Teacher Performance Assessment Task Force
Considerations for Commissioner Chester
Meeting Objectives

- Overview of Task Force work and outcomes
- Solicit Commissioner thoughts
- Share ESE internal team thinking
Presentation Overview

★ Section 1: Task Force Description and Work
★ Section 2: Comprehensive Assessment System Overview
★ Section 3: Observation Protocol
★ Section 4: Student Feedback Surveys
★ Section 5: Portfolios
★ Section 6: Simulations
★ Section 7: Next Steps
Task Force Description and Work

Section 1
Task Force Membership

- Angela Allen, Brookline Public Schools
- Ellen Ballock, Gordon College
- Sean Brooks, Boston Public Schools
- Linda Davis-Delano, Springfield College
- Orin Gutlerner, Match Teacher Residency
- Jo Hoffman, Bridgewater State University
- Nathan Jones, Boston University
- Stacy Kaminski, South Coast Educational Collaborative and Southeastern MA Readiness Center
- Nancy Koh, Boston College
- Michelle LeBlanc, Curry College
- Michelle Morrissey, Boston Public Schools
- Vera Ossen, UMass-Lowell
- Christine Powers, UMass-Boston
- Kathie Skinner, MA Teachers Association
- Gabriella White, Nashoba Valley Technical High School

ESE Staff: Heather Peske, Liz Losee, Meagan Comb, and Matthew Deninger
Task Force Charge

Draft recommendations to the Commissioner to implement a pre-service teacher performance assessment. Commissioner has the authority to accept, modify, or reject any recommendations that we make.
Key Meeting Outcomes

- **Meeting 1:** Charge of the task force and preliminary discussions of national assessments
- **Meeting 2:** National assessment presentation from representatives of: TeachingWorks / TEL, edTPA, and Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers (PPAT)
- **Meeting 3:** 1) Recognition, based on “pulse check,” little consensus, 2) pros and cons of each national assessment, 3) identify essential questions, e.g. should local scoring be part of equation
- **Meeting 4:** Based on “straw man” poll, task force for members signaled support for a multiple component system and adopting/adapting edTPA
- **Meeting 5:** Drafting of considerations and feedback for Commissioner
- **Meeting 6:** Finalized task force considerations in PowerPoint slides and notes
Comprehensive Assessment System Overview

Section 2
Key Elements of Instrument

- Provides formative data for program
- Aligned to Massachusetts Professional Standards for Teachers
- Has predictive validity
- Provides summative rating for candidate
- Local context considered/solicited
- Measures impact of student learning during practicum (e.g., pre/post during practicum)
- Psychometric properties (reliability, validity, bias)
- Alignment to Teacher Evaluation Framework
- Clear & specific developmental rubrics / scoring tools
Key Elements of Implementation

★ Data/Rating return is timely (no more than 6 weeks)
★ Ensures licensure reciprocity
★ Keeps cost low for candidates (no more than $300)
★ Local scoring is an available option
★ Attach stakes to the assessment
  ★ For candidates - program completion
  ★ For Programs - One of many indicators of program effectiveness in program review
★ Importance of training scorers
★ Weighting of components within the larger assessment system
Recommendation: A multiple measure assessment system

Which may include…

★ Observation Protocol

★ Portfolio

★ Student feedback survey data on teacher candidates

★ Simulations
Observation Protocols

⭐ Recommendation to convene educators around developing/selecting a protocol and training of observers

⭐ Observations:
  ⭐ Locally conducted and calibrated
  ⭐ Aligned to educator evaluation
  ⭐ Programs could supplement

⭐ Implementation considerations:
  ⭐ Solicit observation protocols from prep programs and districts
  ⭐ Non-standardized (little/no observer calibration, other than on the protocol itself)
  ⭐ Considered as part of program approval
Student Feedback Surveys

Section 4
Student Feedback Surveys

★ Student surveys:
★ Standardized questions
★ Non-standardized “cut scores”
★ Aligned to educator evaluation
★ Last component to roll out
Portfolios

Section 5
Portfolios

★ Portfolio assessment
★ National, standardized
  ★ edTPA
  ★ PPAT
★ Scored at program level, non-standardized
  ★ Scorers would need to be calibrated

★ N.B. Most candidates must complete a portfolio to pass through their program, but it is not a state requirement, nor is it standardized
Portfolio – edTPA (pros)

- Cross-state comparison
- First opportunity to learn about predictive validity
- Mirrors National Board Certification (NBC)
- Might encourage more to go for NBC
- Better reciprocity
- Discipline specific/vetted
- More support tools for organizations
- Potential to be a formative tool
Portfolio – edTPA (cons)

- Cost
- Turnaround time
- May be unintended negative consequences for candidates from diverse populations
- What can you attribute to the candidate vs what candidate inherited from mentor teacher
- Not fully aligned with the Ed Eval Framework
- Aligned to INTASC standards (Not fully aligned to MA Professional Standards for Teachers)
Possible Adaptation to EdTPA

- Family and Community Engagement Standards
  - Could be built into the practicum
    - Student teacher may have to meet with a willing parent, and it would be observed
  - Work with edTPA on adding task
Portfolio - State Defined (pros)

- Contextual factors are easier to take into consideration
- Potential to be easier for low-incidence fields
- No additional cost to candidates
- Candidates would know where they stood going into the assessment
- Alignment to MA Standards and Ed Eval Framework
Portfolio - State Defined (cons)

- No cross-state comparison
- Lack of reliability & validity
- Limited licensure reciprocity
Simulations

Section 6
Simulations

- Simulation assessments
  - National, standardized
    - TEL (in Pilot stage) – Deborah Ball
Simulations (pros)

- Might work well for hard to assess areas
  - Family (and maybe community) engagement
- Standardizing the stimuli
  - Minimizes context that may make it difficult to attribute to the skill of the candidate
- Potential opportunity to have influence over the TEL
- Authentic on-demand nature of teaching
- Assess transferability of skills
Simulations (cons)

- Feasibility
- Narrowly focused on certain disciplines and skills – TEL specific
- Authenticity
- Cost – TEL specific
- Design doesn’t take into account all different teaching methods
- Implementation – TEL specific
- Lots of questions about format of instrument up in the air – TEL specific
Next steps

Section 7
Next Steps and Timeline

- Align work of PST indicator working group

- Commissioner Decision – June

Implementation and Timeline:

- Outreach and communication with stakeholders re: Commissioner decision and implementation plan

- Work with vendor on implementation

- Pilot and/or field test in 2015-16 academic year
Thoughts?

★ Commissioner

★ ESE Internal Team