA will impact our relationships with schools and districts. Our school partners are concerned with the added burden of the video recording that will occur in their classrooms, including the required gathering of consent from parents/students. We, as EPPs, are concerned with the possibility of schools becoming less willing to take teacher candidates due to the additional burden of edTPA requirements. As EPPs who work to place our teacher candidates in high need, diverse classrooms, we worry that this burdensome aspect of edTPA will impact our high needs schools more.

**Next Steps:**
Collectively, we share a commitment with SBEC and TEA to high-quality teaching and high-quality teacher preparation that serves all the students of Texas. The costs (e.g., to candidate, to the EPP, in teacher production) may outweigh the potential benefits (as yet, not heavily evidenced) of implementing the edTPA. Currently, the TEA is holding stakeholder meetings through February 20, 2019. Please see the SBEC agenda item 11, p. 8-9 for specific meeting times and locations. In addition, the TEA will meet with stakeholders at request.
Research and evidence related to Concern #1:

Decrease in Teacher Production.

States that have implemented edTPA experienced both a decline in EPP teacher enrollment and a reduction in teacher certification roughly twice that of states who have not implemented edTPA.

In Texas, there are reported teacher shortages in rural districts across almost all academic areas. All sizes of districts are in high need of quality teachers in bilingual/ESL, special education, career and technology education, and computer science/technology application, and STEM fields.

Research indicates a drop in enrollment in teacher education programs of 31% across the nation. In addition to the decline in enrollment in EPPs, high school students across the nation have shown a 15% decline in interest in general teacher education majors (Aragon, 2016).

Because of this decline in teacher production and interest in the profession, and the increasing need for effective teachers, we must be thoughtful in how teacher production and teacher preparation programs are supported.

Many districts (over half) have waived certification requirements for teachers in order to fill positions (through the Districts of Innovation option). This has created a quality problem (according to principals and superintendents we have visited with), but it allows them to get someone in the classroom. edTPA may force more to do this because of a decreased teacher pipeline through formal channels.

- **Marder and Rhodes (2018)** (see below) found that when accounting for the number of teachers produced in a state, states without a mandatory standardized performance assessment saw teacher production decline at 3.0% per year while states with a mandatory performance assessment, such as edTPA, saw teacher production decline at 5.6% per year from 2008-2016. This decline in correlation with the edTPA is concerning in light of already declining numbers.
Preliminary examination of teacher production in states that adopted EdTPA or similar performance assessments.

Michael Marder and Annelies Rhodes
UTeach and STEM Education, UT Austin

EdTPA is a performance assessment for beginning educators developed by SCALE (Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity) and marketed by Pearson. According to a review by AACTE, 33 states have at least one institution participating in EdTPA, and 16 states have adopted a policy requiring EdTPA or a similar performance assessment from all institutions. Five of these states completed implementation of EdTPA prior to Fall 2018 and two more will complete implementation within the next year.

A concern with the implementation of EdTPA is that it could accelerate the rate at which teacher production is dropping in states that adopt it. As shown in the Figure 1, completion of teacher programs in all large states is declining.

To investigate whether EdTPA might accelerate the decline in the number of teachers produced in Texas, we compared teacher production in the states that have made edTPA or a similar assessment

---

**Figure 1**: Overall teacher production by program type for the states producing the most teachers. Data from US Department of Education, Title 2 data (https://title2.ed.gov/Public/DataTools/Tables.aspx)
mandatory and compared with teacher production in states that have not. The states with such a mandatory performance assessment are:

Alabama     California     Connecticut     Delaware     Georgia     Hawaii
Illinois     Minnesota     New Jersey     New York     North Carolina     Oregon
Tennessee     Washington     West Virginia     and     Wisconsin.

Analysis of teacher production was carried out using data from the US Department of Education from 2008-2016. For every state, teacher production was fit to a linear regression model. The slopes were divided by production in the first year (2008) so that they represented the rate of annual change for each state. These normalized rates were then modeled in R as:

**Weighted Model**

\[
\text{lm(C$Slope/C$Value~C$"EdTPA or Performance Assessment Mandatory",weight=C$Value)} \ OR
\]

**Unweighted Model**

\[
\text{lm(C$Slope/C$Value~C$"EdTPA or Performance Assessment Mandatory")}
\]

In the first model, states are weighted by the number of teachers they produce. States without a mandatory performance assessment saw teacher production decline at 3.0% per year from 2008 to 2016, while states with EdTPA or other performance assessment saw teacher production decline at 5.6% per year from 2008 to 2016. The difference between these two rates is significant (p< .005 **).

In the second, unweighted, model, the states are all treated equally as teacher production entities with or without mandatory EdTPA. States without a mandatory performance assessment saw teacher production decline at 1.9% per year from 2008 to 2016, while states with EdTPA or other performance assessment saw teacher production decline at 4.2% per year from 2008 to 2016. The difference between these two rates is significant (p< .05 *).

While both models demonstrate similar outcomes, the unweighted model is probably preferred, if only because the estimate of the possible decline in teacher production due to instituting performance assessments is smaller. The sixteen states where EdTPA or a similar assessment is mandatory are at different stages of implementation, and only seven of them have completed or nearly completed implementation. However, the effect of EdTPA on student enrollment in educator preparation programs could begin prior to full implementation of the program. Decline could start as soon as students become aware it will be required and courses begin to reflect it. Therefore, all sixteen states were included in the analysis. The main state for whose classification is uncertain is California, since EdTPA is one of three allowed performance assessments. The results do not depend upon whether California is assigned to the Mandatory group or not, although the p value increases somewhat if California is not listed as Mandatory.

**Note from Figure 1 that Texas stands in contrast to almost all other large states because teacher production has been growing rather than declining for the last five years** (Texas production dropped in 2012 following widely publicized state budget cuts). This growth is mainly because of the increased teacher production from the non-IHE alternative certification sector. It would be a loss to the state if adoption of EdTPA made Texas teacher production look more like that of New York, and Illinois.
Research and evidence related to Concern #2:
Reduction in diversity of teacher workforce and clinical experience

Studies document potential negative scoring bias for Hispanic and Black candidates, evidenced by significant differences in edTPA pass rates. The high cost of edTPA may deter potential FTIC (First Time in College) students, those from HSIs (Hispanic-Serving Institutions), and/or HBCUs (Historically Black Colleges and Universities) from entering the profession. Clinical teaching placements may trend towards districts with more homogeneous or more affluent classrooms to boost edTPA results. A more diverse teaching force is linked to higher student achievement, fewer suspensions, and greater EC-12 student success.

Potential bias in scoring
- Greenblatt and O’Hara (2015) reported a specific language of the edTPA, specific directives, and rubric objectives that must be addressed in reflections. As a result of this specific focus on language and terminology, data indicated that students of color, specifically disadvantaged students of color, and students representing linguistic minority groups were failing at disproportionate rates.
- Supporting this finding, the 2017 edTPA Administrative Report indicates Black candidates performed at lower levels than other candidates, and the mean score for Black candidates at 42.61 is barely above the edTPA recommended cut score of 42 (p.21).
- Research conducted by Goldhaber, Cowan, and Theobald (2017) found that in Washington, when compared to non-Hispanic White teacher candidates, Hispanic teacher candidates scored significantly lower; 13.7% of Hispanic candidates failed the edTPA in comparison to the 3.7% failure rate of non-Hispanic White candidates.

Impact on higher need students through cost
- According to Greenblatt and O’Hara (2015), the cost of the exam has doubled to $600.00 and vouchers for a reduced exam price are limited and difficult to come by. For many students, the increased cost in credentialing at the end of their college experience may dissuade them from obtaining a teaching certificate and encourage other professional pathways that have fewer associated costs.

Potential of placements trending towards “easier” classrooms in higher SES areas
- Of particular concern is the potential limitation of placements in more diverse and challenging student teaching environments. Research indicates there may be a decline of high-quality student teaching placements, and particularly of diverse placements in response to constraints of rubrics used for the edTPA (Greenblatt & O’Hara, 2015).
- Schools serving high populations of low-income students and those with low standardized test scores often use scripted curriculum, making it difficult for candidates to deviate from existing lesson plans to showcase the teacher candidate’s planning skills. Failing accountability test scores increase the stakes for the teacher of record to adapt to edTPA task demands and may create conflict between the needs of the cooperating teacher and the demands of edTPA on the candidate. Cooperating teacher support has been shown to be a positive influence on candidate’s edTPA experience.
- Candidates placed in less homogenous classroom settings must demonstrate additional and more challenging demands which may not complement the edTPA rubric and expectations evaluating a structured lesson delivery. EPP programs may be more motivated to place students in more homogenous settings to improve edTPA passing rates (Greenblatt & O’Hara, 2015).
- Research conducted by Goldhaber, Cowan, and Theobald (2017) indicate that candidates serving schools with a high percentage of minority students, students participating in free and reduced lunch programs, and students with learning disabilities score lower than others taking the edTPA.
- Pecheone and Whittaker (2018) support this by report that a variety of influences impact performance on the edTPA such as length of placements in the field, varying teaching experiences/opportunities, available resources and supports offered to candidates, and the candidate’s disposition. Placing candidates in more
challenging settings (where they are often most needed) may reduce reliability of scores based on these transitory factors.

- Because of the documented potential biases, Goldhaber, Cowan, and Theobald (2017) posit edTPA may reproduce race and class inequalities like high-stakes standardized tests have been shown to do.
Research and evidence related to Concern #3:

Increase in already burdensome regulatory costs for EPPs and candidate

Previous adopters report start-up and ongoing costs including excessive testing fees, added personnel, EPP and district training and workshops, test preparation and coaching, video equipment, district consent for video recording, and purchasing secure digital storage space. TEA has recommended edTPA for many reasons: to level the playing field in terms of program accountability, to address contract abandonment, to raise teacher quality, to increase retention, and to raise EC-12 student achievement. In the absence of compelling evidence edTPA is an adequate solution to address these multiple concerns and assure gains in overall EPP quality and production, imposing costly regulatory burdens does not seem warranted.

Increased Candidate Cost

- Concerns have been noted regarding the need for increased resources for and costs to both candidates and EPPs. While we recommend a thorough cost benefit analysis, several pieces of research indicate an increase in cost to candidates and EPPs with the implementation of the edTPA. In addition to the increase in certification costs for candidates, EPPs must ensure candidates have the appropriate support in place to successfully navigate the edTPA assessment including training for faculty/staff, field supervisors, and cooperating teachers, access to advanced technology, training to build skills needed to use required technology, and full curricular integration of edTPA language, rubrics, and expectations.

District/Campus Implications

- Significant concerns have been noted regarding the impact edTPA will have on the local education agency as well as the impact on university/district relationships. EdTPA raises concerns of student privacy and increases demands on the cooperating teacher making the already complex placement process for EPPs more challenging.
- Kissau, Hart, and Algozzine’s study (2017) reveals the influence of the cooperating teacher on the candidate. Candidates with cooperating teachers who were helpful and supportive scored higher on the edTPA. While more research is needed in this area, evidence suggests that student supervision training is a powerful predictor of candidate success.
- Burns, Henry, and Lindauer (2015) found in a study of edTPA implementation that “Seventy four percent of the cooperating teachers agreed or strongly agreed that a cooperating teacher should be an active supporter of a student teacher’s edTPA work” (p.27). Cooperating teachers in the same study reported being confused and overwhelmed by the demands of the edTPA even after receiving training related to support they should provide.

Impact on the Field Supervisor/Candidate Relationship

- Implementation of edTPA at Georgia State University revealed that the edTPA assessment had a profound impact on the relationship between the field supervisor and candidate. The field supervisor played an integral role in the candidate’s navigation of the assessment indicating a need for advanced training for candidate supervisors (Cannon & Donovan, 2018).
- Greenblatt and O’Hara (2015) found that the implementation of the edTPA shifted the focus of the student teaching experience to test preparation. Student teachers report losing time needed for lesson planning and the completion of coursework to better understanding requirements needed to pass the edTPA. Guidebooks, handbooks, rubrics, and prompts must be well understood to receive a passing score.
- Researchers found that the use of external evaluators shifted the field supervisor’s role away from teaching and focused the attention on compliance (Cronenberg, Harrison, Korson, Jones, Murray-Everett, Parrish, & Johnston-Parsons, 2016).
Technology Requirements

- Technology requirements of the edTPA privilege certain candidates and institutions. There is an assumption that universities and teacher candidates have the advanced technology skills necessary to complete the edTPA requirements. Candidates who have been through the edTPA process advise future candidates to videotape all lessons and to support one another in choreographing lessons for video recording, editing and uploading videos, and scanning files to guard against the loss and/or accidental deletion of files. Instructional technology staff was also trained in the edTPA and provided extensive one-on-one support to students in transferring, editing, and downloading video.
- Universities have reported hiring edTPA coordinators or dedicated tutors to support students in action planning and goals setting around the edTPA (Burns, Henry, & Lindauer, 2015).
- While wealthier schools have the means to hire edTPA coordinators who provide support to candidates through workshops, seminars, and one-on-one consultation, universities with limited funding may provide more general support through online modules or websites thereby providing less human interaction placing these students at a disadvantage (Greenblatt & O'Hara, 2015).

Teacher Education Curriculum

- Research indicates that edTPA may require many additional hours from faculty and staff revisiting, re-aligning, and re-writing curriculum to ensure there is connection between course curriculum and the demands of the edTPA (Ledwell and Oyler, 2016).
- Burns, Henry, and Lindauer (2015) also found the need for curricular change when implementing the edTPA. They share, “Weaving edTPA language and tasks into early field experiences and classes will likely help make the edTPA become easier to manage, and perhaps the value of the tasks will be more evident” (p.30).
- The focus on building a learning portfolio may narrow the curriculum and move it from teaching to compliance (Cronenberg, Harrison, Korson, Jones, Murray-Everett, Parrish, & Johnston-Parsons, 2016).
- Cannon and Donovan (2018) found that the edTPA narrowed the vision for teacher candidates to the next deadline, submission, and result instead of legitimately assessing the teacher learning process. This narrowed vision did not support or encourage candidates in building positive relationships with students, colleagues, and parents. In addition, candidates were lacking critical thinking skills.
- The edTPA impacts preservice coursework and clinical placements of teacher candidates more than the traditional pen-and-paper type test by emphasizing the need for teacher candidates to “get it right” instead of encouraging reflective and critical thinking (Dover & Schultz, 2016).
- Overall, the introduction of high-stakes TPAs undermined the candidates’ sense of self-efficacy, agency, and enthusiasm about their work in the classroom” (p.3). In addition, Dover and Schultz’s research reveals that edTPA prepares candidates to follow rules instead of prepared to advocate for students (Dover & Schultz, 2016).
Research and evidence related to Concern #4:

**Implementation of edTPA as an inauthentic assessment**

edTPA is a set of three artifacts specifically created by the candidate and tailored to meet the standardized edTPA rubric requirements and the evaluators’ preferences. The videoed lessons may be captured during a controlled setting, and the lessons are reviewed and evaluated several weeks later, thus significantly delaying feedback. Many high quality EPPs already have robust, performance-based assessments built into their programs. These assessments occur across multiple semesters, provide both formative and summative feedback to the candidate and to the EPP, and culminate in a more thorough understanding of the candidate’s practice and preparation for teaching.

- Research conducted suggests that edTPA has a high passing rate. Some failures occur because of submission errors or writing quantity or quality (Ledwell & Oyler, 2016).
- Questions have been raised in regard to the reliability, validity and ability to measure future success of candidates. In addition, reports from students and faculty of state universities in NY have reported experiences of their strongest students passing with lower scores than their less prepared candidates calling into question the training of the evaluators and the reliability of the edTPA (Greenblatt & O'Hara, 2015).
- The edTPA relies on reading, writing, and technology skills to assess mastery and de-emphasizes the importance of adapting and relating to students as well as establishing a cooperative learning environment (Greenblatt & O'Hara, 2015).
- edTPA narrowed the vision for teacher candidates to the next deadline, submission, and result instead of legitimately assessing the teacher learning process and supporting building positive relationships with students, colleagues, and parents as well as critical thinking skills teachers need (Cannon & Donovan, 2018).
- Locally scored assessments, such as the robust performance assessments many universities currently have in place are a powerful authentic assessment and serve to inform continuous program improvements. Researchers Bastian, Henry, Pan, and Lys (2016) found that edTPA is a good predictor of first year teacher success when locally scored. In addition, *locally scored* edTPA assessments informed program improvements by building a common language, common expectations, and shared responsibility. Locally scored edTPA assessments give evidence that students in the program are demonstrating expected knowledge and skills. Cronenberg, Harrison, Korson, Jones, Murray-Everett, Parrish, and Johnston-Parsons (2016) report as one of the biggest concerns of edTPA that the teacher candidate is no longer evaluated by the university faculty/staff. This subjective review has resulted in some of the weakest candidates passing and some of the strongest candidates failing the assessment.
- Armstrong and Davis (2018) found both strengths and weaknesses while interviewing participants who had voluntarily used the edTPA. The researchers found that while edTPA grew students as critics and reflectors of their own work and edTPA supported the development of academic language, missing components of the edTPA included classroom environment, classroom management, student learning, and the development and use of pre and post-test assessment data (p.22).
Research and evidence related to Concern #5: **Impact on district partnerships and teacher pipeline**

The video recording requirements that accompany the use of edTPA will impact our relationships with schools and districts. Our school partners are concerned with the added burden of the video recording that will occur in their classrooms, including the required gathering of consent from parents/students. We, as EPPs, are concerned with the possibility of schools becoming less willing to take teacher candidates due to the additional burden of edTPA requirements. As EPPs who work to place our teacher candidates in high need, diverse classrooms, we worry that this burdensome aspect of edTPA will impact our high needs schools more.

**Technology Requirements**

- Kissau, Jart, and Algozzine (2017) conducted research that revealed several areas of weakness within the edTPA. Analyzing and interpreting student assessment data, weak reflective writing, and technical problems when uploading videos were reported as areas of weakness.
- Technology requirements of the edTPA privilege certain candidates and institutions. There is an assumption that universities and teacher candidates have the advanced technology skills necessary to complete the edTPA requirements. Candidates who have been through the edTPA process advise future candidates to video record all lessons and to support one another in choreographing lessons for video recording, editing and uploading videos, and scanning files to guard against the loss and/or accidental deletion of files. Instructional technology staff was also trained in the edTPA and provided extensive one-on-one support to students in transferring, editing, and downloading video.
- Universities have reported hiring edTPA coordinators or dedicated tutors to support students in action planning and goals setting around the edTPA (Burns, Henry, and Lindauer, 2015).
- While wealthier schools have the means to hire edTPA coordinators who provide support to candidates through workshops, seminars, and one-on-one consultation, universities with limited funding may provide more general support through online modules or websites thereby providing less human interaction placing these students at a disadvantage (Greenblatt & O'Hara, 2015).
- Greenblatt and O'Hara (2015) share, “Students have reported it taking them approximately two hours to review all the prompts, submit all the sections, and to upload their materials to meet the specific criteria, which include everything from the size and style of the font to the specifications for compressing and uploading videos.” (p. 65).
- According to SCALE representative, Kelly Crawford, this process can require up to 40 hours of preparation for the candidate, potentially drawing important energy and attention away from their clinical teaching.

**District/Campus Implications**

- Significant concerns have been noted regarding the impact edTPA will have on the local education agency as well as the impact on university/district relationships. EdTPA raises concerns of student privacy and increases demands on the cooperating teacher making the already complex placement process for EPPs more challenging.
- Kissau, Hart, and Algozzine’s study (2017) reveals the influence of the cooperating teacher on the candidate. Candidates with cooperating teachers who were helpful and supportive scored higher on the edTPA. While more research is needed in this area, evidence suggests that student supervision training is a powerful predictor of candidate success.
- Burns, Henry, and Lindauer (2015) found in a study of edTPA implementation that “Seventy four percent of the cooperating teachers agreed or strongly agreed that a cooperating teacher should be an active supporter of a student teacher’s edTPA work” (p.27). Cooperating teachers in the same study reported being confused and overwhelmed by the demands of the edTPA even after receiving training related to support they should provide.
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