

Item 11:**Consider and Take Appropriate Action on Proposed Amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 230, Professional Educator Preparation and Certification, Subchapter A, General Provisions, §230.1, Definitions, Subchapter C, Assessment of Educators, §230.21, Educator Assessment, Subchapter D, Types and Classes of Certificates Issued, §230.36, Intern Certificates, and §230.37, Probationary Certificates, and Subchapter G, Certificate Issuance Procedures, §230.101, Schedule of Fees for Certification Services****DISCUSSION AND ACTION**

SUMMARY: This item provides the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) an opportunity to discuss and propose amendments to 19 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) Chapter 230, Professional Educator Preparation and Certification, Subchapter A, General Provisions, §230.1, Definitions, Subchapter C, Assessment of Educators, §230.21, Educator Assessment, Subchapter D, Types and Classes of Certificates Issued, §230.36, Intern Certificates, and §230.37, Probationary Certificates, and Subchapter G, Certificate Issuance Procedures, §230.101, Schedule of Fees for Certification Services. The proposed amendments would update the figure specifying required tests for issuance of the standard certificate; would create new requirements for issuance of intern and probationary certificates for the proposed new intensive pre-service option, as concurrently proposed in Chapter 228, Requirements for Educator Preparation Programs, in this agenda; and would update the list of certification testing fees to include the performance-based assessment, edTPA, and content certification (subject-matter only) examinations.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: The statutory authority for 19 TAC §230.1 is the Texas Education Code (TEC), §§21.041(b)(1), (2), and (4) and (c), 21.044(a), as amended by SBs 7, 1839, and 1963, 85th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2017; 21.048, 21.050, and 22.082. The statutory authority for 19 TAC §230.21 is the TEC, §§21.041(b)(1), (2), and (4); 21.044(a), as amended by SBs 7, 1839, and 1963, 85th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2017; 21.048; 21.050; 22.082; and the Texas Occupations Code (TOC), §54.003. The statutory authority for 19 TAC §230.36 and §230.37 is the TEC, §§21.003(a), 21.031, 21.041(b)(1)-(5) and (9), 21.051, as amended by SB 1839, 85th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2017, and 22.0831(c) and (f). The statutory authority 19 TAC §230.101 is the TEC, §§21.031(a); 21.041(b)(1)-(5) and (9) and (c); 21.044(a), as amended by SBs 7, 1839, and 1963, 85th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2017, (e) and (f); 21.048, 21.0485, 21.050, 21.054(a), as amended by SBs 7, 179, and 1839, 85th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2017; 22.082; and 22.0831(f); and TOC, §53.105.

TEC, §21.003(a), states that a person may not be employed as a teacher, teacher intern or teacher trainee, librarian, educational aide, administrator, educational diagnostician, or school counselor by a school district unless the person holds an appropriate certificate or permit issued as provided by the TEC, Chapter 21, Subchapter B.

TEC, §21.031(a), states that the SBEC shall regulate and oversee all aspects of the certification, continuing education, and standards of conduct of public school educators.

TEC, §21.031(b), states that the SBEC shall ensure that all candidates for certification or renewal of certification should demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to improve performance of a diverse student population.

TEC, §21.041(b)(1)-(5), requires the SBEC to propose rules that provide for the regulation of educators and the general administration of the TEC, Chapter 21, Subchapter B, in a manner consistent with the TEC, Chapter 21, Subchapter B; require the SBEC to propose rules that specify the classes of educator certificates to be issued, including emergency certificates; the period for which each class of educator certificate is valid; and the requirements for the issuance and renewal of an educator certificate; and require the SBEC to propose rules that include requirements for educators that hold a similar certification issued by another state or foreign country.

TEC, §21.041(b)(9), requires the SBEC to propose rules for regulation of continuing education requirements.

TEC, §21.041(c), states that the SBEC may adopt fees for the issuance and maintenance of an educator certification to adequately cover the cost of the administration.

TEC, §21.044(a), as amended by SBs 7, 1839, and 1963, 85th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2017, requires the SBEC to propose rules establishing training requirements a person must accomplish to obtain a certificate, enter an internship, or enter an induction-year program.

TEC, §21.044(e), states that in proposing rules under this section for a person to obtain a certificate to teach a health science technology education course, the board shall specify that a person must have: (1) an associate degree or more advanced degree from an accredited institution of higher education; (2) current licensure, certification, or registration as a health professions practitioner issued by a nationally recognized accrediting agency for health professionals; and (3) at least two years of wage earning experience utilizing the licensure requirement.

TEC, §21.044(f), states that the SBEC may not propose rules for a certificate to teach a health science technology education course that specify that a person must have a bachelor's degree or that establish any other credential or teaching experience requirements that exceed the requirements under Subsection (e).

TEC, §21.048, states that the SBEC shall propose rules prescribing comprehensive examinations for each class of certificate issued by the board that includes not requiring more than 45 days elapsing between examination retakes.

TEC, §21.0485, states the issuance requirements for certification to teach students with visual impairments.

TEC, §21.050(a), states that a person who applies for a teaching certificate must possess a bachelor's degree.

TEC, §21.050(b), states that the SBEC may not require more than 18 semester credit hours of education courses at the baccalaureate level for the granting of a teaching certificate.

TEC, §21.050(c), states that a person who receives a bachelor's degree required for a teaching certificate on the basis of higher education coursework completed while receiving an exemption from tuition and fees under the TEC, §54.363, may not be required to participate in any field experience or internship consisting of student teaching to receive a teaching certificate.

TEC, §21.051, as amended by SB 1839, 85th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2017, provides a requirement that before a school may employ a certification candidate as a teacher of record, the candidate must have completed at least 15 hours of field-based experience in which the candidate was actively engaged at an approved school in instructional or educational activities under supervision.

TEC, §21.054(a), as amended by SBs 7, 179, and 1839, 85th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2017, require the SBEC to propose rules establishing a process for identifying continuing education courses and programs that fulfill educators' continuing education requirements.

TEC, §22.082, requires SBEC to subscribe to the criminal history clearinghouse as provided by §411.0845, Texas Government Code and may obtain any law enforcement or criminal history records that relate to a specific applicant for or holder of a certificate issued under Chapter 21, Subchapter B.

TEC, §22.0831(c), requires SBEC to review the national criminal history of a person seeking certification.

TEC, §22.0831(f)(1) and (2), states that SBEC may propose rules regarding the deadline for the national criminal history check and implement sanctions for persons failing to comply with the requirements.

TOC, §53.105, states that a licensing authority may require a fee that is an amount sufficient to cover the cost of administration.

TOC, §54.003, states that a licensing authority shall provide accommodations and eligibility criteria for examinees diagnosed as having dyslexia.

EFFECTIVE DATE: If approved for filing as proposed in April 2019 and if adopted, subject to State Board of Education (SBOE) review, at the July 2019 SBEC meeting, the proposed effective date of the proposal would be October 20, 2019 (20 days after filing as adopted with the *Texas Register*). The proposed effective date is based on the SBEC and SBOE meeting schedules.

PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION: The SBEC last amended §230.1 and §230.37 effective December 27, 2016, and last amended §§230.21, 230.36, and 230.101 effective December 23, 2018.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND JUSTIFICATION: The SBEC rules in 19 TAC Chapter 230 specify the requirements for issuance of educator certificates and permits, the testing requirements and associated fees, and the types and classes of certificates issued. These requirements ensure that educators are qualified and professionally prepared to instruct the schoolchildren of Texas.

Some of the changes presented in this item correspond to revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 228, Requirements for Educator Preparation Programs, and amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 227, Provisions for Educator Preparation Programs. The revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 228 are presented for action in a separate item in this agenda, and the amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 227 are presented for discussion in a separate item in this agenda.

§230.1. Definitions.

The proposed amendment to §230.1 would align the test descriptions in Chapter 230 with the changes to pre-admission content testing (PACT) examinations proposed in 19 TAC Chapter 228, and for discussion in Chapter 227.

Proposed new §230.1(8) would define the term *content certification examination* and proposed new §230.1(9) would define the term *content pedagogy examinations*. This amendment would ensure alignment and clarity across chapters regarding the content of certification examinations. Conforming technical edits would also be made.

§230.21. Educator Assessment.

The proposed amendment to §230.21(a)(1)(D) would confirm that a candidate who has not passed a computer- or paper-based certification examination is required to wait 45 days before attempting the examination again. This 45-day wait period would support the reliability and validity of examination results for computer- and paper-based examinations because a candidate could potentially memorize the material and examination questions if he/she were allowed to retake the examination more frequently. The proposed amendment would align with TEC, §21.048(a)(1), that states that the SBEC may not require that more than 45 days elapse before a person may retake an examination.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) staff proposes several revisions to the figure in §230.21(e). Based on feedback from the October and December 2018 and February 2019 SBEC meetings, TEA staff recommends conducting a robust pilot of edTPA, a performance-based assessment for teachers, prior to full implementation. A sample of the secondary mathematics edTPA tasks and rubrics can be found in Attachment IX.

At the February 2019 SBEC meeting, the SBEC asked about the level of interest from programs participating in the edTPA pilot. Staff sent out a pilot summary document and pilot application to collect data to answer this question and allow the agency to proceed with a formal pilot, if approved by the SBEC. These documents are found in Attachments IV and V. A subsequent edTPA pilot FAQ was released and can be found in Attachment VI. The SBEC also asked how staff was responding to the testimony given at the previous SBEC meetings. The most frequent considerations can be found in Attachment III with further detail and supporting evidence in the subsequent attachments.

The proposed amendment to Figure §230.21(e) would add edTPA as an optional assessment in addition to the current Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR EC-12) exam for the demonstration of pedagogical knowledge and skills for the majority of initial educator certification categories. This change is necessary to enable a candidate taking part in the edTPA pilot to receive certification on the basis of edTPA and to prevent a pilot candidate from having to take an additional test, thus removing a potential disincentive from participating in the pilot and helping to ensure a more representative pilot sample.

The proposed amendment would align Figure §230.21(e) to the current list of active certifications by removing §233.10, Dance: Grades 8-12, and §233.5, Technology Applications: Grades 8-12, which are no longer offered. The proposed amendment would replace two TExES assessments: 141 Computer Science, 8-12 and 142 Technology Applications, EC-12, with the following updated TExES content assessments for those certificates: 241 Computer Science, 8-12 and 242 Technology Application, EC-12, respectively. These proposed changes are necessary to remove outdated provisions and provide clarity to candidates and preparation programs.

The proposed change to the column titles in Figure §230.21(e) would align the test descriptions in this chapter with the changes to pre-admission content testing (PACT) examinations, concurrently proposed in 19 TAC Chapter 228 and for discussion in Chapter 227, and would align with the new definitions proposed in §230.1(8) and §230.1(9). The proposed amendment would adjust the "Required Content Test(s)" column name to "Required Content Pedagogy Test(s)" to reflect the distinction between examinations that test only pedagogy and those that test content in alignment with the new PACT examinations. The proposed amendment would adjust the "Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Requirements" column name to "Pedagogical Requirement(s)" as it is intended to encompass all pedagogical assessments for all classes of certification.

In addition, the proposed amendment to Figure §230.21(e) would move the Performance Assessment for School Leaders (PASL), the content test for the Principal as Instructional Leader certification and endorsement, from the proposed new "Required Content Pedagogy Test" column to the proposed new "Pedagogical Requirement" column. This amendment would align with the certificate issuance procedures found in §§230.36, 241.20, and 241.35 because the PASL is a performance-based pedagogical certification exam that will require additional time for candidates to complete during their intern year.

§230.36. Intern Certificates and §230.37. Probationary Certificates.

SBEC is statutorily authorized to ensure that all candidates for certification or renewal of certification demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to improve the performance of the diverse population of this state. The SBEC rules in 19 TAC §230.36 and §230.37 specify the types and classes of certificates issued. These rules help ensure that applicants for certification and candidates enrolled in educator preparation programs (EPPs) are qualified and professionally prepared to instruct the schoolchildren of Texas.

Research has shown that teachers who engage in hands-on practice as educators prior to entering the classroom as teachers of record are better prepared for their first teaching assignments, leading to better student outcomes. The proposed amendments to §230.36 and §230.37, along with concurrently proposed amendments to Chapter 228, would add an optional

new route toward certification for candidates called intensive pre-service. The programmatic requirements of this route are stated in proposed new §228.33. Candidates using the proposed new intensive pre-service would demonstrate their proficiency and readiness to enter a classroom through pre-service practice instead of a standardized assessment. This would allow candidates to focus on their pre-service practice prior to entering the classroom as a teacher of record. Candidates would then be held accountable to the same required certification assessments as other educator candidates before they could become teacher of record. The proposed amendment to §230.36 and §230.37 would set out the requirements for certificate issuance of candidates participating in this proposed new optional intensive pre-service route.

The proposed amendments also include minor technical edits.

§230.36. Intern Certificates.

The proposed amendment to §230.36(d)(1) and (2) would align the test descriptions in Chapter 230 with the forthcoming changes to pre-admission content testing (PACT) examinations as outlined in the Chapter 227 discussion item in this agenda and would align with the definition changes in §230.1(8) and §230.1(9). This change is necessary to ensure alignment across the chapters and to provide clarity and consistency for candidates and EPPs.

Proposed new §230.36(f) would align with proposed new 19 TAC §228.33, Intensive Pre-Service, which would allow certification candidates to be supported by their EPP as they complete the programmatic requirements of intensive pre-service. Specifically, the proposed new rule would reflect the following:

- Section 230.36(f) would clarify that the proposed new intensive pre-service option would apply to applicants for certification admitted into an EPP on or after January 1, 2020, and would clarify that these applicants must meet the requirements specified in rule. This amendment would align with the implementation date listed in proposed new §228.33, Intensive Pre-Service, and would ensure programs are not allowed to issue certifications under this route until the stated implementation date.
- Section 230.36(f)(1) would clarify that a passing score on the aligned pedagogical rubric specified in proposed new §228.33, Intensive Pre-Service, would be a requirement for issuance of an intern certificate for the intensive pre-service option. This amendment would define the proficiency level required for candidates to be issued an intern certification through intensive pre-service. This would ensure that the proficiency level is comparable to the proficiency required by the standardized assessment.
- Section 230.36(f)(2) would confirm successful completion of the required content certification (subject-matter only) examination and would be required for issuance of an intern certificate for the intensive pre-service option. This amendment would ensure that candidates issued an intern certificate through intensive pre-service have demonstrated a minimum amount of content knowledge needed to teach their specific certification category.

The proposed amendment to §230.36(f)(1) and (2) would apply to all certification categories, except Special Education EC-12 and Bilingual Education. This amendment would acknowledge that candidates teaching in special education and bilingual categories need special critical proficiencies to serve in these specialized areas. Section 230.36(f)(2)(A) and (B) would specify that Special Education EC-12 certification candidates must also pass the TExES Special Education Supplemental and that candidates for bilingual certificates would be required to pass

the Bilingual Target Language Proficiency Test (BTLPT) or related language proficiency exam. This amendment would ensure that candidates teaching in Special Education and bilingual categories demonstrate the required critical proficiencies to serve in these specialized areas.

§230.37. Probationary Certificates.

The proposed amendment to §230.37(e)(3) would clarify that the needed assessments for issuance of probationary certificates for certificate categories other than classroom teacher would be those listed in the content pedagogy column of Figure §230.21(e). The pedagogical assessments for certifications other than classroom teacher require extensive preparation and demonstration that would be unreasonable to complete before a candidate seeks a standard certificate. The proposed amendment would ensure that a candidate has the appropriate amount of time to complete the pedagogical assessment. Currently, this only applies to the Principal as Instructional Leader certification.

Proposed new §230.37(f) would allow candidates undertaking intensive pre-service to receive a probationary certificate without having to pass the PPR EC-12 examination. The proposed amendment would also clarify that an applicant must meet the requirements for the intern certificate options specified in §230.36(f) and successfully complete the required content pedagogy tests prescribed in Figure §230.21(e) by the end of the first school year. The proposed amendment would ensure that candidates participating in this optional route are held to the same certification requirements as other candidates and would allow candidates the time needed to complete the required assessments.

§230.101. Schedule of Fees for Certification Services.

The proposed amendment to §230.101(c)(6) would specify the required fee for edTPA. This would establish the fee for edTPA in rule and would allow for the pilot of edTPA. During the pilot period, candidates would have the option to take the edTPA or the current PPR EC-12 assessment.

Proposed new §230.101(d) would differentiate between the examinations used for admission purposes and the examinations used for certification purposes.

Attachment II reflects the proposed changes to Chapter 230, Subchapters A, C, D, and G, including Figure §230.21(e).

FISCAL IMPACT: The TEA staff has determined that there is additional fiscal impact on state government required to comply with the proposal. The TEA estimates a cost of \$128,909 for each of the next five fiscal years (FYs) from FYs 2019-2023 for the development and ongoing administrative costs needed to maintain assessments. However, the TEA will receive an \$11 remittance for each Pre-Admission Content Test taken for an estimated total of \$128,909 for FYs 2019-2023 to offset the costs. Based on the 2017-2018 testing data, the TEA estimated 11,719 test attempts under the Pre-Admission Content Test route. In most cases, because an EPP has a choice in their admission requirements, estimated costs to state government in this analysis do not include EPPs.

LOCAL EMPLOYMENT IMPACT: The proposal would have no effect on local economy; therefore, no local employment impact statement is required under Texas Government Code (TGC), §2001.022.

SMALL BUSINESS, MICROBUSINESS, AND RURAL COMMUNITY IMPACT: The proposal has no direct adverse economic impact for small businesses, microbusinesses, or rural communities; therefore, no regulatory flexibility analysis, specified in TGC, §2006.002, is required. The SBEC does not anticipate an adverse effect for EPPs as a result of this proposal, including EPPs that qualify as small businesses or micro-businesses. The SBEC expects that these proposed rule changes may allow more candidates to qualify for admission into EPPs as a result of the admittance test now only requiring subject-matter knowledge. If EPPs have been relying on the PACT test to screen out candidates who did not already understand pedagogy, rather than teaching pedagogy to the level required by the educator standards, the increased revenue brought by more candidates may be offset to some extent by increased instruction costs. Even for these EPPs, the increase in instructional costs is not expected to be so significant as to overcome the increase in revenue from the additional qualified candidates. The educator standards on which the EPPs' curriculum is based have not changed with these proposed amendments. Moreover, EPPs can avoid any economic impact from the new assessment by implementing an additional pre-admission pedagogy examination of their own as an additional admission requirement. SBEC also does not anticipate an adverse effect for educator preparation programs whom choose to participate in the edTPA pilot, as the standards on which the EPPs' curriculum is based have not changed.

COST INCREASE TO REGULATED PERSONS: The proposal does impose a cost on regulated persons, another state agency, a special district, or a local government, and, therefore, is subject to TGC, §2001.0045. However, the proposal is exempt from TGC, §2001.0045, as provided under that statute, because the proposal is necessary to reduce the burden or responsibilities imposed on regulated persons. In addition, the proposal is necessary to ensure that certified Texas educators are competent to educate Texas students and, therefore, necessary to protect the safety and welfare of the residents of this state.

TAKINGS IMPACT ASSESSMENT: The proposal does not impose a burden on private real property and, therefore, does not constitute a taking under TGC, §2007.043.

GOVERNMENT GROWTH IMPACT: The TEA staff prepared a Government Growth Impact Statement assessment for this proposed rulemaking. During the first five years the proposed rulemaking would be in effect, it would require an increase in fees paid to the agency, but those fees will only cover the increased costs of administering the new PACT examination and the edTPA performance assessment for those who choose to participate in the pilot. The proposed rulemaking would not create or eliminate a government program; would not require the creation of new employee positions or elimination of existing employee positions; would not require an increase or decrease in future legislative appropriations to the agency; would not create a new regulation; would not expand, limit, or repeal an existing regulation; would not increase or decrease the number of individuals subject to its applicability; and would not positively or adversely affect the state's economy.

PUBLIC BENEFIT AND COST TO PERSONS: The public and student benefit anticipated as a result of the proposed amendments would broaden the pool of potential educators in Texas by allowing EPPs to admit educator candidates who are competent in the subject they wish to

teach but are not already well-versed in pedagogy. It would also offer continued and clear guidance on processes and procedures for testing and certificate issuance.

The TEA staff has determined that there is a cost to individuals required to comply with the proposal. Certain candidates for admission to an EPP--candidates who have neither a 2.5 undergraduate grade point average nor the required number of hours of college course work in the specific content area in which the candidate is seeking certification--would have to take a new, additional content certification examination prior to admission. Previously, these candidates could simply take the examination required for final certification as an educator prior to admission. Under the proposed rules, these candidates take three examinations in the course of the educator preparation process: (1) a content certification examination before admission to an EPP, and after completion of the EPP for certification as an educator, (2) the content pedagogy examination, and (3) the PPR EC-12 examination. The total estimated cost to persons will be \$1,242,214 for each of the next five FYs from FY 2019-2023. The cost is based on 11,719 possible examinees estimated to take the tests (using 2017-2018 data) at the price of \$106 per test. The \$106 total testing fee will be required from each candidate applying to take the content certification examination. The remainder of the fee for the content certification examination will go to the testing vendor, NCS Pearson.

DATA AND REPORTING IMPACT: The proposal would have no new data and reporting impact.

PRINCIPAL AND CLASSROOM TEACHER PAPERWORK REQUIREMENTS: The TEA staff has determined that the proposal would not require a written report or other paperwork to be completed by a principal or classroom teacher.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: The public comment period on the proposal begins May 31, 2019, and ends July 1, 2019. The SBEC will take registered oral and written comments on the proposal at the July 26, 2019 meeting in accordance with the SBEC board operating policies and procedures.

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER'S RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the proposed amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 230, Professional Educator Preparation and Certification, Subchapter A, General Provisions, §230.1, Definitions, Subchapter C, Assessment of Educators, §230.21, Educator Assessment, Subchapter D, Types and Classes of Certificates Issued, §230.36, Intern Certificates, and §230.37; Probationary Certificates, and Subchapter G, Certificate Issuance Procedures, §230.101, Schedule of Fees for Certification Services, to be published as proposed in the *Texas Register*.

Staff Member Responsible:

Grace Wu, Director, Educator Standards, Testing, and Preparation

Attachments:

- I. Statutory Citations
- II. Text of Proposed Amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 230, Professional Educator Preparation and Certification, Subchapter A, General Provisions, §230.1, Definitions, Subchapter C, Assessment of Educators, §230.21, Educator Assessment, Subchapter D, Types and Classes of Certificates Issued, §230.36, Intern Certificates, and §230.37, Probationary

Certificates, and Subchapter G, Certificate Issuance Procedures, §230.101, Schedule of Fees for Certification Services, including Figure: 19 TAC §230.21(e)

- III. Most frequent edTPA Myths and Realities
- IV. edTPA Pilot Summary
- V. edTPA Pilot Application
- VI. edTPA Pilot FAQ
- VII. edTPA and edTPA Pilot Testimony Considerations and Responses
- VIII. edTPA Considerations and Responses
- IX. edTPA Tasks and Rubrics

ATTACHMENT I**Statutory Citations Relating to 19 TAC Chapter 230, Professional Educator Preparation and Certification, Subchapter A, General Provisions, §230.1, Definitions, Subchapter C, Assessment of Educators, §230.21, Educator Assessment, Subchapter D, Types and Classes of Certificates Issued, §230.36, Intern Certificates, and §230.37, Probationary Certificates, and Subchapter G, Certificate Issuance Procedures, §230.101, Schedule of Fees for Certification Services****Texas Education Code, §21.003, Certification Required (excerpt):**

- (a) A person may not be employed as a teacher, teacher intern or teacher trainee, librarian, educational aide, administrator, educational diagnostician, or school counselor by a school district unless the person holds an appropriate certificate or permit issued as provided by Subchapter B.

Texas Education Code, §21.031, Purpose:

- (a) The State Board for Educator Certification is established to recognize public school educators as professionals and to grant educators the authority to govern the standards of their profession. The board shall regulate and oversee all aspects of the certification, continuing education, and standards of conduct of public school educators.
- (b) In proposing rules under this subchapter, the board shall ensure that all candidates for certification or renewal of certification demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to improve the performance of the diverse student population of this state.

Texas Education Code, §21.041, Rules; Fees (excerpts):

- (b) The board shall propose rules that:
- (1) provide for the regulation of educators and the general administration of this subchapter in a manner consistent with this subchapter;
 - (2) specify the classes of educator certificates to be issued, including emergency certificates;
 - (3) specify the period for which each class of educator certificate is valid;
 - (4) specify the requirements for the issuance and renewal of an educator certificate;
 - (5) provide for the issuance of an educator certificate to a person who holds a similar certificate issued by another state or foreign country, subject to Section 21.052;
 - (9) provide for continuing education requirements; and
- (c) The board shall propose a rule adopting a fee for the issuance and maintenance of an educator certificate that, when combined with any fees imposed under Subsection (d), is adequate to cover the cost of administration of this subchapter.

Texas Education Code, §21.044, Educator Preparation:

- (a) The board shall propose rules establishing the training requirements a person must accomplish to obtain a certificate, enter an internship, or enter an induction-year program. The board shall specify the minimum academic qualifications required for a certificate.

Texas Education Code, §21.048, Certification Examinations:

- (a) The board shall propose rules prescribing comprehensive examinations for each class of certificate issued by the board.
 - (1) The board may not require that more than 45 days elapse before a person may retake an examination. A person may not retake an examination more than four times, unless the board waives the limitation for good cause as prescribed by the board.
- (b) The board may not administer a written examination to determine the competence or level of performance of an educator who has a hearing impairment unless the examination has been field tested to determine its appropriateness, reliability, and validity as applied to, and minimum acceptable performance scores for, persons with hearing impairments.
- (c) An educator who has a hearing impairment is exempt from taking a written examination for a period ending on the first anniversary of the date on which the board determines, on the basis of appropriate field tests, that the examination complies with the standards specified in Subsection (b). On application to the board, the board shall issue a temporary exemption certificate to a person entitled to an exemption under this subsection.
- (c-1) The results of an examination administered under this section are confidential and are not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code, unless:
 - (1) the disclosure is regarding notification to a parent of the assignment of an uncertified teacher to a classroom as required by Section 21.057; or
 - (2) the educator has failed the examination more than five times.
- (d) In this section:
 - (1) "Hearing impairment" means a hearing impairment so severe that the person cannot process linguistic information with or without amplification.
 - (2) "Reliability" means the extent to which an experiment, test, or measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials.
 - (3) "Validity" means being:
 - (A) well-grounded or justifiable;
 - (B) relevant and meaningful;
 - (C) correctly derived from premises or inferences; and
 - (D) supported by objective truth or generally accepted authority.

Texas Education Code, §21.0485, Certification To Teach Students With Impairments:

- (a) To be eligible to be issued a certificate to teach students with visual impairments, a person must:
 - (1) complete either:
 - (A) all course work required for that certification in an approved educator preparation program; or
 - (B) an alternative educator certification program approved for the purpose by the board;

- (2) perform satisfactorily on each examination prescribed under Section 21.048 for certification to teach students with visual impairments, after completing the course work or program described by Subdivision (1); and
 - (3) satisfy any other requirements prescribed by the board.
- (b) Subsection (a) does not apply to eligibility for a certificate to teach students with visual impairments, including eligibility for renewal of that certificate, if the application for the initial certificate was submitted on or before September 1, 2011.

Texas Education Code, §21.050, Academic Degree Required for Teaching Certificate: Internship:

- (a) A person who applies for a teaching certificate for which board rules require a bachelor's degree must possess a bachelor's degree received with an academic major or interdisciplinary academic major, including reading, other than education, that is related to the curriculum as prescribed under Subchapter A, Chapter 28.
- (b) The board may not require more than 18 semester credit hours of education courses at the baccalaureate level for the granting of a teaching certificate. The board shall provide for a minimum number of semester credit hours of internship to be included in the hours needed for certification. The board may propose rules requiring additional credit hours for certification in bilingual education, English as a second language, early childhood education, or special education.
- (c) A person who receives a bachelor's degree required for a teaching certificate on the basis of higher education coursework completed while receiving an exemption from tuition and fees under Section 54.214 may not be required to participate in any field experience or internship consisting of student teaching to receive a teaching certificate.

Texas Education Code, §21.051, as amended by SB 1839, 85th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2017, Rules Regarding Field-Based Experience and Options for Field Experience and Internships:

- (a) In this section, "teacher of record" means a person employed by a school district who teaches the majority of the instructional day in an academic instructional setting and is responsible for evaluating student achievement and assigning grades.
- (b) Before a school district may employ a candidate for certification as a teacher of record, the candidate must complete at least 15 hours of field-based experience in which the candidate is actively engaged in instructional or educational activities under supervision at:
 - (1) a public school campus accredited or approved for the purpose by the agency; or
 - (2) a private school recognized or approved for the purpose by the agency.
- (c) Subsection (b) applies only to an initial certification issued on or after September 1, 2012. Subsection (b) does not affect:
 - (1) the validity of a certification issued before September 1, 2012; or
 - (2) the eligibility of a person who holds a certification issued before September 1, 2012, to obtain a subsequent renewal of the certification in accordance with board rule.
- (d) Subsection (b) does not affect the period within which an individual must complete field-based experience hours as determined by board rule if the individual is not accepted into

an educator preparation program before the deadline prescribed by board rule and is hired for a teaching assignment by a school district after the deadline prescribed by board rule.

- (e) The board shall propose rules relating to the field-based experience required by Subsection (b). The commissioner by rule shall adopt procedures and standards for recognizing a private school under Subsection (b)(2).
- (f) The board shall propose rules providing flexible options for persons for any field-based experience or internship required for certification.

Texas Education Code, §21.054, as amended by SBs 7, 179, and 1839, 85th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2017, Continuing Education (excerpt):

- (a) The board shall propose rules establishing a process for identifying continuing education courses and programs that fulfill educators' continuing education requirements.

Texas Education Code, §22.082, Access to Criminal History Records by State Board for Educator Certification:

The State Board for Educator Certification shall subscribe to the criminal history clearinghouse as provided by, Texas Government Code, §411.0845 and may obtain from any law enforcement or criminal justice agency all criminal history record information and all records contained in any closed criminal investigation file that relate to a specific applicant for or holder of a certificate issued under Chapter 21, Subchapter B.

Texas Education Code, §22.0831, National Criminal History Record Information Review of Certified Educators (excerpts):

- (c) The board shall review the national criminal history record information of a person who has not previously submitted fingerprints to the department or been subject to a national criminal history record information review.
- (f) The board may propose rules to implement this section, including rules establishing:
 - (1) deadlines for a person to submit fingerprints and photographs in compliance with this section; and
 - (2) sanctions for a person's failure to comply with the requirements of this section, including suspension or revocation of a certificate or refusal to issue a certificate.

Texas Occupations Code, §53.105, Fees:

A licensing authority may charge a person requesting an evaluation under this subchapter a fee adopted by the authority. Fees adopted by a licensing authority under this subchapter must be in an amount sufficient to cover the cost of administering this subchapter.

Texas Occupations Code, §54.003, Examination Accommodations for Person With Dyslexia:

- (a) In this section, "dyslexia" has the meaning assigned by Section 51.970, Education Code.
- (b) For each licensing examination administered by a state agency, the agency shall provide reasonable examination accommodations to an examinee diagnosed as having dyslexia.

- (c) Each state agency shall adopt rules necessary to implement this section, including rules to establish the eligibility criteria an examinee must meet for accommodation under this section.

ATTACHMENT II
Text of Proposed Amendments to 19 TAC

Chapter 230. Professional Educator Preparation and Certification

Subchapter A. General Provisions

§230.1. Definitions.

The following words and terms, when used in this chapter, Chapter 232 of this title (relating to General Certification Provisions), and Chapter 233 of this title (relating to Categories of Classroom Teaching Certificates), shall have the following meanings, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise.

- (1) Accredited institution of higher education--An institution of higher education that, at the time it conferred the degree, was accredited or otherwise approved by an accrediting organization recognized by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.
- (2) Appropriate--Suitable for a particular purpose. The term denotes compliance with State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) rules and with SBEC procedures and policies posted on the Texas Education Agency website that are related to the stated particular purpose.
- (3) Candidate--An individual who has been formally or contingently admitted into an educator preparation program; also referred to as an enrollee or participant.
- (4) Certificate--Any educator credential issued by the State Board for Educator Certification under the authority of the Texas Education Code, Chapter 21, Subchapter B.
- (5) Certification class--A certificate, as described in §230.33 of this title (relating to Classes of Certificates), that has defined characteristics and includes the following: superintendent, principal, classroom teacher, school counselor, school librarian, educational diagnostician, reading specialist, and master teacher.
- (6) Charter school--A Texas public school operated by a charter holder under an open-enrollment charter school granted either by the State Board of Education (SBOE) or commissioner of education, whichever is applicable, pursuant to Texas Education Code, §12.101, identified with its own county district number.
- (7) Classroom teacher--An educator who is employed by a school or district and who, not less than an average of four hours each day, teaches in an academic instructional setting or a career and technical education instructional setting. This term does not include an educational aide or a full-time administrator.
- (8) Content certification examination--A standardized test or assessment required by statute or State Board for Educator Certification rule that governs an individual's admission to an educator preparation program.
- (9) Content pedagogy examinations--A standardized test or assessment required by statute or State Board for Educator Certification rule that governs an individual's certification as an educator.
- (10) [~~8~~] Continuing professional education--Professional development required for the renewal of standard and/or lifetime certificates that is designed to ensure improvement in both the performance of the educator and achievement of his or her students.
- (11) [~~9~~] Educator--An individual who is required to hold a certificate issued under the Texas Education Code, Chapter 21, Subchapter B, also referred to as teacher.
- (12) [~~10~~] Educator preparation program--An entity approved by the State Board for Educator Certification to offer training and coursework that must adequately prepare candidates for educator certification and meet the standards and requirements of the board.

- (13) ~~(11)~~ Examination--A standardized test or assessment required by statute or State Board for Educator Certification rule that governs an individual's admission to an educator preparation program, certification as an educator, continuation as an educator, or advancement as an educator.
- (14) ~~(12)~~ Hearing impairment--As defined in the Texas Education Code, §21.048(d)(1), a hearing impairment so severe that the person cannot process linguistic information with or without amplification.
- (15) ~~(13)~~ Initial certification--The first Texas educator certificate for a particular class issued to an individual as specified in §230.33 of this title (relating to Classes of Certificates).
- (16) ~~(14)~~ Intern certificate--A type of certificate issued to a candidate who has passed all required content examinations and is completing requirements for certification through an approved educator preparation program.
- (17) ~~(15)~~ Private school--A non-public school whose educational program has been evaluated by a regional accrediting agency and whose program has met and is maintaining certain educational standards.
- (18) ~~(16)~~ Probationary certificate--A type of certificate issued to a candidate who has passed all required examinations and is completing requirements for certification through an approved educator preparation program.
- (19) ~~(17)~~ Professional class--A term that refers to certificates for duties other than classroom teacher (e.g., superintendent, principal, school counselor, school librarian, educational diagnostician, reading specialist, and master teachers).
- (20) ~~(18)~~ Standard certificate--A type of certificate issued to an individual who has met all requirements for a given class of certification, as specified in §230.33 of this title (relating to Classes of Certificates).
- (21) ~~(19)~~ Teacher--An individual who is required to hold a certificate issued under the Texas Education Code, Chapter 21, Subchapter B, also referred to as educator.
- (22) ~~(20)~~ Teacher of record--An educator who is employed by a school or district and who teaches in an academic instructional setting or a career and technical instructional setting not less than an average of four hours each day and is responsible for evaluating student achievement and assigning grades.
- (23) ~~(21)~~ Teacher service record--The official document used to record years of service and days used and accumulated under the state's former minimum sick leave program or the state's current personal leave program.
- (24) ~~(22)~~ Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS)--The kindergarten-Grade 12 state curriculum in Texas adopted by the State Board of Education and used as the foundation of all state certification examinations.
- (25) ~~(23)~~ Texas school district--A school district accredited and approved by the Texas Education Agency under the Texas Education Code, Chapter 11.

Subchapter C. Assessment of Educators

§230.21. Educator Assessment.

- (a) A candidate seeking certification as an educator must pass the examination(s) required by the Texas Education Code (TEC), §21.048, and the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) in §233.1(e) of this title (relating to General Authority) and shall not retake an examination more than four times, unless the limitation is waived for good cause. The burden of proof shall be upon the candidate to demonstrate good cause.
- (1) For the purposes of the retake limitation described by the TEC, §21.048, an examination retake is defined as a second or subsequent attempt to pass any examination required for the issuance of a

certificate, including an individual core subject examination that is part of the overall examination required for the issuance of a Core Subjects certificate as described in §233.2 of this title (relating to Early Childhood; Core Subjects).

- (A) A canceled examination score is not considered an examination retake.
 - (B) An examination taken by an educator during a pilot period is not considered part of an educator's five-time test attempt limit.
 - (C) Pursuant to TEC, §21.0491(d), the limit on number of test attempts does not apply to the trade and industrial workforce training certificate examination prescribed by the SBEC.
 - (D) A candidate who fails a computer- or paper-based examination cannot retake the examination before 45 days have elapsed following the candidate's last attempt to pass the examination.
- (2) Good cause is:
- (A) the candidate's highest score on an examination is within one conditional standard error of measurement (CSEM) of passing $\frac{1}{2}$ and the candidate has completed 50 clock-hours of educational activities. CSEMs will be published annually on the Texas Education Agency (TEA) website;
 - (B) the candidate's highest score on an examination is within two CSEMs of passing $\frac{1}{2}$ and the candidate has completed 100 clock-hours of educational activities;
 - (C) the candidate's highest score on an examination is within three CSEMs of passing $\frac{1}{2}$ and the candidate has completed 150 clock-hours of educational activities;
 - (D) the candidate's highest score on an examination is not within three CSEMs of passing $\frac{1}{2}$ and the candidate has completed 200 clock-hours of educational activities;
 - (E) if the candidate needs a waiver for more than one of the individual core subject examinations that are part of the overall examination required for the issuance of a Core Subjects certificate, the candidate has completed the number of clock-hours of educational activities required for each individual core subject examination as described in subparagraphs (A)-(D) of this paragraph up to a maximum of 300 clock-hours. The number of clock-hours for each examination may be divided equally based on the number of examinations in the waiver request, but the number of clock-hours for an examination shall not be less than 50; or
 - (F) if a CSEM is not appropriate for an examination, the TEA staff will identify individuals who are familiar and knowledgeable with the examination content to review the candidate's performance on the five most recent examinations, identify the deficit competency or competencies, and determine the number of clock-hours of educational activities required.
- (3) Educational activities are defined as:
- (A) institutes, workshops, seminars, conferences, interactive distance learning, video conferencing, online activities, undergraduate courses, graduate courses, training programs, in-service, or staff development given by an approved continuing professional education provider or sponsor, pursuant to §232.17 of this title (relating to Pre-Approved Professional Education Provider or Sponsor) and §232.19 of this title (relating to Approval of Private Companies, Private Entities, and Individuals), or an approved educator preparation program (EPP), pursuant to §228.10 of this title (relating to Approval Process); and
 - (B) being directly related to the knowledge and skills included in the certification examination competency or competencies in which the candidate answered less than 70 percent of competency questions correctly. The formula for identifying a deficit competency is the combined total of correct answers for each competency on the five

- most recent examinations divided by the combined total of questions for each competency on the five most recent examinations.
- (4) Documentation of educational activities that a candidate must submit includes:
- (A) the provider, sponsor, or program's name, address, telephone number, and email address. The TEA staff may contact the provider, sponsor, or program to verify an educational activity;
 - (B) the name of the educational activity (e.g., course title, course number);
 - (C) the competency or competencies addressed by the educational activity as determined by the formula described in paragraph (3)(B) of this subsection;
 - (D) the provider, sponsor, or program's description of the educational activity (e.g., syllabus, course outline, program of study); and
 - (E) the provider, sponsor, or program's written verification of the candidate's completion of the educational activity (e.g., transcript, certificate of completion). The written verification must include:
 - (i) the provider, sponsor, or program's name;
 - (ii) the candidate's name;
 - (iii) the name of the educational activity;
 - (iv) the date(s) of the educational activity; and
 - (v) the number of clock-hours completed for the educational activity. Clock-hours completed before the most recent examination attempt or after a request for a waiver is submitted shall not be included. One semester credit hour earned at an accredited institution of higher education is equivalent to 15 clock-hours.
- (5) To request a waiver of the limitation, a candidate must meet the following conditions:
- (A) the candidate is otherwise eligible to take an examination. A candidate seeking a certificate based on completion of an EPP must have the approval of an EPP to request a waiver;
 - (B) beginning September 1, 2016, the candidate pays the non-refundable waiver request fee of \$160;
 - (C) the candidate requests the waiver of the limitation in writing on forms developed by the TEA staff; and
 - (D) the request for the waiver is postmarked not earlier than:
 - (i) 45 calendar days after an unsuccessful attempt at the fourth retake of an examination as defined in the TEC, §21.048; or
 - (ii) 90 calendar days after the date of the most recent denied waiver of the limitation request; or
 - (iii) 180 calendar days after the date of the most recent unsuccessful examination attempt that was the result of the most recently approved request for waiver of the limitation.
- (6) The TEA staff shall administratively approve each application that meets the criteria specified in paragraphs (2)-(5) of this subsection.
- (7) An applicant who does not meet the criteria in paragraphs (2)-(5) of this subsection may appeal to the SBEC for a final determination of good cause. A determination by the SBEC is final and may not be appealed.

- (b) A candidate seeking a standard certificate as an educator based on completion of an approved EPP may take the appropriate certification examination(s) required by subsection (a) of this section only at such time as the EPP determines the candidate's readiness to take the examinations, or upon successful completion of the EPP, whichever comes first.
- (c) The holder of a lifetime Texas certificate effective before February 1, 1986, must pass examinations prescribed by the SBEC to be eligible for continued certification, unless the individual has passed the Texas Examination of Current Administrators and Teachers (TECAT).
- (d) The commissioner of education approves the satisfactory level of performance required for certification examinations, and the SBEC approves a schedule of examination fees and a plan for administering the examinations.
- (e) The appropriate examination(s) required for certification are specified in the figure provided in this subsection.

Figure: 19 TAC §230.21(e) [~~Figure: 19 TAC §230.21(e)~~]

- (f) Scores from examinations required under this title must be made available to the examinee, the TEA staff, and, if appropriate, the EPP from which the examinee will seek a recommendation for certification.
- (g) The following provisions concern ethical obligations relating to examinations.
 - (1) An educator or candidate who participates in the development, design, construction, review, field testing, scoring, or validation of an examination shall not reveal or cause to be revealed the contents of the examination to any other person.
 - (2) An educator or candidate who administers an examination shall not:
 - (A) allow or cause an unauthorized person to view any part of the examination;
 - (B) copy, reproduce, or cause to be copied or reproduced any part of the examination;
 - (C) reveal or cause to be revealed the contents of the examination;
 - (D) correct, alter, or cause to be corrected or altered any response to a test item contained in the examination;
 - (E) provide assistance with any response to a test item contained in the examination or cause assistance to be provided; or
 - (F) deviate from the rules governing administration of the examination.
 - (3) An educator or candidate who is an examinee shall not:
 - (A) copy, reproduce, or cause to be copied or reproduced any test item contained in the examination;
 - (B) provide assistance with any response to a test item contained in the examination, or cause assistance to be provided;
 - (C) solicit or accept assistance with any response to a test item contained in the examination;
 - (D) deviate from the rules governing administration of the examination; or
 - (E) otherwise engage in conduct that amounts to cheating, deception, or fraud.
 - (4) An educator, candidate, or other test taker shall not:
 - (A) solicit information about the contents of test items on an examination that the educator, candidate, or other test taker has not already taken from an individual who has had access to those items, or offer information about the contents of specific test items on an examination to individuals who have not yet taken the examination;
 - (B) fail to pay all test costs and fees as required by this chapter or the testing vendor; or

- (C) otherwise engage in conduct that amounts to violations of test security or confidentiality integrity, including cheating, deception, or fraud.
- (5) A person who violates this subsection is subject to:
 - (A) sanction, including, but not limited to, disallowance and exclusion from future examinations either in perpetuity or for a period of time that serves the best interests of the education profession, in accordance with the provisions of the TEC, §21.041(b)(7), and Chapter 249 of this title (relating to Disciplinary Proceedings, Sanctions, and Contested Cases); and/or
 - (B) denial of certification in accordance with the provisions of the TEC, §21.041(b)(7), and Chapter 249 of this title; and/or
 - (C) voiding of a score from an examination in which a violation specified in this subsection occurred as well as a loss of a test attempt for purposes of the retake limit in subsection (a) of this section.

Subchapter D. Types and Classes of Certificates Issued

§230.36. Intern Certificates.

- (a) General provisions.
 - (1) Certificate classes. An intern certificate may be issued for any class of certificate except educational aide.
 - (2) Requirement to hold an intern certificate. A candidate seeking certification as an educator must hold an intern certificate while participating in an internship through an approved educator preparation program (EPP).
- (b) Requirements for issuance. An intern certificate may be issued to a candidate seeking certification as an educator who meets the conditions and requirements prescribed in this subsection.
 - (1) Bachelor's degree. Except as otherwise provided in rules of the State Board for Educator Certification related to certain career and technical education certificates based on skill and experience, the candidate must hold a bachelor's degree or higher from an accredited institution of higher education. An individual who has earned a degree outside the United States must provide an original, detailed report or course-by-course evaluation for all college-level credits prepared by a foreign credential evaluation service recognized by the Texas Education Agency (TEA). The evaluation must verify that the individual holds, at a minimum, the equivalent of a bachelor's degree issued by an accredited institution of higher education in the United States.
 - (2) General certification requirements. The candidate must meet the general certification requirements prescribed in §230.11 of this title (relating to General Requirements).
 - (3) Fee. The candidate must pay the fee prescribed in §230.101 of this title (relating to Schedule of Fees for Certification Services).
 - (4) Fingerprints. The candidate must submit fingerprints in accordance with §232.35(c) of this title (relating to Submission of Required Information) and the Texas Education Code (TEC), §22.0831.
- (c) Conditions. The validity and effectiveness of an intern certificate is subject to the following conditions.
 - (1) Internship. The holder of an intern certificate must be a participant in good standing of an approved Texas EPP, serving in an acceptable, paid internship supervised by the EPP.
 - (2) Inactive status. An intern certificate will become inactive 30 calendar days after the holder's separation from the school assignment or the EPP. The unexpired term of an intern certificate may be reactivated if the holder satisfies the requirements specified in this section.
 - (3) Term of an intern certificate. An intern certificate shall be valid for one 12-month period from the date of issuance.

-
- (4) Limit on preliminary certifications and permits. Without obtaining standard certification, an individual may not serve for more than three 12-month periods while holding any combination of the following:
- (A) intern certificates, limited to one 12-month period maximum, as described in this subsection;
 - (B) probationary certificates, limited to two 12-month periods maximum, as specified in §230.37 of this title (relating to Probationary Certificates)
 - (C) emergency permits as specified in Subchapter F of this chapter (relating to Permits); or
 - (D) one-year certificates as specified in Subchapter H of this chapter (relating to Texas Educator Certificates Based on Certification and College Credentials from Other States or Territories of the United States) and Chapter 245 of this title (relating to Certification of Educators from Other Countries).
- (5) Reduction in force exception. If an educator is employed under an intern certificate and is terminated or resigns in lieu of termination before the end of the school year due to a reduction in force, that intern term shall not count as one of the three years referenced in paragraph (4) of this subsection.
- (d) Testing requirements for issuance of an intern certificate. Beginning September 1, 2017, a candidate must meet the subject matter knowledge requirements for issuance of an intern certificate to serve an internship in a classroom teacher assignment for each subject area to be taught.
- (1) To meet the subject matter knowledge requirements to be issued an intern certificate for an internship in a classroom teacher assignment on or after September 1, 2017, a candidate must pass all of the appropriate ~~[certification]~~ content ~~pedagogy~~, as prescribed in Subchapter C of this chapter.
 - (2) To meet the subject matter knowledge requirements to be issued an intern certificate for an internship in a career and technical education classroom teacher assignment that is based on skill and experience on or after September 1, 2017, a candidate must satisfy the requirements for that subject area contained in §233.14 of this title (relating to Career and Technical Education (Certificates requiring experience and preparation in a skill area)) and pass the appropriate content ~~pedagogy~~ ~~[certification]~~ examination(s), as prescribed in Subchapter C of this chapter.
- (e) Intern certificate in a certification class other than classroom teacher. An intern certificate may be issued for assignment as a superintendent, principal, reading specialist, master teacher, school librarian, school counselor, and educational diagnostician to an individual who meets the applicable requirements prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and who also meets the requirements prescribed in this subsection.
- (1) An applicant for an intern certificate in a certification class other than classroom teacher must meet all requirements established by the recommending EPP, which shall be based on the qualifications and requirements for the class of certification sought and the duties to be performed by the holder of an intern certificate in that class.
 - (2) The individual must have also been:
 - (A) accepted and enrolled to participate in a Texas EPP that has been approved to prepare candidates for the certificate sought; and
 - (B) assigned in the certificate area being sought in a Texas school district, open-enrollment charter school, or, pursuant to §228.35 of this title (relating to Preparation Program Coursework and/or Training), other school approved by the TEA.
 - (3) The holder of an intern certificate in a certification class other than classroom teacher is subject to all terms and conditions of an intern certificate prescribed in subsection (c) of this section.
 - (4) The following provisions apply to the intern certificate for Principal as Instructional Leader.

- (A) During the transition period of December 1, 2018 through September 1, 2019, the SBEC may issue an intern certificate to a candidate who meets the requirements specified in paragraphs (1)-(3) of this subsection.
 - (B) Effective September 1, 2019, the SBEC may issue an intern certificate to a candidate who meets requirements specified in paragraphs (1)-(3) of this subsection and has passed the Principal as Instructional Leader examination specified in Subchapter C of this chapter (relating to Assessment of Educators).
- (f) Intern certificate for intensive pre-service. An intern certificate may be issued to an applicant who is admitted to an EPP intensive pre-service as prescribed in §228.33 of this title (relating to Intensive Pre-Service) on or after January 1, 2020, and meets the following requirements:
- (1) obtained a passing score on the aligned pedagogical rubric specified in §228.33 of this title; and
 - (2) successfully completed the required content certification (subject-matter only) examination and the following additional requirements for special education and bilingual assignments.
 - (A) Special education assignments also require successful completion of the TExES Special Education Supplemental examination prescribed in §230.21(e) of this title (relating to Educator Assessment).
 - (B) Bilingual education assignments also require successful completion of the TExES Bilingual Target Language Proficiency examination or the related language proficiency examination prescribed in §230.21(e) of this title.

§230.37. Probationary Certificates.

- (a) General provisions.
 - (1) Certificate classes. A probationary certificate may be issued for any class of certificate except educational aide.
 - (2) Requirement to hold a probationary certificate. A candidate seeking certification as an educator must hold a probationary certificate while participating in an internship through an approved educator preparation program (EPP).
- (b) Requirements for issuance. A probationary certificate may be issued to a candidate seeking certification as an educator who meets the conditions and requirements prescribed in this subsection.
 - (1) Bachelor's degree. Except as otherwise provided in rules of the State Board for Educator Certification related to certain career and technical education certificates based on skill and experience, the candidate must hold a bachelor's degree or higher from an accredited institution of higher education. An individual who has earned a degree outside the United States must provide an original, detailed report or course-by-course evaluation of all college-level credits prepared by a foreign credential evaluation service recognized by the Texas Education Agency (TEA). The evaluation must verify that the individual holds, at a minimum, the equivalent of a bachelor's degree issued by an accredited institution of higher education in the United States.
 - (2) General certification requirements. The candidate must meet the general certification requirements prescribed in §230.11 of this title (relating to General Requirements).
 - (3) Fee. The candidate must pay the fee prescribed in §230.101 of this title (relating to Schedule of Fees for Certification Services).
 - (4) Fingerprints. The candidate must submit fingerprints in accordance with §232.35(c) of this title (relating to Submission of Required Information) and the Texas Education Code (TEC), §22.0831.
- (c) Conditions. The validity and effectiveness of a probationary certificate is subject to the following conditions.
 - (1) Internship. The holder of a probationary certificate must be a participant in good standing of an approved Texas EPP, serving in an acceptable, paid internship supervised by the EPP.

-
- (2) Inactive status. A probationary certificate will become inactive 30 calendar days after the holder's separation from the school assignment or the EPP. The unexpired term of a probationary certificate may be reactivated if the holder satisfies the program enrollment and school assignment requirements specified in §228.35 of this title (relating to Preparation Program Coursework and/or Training).
 - (3) Term of a probationary certificate. A probationary certificate shall be valid for a 12-month period from the date of issuance.
 - (4) Limit on preliminary certifications and permits. Without obtaining standard certification, an individual may not serve for more than three 12-month periods while holding any combination of the following:
 - (A) intern certificates, limited to one 12-month period maximum, as described in this subsection;
 - (B) probationary certificates, limited to two 12-month periods maximum, as described in this subsection;
 - (C) emergency permits as specified in Subchapter F of this chapter (relating to Permits); or
 - (D) one-year certificates as specified in Subchapter H of this chapter (relating to Texas Educator Certificates Based on Certification and College Credentials from Other States or Territories of the United States) and Chapter 245 of this title (relating to Certification of Educators from Other Countries).
 - (5) Reduction in force exception. If an educator is employed under a probationary certificate and is terminated or resigns in lieu of termination before the end of the school year due to a reduction in force, that probationary term shall not count as one of the two allowed annual probationary terms.
- (d) Testing requirements for issuance of a probationary certificate.
- (1) Prior to September 1, 2017, a candidate must meet the subject matter knowledge requirements for issuance of a probationary certificate to serve an internship in a classroom teacher assignment for each subject area to be taught:
 - (A) At the elementary school level, by passing the appropriate content area certification examination(s), as prescribed in Subchapter C of this chapter (relating to Assessment of Educators), appropriate to the grade level and subject matter assignment(s) as prescribed in Chapter 231 of this title (relating to Requirements for Public School Personnel Assignments).
 - (B) At the middle or high school level:
 - (i) by passing the appropriate content area certification examination(s), as prescribed in Subchapter C of this chapter, appropriate to the grade level and subject matter assignment(s) as prescribed in Chapter 231 of this title; or
 - (ii) by completing coursework that complies with the TEC, §21.050, and comprised of not fewer than 24 semester credit hours, including 12 semester credit hours of upper division coursework in the subject area(s) taught; or
 - (iii) in the case of career and technical education assignments based on skill and experience, by satisfying the requirements for that subject area contained in §233.14 of this title (relating to Career and Technical Education (Certificates requiring experience and preparation in a skill area)).
 - (C) A candidate who is the teacher of record in a special education assignment must meet the appropriate subject matter knowledge requirements prescribed in subparagraph (A) and/or (B) of this paragraph and pass the appropriate special education certification examination(s), as prescribed in Subchapter C of this chapter, appropriate to the assignment(s) as prescribed in Chapter 231 of this title. If a candidate has not passed the

- special education supplemental examination prior to the beginning of an internship, an EPP may permit the internship assignment if:
- (i) the EPP has developed a plan to address any deficiencies identified through the candidate's previous attempt(s) on the examination; and
 - (ii) the EPP implements the plan during the initial internship. ~~An~~ ~~an~~ EPP shall not permit an additional internship if all examinations requirements are not met.
- (D) A candidate who is in a bilingual education and/or English as a Second Language (ESL) assignment must meet the appropriate subject matter knowledge requirements prescribed in subparagraph (A) and/or (B) of this paragraph and pass the appropriate bilingual education and/or ESL certification examination(s), as prescribed in Subchapter C of this chapter, appropriate to the assignment(s) as prescribed in Chapter 231 of this title. If a candidate has not passed the bilingual education supplemental examination, ESL supplemental examination, or the Bilingual Target Language Proficiency ~~[bilingual target language proficiency]~~ test prior to the beginning of an internship, an EPP may permit the internship if:
- (i) the EPP has developed a plan to address any deficiencies identified through the candidate's previous attempt(s) on the examination(s); and
 - (ii) the EPP implements the plan during the initial internship. An EPP shall not permit an additional internship if all examination requirements are not met.
- (2) Beginning September 1, 2017, a candidate must meet all testing requirements for issuance of a probationary certificate.
- (A) To meet the subject matter knowledge requirements to be issued a probationary certificate for an internship in a classroom teacher assignment, a candidate must pass the appropriate certification examination(s), including the appropriate pedagogy and professional responsibilities examination, as prescribed in Subchapter C of this chapter.
 - (B) To meet the subject matter knowledge requirements to be issued a probationary certificate for an internship in a career and technical education classroom teacher assignment that is based on skill and experience, a candidate must satisfy the requirements for that subject area contained in §233.14 of this title and pass the appropriate certification examination(s), including the appropriate pedagogy and professional responsibilities examination, as prescribed in Subchapter C of this chapter.
- (e) Probationary certificate in a certification class other than classroom teacher. A probationary certificate may be issued for an assignment as a superintendent, principal, reading specialist, master teacher, school librarian, school counselor, and/or educational diagnostician to an individual who meets the applicable requirements prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and who also meets the requirements prescribed in this subsection.
- (1) An applicant for a probationary certificate in a certification class other than classroom teacher must meet all requirements established by the recommending EPP, which shall be based on the qualifications and requirements for the class of certification sought and the duties to be performed by the holder of a probationary certificate in that class.
 - (2) The individual must have also been:
 - (A) accepted and enrolled to participate in a Texas EPP that has been approved to prepare candidates for the certificate sought; and
 - (B) assigned in the certificate category ~~[area]~~ being sought in a Texas school district, open-enrollment charter school, or, pursuant to §228.35 of this title, other school approved by the TEA.
 - (3) Effective September 1, 2017, to meet the subject matter requirements for issuance of the probationary certificate in a certification class other than classroom teacher, the individual must pass the appropriate content pedagogy examination(s) for that certificate.

- (4) The holder of a probationary certificate in a certification class other than classroom teacher is subject to all terms and conditions of an intern certificate prescribed in subsection (c) of this section.
- (f) Probationary certificate for intensive pre-service. A probationary certificate may be issued to an applicant who is admitted to an EPP intensive pre-service as prescribed in §228.33 of this title (relating to Intensive Pre-Service) on or after January 1, 2020, who:
- (1) meets the applicable requirements prescribed in subsection (b) of this section;
 - (2) has met requirements of §230.36(f) of this title; and
 - (3) has successfully completed the required content pedagogy tests prescribed in §230.21(e) of this title (relating to Educator Assessment).

Subchapter G. Certificate Issuance Procedures

§230.101. Schedule of Fees for Certification Services.

- (a) An applicant for a certificate or a school district requesting a permit shall pay the applicable fee from the following list.
- (1) Educational aide certificate:
 - (A) prior to September 1, 2017--\$30; and
 - (B) after August 31, 2017--\$15.
 - (2) Standard certificate--\$75.
 - (3) Probationary or intern certificate:
 - (A) prior to September 1, 2017--\$50; and
 - (B) after August 31, 2017--\$75.
 - (4) Addition of certification based on completion of appropriate examination--\$75.
 - (5) Review of a credential issued by a jurisdiction other than Texas (nonrefundable):
 - (A) prior to September 1, 2016--\$175; and
 - (B) after August 31, 2016--\$160.
 - (6) One-year certificate based on a credential issued by a jurisdiction other than Texas--\$50.
 - (7) Emergency permit (nonrefundable)--\$55.
 - (8) National criminal history check (nonrefundable)--The fee, posted on the Texas Education Agency website, shall include a \$10 criminal history review fee in addition to the current cost of fingerprint scanning, processing, and obtaining national criminal history record information from the Texas Department of Public Safety, its contractors, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The same fee will be paid by current certified educators who are subject to a national criminal history check pursuant to the Texas Education Code, §§22.082, 22.0831, and 22.0836.
 - (9) Review of the superintendent application for the substitution of managerial experience for the principal certificate requirement (nonrefundable)--\$160.
 - (10) On-time renewal of educational aide certificate:
 - (A) prior to September 1, 2017--\$10; and
 - (B) after August 31, 2017--no charge.
 - (11) Additional fee for late renewal of educational aide certificate:
 - (A) prior to September 1, 2017--\$5; and

- (B) after August 31, 2017--no charge.
- (12) Reactivation of an inactive educational aide certificate--\$15.
- (13) Reinstatement following restitution of child support or student loan repayment for educational aide certificate--\$20.
- (14) On-time renewal of a standard certificate--\$20.
- (15) Additional fee for late renewal of a standard certificate--\$10.
- (16) Reactivation of an inactive standard certificate--\$40; except for an inactivation pursuant to §232.9 of this title (relating to Inactive Status and Late Renewal).
- (17) Reinstatement following restitution of child support or student loan repayment--\$50.
- (18) Visiting international teacher certificate--\$75.
- (19) Request for preliminary criminal history evaluation (nonrefundable)--\$50.
- (b) The fee for correcting a certificate or permit when the error is not made by the Texas Education Agency shall be equal to the fee for the original certificate or permit.
- (c) An individual registering to take certification tests shall pay the applicable fee(s) from the following list of categories:
- (1) Selected Response-Only Assessments -- [x] \$116.
- (2) Single Subject Area Tests (801-809)-- [x] \$58.
- (3) Enhanced Selected-Response/Constructed-Response Assessments for Tests (801-809) -- [x] \$70.
- (4) Enhanced Selected-Response/Constructed-Response Assessments -- [x] \$136.
- (5) Enhanced Selected-Response/Constructed-Response Administrator and Student Services Assessments -- [x] \$200.
- (6) Performance-Based Assessments for teachers--\$311.
- (d) An individual registering to take a content certification examination prior to admission to an EPP shall pay the applicable fee(s) from the following list of categories:
- (1) Content Certification Examinations except American Sign Language (ASL)--\$106.
- (2) Essential Academic Skills Sub-Tests Retake (701-703)--\$56.
- (3) Content Certification Examinations for ASL Sub-Tests (784-785)--\$56.

Figure: 19 TAC §230.21(e)

Certificate TAC Reference	Certificate Name	Required Content Pedagogy Test(s)	Pedagogical Requirement(s) [Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Requirements]
Art			
§233.10	Art: Early Childhood-Grade 12	178 Art EC-12 Texas Examinations of Educator Standards (TExES)	160 <u>Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) EC-12 TExES or 2015 edTPA: Visual Arts</u>
Bilingual Education			
§233.6	Bilingual Education Supplemental: Spanish	164 Bilingual Education Supplemental TExES and 190 <u>Bilingual Target Language Proficiency (BTLPT)</u> – Spanish TExES	Not Applicable: Not a Stand-alone Certificate
§233.6	Bilingual Education Supplemental: American Sign Language	164 Bilingual Education Supplemental TExES and 184 American Sign Language (ASL) EC-12 TExES and 073 Texas Assessment of Sign Communications- American Sign Language (TASC-ASL)	Not Applicable: Not a Stand-alone Certificate
§233.6	Bilingual Education Supplemental: Arabic	164 Bilingual Education Supplemental TExES and American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) 614 Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) – Arabic and 615 Writing Proficiency Test (WPT) – Arabic	Not Applicable: Not a Stand-alone Certificate
§233.6	Bilingual Education Supplemental: Chinese	164 Bilingual Education Supplemental TExES and ACTFL 618 OPI – Chinese (Mandarin) and 619 WPT – Chinese (Mandarin)	Not Applicable: Not a Stand-alone Certificate

Certificate TAC Reference	Certificate Name	Required Content Pedagogy Test(s)	Pedagogical Requirement(s) [Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Requirements]
Bilingual Education (continued)			
§233.6	Bilingual Education Supplemental: Japanese	164 Bilingual Education Supplemental TExES and ACTFL 616 OPI – Japanese and 617 WPT – Japanese	Not Applicable: Not a Stand-alone Certificate
§233.6	Bilingual Education Supplemental: Vietnamese	164 Bilingual Education Supplemental TExES and ACTFL 620 OPI – Vietnamese and 621 WPT – Vietnamese	Not Applicable: Not a Stand-alone Certificate
Career and Technical Education			
§233.13	Technology Education: Grades 6-12	171 Technology Education 6-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2143 edTPA: <u>Technology and Engineering Education</u>
§233.13	Family and Consumer Sciences, Composite: Grades 6-12	American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (AAFCS) 200 Family and Consumer Sciences – Composite Examination	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2117 edTPA: <u>Family and Consumer Sciences</u>
§233.13	Human Development and Family Studies: Grades 8-12	AAFCS 202 Human Development and Family Studies Concentration Examination	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2117 edTPA: <u>Family and Consumer Sciences</u>
§233.13	Hospitality, Nutrition, and Food Sciences: Grades 8-12	AAFCS 201 Hospitality, Nutrition, and Food Science Concentration Examination	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2117 edTPA: <u>Family and Consumer Sciences</u>
§233.13	Agriculture, Food, and Natural Resources: Grades 6-12	272 Agriculture, Food, and Natural Resources 6-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2100 edTPA: <u>Agricultural Education</u>
§233.13	Business and Finance: Grades 6-12	276 Business and Finance 6-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2102 edTPA: <u>Business Education</u>
§233.14	Marketing: Grades 6-12	275 Marketing 6-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2102 edTPA: <u>Business Education</u>

Certificate TAC Reference	Certificate Name	Required Content Pedagogy Test(s)	Pedagogical Requirement(s) [Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Requirements]
§233.14	Health Science: Grades 6-12	273 Health Science 6-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES
§233.14	Trade and Industrial Education: Grades 6-12	Not Applicable	270 Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities for Trade and Industrial Education 6-12 TExES
Computer Science and Technology Applications			
§233.5	Computer Science: Grades 8-12	[141 Computer Science 8-12 TExES or] 241 Computer Science 8-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2143 edTPA: <u>Technology and Engineering Education</u>
§233.5	Technology Applications: Early Childhood-Grade 12	[142 Technology Applications EC-12 TExES or] 242 Technology Applications EC-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2108 edTPA: <u>Educational Technology Specialist</u>
[§233.5]	[Technology Applications: Grades 8-12]	[139 Technology Applications 8-12 TExES]	[160 PPR EC 12 TExES]
Core Subjects			
§233.2	Core Subjects: Early Childhood-Grade 6	291 Core Subjects EC-6 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2110 edTPA: <u>Elementary Education: Literacy with Mathematics Task 4</u>
§233.2	Core Subjects: Grades 4-8	211 Core Subjects 4-8 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2016 edTPA: <u>Middle Childhood Mathematics or 2017 edTPA: Middle Childhood Science or 2018 edTPA: Middle Childhood English-Language Arts or 2019 edTPA: Middle Childhood History/Social Studies</u>

Certificate TAC Reference	Certificate Name	Required Content Pedagogy Test(s)	Pedagogical Requirement(s) [Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Requirements]
Counselor			
§239.20	School Counselor: Early Childhood-Grade 12	152 School Counselor EC-12 TExES	Not Applicable: Not an Initial Certificate
Dance			
§233.10	[Dance: Grades 8-12]	[179 Dance 8-12 TExES]	[160 PPR EC-12 TExES]
§233.10	Dance: Grades 6-12	279 Dance 6-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2021 edTPA: K-12 Performing Arts
Educational Diagnostician			
§239.84	Educational Diagnostician: Early Childhood-Grade 12	153 Educational Diagnostician EC-12 TExES	Not Applicable: Not an Initial Certificate

Certificate TAC Reference	Certificate Name	Required Content Pedagogy Test(s)	<u>[Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Requirements]</u> <u>Pedagogical Requirement(s)</u>
English Language Arts and Reading			
§233.3	English Language Arts and Reading: Grades 4-8	117 English Language Arts and Reading 4-8 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2018 edTPA: <u>Middle Childhood English-Language Arts</u>
§233.3	English Language Arts and Reading: Grades 7-12	231 English Language Arts and Reading 7-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2003 edTPA: <u>Secondary English-Language Arts</u>
§233.3	English Language Arts and Reading/Social Studies: Grades 4-8	113 English Language Arts and Reading/ Social Studies 4-8 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2018 edTPA: <u>Middle Childhood English-Language Arts</u> or 2019 edTPA: <u>Middle Childhood History/Social Studies</u>
§239.93	Reading Specialist: Early Childhood-Grade 12	151 Reading Specialist EC-12 TExES	Not Applicable: Not an Initial Certificate
English as a Second Language			
§233.7	English as a Second Language Supplemental	154 English as a Second Language Supplemental TExES	Not Applicable: Not a Stand-alone Certificate
Gifted and Talented			
§233.9	Gifted and Talented Supplemental	162 Gifted and Talented TExES	Not Applicable: Not a Stand-alone Certificate
Health			
§233.11	Health: Early Childhood-Grade 12	157 Health Education EC-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2119 edTPA: <u>Health Education</u>

Certificate TAC Reference	Certificate Name	Required Content Pedagogy Test(s)	<u>[Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Requirements]</u> <u>Pedagogical Requirement(s)</u>
Journalism			
§233.3	Journalism: Grades 7-12	256 Journalism 7-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2003 edTPA: <u>Secondary English-Language Arts</u>
Junior Reserve Officer Training			
§233.17	Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps: Grades 6-12	Not Applicable	160 PPR EC-12 TExES
Languages Other Than English			
§233.15	American Sign Language: Early Childhood-Grade 12	184 ASL EC-12 TExES and 073 TASC-ASL	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2020 edTPA: <u>World Language</u>
§233.15	Arabic: Early Childhood-Grade 12	ACTFL 605 OPI – Arabic and 600 WPT – Arabic	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2020 edTPA: <u>World Language</u>
§233.15	Chinese: Early Childhood-Grade 12	ACTFL 606 OPI – Chinese (Mandarin) and 601 WPT – Chinese (Mandarin)	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2020 edTPA: <u>World Language</u>
§233.15	French: Early Childhood-Grade 12	610 Languages Other Than English (LOTE) French EC-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2020 edTPA: <u>World Language</u>

Certificate TAC Reference	Certificate Name	Required Content Pedagogy Test(s)	Pedagogical Requirement(s) [Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Requirements]
Languages Other Than English (continued)			
§233.15	German: Early Childhood-Grade 12	611 LOTE German EC-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2020 edTPA: <u>World Language</u>
§233.15	Hindi: Early Childhood-Grade 12	ACTFL 622 OPI – Hindi and 623 WPT – Hindi	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2020 edTPA: <u>World Language</u>
§233.15	Italian: Early Childhood-Grade 12	ACTFL 624 OPI – Italian and 625 WPT – Italian	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2020 edTPA: <u>World Language</u>
§233.15	Japanese: Early Childhood-Grade 12	ACTFL 607 OPI – Japanese and 602 WPT – Japanese	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2020 edTPA: <u>World Language</u>
§233.15	Korean: Early Childhood-Grade 12	ACTFL 630 OPI – Korean and 631 WPT – Korean	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2020 edTPA: <u>World Language</u>
§233.15	Latin: Early Childhood-Grade 12	612 LOTE Latin EC-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2104 edTPA: <u>Classical Languages</u>
§233.15	Portuguese: Early Childhood-Grade 12	ACTFL 632 OPI – Portuguese and 633 WPT – Portuguese	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2020 edTPA: <u>World Language</u>
§233.15	Russian: Early Childhood-Grade 12	ACTFL 608 OPI – Russian and 603 WPT – Russian	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2020 edTPA: <u>World Language</u>
§233.15	Spanish: Early Childhood-Grade 12	613 LOTE Spanish EC-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2020 edTPA: <u>World Language</u>
§233.15	Turkish: Early Childhood-Grade 12	ACTFL 626 OPI – Turkish and 627 WPT – Turkish	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2020 edTPA: <u>World Language</u>
§233.15	Vietnamese: Early Childhood-Grade 12	ACTFL 609 OPI – Vietnamese and 604 WPT – Vietnamese	160 PPR EC-12 TExES or 2020 edTPA: <u>World Language</u>
Librarian			
§239.60	School Librarian: Early Childhood-Grade 12	150 School Librarian Early Childhood-12 TExES	Not Applicable: Not an Initial Certificate

Certificate TAC Reference	Certificate Name	Required Content Pedagogy Test(s)	Pedagogical Requirement(s) [Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Requirements]
Master Teacher			
§239.102	Master Mathematics Teacher: Early Childhood-Grade 4	087 Master Mathematics Teacher EC-4 Texas Examinations for Master Teachers (TEMaT)	Not Applicable: Not an Initial Certificate
§239.102	Master Mathematics Teacher: Grades 4-8	088 Master Mathematics Teacher 4-8 TExMaT	Not Applicable: Not an Initial Certificate
§239.102	Master Mathematics Teacher: Grades 8-12	089 Master Mathematics Teacher 8-12 TExMaT	Not Applicable: Not an Initial Certificate
§239.101	Master Reading Teacher: Early Childhood-Grade 12	085 Master Reading Teacher EC-12 TExMaT	Not Applicable: Not an Initial Certificate
§239.103	Master Technology Teacher: Early Childhood-Grade 12	086 Master Technology Teacher EC-12 TExMaT	Not Applicable: Not an Initial Certificate
§239.104	Master Science Teacher: Early Childhood-Grade 4	090 Master Science Teacher EC-4 TExMaT	Not Applicable: Not an Initial Certificate
§239.104	Master Science Teacher: Grades 4-8	091 Master Science Teacher 4-8 TExMaT	Not Applicable: Not an Initial Certificate
§239.104	Master Science Teacher: Grades 8-12	092 Master Science Teacher 8-12 TExMaT	Not Applicable: Not an Initial Certificate

Certificate TAC Reference	Certificate Name	Required Content Pedagogy Test(s)	Pedagogical Requirement(s) [Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Requirements]
Mathematics and Science			
§233.4	Mathematics: Grades 4-8	115 Mathematics 4-8 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2016 edTPA: Middle Childhood Mathematics
§233.4	Science: Grades 4-8	116 Science 4-8 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2017 edTPA: Middle Childhood Science
§233.4	Mathematics/Science: Grades 4-8	114 Mathematics/ Science 4-8 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2016 edTPA: Middle Childhood Mathematics <u>or</u> 2017 edTPA: Middle Childhood Science
§233.4	Mathematics: Grades 7-12	235 Mathematics 7-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2005 edTPA: Secondary Mathematics
§233.4	Science: Grades 7-12	236 Science 7-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2006 edTPA: Secondary Science
§233.4	Life Science: Grades 7-12	238 Life Science 7-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2006 edTPA: Secondary Science

Certificate TAC Reference	Certificate Name	Required Content Pedagogy Test(s)	Pedagogical Requirement(s) [Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Requirements]
Mathematics and Science (continued)			
§233.4	Physical Science: Grades 6-12	237 Physical Science 6-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2006 edTPA: Secondary Science
§233.4	Physics/Mathematics: Grades 7-12	243 Physics/Mathematics 7-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2005 edTPA: Secondary Mathematics <u>or</u> 2006 edTPA: Secondary Science
§233.4	Mathematics/Physical Science/Engineering: Grades 6-12	274 Mathematics/Physical Science/Engineering 6-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2005 edTPA: Secondary Mathematics <u>or</u> 2006 edTPA: Secondary Science <u>or</u> 2143 edTPA: Technology and Engineering Education
§233.4	Chemistry: Grades 7-12	240 Chemistry 7-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2006 edTPA: Secondary Science
Music			
§233.10	Music: Early Childhood-Grade 12	177 Music EC-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2021 edTPA: K-12 Performing Arts
Physical Education			
§233.12	Physical Education: Early Childhood-Grade 12	158 Physical Education EC-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2011 edTPA: Physical Education

Certificate TAC Reference	Certificate Name	Required Content Pedagogy Test(s)	Pedagogical Requirement(s) [Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Requirements]
Principal and Superintendent			
§241.20	Principal as Instructional Leader: Early Childhood-Grade 12	268 Principal as Instructional Leader TExES [and Performance Assessment for School Leaders (PASL)]	[Not Applicable: Not an Initial Certificate] Educational Testing Service (ETS) 368 Performance Assessment for School Leaders (PASL)
§241.35	Principal as Instructional Leader Endorsement	[Performance Assessment for School Leaders (PASL)] Not Applicable: Not an Initial Certificate (Individuals must already hold a valid certificate to serve in the role of principal to be eligible for this endorsement.)	Educational Testing Service (ETS) 368 Performance Assessment for School Leaders (PASL) [Not Applicable: Not an Initial Certificate; however, individuals must already hold a valid certificate to serve in the role of principal to be eligible for this endorsement.]
§241.60	Principal: Early Childhood-Grade 12	068 Principal TExES	Not Applicable: Not an Initial Certificate.
§242.20	Superintendent: Early Childhood-Grade 12	195 Superintendent TExES	Not Applicable: Not an Initial Certificate
Social Studies			
§233.3	Social Studies: Grades 4-8	118 Social Studies 4-8 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2019 edTPA: Middle Childhood History/Social Studies
§233.3	Social Studies: Grades 7-12	232 Social Studies 7-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2004 edTPA: Secondary History/Social Studies
§233.3	History: Grades 7-12	233 History 7-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2004 edTPA: Secondary History/Social Studies

Certificate TAC Reference	Certificate Name	Required Content Pedagogy Test(s)	Pedagogical Requirement(s) [Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Requirements]
Speech Communications			
§233.3	Speech: Grades 7-12	129 Speech 7-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2003 edTPA: Secondary English-Language Arts
Special Education			
§233.8	Special Education: Early Childhood-Grade 12	161 Special Education EC-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2012 edTPA: Special Education
§233.8	Special Education Supplemental	163 Special Education Supplemental TExES	Not Applicable: Not a Stand-alone Certificate
§233.8	Teacher of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing: Early Childhood-Grade 12	181 Deaf and Hard of Hearing EC-12 TExES and 072 TASC or 073 TASC-ASL (required for assignment but not for certification)	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2012 edTPA: Special Education
§233.8	Teacher of Students with Visual Impairments Supplemental: Early Childhood-Grade 12	182 Visually Impaired TExES and 183 Braille TExES or 283 Braille TExES	Not Applicable: Not a Stand-alone Certificate
Theatre			
§233.10	Theatre: Early Childhood-Grade 12	180 Theatre EC-12 TExES	160 PPR EC-12 TExES <u>or</u> 2021 edTPA: K-12 Performing Arts

ATTACHMENT III Most Frequent edTPA Myths and Realities

This document lists the most frequent edTPA myths and realities. Supporting details can be found in the subsequent attachments.

Most Frequent edTPA Myths and Realities	
Myth	Reality
There is no evidence of a problem in teacher preparation.	<p>This is false. Our current system has significant opportunities for improvement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Teachers indicate that they are not adequately prepared. 2) Principals indicate teachers are not adequately prepared. 3) Over 700 teachers completing their internships abandon their students during the school year. 4) School districts pay for the gaps in preparation.
There is nothing wrong with the PPR.	<p>This is false. The current system and test create a false positive for teacher candidates and educator preparation programs.</p> <p>For candidates, the multiple-choice test does not mirror the realities of the classroom.</p> <p>For EPPs, performance on the multiple-choice test does not differentiate their ability to successfully prepare teachers or provide them educative data to continuously improve.</p>
Pearson is telling TEA what to do.	<p>This is false. TEA selected Pearson to provide testing services based on their strength and alignment to the criteria for effective performance assessments.</p>
edTPA will stop current successful EPP practices.	<p>This is false. edTPA supports practice-based preparation focused on planning, instruction, assessment, and reflection.</p> <p>Programs that are not providing practice-based preparation focused on planning, instruction, assessment, and reflection will likely need to alter their preparation.</p>
The edTPA fee will create a teacher shortage.	<p>This is false. Numerous states have faced a decline in teacher production that is occurring regardless of edTPA policy or fees.</p>
edTPA will lead to fewer teachers of color.	<p>This is false. The differences in performance between candidate groups are much less than we see on traditional multiple-choice assessments for educators.</p> <p>A performance assessment may help remove some of the barriers candidates of color face while providing more support during their preparation.</p>

edTPA can be gamed with a slick video and is not authentic.	<p>This is false. edTPA videos must meet specific criteria and are scored with an objective rubric.</p> <p>Furthermore, video-based assignments and reflections are a long-standing best practice used by EPPs.</p>
edTPA is a glorified writing test.	<p>This is false. edTPA is designed as an assessment of pedagogy and reflection not an assessment of writing abilities. Long, elaborate prose is not required. Candidates can use bullet points to identify evidence and to justify their decisions.</p>
Anyone off the street can become an edTPA scorer.	<p>This is false. Scorers must be P-12 teachers or EPP teacher educators with significant pedagogical content knowledge in the field in which they score, as well as with experience working as instructors or mentors for novice teachers.</p>
edTPA isn't aligned to Texas expectations.	<p>This is false. edTPA incorporates the TEKS into the various tasks and rubrics.</p> <p>TEA has conducted a thorough review of edTPA and T-TESS and found significant degrees of alignment.</p>
It would be just as easy to make a Texas performance assessment.	<p>This is false. The development time and cost needed to create a new performance assessment is not conducive to responding to immediate needs of students.</p>
States are pulling out of using edTPA.	<p>This is false. 19 states have policy requiring or allowing edTPA as a requirement for program completion or licensure. Individual programs in 22 other states have chosen to use edTPA as a tool for teacher development.</p> <p>Although the Illinois House of Representatives has passed a non-binding resolution encouraging the removal of edTPA as a licensure assessment, the Illinois State Board of Education has not made a final decision regarding the continued use of edTPA as of the print deadline.</p>
The pilot is a sham.	<p>This is false. The edTPA assessment has been studied and found to be a valid and reliable assessment for certification purposes. The objective of the Texas pilot is not to replicate the studies already completed but to identify and develop best practices on implementation of edTPA and to measure early outcomes for candidates who complete the edTPA with the goal of informing future SBEC decisions.</p>

ATTACHMENT IV
edTPA Pilot Summary**edTPA Pilot Summary****Purpose**

At the February State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) meeting, the Board asked about the level of interest from programs in participating in the edTPA pilot. The pilot application will collect data to answer the Board's question and allow the agency to proceed with a formal pilot, pending approval from the SBEC.

The pilot, if approved by the Board, would offer EPPs the opportunity to participate during the 2019-2020 school-year and renew for the 2020-2021 school-year. The purpose of the pilot is twofold: (1) to identify and develop best practices on implementation of edTPA by EPPs and (2) to measure early outcomes for candidates and EPPs who complete edTPA.

Implementation Question

How can Texas effectively implement edTPA as a certification requirement?

Theory of Action: *Strategic and thoughtful implementation of edTPA will:*

- **Link best preparation practice with certification**
- **Provide EPPs with tools to support candidates, connect coursework with fieldwork, and map pre-service activities to in-service teaching**
- **Accelerate the development of well-prepared teachers through formative goal-setting and professional development plans**
- **Increase targeted and relevant support during internship year to reduce mid-year contract abandonment for intern teachers**
- **Prepare more consistently responsive and reflective teachers who are ready to meet the demands of the classroom**

Why edTPA?

The current certification assessments do not require beginning teachers to demonstrate and reflect upon vital teaching practices learned in their EPPs.

TEA recommends piloting edTPA because:

- **It is valid and reliable.**
- **It measures effective teaching.**
- **It is authentic and contextually relevant.**
- **It better represents the realities of the classroom.**

Who can participate?

Any accredited educator preparation program may apply. Candidates in programs selected for the formal pilot will be eligible for additional funding. During the 2019-2020 school year, their candidates will be eligible for funding to reimburse them for the \$311 edTPA fee as follows:

Upon submission of an edTPA portfolio, all candidates will receive a \$30 rebate from Pearson for a net fee of \$281.	
For up to 600 candidates: edTPA fee = PPR fee	For up to 1,800 candidates: No edTPA fee + \$250 stipend
Participating candidates not eligible for reimbursement by the district will receive a \$165 reimbursement after submission of an edTPA portfolio.	Participating candidates eligible for reimbursement by the district will receive a \$531 reimbursement.

What will candidates receive?

Candidates will receive a standard certification upon successful completion of the edTPA portfolio and will not be required to take the Early Childhood-Grade 12 Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities exam (PPR). **The standard certification is contingent upon candidates meeting all other programmatic and testing requirements.**

What data will TEA use?

- Candidate placement data
- Candidate retention data
- Principal appraisal of candidate preparation
- New teacher appraisal of their preparation
- Perception data collected via survey and focus groups from candidates, faculty members, and P-12 partners
- edTPA portfolio scores by rubric, program, and district.
- Teacher effectiveness data (as applicable)
- Student achievement and growth data (as applicable)

What methods will TEA use to analyze the data collected?

To identify and develop best practices on implementation for edTPA by EPPs, TEA will summarize information about implementation at the EPP level. We will work with the collection of pilot EPPs to collaboratively identify best practices.

To measure early outcomes for candidates and EPPs who complete the edTPA process, TEA will utilize propensity score matching, a quasi-experimental methodology that allows for the comparison of candidates completing the edTPA with highly similar candidates completing the traditional PPR. These candidates will be compared on a number of dimensions, including employment, retention, appraisal, and efficacy in the classroom.

ATTACHMENT V
edTPA Pilot Application**edTPA Pilot Application**

March 18, 2019

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is committed to ensuring that teachers are prepared to meet the diverse needs of our students and the demands of the classroom. Performance-based educator certification assessments, such as edTPA, allow teacher candidates to demonstrate their practice in more authentic ways not captured by current certification exams. For educator preparation programs (EPPs), this assessment is an opportunity to further align coursework to best practices in fieldwork and continuously improve on teacher education in planning, instruction, and assessment. Thoughtful implementation of edTPA can more consistently improve the quality of teacher candidates throughout Texas. The TEA aims to identify best practices on how to implement edTPA specific to the needs of Texas educators and educator preparation programs.

At the February State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) meeting, the Board asked about the level of interest from programs in participating in an edTPA pilot. The pilot application will collect data to answer the Board's question and allow the agency to proceed with a pilot, pending approval from the Board.

The pilot, if approved by the Board, would offer EPPs the opportunity to participate during the 2019-2020 school-year and renew for the 2020-2021 school-year. TEA is inviting educator preparation programs or groups of programs, later referred to in this document as Communities of Practice, to pilot the edTPA assessment in lieu of the current Early Childhood-Grade 12 Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities exam.

Participating candidates will be issued a standard certification upon successful completion of the applicable edTPA portfolio, the approved educator preparation program requirements, and any other required TExES exams.

- Successful completion is defined as a scorable portfolio, which includes receiving no more than one [condition code](#) per task. If candidates receive a condition code, they may choose to resubmit for \$111 per task in the subsequent window (as soon as within 14 days) or take the EC-12 PPR assessment.

TEA encourages all programs to pilot edTPA and will provide support and training throughout the process. All candidates participating in the pilot will receive a \$30 rebate from Pearson for a net fee of \$281.

Programs or Communities of Practice selected for the *formal* pilot will be eligible for funding to partially or wholly reimburse their candidates for the \$311 edTPA fee. Pearson has allocated \$100,000 in vouchers to support candidates participating in the formal pilot. The agency has also secured \$1 million in Title II funds to further support two groups of candidates during the formal pilot.

Depending on the level of interest, TEA anticipates the following funding:

- An estimated 600 candidates seeking certification in the 2019-2020 school-year will receive a reimbursement of \$165 upon submission of an edTPA portfolio. For these candidates, the net edTPA fee will be the same as the current EC-12 PPR (i.e., \$116—following candidate receipt of

the \$165 reimbursement and \$30 rebate). These candidates will be those that are not employed or eligible for reimbursement by a school district during the 2019-2020 school-year.

- The agency has funding for approximately 1,800 candidates employed or eligible for reimbursement by districts in the 2019-2020 school-year seeking certification to receive a reimbursement of \$531 (i.e., the edTPA fee after the \$30 rebate plus a \$250 stipend) from their district upon submission of an edTPA portfolio. The district must provide evidence of the paid fee to TEA and seek reimbursement. These candidates must be employed by a school district during the 2019-2020 school-year.

The amount of funding for each program's candidates will be based on the strength of the application in addition to the number of applicants identified for the pilot. Please refer to the attached rubric when completing the application.

All programs that wish to pilot will receive the following supports from the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) and Pearson:

- On-site introductory sessions entitled 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.
- Regional workshops provided by members of the edTPA National Academy or SCALE. These sessions are intended for methods and foundations faculty, university supervisors, and mentor teachers who support or supervise candidates and will cover the following:
 - 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
 - Examining instrumental resources for best practices from successful implementation plans
 - Guidelines and best practices for supporting candidates completing their edTPA portfolio
 - Curriculum inquiry to map edTPA outcomes to current curriculum and program assignments
 - Specific support around the academic language rubrics embedded in edTPA
 - Supports for P-12 partners who mentor candidates
- Monthly implementation calls with edTPA Program Managers, SCALE staff, and/or members of the edTPA National Academy.
- On-demand virtual supports from edTPA Program Managers, SCALE staff, and/or members of the edTPA National Academy to address questions and concerns and determine next steps.
- Statewide implementation support webinars for edTPA coordinators with edTPA Program Managers and/or SCALE staff.

Programs selected for the formal pilot will be required to participate in additional monthly calls with TEA staff to facilitate support, data collection, and funding. An overview timeline can be found below.

Date	Action
March 18	Applications sent out to EPPs
April 15	Deadline for pilot applications
April 16-25	TEA staff review applications
April 26	Present pilot application information at SBEC meeting
May 3	Notification of acceptance sent to participating EPPs

May 10	edTPA orientation webinar
Before August 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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. ● Collect candidate demographic data and district partner data. ● 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"> ○ 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. ○ Sharing of instrumental resources best practices from successful implementation plans. ○ Guidelines and best practices for supporting candidates completing their edTPA portfolio.
September 1	<p>TEA staff collect following data from programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Demographic information ● Faculty training documents ● Curriculum alignment information ● Materials used to determine which candidates are recommended for edTPA (versus PPR)
October 25	First window opens for submission of edTPA portfolio
November 10	Districts may submit first reimbursement requests for candidates. All subsequent reimbursement requests will be due by the 10 th day of each month.
February 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Focus group of teacher candidates who submitted the edTPA portfolio. ● Survey to collect perception data from EPPs, principals, and districts ● Analyze edTPA rubric scores from portfolios submitted October through March
May-June 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Focus group of teacher candidates who submitted the edTPA portfolio. ● Survey to collect perception data from EPPs, principals, and districts
June 30, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Analyze edTPA rubric scores from portfolios submitted April through June
Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Monthly implementation calls with edTPA Program Managers and/or members of the edTPA National Academy. ● Collect data during monthly calls about retention, perception, and additional costs related to edTPA ● On-demand virtual supports from edTPA Program Managers and/or members of the edTPA National Academy to address questions and concerns and determine next steps.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• State-wide implementation support webinars for edTPA coordinators with edTPA Program Managers.
--	--

***All dates after April 26, 2019 are tentative and pending approval from SBEC**

Programs should submit their application by April 15, 2019 and will be notified by May 3, 2019, pending approval from the SBEC, with their allocated amount of voucher and instructions for their partner districts to access Title II funding. Although programs should apply individually, they are strongly encouraged to identify and work together in Communities of Practice to support effective collaboration and implementation. A community may come from a university system, a region, or a group of programs with similar delivery models. There are no defined criteria for creating a community of practice, just a desire to collaborate and learn together.

Please complete all sections for each participating EPP if applying as a Community of Practice and submit applications to grace.wu@tea.texas.gov and beth.burkhart@tea.texas.gov

Program and Contact Information

Educator Preparation Program	edTPA Contact Person and Contact Information

Community of Practice (if applicable)
If you are applying as a community of practice, list your partnering EPPs here.

Briefly describe why your program would like to participate in the edTPA pilot. How will the process of implementing this performance-based assessment benefit your program and the candidates you serve? (suggested word count 300-500)

Consider your program's coursework together with the edTPA rubrics. For each rubric, list the course or courses that **currently** best align with the rubric.

edTPA Rubric	Existing aligned courses:
Rubric 1: Planning for Content Understandings	
Rubric 2: Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs	

Rubric 3: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning	
Rubric 4: Identifying and Supporting Language Demands:	
Rubric 5: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Learning	
Rubric 6: Learning Environment	
Rubric 7: Engaging Students in Learning	
Rubric 8: Deepening Student Learning	
Rubric 9: Subject-Specific Pedagogy (please note courses for the certification areas you intend to participate in the pilot)	
Rubric 10: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness	

Rubric 11: Analysis of Student Learning	
Rubric 12: Providing Feedback to Guide Learning	
Rubric 13: Student Use of Feedback	
Rubric 14: Analyzing Students' Language Use and Learning in Content	
Rubric 15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction	

<p>Considering the available trainings on page 2 and current curriculum alignment, in what areas would your program like additional support or training? (Check all that apply.)</p>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Planning for content understanding <input type="checkbox"/> Planning to support varied student learning needs <input type="checkbox"/> Using knowledge of students to inform teaching and learning <input type="checkbox"/> Identifying and supporting academic language <input type="checkbox"/> Planning assessments to monitor and support learning	<input type="checkbox"/> Subject-specific pedagogy (please specify the content areas) <input type="checkbox"/> Analyzing teaching effectiveness <input type="checkbox"/> Analysis of student learning <input type="checkbox"/> Providing feedback to guide learning <input type="checkbox"/> Student use of feedback <input type="checkbox"/> Analyzing student's language use and learning in content area

<input type="checkbox"/> Learning environment <input type="checkbox"/> Engaging students in learning <input type="checkbox"/> Deepening student learning	<input type="checkbox"/> Using assessment to inform instruction <input type="checkbox"/> Logistical issues (video-recording lessons, using edTPA website and resources, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Please explain:
--	---

Describe how your program plans to **select** and **inform** candidates who will participate in the pilot. (suggested word count 300-500)

Describe the qualifications, skills, and abilities of your program's edTPA contact person to lead candidates, faculty members, and P-12 partners in preparing for a new pedagogical performance-based assessment. (suggested word count 300-500)

Describe the steps your program has taken toward piloting edTPA in the 2019-2020 school-year. What role has the contact person had in these steps and what role will they have moving forward? (suggested word count 300-500)

Candidate Information

Certificate Area	Number of anticipated <u>total</u> candidates in 2019-2020	Number of anticipated <u>pilot</u> candidates in 2019-2020	Number of anticipated <u>total</u> candidates in 2020-2021	Number of anticipated <u>pilot</u> candidates in 2020-2021

P-12 Information

Will your candidates be eligible for Title II reimbursement from a partner district (primarily for candidates in alternative or post-baccalaureate program)?

_____ Yes _____ No

If yes, which districts do you plan to partner with? How many candidates from each district do you anticipate participating?

District	Number of pilot candidates 2019-2020	Number of pilot candidates 2020-2021

What steps has your program taken to ensure that program faculty, district leadership, and external partners will be oriented to edTPA and provide aligned support to candidates for edTPA consistent with your curriculum and program mission/values? (check all that apply)

Faculty members are trained or will be trained as scorers

Names of faculty:

Reviewed the edTPA rubrics

Participated in edTPA 101 training

Participated in other related professional development related to edTPA. Please identify.

Evaluated current coursework and preparation practices for alignment with edTPA rubrics

Added new coursework or revised current coursework to support candidates. Please explain.

<input type="checkbox"/> Other. Please describe.
If you are applying to participate as a community of practice, please describe how you plan to collaborate with your partnering programs. (suggested word count 300-500)

Funding Requested

	Number of pilot candidates 2019-2020	Approximate demographics of pilot participants
Candidates Participating in Pilot (candidates <u>not employed</u> by districts in 2019-2020)		
Candidates Participating in Pilot (candidates <u>employed</u> by districts in 2019-2020)		

Partnering programs will be required to collect and provide the Texas Education Agency and their partners at Pearson and SCALE access to the following data during the pilot periods:

Participating educator preparation programs will be required to collect and provide the following information during the pilot:

- Curricular materials used for candidate preparation in planning, instruction, assessment, reflective teaching and academic language
- Faculty training materials used for planning, instruction, assessment, reflective teaching and academic language
- Best practices in addressing the technical aspects of completing edTPA
- Information about district level trainings and other collaboration between districts and EPPs

What other data will TEA use?

- Candidate placement data
- Candidate retention data
- Principal appraisal of candidate preparation

- New teacher appraisal of their preparation
- Perception data collected via survey and focus groups from candidates, faculty members, and P-12 partners
- edTPA portfolio scores by rubric, program, and district
- Teacher effectiveness data (as applicable)
- Student achievement and growth data (as applicable)

Application Scoring Rubric

Category	4	3	2	1
Program Intent	Participating EPPs view the formal pilot as an opportunity to strengthen educator preparation practices around developing educator skills in reflective planning, instruction, and assessment and have identified current areas in their program as opportunities for improvement	Participating EPPs view the formal pilot as an opportunity to strengthen educator preparation practices around developing educator skills in reflective planning, instruction, and assessment	Participating EPPs do not view the formal pilot as an opportunity to strengthen educator preparation practices around developing educator skills in reflective planning, instruction, and assessment	Participating EPPs do not view the formal pilot as an opportunity to strengthen educator preparation practices around developing educator skills in reflective planning, instruction, and assessment and have not identified current areas of their program as opportunities for improvement
Program Readiness	Participating EPPs have proactively taken initiative to learn about edTPA and have some structures in place for the pilot	Participating EPPs have proactively taken initiative to learn about edTPA and have plans to put structures in place for the pilot	Participating EPPs have taken steps to learn about edTPA	Participating EPPs have not taken steps to learn about edTPA
Contact person	Contact person has experience and expertise in leading training for faculty, cooperating teachers, candidates, and P-12 partners for edTPA	Contact person has experience and expertise in leading training for faculty, cooperating teachers, candidates, and P-12 partners for a grade and content specific performance assessment	Contact person has experience and expertise in leading training for faculty, cooperating teachers, candidates, and P-12 partners	Contact person does not have experience and expertise in leading training for faculty, cooperating teachers, candidates, and P-12 partners
Candidate information	Candidates identified for the pilot represent at least 5 different certification areas and represent at	Candidates identified for the pilot represent at least 5 different certification areas and represent at	Candidates identified for the pilot represent at least 3 different certification areas and represent at	Candidates identified for the pilot represent at least 3 different certification areas and represent at

	least 25% of eligible standard seeking candidates	least 10% of eligible standard seeking candidates	least 25% of eligible standard seeking candidates	least 10% of eligible standard seeking candidates
District partners	Districts identified represent a diversity of sizes, TEA district ratings, and student demographics	Districts identified represent a diversity of TEA district ratings and student demographics	Districts identified represent a diversity of student demographics	Districts identified do not represent a diversity of sizes, TEA district ratings, and student demographics
Partnerships	Partnership plan contains multiple opportunities prior to candidate placement and during for program faculty, candidate, external partners, and district staff to engage around edTPA	Partnership plan contains some opportunities prior to candidate placement and during for program faculty, candidate, external partners and district staff to engage around edTPA	Partnership plan contains multiple opportunities during candidate placement for program faculty, candidate, external partners and district staff to engage around edTPA	Partnership plan contains minimal opportunities during candidate placement for program faculty, candidate, external partners and district staff to engage around edTPA

ATTACHMENT VI edTPA Pilot FAQ

edTPA Pilot Application FAQs

April 2019

The Texas Education Agency's formal pilot aims to: (1) identify and develop best practices on implementation of the edTPA; and (2) measure early outcomes for candidates and EPPs who complete the edTPA.

Must all our candidates participate?

No. A program may choose which candidates participate in the pilot. For example, a program could choose to select all candidates, candidates within a certification field, or another grouping of candidates.

Is there a minimum or maximum number of candidates who can participate in the pilot?

No. A program may choose how many (or how few) candidates participate in the pilot.

We don't know exactly how many candidates we have in each certification area. Can we estimate?

Yes. This number will be used to help the TEA allocate funding. For the purpose of the application, a good estimate is sufficient.

Can we participate in the 2020-2021 pilot if we did not participate in the 2019-2020 school year?

Yes, a program can apply to participate for the second year of the pilot even if they do not participate in the 2019-2020 pilot.

What will be the cost to our candidates?

The fee for the edTPA is \$311. All candidates who take the edTPA will receive a \$30 rebate from Pearson for a net fee of \$281. Additionally, candidates participating in the formal pilot will be eligible for reimbursement as follows:

For up to 600 candidates:

edTPA fee = PPR fee

Participating candidates **not eligible for reimbursement by the district** will receive a \$165 reimbursement after submission of an edTPA portfolio.

For up to 1,800 candidates:

No edTPA fee + \$250 stipend

Participating candidates **eligible for reimbursement by the district** will receive a \$531 reimbursement.

How will TEA protect the intellectual property (curricular materials) collected during the pilot?

TEA recognizes that these materials are proprietary, and Chapter 552 of the Texas Government Code permits TEA to protect these materials from disclosure under the Texas Public Information Act. EPPs can protect their proprietary curriculum by marking the information as such and upon receipt of a PIR, the agency will notify the program. It will be the responsibility of the program to submit their proprietary arguments against public disclosure to the OAG (Texas Attorney General).

How will TEA use the curricular materials collected during the pilot?

It is routine practice for programs, including for-profit programs, to share curricular materials with TEA. We are requesting these materials to inform best implementation practice and to identify curricular materials that best support candidates.

Still have questions? Please contact Beth Burkhart at beth.burkhart@tea.texas.gov

edTPA Pilot Application FAQs

April 2019

What does successful completion of the edTPA mean?

Successful completion is defined as a scorable portfolio, which includes receiving no more than one condition code per task. If candidates receive a condition code, they may choose to resubmit for \$111 per task in the subsequent window (as soon as within 14 days) or take the EC-12 PPR assessment.

What are condition codes?

[Condition codes](#) are requirements for the edTPA that make a portfolio submission scorable. Some examples of condition codes include:

- Fewer than three lesson plans are submitted
- Insufficient or excessive information to score
- A video that is edited
- A video submission that is not viewable or audible to scorers
- Incorrect or missing, blank, or otherwise inaccessible files

Does the edTPA count toward the 5-time test limit for the PPR?

No. All edTPA submissions during the pilot will not count as a test attempt and will not factor into an EPP's certification assessment pass rate.

Is there a limit on the number of times candidates can resubmit edTPA?

No. Since edTPA is not considered a test attempt, there is no limit on the number of times a candidate can resubmit. There is not a maximum number of condition codes to determine eligibility to resubmit.

For more information about edTPA, check out this online informational session:

[edTPA Informational Session for Texas](#)

Still have questions? Please contact Beth Burkhart at beth.burkhart@tea.texas.gov

ATTACHMENT VII
edTPA Pilot Testimony Considerations and Responses

Consideration	Response
1. Will there be participation from all EPP types in the pilot?	To ensure the quality of the robust pilot, the TEA is seeking a diverse group of pilot EPPs that will include ACPs, IHEs, and post-baccalaureate programs.
2. How will TEA communicate about the pilot throughout the process?	The agency is committed to providing updates at SBEC meetings, stakeholder meetings, including the Educator Preparation Advisory Committee, and using the EPP contact list for periodic updates.
3. Will TEA explore ideas of a residency model?	The agency recommends piloting edTPA while discussing additional opportunities to strengthen preparation with the field.
4. Will TEA create a hybrid of the best practices of edTPA and PPR?	The agency recommends completing the edTPA pilot to determine how best to implement edTPA and to measure early outcomes of edTPA candidates before considering other assessment alternatives.
5. Will TEA consider modifying existing structures rather than move to a new assessment?	The agency recommends piloting edTPA while discussing additional opportunities to strengthen preparation with the field.
6. Will TEA conduct research to compare edTPA and PPR candidates in the pilot?	To meet the second purpose of the pilot, TEA will utilize propensity score matching, a quasi-experimental methodology, which allows for the comparison of candidates completing the edTPA with highly similar candidates completing the traditional PPR. These candidates will be compared on a number of dimensions, including employment, retention, appraisal, and efficacy in the classroom.
7. Can the pilot include research, not from Pearson, about edTPA implementation?	TEA staff will collect and analyze data related to the edTPA pilot from Texas EPPs and districts.
8. Can the pilot show the impact of edTPA on cooperating and mentor teachers?	The proposed pilot would include gathering perception data from cooperating and mentor teachers.

9. Will TEA use principal survey data to assess readiness of candidates after they complete edTPA?	Yes.
---	------

ATTACHMENT VIII
edTPA Considerations and Responses
April 2019

Staff provides the following considerations and responses that have been compiled from prior Board meetings and other stakeholder engagement.

Consideration	Response
<p>1. How is edTPA an authentic assessment?</p>	<p>edTPA is a subject-specific performance assessment and support system, aligned to new Texas Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) standards. edTPA is designed to examine candidates' abilities to plan and implement an authentic cycle of teaching aimed at subject-specific student learning goals, using evidence derived from candidates' teaching practice.</p> <p>Candidates' edTPA teaching portfolios demonstrate the complexity of the local teaching context and the way the candidate responds to real students when teaching them in a real setting. To that end, and before a candidate begins planning for his/her students, he/she should consider the following questions so the learning tasks, planned supports, and assessments reflect the students' prior learning and personal, cultural, and/or community assets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What do your students know, what can they do, and what are they learning to do? ● What do you want your students to learn? What are the important understandings and key concepts you want students to develop within the learning segment? ● How will you use your knowledge of your students' assets to inform your plans? ● What instructional strategies, learning tasks, and assessments will you design to support student learning and language use? ● How will your learning segment support students to develop and use language that deepens content understanding? ● How is the teaching you propose supported by research and theory about how students learn?
<p>2. How do candidate demographics and placement impact their performance on edTPA?</p>	<p>According to the 2017 edTPA Annual Administrative Report, performance on edTPA performance shows smaller gaps across race/ethnicity categories than other licensure assessments. The most recent administrative report shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Equivalent performance (no statistically significant difference) for White and Hispanic/Latino (45.19 and 45.03, respectively), a bit higher for Asian (45.58), and lower for African American (42.61) and Native American (43.60). Multiracial is (45.18) very similar to White, and those self-identified as Other (44.46) is slightly lower.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates teaching more English learners perform better on edTPA. • Virtually no differences in candidate performance based on % of free and reduced lunch (less than one-point difference in candidate performance across all ranges).
<p>3. What are the effects of edTPA on teacher production?</p>	<p>According to data drawn from Title II reporting, enrollment in and completion of educator preparation programs (EPPs) have experienced steady decline nationally since 2009, regardless of whether the state uses edTPA. Recent research demonstrates there are many reasons for this decline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low salary (in combination with high tuition and loan debt) • Increased competition for graduates from other disciplines • Increased accountability in P–12 (less autonomy, choice and upward mobility) • Lack of resources to support induction and support into the profession, and in general, reduced respect for the profession <p>Any examination of declining enrollment or completion rates should consider the full range of variables influencing entry into the profession and barriers to program completion and licensure. The remainder of this response examines enrollment and completion data provided by Title II reporting for a sample of states with edTPA policy and those without. Further, enrollment data by demographic group (ethnicity/race) is presented.</p> <p>Note: Comprehensive statistical analyses are needed to identify any trends or patterns across all 50 states.</p> <p>About the Title II Data There are currently 849 educator preparation programs in 41 states and the District of Columbia participating in edTPA and 19 states have developed policies related to edTPA use. Some states allow edTPA as a choice among other assessments and others use edTPA for program completion or program review rather than licensure.</p> <p>For the purpose of this response, a sample of ten states with edTPA policy was selected to identify changes pertaining to teacher preparation enrollment and completers from 2010–2016. States chosen as "edTPA" states include those who have had participation in edTPA within the years documented and have consequential policies in place in 2019.</p> <p>For comparison, a sample of ten states that do not currently have edTPA policy was selected to identify teacher preparation enrollment and completion in those states.</p>

Identified states (10 edTPA and 10 non-edTPA) represent a range according to size (state population and teacher education enrollment), geographic region, demographic diversity, and professional licensure policy requirements. This sampled subset of nationally available data provides preliminary comparisons and should be augmented with a full statistical analysis of all states.

Percentage Change in Enrollment and Completion

In Table 1 that follows, the percentage change in enrollment¹ and completion numbers from 2010–11 to 2015–16 are displayed for the ten states with edTPA policy and the ten states without edTPA policy. States in both groups have had large drops in both enrollment and completion between 2010 and 2016 and the average percentage decreases are quite similar.

- The average percentage decrease in enrollment for edTPA states was 33.92% and 34.63% for non-edTPA states.
- The average percentage decrease for completion was 27.67% for edTPA states and 25.56% for non-edTPA states.

Given the declining enrollments/completion overall, the differences between these two groups is minimal.

Note also that two edTPA states (MN and WA) had small increases in completion despite declining enrollment within that time period.

In contrast, despite a percentage enrollment increase in Texas between 2010 and 2016 (+22.93%), a percentage decline in completion (-14.64%) persisted during the same time period.

In summary, the percentage change varies within both groups (edTPA and non-edTPA), but the differences between states with edTPA policy and those without are quite small. The trend for declining enrollment and completion is occurring nationally.

Table 1: Enrollment and completer data for ten states with edTPA policy and ten states without edTPA policy

Sample	Enrollment Change (2010-2016)	Completion Change (2010-2016)
<u>Sample edTPA Policy States</u>	AL -29.16%	AL -23.51%
Range for Change in Enrollment:	CA -35.39%	CA -20.94%
-11.83% (WA) to -60.65% (IL)	GA -18.13%	GA -42.85%
Average: -33.92%		

¹ Title II reporting provides both enrollment and completion numbers each year. Enrollment refers to all candidates at any point in the preparation pipeline who are enrolled in program for that year. Completion numbers for a given year represent the subset of enrolled candidates who finish the program in that year. Therefore, the completion number is always a smaller number.

	Range for Change in Completion: +2.50% (WA) to -52.79 (IL) Average: -27.67%	IL -60.65% MN -12.86% NJ -50.88% NY -40.28% TN -47.50% WA -11.84% WI -32.50%	IL -52.79% MN +0.32% NJ -37.05% NY -38.12% TN -31.87% WA +2.59% WI -32.41%
	<u>Sample States without edTPA Policy</u> Range for Change in Enrollment: +22.93% (TX) to -66.60% (NM) Average: -34.63% Range for Change in Completion: -5.90% (MA) to - 48.16% (PA) Average: -25.56%	AZ -45.26% FL -9.29% KS -33.59% MA -36.01% MI -57.24% MO -44.62% NH -13.91% NM -66.60% PA -62.73% TX +22.93%	AZ -24.55% FL -30.24% KS -18.85% MA -5.90% MI -35.84% MO -18.50% NH -21.95% NM -36.93% PA -48.16% TX -14.64%

Percentage Change in Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity
 In Table 2 that follows, the percentage change in enrollment data by race/ethnicity from 2010–11 to 2015–16 is displayed for ten states with edTPA policy and ten states without edTPA policy.

(Items with asterisks indicate increase in enrollment. One (*) asterisk is used for increases below 10%, two (**) asterisks for 10 to 50%, three (***) asterisks for 50 to 100%, and four (****) asterisks for increases greater than 100%. Some very large percentage increases (200 to 500%) are based on very small numbers and represent outliers. They are removed from the calculation of average percentage change shown in the first column for each group. See Table 2 notes by group for additional details.)

As with the completion and enrollment data presented in Table 1 in the aggregate, enrollment decreases persist across ethnic/racial groups in both edTPA and non-edTPA states.

- Every state (edTPA or non edTPA) saw decreased enrollment for white candidates (range edTPA = - 9.54% in WA to -62.78 in IL; range non edTPA states = -2.28 in NH to -65.15 in NM).
- There were a few cases of percentage increases in enrollment for some ethnic/racial groups (Native American, Two or more races, Native Hawaiian, Asian, Hispanic) in some states (see detail in Table 2), typically in cases of small N.
- Only New Hampshire and TX had a percentage increase in enrollment for African American candidates.

With few exceptions most states (edTPA and comparison non-edTPA) reported decreases in ethnic/racial group enrollment over time. For five ethnic groups, the average decrease in enrollment was smaller for edTPA states (American Indian, Native Hawaiian, white, Two or more races, and Hispanic). Non edTPA states had a smaller decrease in enrollment for Asian candidates (edTPA average = - 20.56%, non edTPA average = -12.36%) and a negligible difference for African American candidates (edTPA average = -33.23%, non edTPA average = -32.03%).

Table 2: Enrollment change by race/ethnicity for ten states with edTPA policy and ten states without edTPA policy

Race/Ethnicity	Enrollment Change (2010-2016) edTPA Policy	Enrollment Change (2010-2016) No edTPA Policy
American Indian or Alaska Native edTPA state Range for Change in Enrollment: -8.64% (WA) to -64.20% (IL) edTPA state average percentage change: -39.24% Non edTPA Range for Change in Enrollment: -14.71% (MA) to -75.60% (NM) (NH excluded)	AL -27.59%	AZ -69.09%
	CA -40.00%	FL -50.00%
	GA -33.33%	KS -40.66%
	IL -64.20%	MA -14.71%
	MN -30.77%	MI -64.71%
	NJ -58.62%	MO -41.89%
	NY -37.50%	NH +500.00%****
	TN -55.88%	NM -75.60%

	<p>Non edTPA Average percentage change: -50.87% (with NH excluded)</p> <p>Note: 1) NH is not included in the average percentage change. NH is an extreme outlier (500% increase is from 2 students to 12)</p>	<p>WA -8.64%</p> <p>WI -35.87%</p>	<p>PA -67.07%</p> <p>TX -34.08%</p>
	<p>Asian</p> <p>edTPA state Range for Change in Enrollment: -50.00% (IL) to +1.58% (MN)</p> <p>edTPA state average percentage change: -20.56</p> <p>Non edTPA Range for Change in Enrollment: -54.20% (MI) to +15.12% (FL); NH excluded</p> <p>Non edTPA state average percentage change: -12.36 (NH included for this group)</p> <p>Note: 1) NH's large positive percentage change is based on an increase of 13 candidates (from 15 to 28) and influences the average percentage change disproportionately.</p>	<p>AL -13.79%</p> <p>CA -39.89%</p> <p>GA -12.92%</p> <p>IL -50.00%</p> <p>MN +1.58%*</p> <p>NJ -30.02%</p> <p>NY -13.55%</p> <p>TN -18.26%</p> <p>WA -22.60%</p> <p>WI -6.10%</p>	<p>AZ -48.26%</p> <p>FL +15.12%**</p> <p>KS -7.41%</p> <p>MA -17.38%</p> <p>MI -54.20%</p> <p>MO -41.84%</p> <p>NH +86.67%***</p> <p>NM -41.33%</p> <p>PA -25.83%</p> <p>TX +10.84%**</p>
	<p>Black or African American</p> <p>edTPA state Range for Change in Enrollment: -6.43% (MN) to 65.25% (IL)</p> <p>edTPA state average percentage change: -33.23%</p>	<p>AL -36.81%</p> <p>CA -42.12%</p> <p>GA -27.22%</p> <p>IL -65.25%</p> <p>MN -6.43%</p>	<p>AZ -65.94%</p> <p>FL -3.87%</p> <p>KS -33.48%</p> <p>MA -23.95%</p> <p>MI -73.45%</p>

	<p>Non edTPA Range for Change in Enrollment: -73.45% (MI) to +48.82% (TX) Non edTPA state average percentage change: -32.03%</p> <p>Notes: 1) NH is not included in the average percentage change. NH is an extreme outlier (200% increase is from 14 students to 42) 2) The TX increase of 48.82% is based on a huge number of enrolled African American candidates in 2015-16 (8609) compared to other years with around 5000.</p>	<p>NJ -40.68%</p> <p>NY -23.08%</p> <p>TN -51.16%</p> <p>WA -11.54%</p> <p>WI -28.02%</p>	<p>MO -60.35%</p> <p>NH +200.00%****</p> <p>NM -24.74%</p> <p>PA -51.32%</p> <p>TX +48.82%**</p>
	<p>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</p> <p>edTPA state Range for Change in Enrollment: +85.71%(WI) to -45.63% (CA) edTPA state average percentage change: -4.08%</p> <p>Non edTPA Range for Change in Enrollment: +200% (FL) to -50.00% (MI and NH) Non edTPA state average percentage change: -17.94%</p> <p>Notes: 1) MN's 60% increase represents a change from 5 to 8 candidates. 2) MA's 123% increase represents a change from 13 to 29 candidates. 3) WI's 85.71% increase represents a change from</p>	<p>AL +9.09%*</p> <p>CA -45.63%</p> <p>GA -15.38%</p> <p>IL -38.30%</p> <p>MN +60.00%**</p> <p>NJ -12.0%</p> <p>NY -30.11%</p> <p>TN -37.50%</p> <p>WA -16.67%</p> <p>WI +85.71%**</p>	<p>AZ -25.42%</p> <p>FL +200.00%****</p> <p>KS -89.71%</p> <p>MA +123.08%****</p> <p>MI -50.0%</p> <p>MO -57.14%</p> <p>NH -50.00%</p> <p>NM +20.00%**</p> <p>PA -42.11%</p> <p>TX +9.88%*</p>

	<p>7 to 13 candidates 4) FL is not included in the average percentage change. FL is an extreme outlier (200% increase is from 14 students to 42)</p>		
	<p>White edTPA state Range for Change in Enrollment: -9.54 (WA) to -62.78% (IL) edTPA state average percentage change: -38.03% Non edTPA Range for Change in Enrollment: -2.28% (NH) to -65.15% (NM) Non edTPA state average percentage change: -39.39%</p>	<p>AL -31.04% CA -43.87% GA -18.35% IL -62.78% MN -20.43% NJ -52.01% NY -54.58% TN -53.49% WA -9.54% WI -34.21%</p>	<p>AZ -59.44% FL -12.89% KS -33.64% MA -35.54% MI -56.10% MO -44.85% NH -2.28% NM -63.15% PA -65.06% TX -20.93%</p>
	<p>Two or More or Races edTPA state Range for Change in Enrollment: -25.49% (IL) to +107.48% (WA) edTPA state average percentage change: +31.88% Non edTPA Range for Change in Enrollment: -49.86% (MI) to 109.38% (FL) Non edTPA state average percentage change: +18.91% Notes: 1) NH is not included in the average percentage change. NH is an extreme outlier (262.50% increase is from 8 students to 29)</p>	<p>AL +61.54%*** CA +12.50%** GA +42.11%*** IL -25.49% MN +50.00%** NJ -24.66% NY +99.63%*** TN -12.69% WA</p>	<p>AZ +98.0%** FL +109.38%*** KS +21.47%** MA +56.02*** MI -49.86% MO -29.86% NH +262.50%**** NM -26.32% PA -13.62% TX +4.99%*</p>

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="527 191 993 321"></td> <td data-bbox="993 191 1198 321">+107.48%****</td> <td data-bbox="1198 191 1404 321"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="527 321 993 1087"> <p>Hispanic/Latino of Any Race</p> <p>edTPA state Range for Change in Enrollment: -32.92% (NJ) to +29.64% (GA) edTPA state average percentage change: -3.56%</p> <p>Non edTPA Range for Change in Enrollment: -46.88% (MI) to +60.00% (NH) Non edTPA state average percentage change: -13.34%</p> </td> <td data-bbox="993 321 1198 1087"> <p>WI +8.33%*</p> <p>AL -1.39%</p> <p>CA -15.71%</p> <p>GA +29.64%**</p> <p>IL -4.84%</p> <p>MN -4.84%</p> <p>NJ -32.92%</p> <p>NY -6.87%</p> <p>TN -10.58%**</p> <p>WA +11.88%**</p> <p>WI +/-0.00%</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1198 321 1404 1087"> <p>AZ +8.58%*</p> <p>FL +6.13%*</p> <p>KS -7.06%</p> <p>MA +6.73%*</p> <p>MI -46.88%</p> <p>MO -35.66%</p> <p>NH +60.00%***</p> <p>NM -73.79%</p> <p>PA -44.50%</p> <p>TX -7.02%</p> </td> </tr> </table> <p>Note: As previously noted, comprehensive statistical analyses are needed to identify any trends or patterns across all 50 states.</p>		+107.48%****		<p>Hispanic/Latino of Any Race</p> <p>edTPA state Range for Change in Enrollment: -32.92% (NJ) to +29.64% (GA) edTPA state average percentage change: -3.56%</p> <p>Non edTPA Range for Change in Enrollment: -46.88% (MI) to +60.00% (NH) Non edTPA state average percentage change: -13.34%</p>	<p>WI +8.33%*</p> <p>AL -1.39%</p> <p>CA -15.71%</p> <p>GA +29.64%**</p> <p>IL -4.84%</p> <p>MN -4.84%</p> <p>NJ -32.92%</p> <p>NY -6.87%</p> <p>TN -10.58%**</p> <p>WA +11.88%**</p> <p>WI +/-0.00%</p>	<p>AZ +8.58%*</p> <p>FL +6.13%*</p> <p>KS -7.06%</p> <p>MA +6.73%*</p> <p>MI -46.88%</p> <p>MO -35.66%</p> <p>NH +60.00%***</p> <p>NM -73.79%</p> <p>PA -44.50%</p> <p>TX -7.02%</p>
	+107.48%****						
<p>Hispanic/Latino of Any Race</p> <p>edTPA state Range for Change in Enrollment: -32.92% (NJ) to +29.64% (GA) edTPA state average percentage change: -3.56%</p> <p>Non edTPA Range for Change in Enrollment: -46.88% (MI) to +60.00% (NH) Non edTPA state average percentage change: -13.34%</p>	<p>WI +8.33%*</p> <p>AL -1.39%</p> <p>CA -15.71%</p> <p>GA +29.64%**</p> <p>IL -4.84%</p> <p>MN -4.84%</p> <p>NJ -32.92%</p> <p>NY -6.87%</p> <p>TN -10.58%**</p> <p>WA +11.88%**</p> <p>WI +/-0.00%</p>	<p>AZ +8.58%*</p> <p>FL +6.13%*</p> <p>KS -7.06%</p> <p>MA +6.73%*</p> <p>MI -46.88%</p> <p>MO -35.66%</p> <p>NH +60.00%***</p> <p>NM -73.79%</p> <p>PA -44.50%</p> <p>TX -7.02%</p>					
<p>4. How do videos provide authentic artifacts for edTPA?</p>	<p>For decades, EPPs have used video recordings to provide candidates with feedback and video-based assignments to support candidates' reflection, goal setting, and analysis of teaching. Teacher performance assessments use this long-standing practice as a source of authentic evidence of real teaching with real students in real classrooms.</p> <p>To that end, candidates' video(s) are an integral component of edTPA as they must demonstrate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that the learning environment the teacher candidate creates not only supports students in learning but also challenges them to learn at a deeper level. • how the candidate engages students in learning activities or tasks (e.g., an assignment, a discussion) that require the students to do more than just participate. In other words, they need to be actively engaged, using higher-level thinking skills so that they are developing their conceptual understanding of the content and related academic language. 						

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how the candidate elicits and builds upon student responses to monitor student learning during and related to the central focus and learning objectives. Candidates draw upon interactions in the video to highlight how the candidate prompts, listens to students, and responds in such a way that the candidate is providing feedback and supporting them to build on their new learning.
<p>5. How well does edTPA align with the Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System (T-TESS)?</p>	<p>TEA has reviewed the edTPA constructs and T-TESS standards. Reviewers found there to be partial to full alignment between the two sets of standards on all rubrics, with the exception of T-TESS rubric 4, which measures the professional responsibilities of an in-service teacher.</p>
<p>6. Has there been a consideration for allowing Texas EPPs to develop their own performance-based assessment?</p>	<p>TEA recommends the use of an already-developed assessment because of the comprehensive nature of edTPA and the support resources and structures that are currently offered by SCALE, Pearson, and AACTE. The quality of edTPA as well as the provided support will allow resources at the agency and preparation programs to be used toward building out effective instructional practices. Additionally, the adoption of an instrument that has been iteratively developed in other settings and that can be adapted for the Texas context will allow a less expensive and more expedient implementation.</p> <p>edTPA serves as an objective, uniform, independent, and empirical measure of candidate knowledge and skills, which verifies job-related competence and ability to teach in accordance with state-approved teaching standards, in support of the issuance of certification into the profession.</p>
<p>7. What resources are available to support programs in the implementation of edTPA?</p>	<p>Programs (faculty and candidates) are encouraged to review each of the edTPA tasks and ask the question: "Does this task represent authentic and important skills worth teaching to"? Hundreds of teacher educators and teachers have done this exercise as a form of curriculum inquiry and determined how edTPA is aligned with program mission, values and curriculum and what it does not measure. When programs are engaged in discussing edTPA in a multiple measures assessment system that authentically addresses effective teaching, then edTPA can be integrated seamlessly into foundational and methods courses and clinical practice.</p> <p>Resources Provided to the EPP Community edTPA resources include nearly 200 support items downloaded more than 1,000,000 times by the 9,000 teacher educators in the edTPA</p>

	<p>professional community at edTPA.aacte.org. Further, the edTPA National Academy members (75 EPP faculty with extensive edTPA experience) have provided about 200 workshops across more than a dozen states. These resources are intended to move away from compliance-based approaches to inquiry-based uses of edTPA.</p> <p>For example, resources include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● curriculum inquiry protocols, ● guides for examining and providing feedback on formative assignments leading up to edTPA, and ● individualized growth plans informing ongoing professional development during induction. <p>These tools support EPPs to examine edTPA as building blocks for program coherence, communicate with P–12 partners, and engage in reflective practice that improves teacher preparation.</p>
<p>8. Are candidates' edTPA scores affected by their ability to write?</p>	<p>edTPA is designed as an assessment of pedagogy and not writing skill; scorers are trained and monitored to ensure that writing quality does not bias a scoring decision. edTPA is an assessment of reflection on practice—it's about the evidence candidates provide. Long, elaborate prose is not required. Candidates can use bullet points to identify evidence and to justify their decisions in reflective commentaries.</p>
<p>9. How were the edTPA handbooks developed and aligned with standards for specific subjects?</p>	<p>edTPA was developed by subject-specific faculty design teams and staff at the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity (SCALE). An extensive, multi-year development process involved hundreds of teachers and teacher educators in the assessment's design, review, piloting, and field tests, which generated substantial technical data to support the use and interpretations of edTPA, and meeting or exceeding the standards for licensure assessment put forward by APA, AERA, and NCME (2014) in the <i>Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing</i>. The empirical and evidence-based research on which the development of edTPA was based is detailed in the edTPA Review of Research on Teacher Education and various technical reports vetted by a technical advisory committee of nationally and internationally renowned psychometricians and educational experts.</p> <p>The 15 job-related, high leverage teaching behaviors measured by edTPA are all research-based (refer to the edTPA Review of Research on Teacher Education for more information). These behaviors were determined following more than 25 years of research in the field and experience developing performance-based assessments of teaching.</p>

	<p>Early validity studies for edTPA handbooks included a comprehensive content validation process that examined edTPA prompts and rubrics in reference to state and national standards for teaching, and national standards for student content learning. A job analysis examined the extent to which what edTPA measures is important to the job of teachers. Further, the rubrics and handbooks were field tested after the results of the validity studies affirmed that edTPA was measuring important aspects of teaching and learning.</p> <p>Aligned to the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills Before candidates begin developing their edTPA teaching portfolios within their clinical experience, they are encouraged to identify their handbook's subject-specific focus. Then, candidates are asked to develop a central focus for their learning segment (i.e., 3–5 days of instruction). A central focus is a description of the important understandings and core concepts candidates want students to develop within the learning segment. The central focus should go beyond a list of facts and skills, align with content standards (e.g., TEKS) and learning objectives, and address subject-specific components in the learning segment.</p>
<p>10. How were the edTPA Visual Arts and Performing Arts Handbooks developed?</p>	<p>edTPA Visual Arts Handbook: Design Design Team members were chosen for their expertise and experience in the field of visual arts. Since states often vary in their standards, the Design Team was instructed to align with a national set of student content standards for the field of visual arts. They were instructed to choose a subject-specific focus for the learning segment (3–5 lessons) that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● represented key themes in the student content standards which would be expected to be addressed in any learning segment, ● included higher-order thinking skills, and ● was applicable to a broad variety of topics in the field. <p>edTPA Visual Arts Handbook: Subject-Specific Focus For candidates completing the Visual Arts Handbook, their learning segments should reflect a broad view toward creating, presenting, or responding to visual art that incorporates at least one of the following components while providing opportunities for student choice (of content, methods, or styles):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● interpreting art (analyzing art-making approaches, theories, art forms, genres, etc., used to convey meaning) ● developing works of art/design (using techniques, methods of experimentation, or investigation) ● relating art to context (personal, social, cultural, or historical perspectives)

	<p>edTPA Performing Arts Handbook: Design The same processes were conducted as described above when designing the edTPA Performing Arts Handbook, with the exception that Design Team members were chosen for their expertise and experience in the field of performing arts. More specifically, the Design Team members represented the sub-fields of dance education, music education (i.e., choral and instrumental), and theatre education as candidates completing educator preparation programs within one of these sub-fields complete the edTPA Performing Arts Handbook.</p> <p>edTPA Performing Arts Handbook: Subject-Specific Focus For candidates completing the Performing Arts Handbook, their learning segments should include learning tasks that support students to create, perform, or respond to music/dance/theater by applying</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● artistic skills (e.g., self-expression, creativity, exploration/improvisation), ● knowledge (e.g., tools/instruments, technical proficiencies, processes, elements, organizational principles), and ● contextual understandings (e.g., social, cultural, historical, global, and personal reflections).
<p>11. What is the purpose of academic language in edTPA?</p>	<p>Academic language is the "language of the discipline" used to engage students in learning and includes the means by which students develop and express content understandings. It includes the oral and written language and visual representations used for academic purposes.</p> <p>Plans for language development in edTPA should address how candidates support linguistically diverse learners to be able to understand and use academic language. Language demands include the oral, visual, and written language that students need to understand and use to complete learning tasks successfully within the learning segment.</p> <p>Academic language demands are embedded in instructional activities, and candidates may take them for granted, especially when they are subject-matter experts. It is therefore important for candidates to examine learning tasks and consider what language students need to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● understand (what will they need to read, listen to, think about); ● communicate (what will they need to speak about, write about, connect to); and ● perform (what will they need to sing, play, demonstrate, express, read, create, and expectations for acceptable forms).

<p>12. Who are the edTPA partners, and how is Pearson involved?</p>	<p>edTPA Partnership is comprised of the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity (SCALE), American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), and Pearson. The roles for each partner are described below.</p> <p>Stanford's SCALE (Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity) is the developer, and Stanford University owns the intellectual property rights to edTPA. SCALE partners with Pearson to administer the assessment.</p> <p>Role of SCALE Stanford University faculty and staff at SCALE developed edTPA. They received substantive advice and feedback from teachers and teacher educators and drew on more than 25 years of experience in developing performance-based assessments including the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Standards and the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). A design team of teacher educators has informed the work since 2009 and individual subject-specific design teams were convened to develop the handbooks for each of the 27 teaching fields. Design team members included subject-matter organization representatives from higher education and P-12.</p> <p>As the lead in development, Stanford University owns the intellectual property rights and trademark for edTPA. SCALE is responsible for all edTPA development including candidate handbooks, scoring rubrics, and the scoring training design, curriculum and materials (including benchmarks). SCALE also develops and vets implementation support materials provided in the Resource Library (available at edtpa.aacte.org) and through the National Academy.</p> <p>Role of American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) As a national edTPA implementation partner, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is strengthening the edTPA professional learning community by supporting communications, implementation, professional development and online resources to help all programs prepare teachers who are ready to educate each and every child.</p> <p>AACTE believes that edTPA will help give the public and educators confidence that teacher candidates are graduating ready to be effective teachers from Day 1. AACTE is a national partner because it believes that edTPA is an innovation that will improve teacher preparation and student performance. For the first time, the field has an agreed-upon set of principles to define effective teaching.</p>
--	---

	<p>Role of Pearson Stanford University engaged Pearson as an operational partner to make edTPA available to meet demand among a wide educational audience. As the operational partner, Pearson provides management support required for multistate use of the edTPA program, including providing the systems infrastructure that facilitates the administration of the assessment for submission, scoring, and reporting.</p>
<p>13. What states are currently using edTPA and what is their level of implementation?</p>	<p>Currently, there are 849 educator preparation programs in 41 states and the District of Columbia participating in edTPA. Results of edTPA are used for state licensure, for program completion decisions by institutions, or as part of institutional accreditation.</p> <p>There are currently 19 states that have policy either requiring or allowing edTPA as a requirement for either program completion or licensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alabama • Delaware • Iowa • North Carolina • Washington • Arkansas • Georgia • Minnesota • Oregon • West Virginia • California • Hawaii • New Jersey • South Carolina • Wisconsin • Connecticut • Illinois • New York • Tennessee <p>The remaining 22 states are taking steps toward edTPA implementation or have one or more educator preparation programs using edTPA.</p> <p>edTPA implementation is a multi-year process that engages the educator community in meaningful discussion around teacher education, teacher licensure, and impact to student learning. Actionable data from edTPA performance further supports states, EPPs, and teacher candidates to make informed decisions about important teacher preparation strategies, coursework, and policies.</p> <p>Since the operational start of edTPA in fall 2013, states and EPPs nationwide have implemented and strongly support the use of edTPA for various educative and certification purposes. During the time of edTPA transition, education stakeholders in a state may pose important considerations regarding the design, purpose, and support of edTPA.</p> <p>edTPA partners led by SCALE continue to provide prompt and thorough information to engage the educator community about the research basis, technical qualities, and support mechanisms around edTPA. For these reasons, edTPA is explicitly designed as a support and assessment system with hundreds of resources to support an educative experience for candidates, inquiry-based implementation for program faculty, and participation in a professional network with teacher educators across the country.</p>

	<p>For example, the State of Illinois implemented edTPA in 2015. Since then the state and its educator preparation community have been deeply engaged in the educative process around edTPA. The successful implementation of edTPA in Illinois involves considerations from the field that are important to address to clarify the facts, role, and impact of edTPA as an empirical, objective measure of teacher readiness. In Illinois, a recent non-binding (i.e., not legislation) House Resolution passed that encouraged removal of edTPA as a licensure assessment based on claims that are not reflective of the purpose, goals, and implementation of the edTPA. The Illinois State Board of Education will discuss this topic later this month.</p>
<p>14. How can programs prepare candidates for edTPA and maintain their distinctive preparation models?</p>	<p>Within the edTPA implementation process, faculty are engaged about what edTPA intends to measure; how to engage with and interact with the assessment as one key measure of effective beginning teaching practice; and how this work relates to their own EPP mission and values.</p> <p>Strong EPPs are already preparing candidates for what edTPA measures—inquiry helps faculty see those connections, and identify any potential gaps, challenges, and opportunities in their EPP that they wish to address.</p> <p>Unique among externally delivered high stakes assessments, SCALE and AACTE provide support to use edTPA resources as an opportunity for inquiry and educative implementation. Support includes a National Academy of experts who have led edTPA implementation in their own EPPs and demonstrated expertise in supporting candidates without "teaching to the test." SCALE recommends trusting the quality of the program and integrating edTPA as appropriate within the authentic context of program preparation.</p>
<p>15. How will edTPA affect programs' formative assessments?</p>	<p>edTPA is intended to be a summative, capstone assessment with formative elements that are embedded in a multiple measures system that maintains local processes for ongoing monitoring, feedback, and growth for candidates. edTPA is not designed to replace the high-quality formative assessment, assignments, clinical supervision, and evaluation carried out by programs.</p>
<p>16. What is the role of the mentor teacher during the edTPA process?</p>	<p>Mentor teachers will continue to offer support for excellent teaching. Teacher candidates going through edTPA, however, may need the mentor teacher's input about the context and background of the students in the mentor teacher's classroom early in the process so that they can learn to plan instruction based on specific student strengths and needs.</p>

	<p>Also, mentor teachers may find that candidates want to spend more time reflecting on their instruction and lessons in preparation for the written commentaries they must submit.</p>
<p>17. Who scores edTPA?</p>	<p>All edTPA portfolio submissions are scored by officially trained edTPA scorers. Over 3,000 teachers and teacher educators serve as scorer trainers, supervisors, or scorers. Scorers must be P–12 teachers or EPP teacher educators with significant pedagogical content knowledge in the field in which they score (e.g., NBPTS teachers), as well as with experience working as instructors or mentors for novice teachers.</p> <p>The criteria for selecting and training scorers are rigorous and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● expertise in the subject matter and developmental level of the teaching field (degree and professional experience) ● teaching experience in the field (or experience teaching methods courses or supervising candidates in that field) ● experience mentoring or supervising beginning teachers or administering programs that prepare them ● verification that the qualifications above are recent (within the past 5 years). All scorer training is designed by SCALE.
<p>18. What is Pearson's role in scoring?</p>	<p>Pearson provides the necessary technical infrastructure to distribute, collect, and manage scoring.</p>
<p>19. What are the candidate's ethical responsibilities when completing edTPA?</p>	<p>Although candidates may seek and receive appropriate support from supervisors, cooperating/master teachers, instructors, or peers during the edTPA drafting process, the ultimate responsibility for completing this assessment lies with the candidate.</p> <p>In each of the edTPA handbooks, the responsibilities are listed for candidates to review prior to beginning the drafting process of edTPA. When candidates submit completed work, they must be able to confirm their adherence with certain statements, such as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I have primary responsibility for teaching the students/class during the learning segment profiled in this assessment. ● I have not previously taught this learning segment to the students/class. ● The video clips submitted are unedited (continuous) and show me teaching the students/class profiled in the evidence submitted.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The student work included in the documentation is that of my students, completed during the learning segment documented in this assessment. ● I am the author of the commentaries and other written responses to prompts in this assessment. ● Appropriate citations have been made for all materials in the assessment whose sources are from published text, the Internet, or other educators.
<p>20. Is providing feedback appropriate during the edTPA drafting process?</p>	<p>edTPA is a subject-specific portfolio-based assessment of teaching performance, completed during a preparation program within a clinical field experience. edTPA is designed to assess a teacher candidate's readiness to teach. The document edTPA Guidelines for Acceptable Candidate Support outlines guidelines for supporting candidates during their completion of edTPA. These guidelines apply to all edTPA support—including faculty, supervisors, cooperating teachers, peers, and other support providers (e.g., a writing center or tutor).</p> <p>Specific to providing feedback throughout the edTPA drafting process, some examples of appropriate support are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● answering common questions in a group setting ● paraphrasing or answering questions about the content of a handbook prompt, rubric, direction, or support document to clarify what the prompt or direction is requesting ● asking probing questions about candidates' draft edTPA responses or video recordings, without providing direct edits of the candidate's writing or providing candidates with specific answers to edTPA prompts ● providing references to relevant articles or sections of a text to address questions about effective teaching strategies ● flagging instances where identifying information (e.g., student's name) still needs to be removed from an edTPA draft to ensure confidentiality
<p>21. How can edTPA data be used?</p>	<p>Teacher educators from a variety of contexts have successfully integrated edTPA in their preparation programs and value the ways in which edTPA can be educative to candidates and provide actionable evidence to programs.</p> <p>Accessing and Analyzing Data EPPs participating in edTPA have access to official edTPA data through an interactive reporting platform used to analyze candidate and program performance. Data include candidate, program, and</p>

	<p>state outcomes, as well as aggregate performance across edTPA handbooks, tasks, and rubrics.</p> <p>EPPs can explore aggregated edTPA data performance trends, as well as content and program-specific data views, and generate customized reports to analyze assessment data and to inform ongoing program renewal, review, and accreditation needs. For example, EPPs can</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● create relevant and timely reports on candidate and program-level assessment results;● customize data queries to align with program-specific goals and areas of interest;● aggregate performance data across time periods of interest, such as program years or semesters;● explore various data overlays and filters to gather and share data sets that are targeted to program-specific goals;● analyze candidate and program-level data for numerous variables (including self-reported demographic data, such as gender and ethnicity); and● export data to Microsoft Excel for use in other data reporting systems. <p>EPPs may wish to set aside time for ongoing content and program-specific data discussions to anchor program improvement or curriculum planning with evidence of candidate performance. Programs are encouraged to do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Use performance data to inform data retreats and other faculty forums for feedback and discussion across the entire unit or with smaller groups of faculty to examine program-specific data.● Discover connections between curriculum and coursework content and candidate performance on edTPA.● Examine a variety of quantitative data—including candidate scores and overall assessment scores, as well as trends at the rubric and task levels—which may be combined with other qualitative data collected by programs, such as candidate surveys and P–12 engagement data; and examine candidate edTPA artifacts and commentaries.● Conduct conversations framed around key reflective questions related to candidate understanding of the knowledge and skills necessary for successful teaching assessed by edTPA, with implications for program planning.
--	--

	<p>How Teacher Candidates Can Use edTPA Data The five-level scale used for edTPA rubrics represents a continuum of practice from not quite ready to teach (i.e., level 1) to advanced beginning teacher (i.e., level 5), and each rubric progression shows an expanding repertoire of skills and strategies for teaching and a deepening rationale. With guidance from cooperating teachers and program clinical supervisors, candidates are encouraged to use varied sources of evidence, including edTPA data, collected within their clinical experiences to reflect on and analyze their teaching effectiveness. By synthesizing varied sources of evidence, candidates can complete the edTPA Professional Growth Plan (PGP) to help inform the development of their professional learning goals for their induction years of teaching.</p> <p>How School Personnel (e.g., School Administrators and Hiring Managers) Can Use edTPA Data edTPA is intended to be used as a summative assessment given at the end of an educator preparation program for program completion or teacher licensure and to support state and national program accreditation. However, edTPA score results can be used formatively to assist administrators and in-service teachers with the reflective goal-setting process required for professional development.</p>
<p>22. What is the process for edTPA retake during the pilot period?</p>	<p>TEA staff are proposing rule text at the April 26, 2019, SBEC meeting that will apply the 45-day wait between test attempts to only computer- or paper-based exams.</p> <p>Attempts during the pilot period will not count toward the five-time test limit for the candidates, but candidates will be required to submit complete portfolios.</p> <p>Successful completion of a portfolio is defined as a scorable portfolio which includes receiving no more than one condition code per task (<i>edTPA Submission Requirements and Condition Codes</i> is accessible at edTPA.com). If a candidate receives an unscorable portfolio, they may choose to retake an edTPA task(s) in the subsequent submission window (as soon as within 14 days) or take the EC-12 PPR assessment.</p> <p>There are 19 submission windows throughout the 2018–2019 academic year; the turnaround time for scoring is three weeks.</p>
<p>23. Are edTPA results predictive of positive outcomes?</p>	<p>The following describes research studies associated with the predictive validity of edTPA.</p> <p>Washington A study by Goldhaber, Cowan, and Theobald (2017) used teacher candidates' scores on edTPA (from the field test and first operational</p>

	<p>year) to provide estimates of the extent to which edTPA performance is predictive of the likelihood of employment in the teacher workforce and value-added measures of teacher effectiveness. They found that edTPA scores were predictive of employment in the state's public teaching workforce, and evidence on the relationship between edTPA scores and teaching effectiveness was more mixed. "Specifically, continuous edTPA scores are a significant predictor of student mathematics achievement in some specifications, but when we consider that the edTPA is a binary screen of teaching effectiveness (i.e., pass/fail), passing edTPA was significantly predictive of teacher effectiveness in reading but not in mathematics." These results are consistent with value-added model (VAM) studies conducted on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Washington's ProTeach, and PACT.</p> <p>North Carolina EPIC (Education Policy Initiative at Carolina) has also produced a policy brief summarizing edTPA implementation in North Carolina, detailing how UNC system candidates are scoring on edTPA, and assessing the construct validity and predictive validity of officially evaluated portfolios. These predictive validity analyses focus on the 2013–14 graduating cohort of one UNC system institution who went on to be first-year teachers in the 2014–15 school year. Importantly, these predictive validity analyses focus on first-year teachers' value-added estimates and evaluation ratings. Overall, these predictive validity results show that edTPA measures significantly predict first-year teacher performance.</p>
--	--

ATTACHMENT IX
Sample Secondary Mathematics edTPA Tasks and Rubrics



Task 1: Planning for Instruction and Assessment

Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning

edTPA Commentary Prompts - Commentaries are the candidates' opportunity to describe their artifacts, explain the rationale behind their choices, and analyze what they have learned about their teaching practice and their students' learning.

edTPA Secondary Mathematics Assessment Handbook

Task 1 Commentary Prompt 2 – Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching

2. Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching

For each of the prompts below (2a–c), describe what you know about **your** students **with respect to the central focus** of the learning segment.

Consider the variety of learners in your class who may require different strategies/support (e.g., students with IEPs or 504 plans, English language learners, struggling readers, underperforming students or those with gaps in academic knowledge, and/or gifted students).

- a. Prior academic learning and prerequisite skills related to the central focus—**Cite evidence of what students know, what they can do, and what they are still learning to do.**
- b. Personal, cultural, and community assets related to the central focus—**What do you know about your students' everyday experiences, cultural and language backgrounds and practices, and interests?**
- c. Mathematical dispositions—What do you know about the extent to which your students
 - perceive mathematics as “sensible, useful, and worthwhile”¹
 - persist in applying mathematics to solve problems
 - believe in their own ability to learn mathematics

Copyright © 2018 Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. All rights reserved.

edTPA Secondary Mathematics Assessment Handbook

Task 1 Commentary Prompt 3 – Supporting Students' Learning

3. Supporting Students' Mathematics Learning

Respond to prompts below (3a–c). To support your justifications, refer to the instructional materials and lesson plans you have included as part of Planning Task 1. In addition, **use principles from research and/or theory to support your justifications.**

- a. Justify how your understanding of your students' prior academic learning; personal, cultural, and community assets; and mathematical dispositions (from prompts 2a–c above) guided your choice or adaptation of learning tasks and materials. Be explicit about the connections between the learning tasks and students' prior academic learning, their assets, their mathematical dispositions, and research/theory.
- b. Describe and justify why your instructional strategies and planned supports are appropriate for **the whole class, individuals, and/or groups of students with specific learning needs.**

Consider the variety of learners in your class who may require different strategies/support (e.g., students with IEPs or 504 plans, English language learners, struggling readers, underperforming students or those with gaps in academic knowledge, and/or gifted students).

- c. Describe common mathematical preconceptions, errors, or misunderstandings within your central focus and how you will address them.

Copyright © 2018 Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. All rights reserved.



Task 1: Planning for Instruction and Assessment

Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning

edTPA rubric - Subject-specific evaluation criteria used to score performance on edTPA. These rubrics are included in the handbook following the directions for each task. The descriptors in the five-level rubrics address a wide range of performance, beginning with the knowledge and skills of a novice not ready to teach (Level 1) and extending to the advanced practices of a highly accomplished beginner (Level 5).

edTPA Secondary Mathematics Assessment Handbook

Task 1 Rubric 2: Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs

The Guiding Question addresses how the candidate plans to support students in relationship to students' characteristics. This includes using the candidate's understanding of students to develop, choose, or adapt instructional strategies, learning tasks and materials.

Planning Rubrics continued				
Rubric 2: Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs				
How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to target support for students to develop conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, AND mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills?				
Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
There is no evidence of planned supports. OR Candidate does not attend to ANY INSTRUCTIONAL requirements in IEPs and 504 plans.	Planned supports are loosely tied to learning objectives or the central focus of the learning segment.	Planned supports are tied to learning objectives and the central focus with attention to the characteristics of the class as a whole.	Planned supports are tied to learning objectives and the central focus. Supports address the needs of specific individuals or groups with similar needs.	Level 4 plus: Supports include specific strategies to identify and respond to preconceptions, common errors, and misunderstandings.

Copyright © 2018 Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. All rights reserved.

edTPA Secondary Mathematics Assessment Handbook

Task 1 Rubric 3: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning

The Guiding Question addresses how the candidate justifies the ways in which learning tasks and materials make content meaningful to students, by drawing upon knowledge of individuals or groups, as well as research or theory.

Planning Rubrics continued

Rubric 3: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning

How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to justify instructional plans?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Candidate's justification of learning tasks is either missing OR represents a deficit view of students and their backgrounds.	Candidate justifies learning tasks with limited attention to students' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • prior academic learning OR • personal, cultural, or community assets. 	Candidate justifies why learning tasks (or their adaptations) are appropriate using examples of students' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • prior academic learning OR • personal, cultural, or community assets. <p>Candidate makes superficial connections to research and/or theory.</p>	Candidate justifies why learning tasks (or their adaptations) are appropriate using examples of students' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • prior academic learning AND • personal, cultural, or community assets. <p>Candidate makes connections to research and/or theory.</p>	Level 4 plus: Candidate's justification is supported by principles from research and/or theory.

Copyright © 2018 Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. All rights reserved.



Task 2: Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning

Deepening Student Learning

For Task 2, the major source of evidence is video clips of instruction. In the Task 2 commentary, candidates identify and explain evidence from the clips

edTPA Commentary Prompts - Commentaries are the candidates' opportunity to describe their artifacts, explain the rationale behind their choices, and analyze what they have learned about their teaching practice and their students' learning.

edTPA Secondary Mathematics Assessment Handbook

Task 2 Commentary Prompt 4a – Deepening Student Learning during Instruction

4. Deepening Student Learning during Instruction

Refer to examples from the video clip(s) in your explanations.

- a. Explain how you **elicited and built on student responses** to promote thinking and develop conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, **AND** mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills.

Copyright © 2018 Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. All rights reserved.



Task 2: Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning

Deepening Student Learning

edTPA rubric - Subject-specific evaluation criteria used to score performance on edTPA. These rubrics are included in the handbook following the directions for each task. The descriptors in the five-level rubrics address a wide range of performance, beginning with the knowledge and skills of a novice not ready to teach (Level 1) and extending to the advanced practices of a highly accomplished beginner (Level 5).

edTPA Secondary Mathematics Assessment Handbook

Task 2 Rubric 8: Deepening Student Learning

The Guiding Question addresses how, in the video clip, the candidate brings forth and builds on student responses to guide learning; this can occur during whole class discussions, small group discussions, or consultations with individual students.

Instruction Rubrics continued				
Rubric 8: Deepening Student Learning				
How does the candidate elicit responses to promote thinking and to develop conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, AND mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills?				
Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Candidate does most of the talking and students provide few responses.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate responses include significant content inaccuracies that will lead to student misunderstandings.</p>	<p>Candidate primarily asks surface-level questions and evaluates student responses as correct or incorrect.</p>	<p>Candidate elicits student responses related to understanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> mathematical concepts, procedures, OR mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills. 	<p>Candidate elicits and builds on students' responses to develop understanding of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> mathematical concepts, procedures, AND mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills. 	<p>Level 4 plus:</p> <p>Candidate facilitates interactions among students so they can evaluate their own abilities to understand and apply</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> mathematical concepts, procedures, AND mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills.

Copyright © 2018 Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. All rights reserved.



Task 3: Assessing Student Learning

Analyzing Student Learning

edTPA Commentary Prompts - Commentaries are the candidates' opportunity to describe their artifacts, explain the rationale behind their choices, and analyze what they have learned about their teaching practice and their students' learning.

edTPA Secondary Mathematics Assessment Handbook Task 3 Commentary Prompt 1 – Analyzing Student Learning

1. Analyzing Student Learning

- a. Identify the specific learning objectives measured by the assessment you chose for analysis.
- b. Provide a graphic (table or chart) or narrative that summarizes student learning for your whole class. Be sure to summarize student learning for all evaluation criteria submitted in Assessment Task 3, Part D.
- c. Use evidence found in the **3 student work samples and the whole class summary** to analyze the patterns of learning **for the whole class** and differences for groups or individual learners relative to
 - conceptual understanding,
 - procedural fluency, **AND**
 - mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills.

Consider what students understand and do well, and where they continue to struggle (e.g., preconceptions, common errors, common struggles, confusions, and/or need for greater challenge).

Copyright © 2018 Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. All rights reserved.



Task 3: Assessing Student Learning

Analyzing Student Learning

edTPA rubric - Subject-specific evaluation criteria used to score performance on edTPA. These rubrics are included in the handbook following the directions for each task. The descriptors in the five-level rubrics address a wide range of performance, beginning with the knowledge and skills of a novice not ready to teach (Level 1) and extending to the advanced practices of a highly accomplished beginner (Level 5).

edTPA Secondary Mathematics Assessment Handbook Task 3 Rubric 11: Analyzing Student Learning

The Guiding Question addresses the candidate's analysis of student work to identify patterns of learning across the class.

Assessment Rubrics				
Rubric 11: Analysis of Student Learning				
How does the candidate analyze evidence of student learning of conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, AND mathematical reasoning and/or problem-solving skills?				
Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>The analysis is superficial or not supported by either student work samples or the summary of student learning.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The evaluation criteria, learning objectives, and/or analysis are not aligned with each other.</p>	<p>The analysis focuses on what students did right OR wrong.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The analysis focuses solely on students' ability to apply procedures and/or their factual knowledge.</p>	<p>The analysis focuses on what students did right AND wrong.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Analysis includes some differences in whole class learning.</p>	<p>Analysis uses specific examples from work samples to demonstrate patterns of learning consistent with the summary.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Patterns of learning are described for whole class.</p>	<p>Analysis uses specific evidence from work samples to demonstrate the connections between quantitative and qualitative patterns of learning for individuals or groups.</p>

Copyright © 2018 Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. All rights reserved.