Walden University ScholarWorks

Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies

Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection

2016

Perceptions of Completers of a Four-Task Teaching Performance Assessment

Jordan Morton
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations

Part of the Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons, and the Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Education

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Jordan Morton

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. John Flohr, Committee Chairperson, Education Faculty
Dr. Estelle Jorgensen, Committee Member, Education Faculty
Dr. Asoka Jayasena, University Reviewer, Education Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2016

Abstract

Perceptions of Completers of a Four-Task Teaching Performance Assessment

by

Jordan Morton

MEd, Grand Canyon University, 2006

BA, University of Oregon, 1987

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Education

Walden University

August 2016

Abstract

In California, 55 teacher preparation programs have embedded a standardized four-task teaching performance assessment (CalTPA) as a requirement for initial teacher licensure. Guided by the frameworks of transactional experience and the theory of formative assessment, this phenomenological study addressed the meaning and role ascribed to the CalTPA by those who complete it. Research questions examined participants' perceptions of their CalTPA experience with respect to preparation, completion of the tasks, feedback, remediation, activities between tasks, and overall experience Data were collected through 3 semi-structured interviews of 8 participants who had successfully completed the CalTPA tasks, chosen by reputational case selection from 1 teacher preparation program. Data were coded for elements of process and overarching themes using inductive descriptive coding in 2 cycles, beginning with discrete codes and then grouping those into themes. Results indicated that the CalTPA played a significant role in the development of completers. Themes included common process elements, emotions, perceptions of tasks, key success factors, and overall influence of the experience. Implications for positive social change include informing stakeholders in teacher preparation programs on best policies and practices to support the development of pre-service teachers into effective in-service teachers, whose future students will benefit from improved educational quality.

Perceptions of Completers of a Four-Task Teaching Performance Assessment

by

Jordan Morton

MEd, Grand Canyon University, 2006

BA, University of Oregon, 1987

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Education

Walden University

August 2016

Dedication

Soli Deo Gloria.

Acknowledgments

Many, many innumerable thanks are due to Dr. John Flohr for his invaluable guidance and wisdom as committee chair and mentor professor. Also, many thanks to Dr. Estelle Jorgensen for serving on my committee and providing methodological support. Thanks to each Walden faculty member who contributed to my development as a scholar-practitioner by teaching a course I took, evaluating a KAM I wrote, or leading a residency session I attended. Thanks to the study participants for sharing your experiences and contributing your voices. Thanks to my colleagues at the K-12 schools and institutions of higher education with whom I had the privilege of working, with extra thanks to those with whom I currently labor for making room for my doctoral studies. Thanks to the clutch of Walden candidates who welcomed me in a supportive cohort. Thanks to my students, past and present, from middle school to graduate school. Thanks to my extended church family, especially the prayer warriors. Finally, thanks to my husband and son, whose loving, tangible support gave me sense and hope throughout this journey.

Table of Contents

List of Tables v

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study..1

Background 2

Structure and Implementation of the CalTPA 4

Research on the CalTPA.. 8

Problem Statement 9

Purpose of the Study 13

Research Question 14

Conceptual Framework 14

Nature of the Study 18

Definitions..21

Assumptions..23

Scope and Delimitations 25

Limitations 26

Significance..28

Summary 29

Chapter 2: Literature Review..31

Literature Search Strategy..33

Conceptual Framework 34

Review of Literature on Experience 41

Types of Experiences 42

Influences of Experiences on Perceptions 44

Skills Learned as a Result of Experience.. 47

Contributing Factors of Experiences 48

Major Themes 49

Review of Literature on Assessment 50

Political Motivation 50

Foundational Assumptions of Pre-service Teacher Assessment 56

Purposes or Goals of Pre-service Teacher Assessment 64

Assessment Methods... 76

Validity and Reliability... 83

The Role of Assessment in Pre-service Teacher Development........................... 89

Major Themes 94

Summary..96

Chapter 3: Research Method..98

Research Design and Rationale 98

Role of the Researcher...103

Methodology..105

Participant Recruitment and Selection... 105

Instrumentation and Data Sources 108

Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection....................... 112

Data Analysis Plan.. 113

Issues of Trustworthiness...116

Credibility, Transferability, Dependability, and Confirmability 116
Ethical Procedures 118
Summary 121
Chapter 4: Results 123
Setting 123
Demographics 124
Data Collection 128
Data Analysis 129
Evidence of Trustworthiness...133
Results 136
Process 137
Themes 141
Response to the Research Question 161
Summary 162
Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations 163
Interpretation of the Findings...163
Comparison to Literature on Experience and Assessment 164
Literature of the Conceptual Framework 171
Summary of Interpretation of Findings... 174
Limitations of the Study..174
Recommendations...176
Implications...178

Conclusion 182

References..185

Appendix A: Interview Protocols 213

Initial Interview Protocol 213

Second Interview Protocol 217

Third Interview Protocol 219

Appendix B: Draft of Institutional Letter of Cooperation 221

Appendix C: CalTPA Task – Subject-Specific Pedagogy (SSP).....................223

Appendix D: CalTPA Task – Designing Instruction (DI) 243

Appendix E: CalTPA Task – Assessing Learning (AL)..................................258

Appendix F: CalTPA Task – Culminating Teaching Experience (CTE) 274

List of Tables

Table 1. Study Participants 125

Table 2. Code List 132

Table 3. Overarching Themes 133

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

This study examined the perceptions of participants who have successfully completed a state-required four-task teaching performance assessment as part of their teacher preparation program, with the goal of understanding the meaning of the assessment and its influence on the participants' development. While research has shown the validity of performance assessments (Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2013; Denney, Grier, & Buchanan, 2012; Duckor, Castellano, Tellez, Wihardini, & Wilson, 2014; Gallant & Mayer, 2012; Meeus, Van Petegem, & Engels, 2009; Riggs, Verdi, & Arlin, 2009; Pecheone & Chung, 2006; Torgerson, Macy, Beare, & Tanner, 2009), little research has been done on this particular assessment. Thus, while it is a significant feature in teacher preparation programs, its meaning to and role in the development of pre-service teachers is unknown. To fill this gap, data was drawn from the first-hand remembrances of participants who have successfully completed the assessment tasks. This chapter contains the following sections: background, problem statement, purpose, research questions, conceptual framework, nature of the study, definitions, assumptions and limitations, scope and delimitations, significance, and summary.

This study carries implications for social change, as it informs all involved in teacher preparation programs about the perceptions of pre-service teachers (students in these programs) by understanding the meaning they ascribe to this particular assessment and its role in their development. Ideally, findings will inform teacher education policies and practices, which will lead to better support for the development of pre-service teachers, leading in turn to improvement in teacher quality, resulting in an improvement in K-12 education.

At the individual level, a better prepared teacher has the potential to make a positive impact on his or her students' personal growth and development. At the organizational and policy levels, a more effective teacher preparation program has the potential to better prepare more teachers, making an impact on more students. This improvement to the K-12 education system may result in even more positive changes for students and teachers, what Freire (1970/2000) called "mutual humanization" (p. 76), a positive social change.

Background

With the passage of national legislation that came to be known as the No Child Left Behind Act in 2001 in the United States, states became responsible for ensuring that all K-12 classroom teachers were "highly qualified" (U.S. Department of Education, 2001; Wilkins, Shin, & Ainsworth, 2009). Thus, accountability became the focus of state teacher licensing authorities. In order to meet the federal mandate and ensure teacher qualifications, states began requiring candidates for initial teacher licensure to pass standardized assessments aimed at measuring various skills. Currently, 48 states, the District of Columbia, and several United States Territories require all candidates for initial teacher certification to pass some form of standardized examination (U.S. Department of Education, 2013). A 2011 survey by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education found that 38% of bachelor's degree level teacher preparation programs, 23% of postbaccalaureate programs, and 23% of master's level teacher preparation programs currently require a teaching performance assessment as an exit examination (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 2013).

Traditionally, pre-service teachers have been assessed by various methods at various points in a teacher preparation program, including summative and formative methods (Duckor, Castellano, Tellez, Wihardini, & Wilson, 2014; Parker & Volante, 2009; Yarbrough, 1995). Program-developed assessment methods such as portfolios of work samples and observation by program faculty have been shown to be effective, valid methods for determining if a pre-service teacher has met necessary criteria and is therefore ready for licensure (Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2010; Taut & Sun, 2014). Additionally, pre-service teachers often must pass assessments developed externally to a program, such as state required basic skills tests and content knowledge tests (Campa, 2010; White, 2011). Because licensure depends on the standardized assessments, they are considered high-stakes assessments for pre-service teachers (Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2010). Thus, it is common practice in teacher preparation programs for pre-service teachers to complete multiple assessments in their process of obtaining teacher licensure (Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2010).

In 2006, the California state legislature enacted changes to the education code regarding teacher preparation that specifically mandated that, in addition to two already required tests of basic skills and content area knowledge, pre-service teachers must also pass an assessment of teaching performance in order to be eligible for initial teacher licensure. The legislature further directed that standardized teaching performance assessments be created to measure pre-service teachers' achievement of 12 state adopted teaching performance expectations, which codified the teaching skills that beginning teachers would be expected to possess (Chung, 2008; Pecheone & Chung, 2006; Riggs, Verdi, & Arlin, 2009; Torgerson, Macy, Beare, & Tanner, 2009). Thus, beginning in 2008, all teacher preparation programs in the state were required by law to use one of several state approved teaching performance assessments in their programs, one of which is a four-task assessment system called the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA), developed by the state teacher licensing authority in conjunction with Educational Testing Service (ETS) (Coggshall, Max, & Bassett, 2008). Currently, 55 teacher preparation programs in California use the CalTPA, making it a significant feature of teacher preparation statewide (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2013). Thus, what role this assessment plays in pre-service teacher development has become an important issue.

Structure and Implementation of the CalTPA

The CalTPA consists of four tasks, each of which contains a set of open-ended questions which must be answered in writing. (The tasks and rubrics are found in Appendices D-G). Each task focuses on a different topic related to teaching. The first task concerns subject-specific pedagogy, the second concerns designing instruction, the third concerns assessment, and the fourth concerns a specific teaching experience, also requiring a video of the pre-service teacher teaching a lesson and student work samples. Pre-service teachers must achieve passing scores on each task in order to successfully progress in their teacher preparation program, with passing scores on all four tasks required at program exit for initial teacher licensure. The CalTPA was designed to function as both formative and summative assessment. As a series of interrelated tasks (as opposed to one culminating task), the CalTPA affords pre-service teachers the opportunity to receive and process feedback from one task prior to taking the next task. The CalTPA is one of the state-approved instruments by which pre-service teachers at the completion can demonstrate they have reached competency in skills the state has determined are vital for teachers (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2013).

Tasks are scored by trained assessors, who could be college faculty, K-12 educators, or others with sufficient background knowledge and experience. At this time, programs are responsible for selection and training of assessors, though the state licensing agency provides assessor training at scheduled intervals. Programs are also responsible for ensuring that assessors maintain calibration, or accuracy, and provide additional or follow-up training as needed.

Scoring is required to be double-anonymous, in that neither pre-service teachers nor assessors know each other's identity; each is assigned an identification number by the program. Using a standardized rubric, assessors assign each task a score of one to four, with three being the minimum passing score for each task (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2013).

Though the CalTPA is a standardized assessment, programs do have flexibility in the implementation of the assessment. The task content, scoring, and sequence of the tasks are standardized across programs, and anonymity of assessor and pre-service teacher is required. All programs use the same task questions and the same scoring criteria (as delineated on a common rubric). The tasks must be completed in order, regardless of the program. Implementation procedures may vary from program to program.

For example, the tasks may be embedded as assignments in methods courses, or candidates may take a separate seminar or online forum in which the CalTPA is the sole focus. Though pre-service teachers complete each task in sequence, each program determines at what specific date or milestone the tasks must be submitted. Programs also establish their own policies and procedures for advising and supporting pre-service teachers, collecting the tasks, sending the tasks to assessors (who may or may not be faculty in the program), reporting scores, and determining the amount and type of feedback that accompanies the score reports returned to candidates. If a pre-service teacher does not pass a task, programs are responsible for providing remediation support, and may or may not set a limit on the number of times a task may be attempted.

Due to the logistical and reporting requirements of this assessment program, teacher preparation programs that utilize the CalTPA designate a faculty member to be TPA coordinator, and may designate one of their assessors to be lead assessor. These designations come with responsibility for ensuring all aspects of the assessment flow smoothly and meet requirements, including pre-service teacher orientation, assessor calibration, and score reporting and analysis (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2013). Clearly, this externally developed, high stakes teaching performance assessment has become an integral part of a large number of California's teacher preparation programs.

My own experience with the CalTPA began in 2010. I was trained as a CalTPA assessor while working as a staff member and adjunct faculty member at a college's teacher preparation program. (I completed the training offered by the state licensing agency.) I scored CalTPA tasks for 2 years, and I also became TPA coordinator for the program. When I changed employment, moving to a full-time faculty position at another college, I did not assess tasks because the smaller size of the program and its classes made the required double-anonymity difficult; I might know whose task I was scoring, as the pre-service teacher was likely to be a student in one of my classes. Working with the CalTPA as an assessor and as a faculty member in a teacher preparation program raised the question in my mind regarding its role in the development of the pre-service teachers who must complete it, and what it means to them.

In the teacher preparation program in which I currently work, the CalTPA is implemented in the following manner. The program is a full time, two semester program. Pre-service teachers complete the first two tasks during their first semester. The first task is due to be submitted halfway through the semester, and the second is due to be submitted at the end of the semester. The pre-service teachers complete the third and fourth tasks during the student teaching semester. The third task is due to be submitted halfway during the semester, and the last task is due to be submitted at the end of the semester. Pre-service teachers complete the tasks on their own, using the provided standardized templates (Appendices C-F), and submit tasks electronically through the program's online classroom system. The program utilizes a plagiarism checker program to verify that each task is the original work of the pre-service teacher who submitted it.

The candidates are oriented to the CalTPA and submit tasks as part of the practicum class taken during the first semester, and the student teaching seminar taken in the second semester. The program contracts with trained assessors (who are not faculty in the program) who also assess tasks for other programs. The candidates receive a numeric score report for each of their submitted tasks. Candidates who do not pass the task are required to meet with me (or another professor) for remediation, and are allowed to resubmit a revised task. Candidates must pass the first two tasks during the first semester to be eligible for student teaching the second semester. The program does not have a limit on the number of times a candidate may attempt a task. The study participants will be drawn from this program and will all have undergone this particular process to complete the CalTPA. Thus, they will have undergone the same experience as one another, following precepts posited by Moustakas (1994) and Van Manen (1990).

Research on the CalTPA

Recent research has established the validity of teaching performance assessments in general (Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2013; Denney, Grier, & Buchanan, 2012; Duckor, Castellano, Tellez, Wihardini, & Wilson, 2014; Gallant & Mayer, 2012; Meeus, Van Petegem, & Engels, 2009; Torgerson, Macy, Beare, & Tanner, 2009), but the CalTPA itself has not been widely studied. Two published studies established the content validity of the CalTPA (Riggs, Verdi, & Arlin, 2009; Selvester, Summers, & Williams, 2006), but little additional research has been done on the CalTPA. I conducted this study to address this gap. This study differed from previous studies in that it drew upon the voices of those who have experienced taking the CalTPA, seeking to understand its meaning from their perspective (Riggs, Verdi, & Arline, 2006; Selvester, Summers, & Williams, 2006).

More research was needed for several reasons. First, there is a significant gap in the literature regarding this particular assessment. Very little research has been done on an assessment that has become a focal point of a substantial number of teacher preparation programs in one state, affecting thousands of pre-service teachers annually (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2013). By obtaining first-hand accounts of the perceptions of those who successfully complete the CalTPA, it would be possible to understand its meaning to them and its influence on their development. Their voices would be heard. As a result, teacher preparation programs will be able to craft policies and practices to better support the positive development of pre-service teachers and ensure their successful achievement of licensure, leading to improved teacher quality, and thus, improvement in K-12 education (an important social change). In addition, the findings of this study will contribute to knowledge in the discipline regarding assessment. As assessments are and will continue to be central to the field of education, it is prudent to discover as much as possible about them (Black & Wiliam, 2009; Clark, 2012).

Problem Statement

The research problem for this study was found in the gap in the literature. There is limited research on the CalTPA, and thus limited understanding of its meaning to or influence on pre-service teachers. To date, little research has been conducted utilizing first-person accounts of it, and none on the meaning pre-service teachers ascribe to it or what they derive from it. The need to understand the meaning of the CalTPA and its role in pre-service teacher development can be addressed by understanding the experiences of those who have completed it.

Selvester, Summers, and Williams (2006) studied the pilot version of the assessment, focusing on its effective implementation from the vantage point of the teacher preparation program. Riggs, Verdi, and Arlin (2009) conducted a mixed-methods study of the pilot version of the particular teaching performance assessment, determining the overall content validity of the assessment. Fenderson (2010) conducted a study of inservice teachers who had completed the teaching performance assessment in their preparation programs. She collected survey data, focusing on the instructional choices made by the inservice teachers. As part of the survey, she did ask participants if they believed their experience with the particular teaching performance assessment had led them to make adaptations for English language learners and students with special needs in their classrooms, and found that a majority of participants said yes, though no further details were given as to how or why the teaching performance assessment affected the practice of the inservice teachers. Luster (2010) wrote an article in which he argued for making a teaching performance assessment a requirement of state licensure. He focused on the benefits such an assessment could provide for teacher preparation programs, and he only mentioned the CalTPA as an example. Thus, though the particular assessment has been implemented for almost a decade, and is currently used widely in one populous state (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2013), little research exists on its developmental influence on pre-service teachers, let alone from their own perspective.

I expanded my search for research studies to include those related to any assessment given to pre-service teachers. I found studies that involved internally designed pre-service teacher assessments (those designed by teacher preparation programs themselves for use within their program). One type of these assessments involved observation of the pre-service teacher by a college faculty supervisor (Bryant, Maarouf, Burcham, & Greer, 2016; Chaffin & Manfredo, 2010; Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2010; Miller & Carney, 2009; Parker & Volante, 2009). A second type of program designed assessment involved pre-service teacher work samples collected into a portfolio (Bairral & dos Santos, 2012; Dee, 2012; Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2013; Denney, Grier, & Buchanan, 2012; Gallant & Mayer, 2012; Granberg, 2010). The third broad area of program designed assessments involved other reflective activities (Al-Barakat & Al-Hassan, 2009; Wilkins, Shin, & Ainsworth, 2009). Findings from the studies of these three types of assessments have been primarily program centered, focusing on the usefulness of data in program evaluation, with two studies showing that the assessment makes a positive contribution toward pre-service teacher development (Al-Barakat & Al-Hassan, 2009; Wilkins, Shin, & Ainsworth, 2009).

In addition, I found recent studies involving another standardized teaching performance assessment used in the same state (The Performance Assessment for California Teachers, or PACT). This different TPA was developed by a university consortium (Bunch, Aguirre, & Tellez, 2009; Bunch, Aguirre, & Tellez, 2015; Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2010; Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2013; Gainsburg & Ericson, 2015; Pecheone & Chung, 2006; Peck & McDonald, 2013; Sloan, 2013).

Findings of studies involving that assessment have primarily focused on the effects of implementation on the teacher education program and the validity of the assessment. Again, the findings have been primarily program-centered.

I also found recent studies involving another commercially developed teaching performance assessment originally called the Teacher Performance Assessment and now simply called the edTPA. Based on the PACT, the edTPA was commercially developed for use in multiple states (Chandler-Olcott, Fleming, & Nieroda, 2016; Chiu, 2014; Dover & Schultz, 2016; Madeloni & Gorlewski, 2013; Pecheone, Shear, Whittaker, & Darling-Hammond, 2013). Again, a majority of these studies have focused on implementation and thus have been program centered (Dover, Shultz, Smith, & Duggan, 2016; Heafner & Pettry, 2016; Lachuk & Koellner, 2015; Lys, L'Esperance, Dobson, & Bullock, 2014; Miller, Carroll, Jancic, & Markworth, 2015; Margolis & Doring, 2013; Ratner & Kolman, 2016; Williams, Evans, & King, 2016). I found a few studies examining the edTPA from the perspective of the candidate (Barnes & Gillis, 2016; Chiu, 2014; Coloma, 2015; Meuwissen & Choppin, 2015). I also found one dissertation study in which the author examined candidate experiences with the edTPA (Hobbs, 2015). I also found one dissertation study in which the author examined the implementation of the Missouri Pre-Service Teacher Assessment (MoPTA), a commercially developed four-task teaching performance assessment used in Missouri (Elder, 2015). The study was program centered, evaluating the effectiveness of the implementation of the assessment and making recommendations for improvement.

Thus, this study addressed a gap in the literature regarding the lack of knowledge about the influence of the CalTPA on the development of pre-service teachers. I have found that research has been conducted on other types of assessments of pre-service teachers, but little research has been done on the CalTPA. Given its widespread use in many teacher preparation programs, it was important to understand pre-service teachers' perceptions of this specific assessment as a step toward understanding its influence and meaning. This study investigated participants' perceptions of their entire CalTPA experience by examining their actions, beliefs, understandings, and feelings, and arrived at the meaning they ascribe to it now that they have completed it.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of those who have successfully completed the four tasks of the CalTPA as part of their teacher preparation program, with the goal of understanding the meaning of the experience and its influence in their development. The study design was empirically phenomenological in approach, seeking to analyze the common essences of the phenomenon and factors that contributed to those essences, thus arriving at the meaning ascribed to it by the participants (Moustakas, 1994; Patton, 2002; Van Manen, 1990). The phenomenon of interest (the successful completion of the four tasks of the CalTPA) is not a one-time event, but an extended process spanning the whole course of a teacher preparation program. Pre-service teachers are required to complete and pass the four tasks one at a time, in sequence, spread throughout the teacher preparation program. The overall aim of this study was to better understand this phenomenon and its meaning as perceived by those who undergo it.

Research Question

This study sought to answer one research question:

RQ: How do CalTPA completers perceive and describe the process of completing the four tasks, with respect to preparation, completion of the tasks, feedback, remediation, activities between tasks, and their overall experience?

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of those who have successfully completed the four tasks of the CalTPA as part of their teacher preparation program. The wording of the research question and the aspects of the process mentioned in it directly stated this purpose. The question also directly aligned with the empirical phenomenological approach. The question called for participants to recall and reflect on details about a phenomenon they have undergone, namely the process of successfully completing the sequence of four CalTPA tasks. This aligned with empirical phenomenology, which investigates the lived experiences of persons who have undergone a similar phenomenon (Moustakas, 1994; Van Manen, 1990).

Conceptual Framework

This study relied upon a dual conceptual framework. The first concept was that of experience as formative, as theorized by Dewey (1938) and later expanded by Kolb (1984). Dewey (1938) posited that each and every experience in the life of a human being changes that human being (p. 35). The experience acts like a molding force on the human being, who undergoes change as a result of the experience. Such change could be cognitive, physical, or moral. Furthermore, the resulting change in turn affects the human being's subsequent experiences, as the human being lives those in a different state developmentally. In this view, the human being's relationship with experience is transactional. Thus, the chain of experiences that constitute the life of the human being act in concert and the result is overall growth or development of the human being. Dewey (1938) proposed that experiences could be situated along a continuum, from less to more beneficial, and thus he posited that educators (who are necessarily concerned with human development) should attend to and seek to arrange experiences that would lead to the most beneficial growth possible for their students.

Kolb (1984) developed a theory of experiential learning that relied, in part, on Dewey's (1938) theory of experience. Kolb (1984) delved deeper into analyzing the role of experience in learning, viewing learning as a cycle in which the individual lived an experience, reflected on it, conceptualized it, and then experimented with the learning in the next experience. By emphasizing the role of the individual in the interaction (by means of reflection), Kolb (1984) conceptualized that experiences were at once both objective and subjective. He posited that learning is a lifelong process of interaction with experience, and the definition of learning is incomplete without including experience.

The second conceptual lens for this study was the concept of assessment as a formative experience as theorized by Black and Wiliam (2009) and later expanded by Clark (2012). The theory of formative assessment presupposes the theory of experience. Black and Wiliam (2009) posited five teacher strategies that define formative assessment.

First, the teacher must be certain to articulate both the learning objectives and the criteria for success. Second, the teacher must design and implement effective classroom activities that elicit evidence of student learning. Third, the teacher must give feedback that helps the learner progress toward the objectives. Fourth, the teacher must activate students as peer-to-peer learning resources. Finally, the teacher must ensure that students take ownership of their learning (Black & Wiliam, 2009, p. 8).

By using these five strategies, teachers can engage students in the experience of formative assessment. The key to the success of formative assessment lies in the concept of feedback (Black & Wiliam, 2009), which is the crucial data provided to teachers (and students) about the effectiveness of the learning, leading to the next instructional steps.

Black and Wiliam (2009) posited that the definition of formative assessment also allowed for inclusion of "tests designed primarily to serve a summative function" (p. 8), but only if such tests were used appropriately. They stated this meant using summative tests as prompts for feedback to move learning forward. In addition, they posited that summative assessments could "communicate to learners what is and is not valued in a particular discipline, thus communicating criteria for success" (p. 8), which is the first crucial component of formative assessment.

Clark (2012) defined formative assessment by identifying two objectives that mark it. He referred to the first objective as *assessment for learning*, the purpose of which is to "monitor the progress of the learner toward a desired goal" (Clark, 2012, p. 208) and thus enable the learner to move closer toward and eventually reach the goal. The second purpose he called *assessment as learning*, the purpose of which is to provide opportunity for "the collaborative and individual reflection on evidence of learning" (Clark, 2012, p. 208). When these two purposes coexist, the result is an act of formative assessment. Clark (2012) posited that the act of formative assessment was significant not in itself, but because of two results. First, formative assessment provides feedback to both teacher and learner, which allows both to determine their next steps toward meeting the goal of learning. Clark (2012) posited that effective feedback "forms the core of formative assessment practice" (p. 209). Second, and related, formative assessment allows an internal process (learning) to be made visible. Clark (2012) posited that formative assessment, due to its inherent interactivity, could not be a singular, isolated event. However, like Black and Wiliam (2009), he did find that formative assessment does require a moment of contingency, a discrete and singular event which must be utilized by both teacher and learner to engage in formative assessment (Clark, 2012).

Both Black and Wiliam (2009) and Clark (2012) posited that formative assessment serves to advance learners toward the goal of education, namely self-regulated learning (SRL). In this view, the goal of education is to empower the learner to take responsibility for and control of his or her own development, thus becoming an independent learner (Black & Wiliam, 2009; Clark, 2012). Black and Wiliam (2009) posited that the five-step framework of formative assessment they described directly leads learners to assume control of their own learning process. Clark (2012) also directly connected formative assessment and self-regulated learning, claiming that "formative assessment brings SRL into existence" (Clark, 2012, p. 227). Thus, formative assessment has been shown to be integral to the self-regulated learning process. Further discussion of the conceptual framework can be found in Chapter 2.

The theories of experience and formative assessment relate to the phenomenological approach of this study and to the research question. Experiences play an active role in human development (Dewey, 1938). Formative assessment simultaneously reveals and advances the development of those taking the assessment, which is an internal process (Black & Wiliam, 2009; Clark, 2012). An empirical phenomenological approach afforded the opportunity to obtain rich, detailed data directly from participants, revealing specific ways these internal processes are working. The research question for this study explicitly seeks understanding of the perceptions of pre-service teachers successfully completing the assessment tasks, in service of better understanding the meaning of it and its influence on the development of pre-service teachers. Thus, an empirical phenomenological approach was used for this study.

Nature of the Study

The empirical phenomenological approach was well-suited for the research problem of the study. The research problem centers on an assessment about which much is not known from the candidate's perspective, particularly the influence of the CalTPA in the development of pre-service teachers. It is important to understand the perceptions of those who take the CalTPA in order to understand its role in their development (Creswell, 2007). The study sought to investigate perceptions and meaning ascribed to the CalTPA by examining recollections of those who have undergone it (Moustakas, 1994; Patton, 2002; Van Manen, 1990). This approach directly ties in with the conceptual frameworks for the study, being based on first-hand accounts of recollected experience. A phenomenological approach is appropriate in cases where "it would be important to understand several individuals' common or shared experiences … in order to develop practices or policies, or to develop a deeper understanding about the features of the phenomenon" (Creswell, 2007, p. 60).

In this case, findings from this study could indeed lead to development of effective practices or policies in teacher preparation programs, particularly in support of pre-service teacher development. It is also anticipated that findings could lead to a deeper understanding of the role this type of assessment plays in the development of pre-service teachers. The phenomenological approach affords the opportunity to explore and understand how participants make meaning from undergoing a phenomenon (Creswell, 2007; Moustakas, 1994; Van Manen, 1990); this study afforded the opportunity to explore and understand how pre-service teachers make meaning from completing four teaching performance assessment tasks, opening a window into pre-service teacher development.

The phenomenon that was investigated was the successful completion of the CalTPA by those who have completed it as part of a teacher preparation program leading to initial teacher licensure. Pre-service teachers complete the tasks sequentially at pre-designated intervals in the program. The tasks consist of open-ended essays and performance tasks related to the skills of teaching. The first task focuses on subject-specific pedagogy, the second focuses on designing instruction, the third focuses on assessment, and the fourth focuses on a teaching experience (including a video of the pre-service teacher teaching a lesson to K-12 students). Pre-service teachers submit each task for scoring by trained assessors, who can be faculty in the teacher preparation program or other educators who have been trained under the auspices of a program and/or the state's teacher licensing authority. The assessor evaluates each submitted task using a standardized rubric, assigning a score from one to four. A score of three or four is considered passing. Pre-service teachers must earn a total score of 12 across the four tasks, and may not score lower than two on any task, though programs may set higher total passing scores (Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2013).

In order to study the completers' perceptions of this phenomenon, I conducted a series of three in-depth, semistructured interviews with eight recent graduates of a teacher preparation program in which the teaching performance assessment in question is embedded. These participants successfully completed all four tasks of the CalTPA as part that program. Participants were selected using reputational case selection, based on recommendations from faculty. I digitally recorded and had transcribed the participant interviews, and analyzed them by coding for themes, thus arriving at the essences of the experience. This method follows Moutstakas' (1994) description of the empirical phenomenological approach, in which the "aim is to determine what an experience means for the persons who have had the experience and are able to provide a comprehensive description of it" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 13). More details about the methodology for this study are explained in Chapter 3.

Definitions

The following definitions will aid understanding of certain terms related to this study.

An e*xperience* is any event enacted by or undergone by a person (Dewey, 1938; Moustakas, 1994; Van Manen, 1990). Dewey (1938) posited that a transactional relationship exists between an experience and the person who lives it, resulting in a change to the person. The resulting change to the person will then affect future experiences lived by the person. Phenomenology is the study of a lived experience (or phenomenon), with the goal of deriving the meaning of it to those who have lived it (Moustakas, 1994; Van Manen, 1990).

A *perception* is a belief or understanding a person holds about something, including a phenomenon they have experienced (Hourigan, 2009; Lin, Chiu, & Lai, 2014; Miller & Milkulec, 2014; Moustakas, 1994; Patton, 2002; Van Manen, 1990). Individuals arrive at perceptions by consciously reflecting and evaluating, or conceptualizing, concrete details from their experiences (Sancar-Tokmak, Surmeli, & Ozgelen, 2014; Yavetz, Goldman, & Pe'er, 2014). Thus, people construct perceptions based on their experiences (Miller & Milkulec, 2014; Napoles & MacLeod, 2013; Simic-Muller, 2015). Investigating the perceptions of those who have undergone a similar experience is a foundational step in the process of understanding the meaning the experience, and thus perceptions play a pivotal role in phenomenological research (Moustakas, 1994; Patton, 2002; Van Manen, 1990).

A *pre-service teacher* is a student in a teacher preparation program (Berg & Miksa, 2010; Bunch, Aguirre, & Tellez, 2009; Chaffin & Manfredo, 2010; Dee, 2012; Oner & Adadan, 2011). These programs are typically offered by colleges or universities, and lead to teacher licensure granted by a state governing authority. The teacher preparation program may or may not be combined with a college degree. The pre-service teacher may also be called a *candidate* for teacher licensure (Berg & Mizksza, 2010; Chaffin & Manfedo, 2010; Lit & Lotan, 2013; Peck, Singer-Gabella, Sloan, & Lin, 2014; Whitaker & Nelsen, 2013; Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2013). An *inservice teacher* is a licensed graduate of the teacher preparation program who is employed as a teacher (Wilkins, Shin, & Ainsworth, 2009).

A *teaching performance assessment*, or *TPA*, is a standardized assessment designed to provide evidence of the quality of teaching skills of the pre-service teacher for evaluation purposes (Clayton, 2013; Guaglianone, Payne, Kinsey, & Chiero, 2009). Sometimes such an assessment is called a *teacher performance assessment* (Clayton, 2013; Dee, 2012; Peck, Singer-Gabella, Sloan, & Lin, 2014; Torgerson, Macy, Beare, & Tanner, 2009). This type of assessment is becoming increasingly common in teacher preparation programs, often mandated by state statute (Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2013; Lit & Lotan, 2013).

The *California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA)* is an assessment instrument developed by the California state teacher licensing authority in conjunction with Educational Testing Service (ETS). Pre-service teachers take each task of the four-task assessment at a predetermined point in their teacher preparation program, and must pass each task as a condition of initial teacher licensure (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2013). The CalTPA tasks and rubrics are found in Appendices C-F.

A *portfolio* is a collection of artifacts or work samples, such as lesson plans, videos of a teaching event, or other assignments submitted by the pre-service teacher to the teacher preparation program for evaluation purposes. This collection can be hard-copy or virtual. This assessment is historically common to teacher preparation programs (Bairral & dos Santos, 2012; Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2013; Denney, Grier, & Buchanan, 2012; Oner & Adadan, 2011).

Observation is an assessment method historically common to teacher preparation programs. In this assessment, a pre-service teacher is observed teaching a lesson in a classroom by a designated faculty member of the teacher preparation program. The faculty member utilizes an assessment instrument, typically a checklist, to record details and evaluation of what is observed. This assessment provides direct and immediate feedback to the pre-service teacher (Al-Barakat & Al-Hassan, 2009; Berg & Miksza, 2010; Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2010).

Assumptions

This study was based on four assumptions. First, it was assumed that participants would provide truthful, accurate responses to interview questions. This was a necessary assumption in that interview responses contributed the primary data for the study. I assured participants of confidentiality and anonymity prior to conducting interviews. I utilized purposeful selection of participants, namely reputational case selection, in order to better ensure participants were able to be truthful and accurate (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014).

The second assumption was that participants' description of perceptions, beliefs, actions, and feelings would reveal information about their actual experiences and development. This was a necessary assumption in that the study sought to examine the perceptions of participants regarding the teaching performance assessment and the role the assessment played (if any) in their development. A researcher cannot see inside the mind of a participant to observe development; thus, a researcher must rely on the participant to describe the processes, particularly if these happened over a period of time. In this case, I conducted live interviews utilizing a semi-structured protocol to prompt participants' recall and description. The participants' description of completing the four tasks of the CalTPA provided means to understand the phenomenon. This follows the Husserlian concept of intentionality, as Moustakas (1994) described, in which "the act of consciousness and the object of consciousness are intentionally related" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 28).

The third assumption was that the act of completing an assessment is a formative experience for the person completing it (Black & Wiliam, 2009; Clark, 2012). This was a necessary assumption, in that it forms the conceptual framework for the study. During interviews, I asked participants to describe their actions, feelings, beliefs, and perceptions. I framed open-ended questions that sought to elicit the formative aspects of participants' experiences (if any) with the four tasks of the teaching performance assessment.

The fourth assumption was that I would be able to mitigate my influence on participants. This was a necessary assumption. As I was the sole researcher responsible for data collection and analysis in total, I needed to mitigate or reduce the probability of any of my preconceived notions or previous interactions with participants affecting participant responses. I had a previous instructor relationship to the participants, and I had experience as an assessor for the teaching performance assessment. I therefore intentionally mitigated any potential influence by taking several steps. First, I practiced Epoche, the deliberate and intentional process of acknowledging and then setting aside any preconceived ideas or beliefs about the topic at hand (Moustakas, 1994). This allowed me to be demonstrably open to any new perceptions or ideas raised by participants. Second, I adhered to interview protocols in which I explicitly assured participants that they may speak freely. I structured open-ended interview questions so as to allow participants to have freedom in responses, instead of asking leading questions or multiple choice questions with limited choice of answers. In addition, I included the practice of member-checking in the methodology, as I sought input from the participants regarding data analysis and findings at several points in the process of data collection. Participants became co-researchers in this regard (Moustakas, 1994).

Scope and Delimitations

This study investigated the perceptions of those who have completed the CalTPA, a four-task teaching performance assessment, in their teacher preparation program. Little research exists on this particular assessment, and none on its meaning to and influence on those who take it. No recent research exists investigating the first-hand accounts of those who have taken this high-stakes, multi-part assessment. This was a significant gap in the research, and this study helped to fill it.

Participants in this study were eight people who had recently completed (within 24 months) the CalTPA as part of a certain teacher preparation program in California in which the assessment is embedded. This population excluded those who had completed any other teacher preparation program. It also excluded those who had completed this particular program at an earlier time, over two years ago. (The recency of participants' completion was important, as participants needed to recall and describe details of their actions, beliefs, feelings, and perceptions, and such memories may fade over time.) As face-to-face interviews were the primary method of data collection, all but one of the participants were located in one area of the state to ensure proximity to the researcher and thus availability for interview.

Though the explicit criteria regarding participants may make transferability difficult, the specific and detailed description of certain elements of the study may make it possible. I provide a complete, detailed description of all the study parameters, so it may be possible for others to compare with their populations and settings. I also identify connections of study findings to prior research and theory. Thus, while transferability of findings cannot be guaranteed, given these factors it may be possible (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014).

Limitations

This study's limitations were as follows. First, only one specific version of a teaching performance assessment (the CalTPA) was studied. Currently, four versions of a teaching performance assessment are approved for use in California, each of which has a different format, timing, scoring, and purpose (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2013). This study excluded other TPA versions currently in use or under development, as the differences between assessments would preclude candidates undergoing the same phenomenon. By focusing on only one version of a TPA and its implementation procedures in one program, the phenomenon under investigation was more specifically defined, and thus common events and meanings could be gleaned, as factors such as questions, format, and timing were the same for all participants.

Second, this study had several limitations related to participants. To ensure they have undergone the same phenomenon, participants were drawn from one teacher preparation program. This limited participants to only those who have completed that particular teacher preparation program. This study relied on participants' recollections and perceptions of previous events, but it was possible that participants' recollections and perceptions could have been inaccurate. Multiple interviews with carefully designed protocols and member-checking helped to counter that possibility.

Third, this study had limitations stemming from the researcher. I was the sole researcher, and thus the only person who collected and analyze data. Thus, findings came from one person's analysis (mine). In addition, I have experience as a CalTPA assessor, and knew participants as former students. Member-checking by participants and clear positioning of participants as co-researchers (Moustakas, 1994) helped to mitigate this limitation.

Additionally, there were limitations imposed by a specific time frame allotted for data collection and analysis. Selection and inclusion of participants was limited to those who are available for interview during that period of time. So, a potential participant could have been excluded if he or she was not available to complete all three interviews. Indeed, this was the case, as will be explained later. I scheduled interviews at times and locations convenient to the participants, which helped increase the likelihood of participant availability.

Given all these limitations, study findings may not be easily generalized to a broader population. However, further research may stem from the findings of this study. A more detailed explanation of the steps I took to ensure study credibility can be found in Chapter 3. The process for recruiting participants will be clearly explained. In addition, the role of the researcher and the participant will be clearly explained.

Significance

It is anticipated that this study will make contributions to the field of education, particularly teacher preparation, advancing knowledge in the discipline and contributing to positive social change. First, the findings of the study have revealed more about the meaning pre-service teachers ascribe to the required teaching performance assessment, and shed light on its influence in their development. The study addressed a gap in the literature by examining a particular assessment which has not been widely studied, and by relying on the voices of those who have successfully completed it (Fenderson, 2010; Selvester, Summers, & Williams, 2006). Second, the findings of the study provide particular insight into the formative aspects of the assessment process with respect to the development of those who are assessed (Black & Wiliam, 2009; Clark, 2012). In particular, the study findings provide more insight into the role summative assessment plays as formative assessment.

The findings of this study can be seen to advance practice and/or policy. The study findings reveal factors that contribute to the development of pre-service teachers. Thus, stakeholders in teacher preparation programs can derive best practices from these findings in terms of providing support for pre-service teachers. In addition, teacher preparation program leaders can use the findings in their evaluation of teacher preparation effectiveness, and develop policies regarding the implementation of the particular teaching performance assessment.

This study carried clear implications for positive social change. The findings of this study shed new light on aspects of pre-service teacher development. This enables stakeholders in teacher preparation programs to examine practices and policies in order to provide greater support for the success of pre-service teachers. The study also made contributions to the knowledge of the discipline, as findings advanced knowledge related to assessment. Overall, the study may contribute to improved teacher preparation. This would raise the quality of K-12 education, resulting in positive social change.

Summary

I have shown in this chapter that this study filled a gap in the literature. The study examined perceptions of those who have successfully completed a state-required teaching performance assessment as part of their teacher preparation program. The concepts of experience and formative assessment provided the conceptual framework for the study

(Black & Wiliam, 2009; Clark, 2012; Dewey, 1938). The study relied on a phenomenological approach, with data collected primarily by means of in-depth semi-structured interviews, following procedures set forth by Van Manen (1990), Moustakas (1994), Creswell (2007), and Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014). The significance of the study can be seen as it filled a gap in current research: lack of research on the particular teaching performance assessment, particularly from the point of view of those taking the assessment. The study contributed to knowledge in the discipline regarding assessment. It also contributed to improving the field of teacher preparation, leading to improved K-12 education, and thus contributing to positive social change.

The following chapter, Chapter 2, will provide a review of the literature related to the study topic. First, I will review the literature search strategy and the conceptual framework used for this study. I will then review the literature on the experience of pre-service teachers and the literature on the assessment of pre-service teachers.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

With the passage of No Child Left Behind legislation in 2001, and the subsequent Race to the Top legislation in 2009, the responsibility for ensuring teacher quality was vested in state licensing authorities. In response, state teacher licensing boards have mandated pre-service teachers pass various assessments at entrance to, during, and upon exit of their teacher preparation programs. In 2006, the California state legislature passed legislation requiring pre-service teachers to pass a teaching performance assessment as a condition of initial licensure; thus, the legislation required all teacher education programs in that state to include such an assessment. However, little research exists on this assessment's meaning and role in pre-service teacher development. The purpose of this study is to examine the perceptions of those who have successfully completed the CalTPA, a four-task teaching performance assessment, as part of their teacher preparation program, and by doing so to arrive at its meaning.

I found few studies directly examining the CalTPA. Selvester, Summers, and Williams (2006) conducted a qualitative study analyzing one university's piloting of the assessment, focusing on the programmatic implementation and its effects on the teacher education program itself. Fenderson (2010) conducted a qualitative dissertation study examining how in-service teachers who had completed the CalTPA during their preparation program made instructional choices in the classroom related to the certain assessment's tasks. Luster (2010) wrote a theoretical article seeking to explain why teaching performance assessments were needed, citing the certain assessment (and one other assessment authorized for use in the same state) as examples. Twenty-two studies were found in which authors examined various factors relating to the implementation of another state-authorized teaching performance assessment.

I found studies related to broad themes centered on experience, assessment, and development of pre-service teachers. The overwhelming majority of studies conducted within the past 5 years were qualitative, but some studies relied on quantitative or mixed methods. Darling-Hammond, Newton, and Wei (2013) conducted a quantitative study examining the predictive validity of another teaching performance assessment as a gauge of student achievement, correlating the scores inservice teachers received on their assessments with the state achievement test scores of their students. Jones, McDonald, Maddox, and McDonald (2011) conducted a quantitative analysis of pre-service teacher grade point average and scores on a state-mandated test in reading pedagogy. Lombardi (2011) used a certain teaching performance assessment as an instrument in an experimental study investigating the effects of including a certain topic in pre-service teacher education programs at one university. Berg and Miksza (2010) conducted a mixed-methods study investigating the concerns of pre-service music teachers as they reflected on their development. Chang (2011) conducted a mixed methods study exploring the perceptions of pre-service teachers regarding instructor feedback on course-based assessments. Both the recent and foundational articles examined for this literature review presented findings in light of four themes related to experience and six themes related to assessment in pre-service teacher education. Each of these themes will be discussed in the literature review section of this chapter.

There will be three sections in this chapter. First, the literature search strategy used to find articles will be explained, including the conceptual framework. Second, the literature on pre-service teacher experiences and relationship to development will be reviewed thematically, including the type of experience studied, the effects on the feelings or beliefs of the pre-service teacher, the skills learned through the experience, and the contributing factors of the experience. Third, the literature on pre-service teacher assessment will be reviewed thematically, including political motivation, foundational assumptions, purposes or goals, methods, validity and reliability, and role in development. The chapter will conclude with a summary.

Literature Search Strategy

Research articles and publications were found by searching the following databases: Academic Search Complete, ProQuest Central, Education Research Complete, Education Resource Information Center (ERIC), Education from SAGE, and Teacher Reference Center. Searches were limited to English language peer-reviewed journals and official publications of government agencies and institutions. The following search terms were used in all databases: *pre-service teacher development, teacher education, assessment in teacher education, assessment of teaching performance, assessment of pre-service teachers, teacher performance assessment, teaching performance assessment, pre-service teacher experience, pre-service teacher perception, phenomenology in and of education, phenomenology* and *experience*.

I conducted several search rounds. First, I searched for articles published recently, from 2009 through 2014, using the first seven search terms above. I found 108 articles. A second search round involved finding 20 articles published prior to 2009 that were commonly referenced in the bibliographies of first-round articles. An additional search round used the last five search terms above, resulting in 29 articles from 2009 to 2015. I also created a Google Scholar Alert to discover peer-reviewed journal articles published after these rounds (since January 2014). A total of 29 additional articles were found through this avenue. As a result of these search rounds, 176 total articles were retrieved. A review of the article abstracts led to 162 of those articles being annotated and cited for this literature review. The scope and specificity of the terms, the number of databases, and the saturation of article findings leads me to believe that this literature review is exhaustive, reflecting all pertinent research relevant to the topic of the study.

Conceptual Framework

I reviewed the literature using a two part conceptual framework. The framework is a joining of two related theories, the first of which is foundational to the second. Taken together, these theories form lenses through which I viewed the literature. The first lens was the theory of experience as described by Dewey (1938) and expanded by Kolb (1984). The second lens was the theory of formative assessment as described by Black and Wiliam (2009) and expanded by Clark (2012). The theory of formative assessment depends upon the theory of experience, so I will begin by discussing the theory of experience.

The theory of experience as proposed by Dewey (1938) concerns the impact of an experience on a person who lives through it. In this context the definition of an experience is any event in the life of a person. Dewey (1938) posited that each and every experience lived by a person changes that person. He held that to be true whether or not that person initiates or acts during the event, or does not initiate but rather receives the action of the event. How an experience modifies the person can be analyzed in terms of two criteria: continuity and interaction.

First, Dewey (1938) proposed a principle of continuity. By this he meant that each experience does not affect a person in isolation, but rather works in concert with previous experiences and informs future experiences. In other words, each individual experience functions as a link in a chain of experiences in the life of a person. The individual experience modifies the person, meaning that it could change the person’s intellect, emotion, attitude, and/or basic sensitivities (Dewey, 1938, p. 35). It follows that how the person is changed by one individual experience depends upon previous changes wrought by previous experiences, and change wrought by a current experience will influence future experiences chosen by the person (inasmuch as experiences can be chosen). Thus, if we wish to analyze a person’s growth or development, we must analyze the experiences they have lived. If our goal is to ensure positive change in the person, only such experiences as may result in positive change should be chosen, orchestrated, and lived.

Second, Dewey (1938) proposed a principle of interaction at work in each experience. He saw both external and internal factors involved in each experience. External factors, which he called objective factors, lay outside the person living the experience. These would include physical surroundings and other people involved. Internal factors include feelings, needs, and interests of the person. According to Dewey

(1938), the external and internal factors of each experience are equally important, and an experience depends upon the interplay of both sets of factors. The modification resulting from an experience is really the result of this transaction between the person and the environment. Thus, if our goal is to ensure positive change in the person, both the internal and external factors which constitute an experience must be attended to in order to achieve the goal of positive change.

Though he proposed two principles that explain the effect of experience on the life of a person, Dewey (1938) emphasized that the two principles are not separate. He described them as intercepting or uniting, working together in a process of modification or development at work in a person as long as that person lives. Thus, if the goal is to understand a person’s development, it is important to thoroughly analyze their experiences.

Kolb (1984) shared these views of experience, citing Dewey (1938) prominently in his theory of experiential learning. However, Kolb (1984) added one important factor regarding the way experience works: reflection by the individual undergoing the experience. Thus, while Dewey (1938) posited that experience plays a crucial role in human development, and that this role can be understood as resulting from interactivity (or transaction), Kolb (1984) found that a person’s reflection on an experience was a crucial component in that transaction. Kolb (1984) described the transactional influence of experience in human development as a cycle of learning, in which a person undergoing an experience reflects on what the experience was and meant and that this act of reflection becomes part of the mechanism by which experience influences the person’s development. He asserted that the very definition of learning relies on experience, and that there was no learning separate from experiential learning. He also described the role experience plays as transformative in the life of an individual.

The theory of formative assessment, described by Black and Wiliam (2009) and later by Clark (2012), rests upon the theory of experience. In the theory of formative assessment, any assessment activity is considered an experience, and thus makes an impact on those who undergo it. The authors studied assessment in the context of the classroom, focusing on its role in student learning. Black and William (2009) defined formative assessment as any practice in the classroom in which "evidence about student achievement is elicited, interpreted, and used by teacher, learners, or their peers, to make decisions about the next steps in instruction that are likely to be better, or better founded, than the decisions they would have taken" (p. 9). The authors based their definition on the concept of a formative interaction as "one in which an interactive situation influences cognition" (Black & Wiliam, 2009, p. 11).

To develop a theory about formative assessment, the authors investigated how formative assessment works in practice. Their theory rests on two key propositions about the learning process. The first proposition is that three agents (teacher, learner, and learner's peers) interact in the learning process, each playing a role. The success of the learning process rests on each agent fulfilling their role, and thus each agent bears responsibility toward the learner. In the words of Black and William (2009), the teacher, the learner, and the learner's peers are "jointly and severally liable" (p. 8) for learning.

The second proposition on which the theory rests is the view of learning as a journey. In this view, the agents responsible for learning must first determine where learners are in the journey, then determine where the learners are going, and finally determine what must be done to ensure the learners reach their destination (Black & Wiliam, 2009). The intersections of these two propositions led the authors to develop a theory of formative assessment. Clark (2012) included their work in his article, which was based on a literature review. He concurred with Black and William (2009), and added the necessary component of feedback. In other words, Clark (2012) viewed feedback as a key component in the theory of formative assessment. He posited that the purpose of formative assessment was to develop the students' capacity for self-regulated learning.

Black and Wiliam (2009) posited five strategies that conceptualize formative assessment. The first strategy is to articulate objectives and criteria for success. The second is to design and implement effective classroom activities that elicit evidence of student learning. The third is to give feedback that helps the learner progress toward the objectives. The fourth is to activate students as peer-to-peer learning resources. The fifth is to ensure students take ownership of their learning (Black & Wiliam, 2009, p. 8).

In order to utilize these strategies, and thus engage in formative assessment, Black and Wiliam (2009) posited that the agents involved must create and use "'moments of contingency' in instruction for the purpose of the regulation of the learning processes" (Black & Wiliam, 2009, p. 10). Clark (2012) concurred, focusing on the opportunity such moments afford to provide feedback. Thus, formative assessment activities can be identified, analyzed, and understood distinctly and separately from the overall learning process.

While a theory of formative assessment exists, it exists in a preliminary state. Black and Wiliam (2009) directly stated that their work represented only the first step toward a theory (p. 26). Their work focused on the traditional K-12 classroom setting. What role formative assessment plays in other contexts, if any, remains to be investigated. In addition, the connection of summative assessment to formative purpose needs to be more clearly articulated, as Black and Wiliam (2009) posited (p. 4). Clark (2012) also called for further research, particularly in areas connecting "the goals and practices of formative assessment to the actualization of SRL [self-regulated learning] characteristics and strategies" (p. 242).

Formative assessment has been used as the conceptual framework for several recent studies. Bunch, Aguirre, & Tellez (2009) utilized formative assessment as the framework for their case study investigating how a certain teaching performance assessment provided feedback to pre-service elementary teachers regarding their practices with students who were English language learners. They found that "requiring pre-service teachers to engage in comprehensive assessment of their teaching did not mean they had to sacrifice" (Bunch, Aguirre, & Tellez, 2009, p. 123) activities which contributed to their development, in that the assessment could function formatively. Croussard and Pryor (2012) utilized formative assessment as the framework for their study in which they investigated the role theory played in the K-12 classroom, finding that it contributed to teacher practice.

Lane, Mollica, and Windjue (2013) used formative assessment as the framework for their study investigating how a certain curricular program utilized assessment data to engage in program development. Dorn (2010) utilized formative assessment in his literature review, in which he sought to analyze the response of educators to standardized testing programs with particular reference to special education and school improvement efforts. Popham (2013) utilized formative assessment overtly in his opinion article in which he advocated that teachers should engage in formative assessment practices in the classroom given the trend toward including student test scores as a basis for teacher performance evaluations. Formative assessment has been used as a viable lens through which to view educational development and practices.

Both these theories of experience and formative assessment combine to create an appropriate conceptual framework for this literature review and this study. This study investigated the experiences of pre-service teachers taking a particular teaching performance assessment, which is (in part) formative by design. It is thus expected that the experience of completing the four-task teaching performance assessment will be transactional, playing a role in the development of pre-service teachers. The two theories form the lens through which to examine the perceptions and descriptions of the participants.

The research question for the study was:

RQ – – How do CalTPA completers perceive and describe the process of completing the four tasks, with respect to preparation, completion of the tasks, feedback, remediation, activities between tasks, and their overall experience?

The research question provided opportunity to investigate the formative and transactional aspect of the CalTPA experience, examining the perceptions and descriptions of those who have successfully completed the CalTPA order to arrive at a sense of the meaning of the entirety of the experience and its influence on their development. Findings clarified the features of the CalTPA experience and its influence on the development of pre-service teachers. Though the assessment is not a typical formative assessment, being externally-developed and also summative, it was designed to be formative. The conceptual framework based on the theory of experience and the theory of formative assessment (and especially the transactional function of each) provided the basis on which the study was conducted, and the lens through which the literature regarding the experience and assessment of pre-service teachers was reviewed.

The vast majority of the articles reviewed in the following sections reported on studies relying on qualitative methodology, though some relied on quantitative or mixed methods. The specific methods of the qualitative studies varied, with case study and literature review being the most common. Several studies relied on a mixed methods approach, and fewer studies relied on quantitative methodology. Most importantly, few studies relied on phenomenology, though several recent studies in the generally related field of education have done so.

Review of Literature on Experience

I reviewed recent articles examining experiences of pre-service teachers and found four themes. The following section will discuss these themes. First, the type of experience studied will be discussed. Second, the effects of the experience on the perceptions of pre-service teachers will be discussed. Third, the skills learned as a result of the experience will be discussed. Finally, the factors of the experience contributing to the development of the pre-service teacher will be discussed.

Types of Experiences

The experiences which researchers examined in order to understand the development of pre-service teachers can be categorized in three general types. The first type of experience studied can be called fieldwork, in which the pre-service teacher works directly with K-12 students. Bartolome (2013), Harrison (2013), Kearney, Perkins, and Maakrun (2014), McCarthy (2015), Murley, Gandy, and Huss (2016), and Uzum, Pteron, and Berg (2014) each conducted qualitative studies examining different short-term fieldwork projects carried out by pre-service teachers. All except McCarthy (2015) and Murley, Gandy, and Huss (2016) referred to the particular experience they studied as service-learning, emphasizing the nature of the experience as an opportunity to serve, and through serving, to learn. The focus of these authors' research was on the unique experiences described in their studies. By conducting qualitative research, limited to one particular experience, the authors were able to find connections between the experience and the pre-service teachers' development.

Another quasi-experimental study examined a virtual school field experience, in which pre-service teachers participated in teaching an online course (Wilkens, Eckdahl, Morone, Cook, Giblin, & Coon, 2014). Though the study included what the authors called a treatment (teaching the online course), the authors chose participant interview as a method of data collection. This type of fieldwork they were studying differed from the more traditionally structured fieldwork examined by other authors, which included classroom observation, working with small groups or individuals, and student teaching (Al-Awidi & Alghazo, 2012; Bahr, Monroe, & Shaha, 2012; Miller & Mikulec, 2014; Raven & Jurkeiwicz, 2014; Subramaniam, 2012). Thus, the researchers chose to interview participants to obtain a first-hand account of their experience.

In all of these studies, the authors chose to study experiences in which pre-service teachers had contact with K-12 inservice teachers and students. The authors were seeking to analyze the quality of the experience by examining the development of pre-service teachers who completed it. By using mainly qualitative approaches, studying a small number of participants undergoing a similar experience, the authors were able to examine thoroughly the influence of the experience on the internal process of development of the pre-service teachers. It should be noted that none of these studies examined assessment experiences.

Other authors studied course-based experiences (Huxhold & Willcox, 2014; Jong & Hodges, 2014; Kang, Bianchini, & Kelly, 2012; Lin, Chiu, & Lai, 2014; Lin, Ko, & Kuo, 2013; Miller, Xu, & Thompson, 2012). In these qualitative studies, the authors were evaluating the effectiveness of the courses by examining the development of the pre-service teachers who completed them. In the studies reviewed above, the participants have undergone the same type of experience (taking a course). In two other studies, however, participants have undergone different types of experiences. Milford and Tippett (2012) examined the individual experiences pre-service science teachers had learning science in their own K-12 schooling, relying on mixed-methods. Dickson and

Kadbey (2014) undertook a similar examination in another country, utilizing a survey. In both of these studies, the authors sought to find similarities in the participants' own schooling experiences, categorizing them and comparing them to the types of experiences the participants wanted to arrange for their K-12 students in the future. Regardless of the focus of the study or type of experience, the study methodologies allowed authors to identify the developmental effects experiences had on pre-service teachers in terms of feelings or beliefs and skills.

Influences of Experiences on Perceptions

The majority of study findings centered on changes in pre-service teacher perceptions brought about by the experience under study. Four distinct feelings or beliefs were identified as undergoing change as a result of the experiences: self-efficacy or confidence, self-perception or identity as a teacher, attitude toward others, and attitude toward their own development. Al-Awidi and Alghazo (2012) conducted a qualitative study of the experience of pre-service teachers with student teaching, seeking to understand their preparation to integrate technology into their future teaching practice. They found that the pre-service teachers gained self-efficacy regarding this element of practice, reporting that the majority perceived themselves as more confident in their ability to successfully integrate technology into teaching. Lin, Ko, and Kuo (2013) made similar findings in their qualitative study of pre-service teachers taking a course which included computer-assisted instruction. They found that the pre-service teachers developed greater self-efficacy regarding the use of computer-assisted instruction in their future teaching. In a similar vein, Jong and Hodges (2013) and Bahr, Monroe, and Shaha

(2013) conducted qualitative studies of pre-service teacher experiences and found pre-service teachers developed an increase in self-efficacy regarding teaching mathematics. This came as a result of two different types of experiences: coursework (Jong & Hodges, 2014) and fieldwork (Bahr, Monroe, & Shaha, 2013). Wilkens, Eckdahl, Morone, Cook, Giblin, and Coon (2014) utilized a mixed-methods approach to find that pre-service teachers developed more self-efficacy regarding communication and differentiation of instruction. Miller, Thompson, and Xu (2012) found pre-service teachers' experience in a middle-level education course led to increased self-efficacy regarding teaching young adolescents. In all these studies, the researchers were able to use qualitative methods to find that experiences positively influenced the development of self-efficacy (a perception) in the pre-service teachers.

In addition to self-efficacy, researchers found that pre-service teachers developed a clearer understanding of the role of a teacher, including a greater sense of self-identity as a teacher. Raven and Jurkiewiz (2014) utilized qualitative methods to find that pre-service teachers who had completed an observation fieldwork experience had developed the belief that the role of teacher included the duty to prevent bullying in the classroom. These findings closely aligned with those of Subramaniam (2012), who conducted a qualitative study to find that a field experience led pre-service teachers to develop perceptions of teachers as mediators and guides. Kang, Bianchini, and Kelly (2012), Harrison (2013), and Huxhold and Willcox (2014) each conducted qualitative studies to find that pre-service teachers developed a sense of identity as a teacher (as opposed to an identity as a student) as a result of an experience involving fieldwork with K-12 students.

In all these cases, the researchers relied on qualitative methods to find that an experience working with students contributed to the development of pre-service teachers' understanding of the role of a teacher and a sense of self-identity.

Experience has also been found to affect pre-service teachers' attitude toward others. Bartolome (2013) conducted a qualitative study to find that pre-service teachers who completed a fieldwork project had developed positive views about the students with whom they worked (students with disabilities), and felt more at ease around anyone with a disability. Milford and Tippett (2012) conducted a qualitative study to find that pre-service teachers with more personal experience with science in their own educational background held less stereotypical views of scientists, and thus more positive views toward becoming science practitioners. In both these cases, the researchers found the experience under study led pre-service teachers to challenge previously held views or perceptions regarding others.

Finally, experience has been found to influence pre-service teachers' perceptions of their own development. Kearney, Perkins, and Maakrun (2014) conducted a case study to find that pre-service teachers who had participated in a cross-cultural fieldwork experience gained a greater awareness of their own aptitudes for teaching. Similarly, Lin, Chiu, and Lai (2014) conducted a qualitative study to find that pre-service teachers who had experienced an elective course in adolescent psychology reported a greater sense of self-understanding (in addition to a greater understanding of adolescents). Miller and Mikulec (2014) conducted a qualitative study to find that pre-service teachers completing a fieldwork experience in an alternative progressive charter school gained more appreciation of the value of diversity, and recognized that change, with some reporting a newfound willingness to consider working in an alternative school setting.

Thus, experience has been shown to have an influence on pre-service teachers' feelings, beliefs, understanding, and attitudes, or their perceptions. The authors of these studies relied on qualitative methodology to investigate the internal processes at work in the development of pre-service teachers. The purposes of their studies were to evaluate the effectiveness or value of the experience as part of the teacher preparation program.

Skills Learned as a Result of Experience

In addition to changes in perception, researchers have found that pre-service teachers have developed certain skills as a result of experiences. In her case study, Bartolome (2013) found that pre-service teachers had developed reflective ability as a result of participating in a fieldwork experience. She also found the pre-service teachers had developed an ability to make connections between theory and practice, a skill also found by Lin, Chiu, and Lai (2014), McCarthy (2015), Murley, Gandy, and Huss (2016), and Uzum, Pteron, and Berg (2014). Various authors found that pre-service teachers had developed pedagogical skills as a result of an experience (Harrison, 2013; Huxhold & Willcox, 2014; Jong & Hodges, 2014; Kearney, Perkins, & Maakrun, 2014; Miller, Thompson, & Xu, 2012; McCarthy, 2015; Wilken, Eckdahl, Morone, Cook, Giblin, & Coon, 2014). Again, these authors relied on qualitative methodology to investigate the relationship between the experience and pre-service teacher development. They found experience has an effect on pre-service teacher development of skills which can improve their future teaching practice.

Contributing Factors of Experiences

Finding that experience influences pre-service teacher development, several authors sought to analyze experiences to identify contributing factors. Three types of factors have been found; interactivity, application, and reflective opportunity. Al-Awidi and Alghazo (2012) surveyed pre-service teachers and found that interaction with peers and with cooperating teachers was a significant factor in pre-service teachers' fieldwork experience. This factor was also identified by Miller, Thompson, and Xu (2012), whose case study found pre-service teachers benefited from positive interactions with K-12 students and cooperating teachers in a fieldwork experience. Later, Harrison's (2013) qualitative self-study found pre-service teachers' interaction with school personnel and students in the fieldwork experience to be significant factors of the experience. In these three studies, the findings were virtually identical, underscoring their validity, though the methodology differed.

Two researchers identified application of theory in an experience as an important factor. Bahr, Monroe, and Shaha (2013) conducted an experimental study and found that one of the benefits of pre-service teachers' fieldwork experience was the immediate relevant application of previously-learned theoretical knowledge. Similarly, Bartolome's (2013) case study found that pre-service teachers themselves identified the clear connection of a service learning project to previous coursework as a benefit to their development. Though their methodology differed, both authors found the ability to apply knowledge is a key factor in an experience leading to pre-service teacher development.

Researchers identified a third contributing factor in a beneficial experience: reflective opportunity. Huxhold and Willcox's (2014) case study found that pre-service teachers who engaged in an art activity as part of an art methods course had the opportunity to reflect on their experience with the course content, and that this was a key component of the experience. Similarly, Kearney, Perkins, and Maakrun's (2014) case study found that daily reflection and discussion sessions played a key part in the cross-cultural service learning experience for pre-service teachers. Both authors relied on case study, narrowing the focus of their studies to one particular experience. They posited that the reflective opportunities afforded pre-service teachers as part of the experiences played an important role in their development.

Major Themes

In summary, a review of recent literature on the role of experience in pre-service teacher preparation revealed several key themes. First, various types of experiences in teacher preparation programs were studied, though none was an assessment experience. Second, experience was found to influence pre-service teacher feelings or beliefs toward several ideas which are foundational to teaching. Third, experience was found to impart certain skills relevant to teaching practice. Fourth, several key factors of beneficial experiences were identified. The studies relied on qualitative methodology, allowing the researchers to focus on a particular or unique experience and also obtain participants' views and perceptions. None of these studies relied on the phenomenological approach, but then none of the researchers attempted to define the meaning of the experiences according to the participants or derive a common essence.

Review of Literature on Assessment

I reviewed articles related to the assessment of pre-service teachers, and found six themes in the literature. The following section will discuss the themes. First, the theme of political motivation of pre-service teacher assessment will be discussed. Second, the foundational assumptions upon which pre-service teacher assessment rests will be discussed. Third, the purposes or goals of pre-service teacher assessment will be discussed. Fourth, assessment methods will be discussed. Fifth, the validity and reliability of various methods will be discussed. Finally, the role of assessment in pre-service teacher development will be discussed.

Political Motivation

The political motivation of the assessment of pre-service teachers is a topic of studies reaching back several decades. Upon review of these, I categorized these into two periods based on trends in their findings: those made prior to certain national legislation, and those made following the national legislation. Several authors published articles prior to the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). This legislation nationally codified pre-service teacher testing as a condition of initial licensure. Wise, Darling-Hammond, & Purnell (1988) conducted a qualitative study investigating the impacts of pre-service teacher testing by examining the policies and practices of five individual states. The authors deliberately chose to study these certain states because they perceived the states were at the forefront of what they called a pre-service teacher testing legislation movement (Wise, Darling-Hammond, & Purnell, 1988, p. 1). The authors found that the political motivation to legislate testing as a condition of pre-service teacher licensure was overt, and stemmed from public perception of teachers as not well-educated. They found that testing became an "instrument of professional reform" (Wise, Darling-Hammond, & Purnell, 1988, p. 8), much like a sword to be wielded in an attempt to overhaul the educational system. As a result of implementing mandatory testing, they posited, states would gain increased political control over the teaching profession, and state officials would take on the role of determining who would become a teacher (as opposed to teacher educators, or potential teachers themselves). Mandatory testing, they argued, would affect the teaching profession as a whole. Popham (1990) wrote a theoretical article in which he assumed the political motivation for testing, and argued that since testing is clearly a result of politics, the validity of any test used for teacher licensure must be ensured. He found that while it was tempting to focus on face validity, or the perceived legitimacy of a test, this was problematic in what he called a "politicized milieu" (Popham, 1990, p. 14), as the definition of a legitimate test could suffer as a result of the input of many parties. He suggested that these conditions would negatively impact the teaching profession. Brookhart and Loadman's (1995) theoretical article posited three goals of teacher competency testing: providing evidence to the public of teacher quality, providing data to state legislatures for certification purposes, and providing data for hiring agencies such as school districts. The authors found these goals directly followed political will. They criticized these goals as too narrow, since the goals dictated the purpose of teacher testing as only "weeding out incompetent teachers" (Brookhart, & Loadman, 1995, p. 16). The authors argued for a professional orientation to the teaching profession, in which professional educators would determine the goals and content of pre-service teacher testing, thus improving teacher quality. Mehrens' (1990) theoretical article took a different view, and argued that since the "rapid spread of teacher-testing programs [was] politically based" (Mehrens, 1990, p. 79), it was inevitable. He argued that while it would not "cure all educational ills" (Mehrens, 1990, p. 129), testing candidates for a teacher license would ensure a minimal level of competence, and thus improve the profession. Though only Wise, Darling-Hammond, and Purnell (1988) conducted a study, all of these authors drew conclusions based on research, positing implications about the political motivation of the then-emerging trend of pre-service teacher testing and forecasting ramifications for the profession as a whole. Their purpose was to affect political policy. Thus, the issue of pre-service teacher testing became important as a factor in program design and pre-service teacher development.

As pre-service teacher testing became a concern with the passage of NCLB, various authors noted a change in practice from assessment of basic competency skills to assessment of teaching skills (Clayton, 2013; Dover & Schultz, 2016; Gugilianone, Payne, Kinsey, & Chiero, 2009; Miller & Carney, 2009; Noel, 2014; Pecheone & Chung, 2006; Reagan, Schram, McCurdy, Chang, & Evans, 2016; Riggs, Verdi, & Arlin, 2009; Selvester, Summer, & Williams, 2006; Torgerson, Macy, Beare, & Tanner, 2009). Sleeter (2003) wrote an opinion article focusing on one particular state's legislation which mandated that pre-service teachers must pass a teaching performance assessment as a condition of licensure. He echoed the concern of Wise, Darling-Hammond, and Purnell (1988), decrying the fact that the state had become the sole determiner of what constituted good teaching, stifling debate and "promoting anti-intellectualism, creating a hierarchy of authority that locates communities at the bottom" (Sleeter, 2003, p. 20). Chung (2008) conducted a qualitative study of pre-service teachers completing a certain teaching performance assessment in one state, and found that while the particular assessment had potential for contributing to the development of pre-service teachers, the "impact of a top-down state mandate in teacher education" (Chung, 2008, p. 24) had limits. Miller and Carney (2009) conducted a case study investigating the practices of a university student teaching supervisor, and found that the state policy directly influenced the assessment of teaching performance, as the state-approved observation assessment instrument defined success. The authors found that the supervisor faced difficulty using the instrument, and felt "the need to devise what felt like artificial demonstrations" (Miller & Carney, 2009, p. 225) in order to meet the state-dictated requirements. Each of these authors reported negative consequences of direct political influence on pre-service teacher assessment.

The passage of NCLB as a line of demarcation became even more evident as time progressed, as the legislation was a specific reference in several recent studies of pre-service teacher assessment (Luster, 2010; Merino & Pecheone, 2013; Whitenack & Swanson, 2013). Some of the findings related to direct political influence on pre-service teacher assessment were less overtly negative. Cochran-Smith, Piazza, & Power (2012) analyzed three current assessment initiatives, conducting a document analysis. One of the documents was a teaching performance assessment. They argued that their "current reading of the potential impact of the TPA on local control and professionalization is mixed" (p. 21). Denton (2013) conducted an exploratory case study of a particular teaching performance assessment in one state and found that while there was "evidence to show that linking performance to consequences can result in negative consequences" (p. 33), a survey of the new assessments suggested they were designed, in part, for professional growth purposes, which they regarded as positive. The focus of the research was the assessment itself, rather than overarching state policy. Thus, while political influence on pre-service teacher assessment was shown to bea valid factor, it may not be automatically assumed to be a negative factor, nor the only factor.

Very recent studies underscored the expanding intersection of politics and the assessment of teaching performance. Caughlin and Jiang (2014) conducted a qualitative case study in which they analyzed three different pre-service teaching performance assessments used in programs in three different states. They posited that in each case the state was "increasing its mediation of the pedagogical relationships between students and teachers, and between teacher candidates and teacher educators" (Caughlin & Jiang, 2014, p. 11). Taut and Sun (2014) conducted a literature review to study the inservice teacher assessment system implemented by the Chilean government, and found that the result was a "complex and challenging trade-off" (p. 22) between the government's goals of ensuring quality and the pre-service teacher preparation programs' educational goals. Lincove, Osborne, Dillon, and Milles (2013) conducted a qualitative study in which they analyzed one states' plan to evaluate teacher education programs using student achievement data from K-12 classes taught by program graduates. They found the plan included "the ambiguity of value-added metrics … without clear criteria" (p. 34) and cautioned that the political controversy created by the plan could be too high a price to pay for its implementation. Noel's (2014) case study described the work she did to design and embed a particular assignment into her pre-service teacher course due to the state adopting a teaching performance assessment requirement, outlining her concern regarding the clear impact of legislation on her course design. The focus of these studies was on policy implications. Clearly, these authors suggested that politics has played and continues to play a role in the assessment of pre-service teachers, and thus raised the question of the implications for teacher preparation programs and pre-service teacher development.

A series of articles on the emergence of a nationally available teaching performance assessment, edTPA, echoed similar socio-political themes. An (2016) wrote a self-study analyzing her own work as a professor in a program that had recently begun requiring pre-service teachers to complete the edTPA. She found challenges in practice for social studies methods professors such as herself, and decried the "hidden curriculum" (p. 24) of the assessment, which she identified as discounting the importance of social studies in elementary teacher preparation. Madeloni and Gorlewski (2013) wrote an opinion article in which they argued that the edTPA is flawed because it has been designed and implemented in a time when "those seeking to exploit the public good and privatize education" (n.p.) are wielding influence on teacher preparation program development. These sentiments were echoed in an essay by Dover, Shultz, Smith, and Duggan (2016), in which they criticized the edTPA as an example of the "outsourcing of teacher evaluation" (p. 3).

Foundational Assumptions of Pre-service Teacher Assessment

The foundational assumptions of pre-service teacher assessment were investigated by authors of recent studies. Their findings can be synthesized into several categories: cultural bias, skills assessed, and underlying principles of teacher development. Each group of findings will be discussed in turn.

First, one underlying assumption of the assessment of pre-service teachers was that it carries inherent cultural bias. Sleeter (2003) conducted a qualitative study and argued that while one state's program for assessing pre-service teachers was reform-driven (a positive foundation), the resulting assessment programs were culturally biased (a negative outcome). He warned that "in the most diverse state in the nation, all teachers will have been dipped into the same narrow and shallow well of knowledge" (p. 23). Tellez (2003) wrote an opinion article based on a testing instrument used in the same state. He shared Sleeter's (2003) view, arguing that the instrument had what he termed "accretionary bias" (p. 15), or a cumulative cultural bias at the test level. White's (2012) case study investigated the help-seeking behavior of pre-service teachers in a different state who were preparing to take the first of a series of three state certification exams. She found a "notable discrepancy between the [pass] rate of minority teachers … and their white counterparts" (White, 2011, p. 38), which suggested bias, and called for increased support for minority pre-service teachers. McCall, McHatton, and Shealey (2014) conducted a literature review examining assessment of pre-service special education teachers. They found that the so-called hidden curriculum of teaching performance assessments had not been studied. Fleet and Kitson (2009) studied assessment in a pre-service teacher education program in which a significant number of indigenous candidates enrolled. Their case study investigated the performance of the indigenous candidates. They found the need to develop the assessments, changing from a deficit view of the cultural minority students to a view that gives value to the different cultural perspectives (Fleet & Kitson, 2009, p. 410). Each author expressed concern that cultural bias in pre-service teacher assessment would negatively affect the future make-up of the teaching profession by making access to programs or licensure difficult for minority pre-service teaching candidates.

A second underlying assumption of pre-service teacher assessment concerned the skills that are assessed. Mitchell (1990) wrote a theoretical article in which he argued that the assessment instrument designer's value choice determines what is tested and how it is tested. Thus he posited that those who design assessments would build them on assumptions about what skills are valued in teaching. However, he did not articulate what those were. Medley (1990) wrote a theoretical article in which he investigated the practice of observation as evaluation of teaching performance. He posited that the fundamental assumption of observation is that the observed behavior is a representative sample of the actual behavior, and thus it would be possible to "specify rules of procedure that a teacher should follow" (p. 41). He also did not specify what those procedures were, but suggested they fell into three aspects of teaching, namely effectiveness, performance, and competence. He posited that specific definitions of teacher competencies would need to be developed for any assessment system to be accurate. Milanowski, Heneman, and Kimball (2011) qualitatively investigated eight inservice teacher evaluation systems. They posited the need to develop a competency model in order to ensure that the evaluations could "produce scores with useable levels of criterion-related validity" (p. 18). Miksza and Berg (2013) conducted a literature review in order to investigate several theoretical frameworks which inform the structure of music teacher education programs. They found that including a framework would have implications for every aspect of pre-service teacher development, including assessment, but did not advocate for any particular one. These authors emphasized that the skills to be taught and assessed in pre-service teacher development should be determined and articulated in advance, but did not posit which specific skills should be included.

In contrast, Dee (2012), Palmer (2012), and McCall, McHatton, and Shealey (2014) did identify certain skills they found to be assumptions of pre-service teacher assessment. Dee (2012) qualitatively analyzed samples of a certain teaching performance assessment in one teacher education program in order to evaluate its potential for evaluating the cultural competence, or sensitivity, of candidates. He found that the assessment provided opportunities for candidates to demonstrate cultural competency provided that the programs deliberately included a rubric which guided the candidate to do so. He argued that although this was not the primary goal of the assessment, the assessment could be used to measure the cultural competence of pre-service teachers as a foundational skill. Palmer (2012) conducted a literature review in order to investigate two theoretical frameworks regarding the development and assessment of pre-service teachers. He found that the two frameworks were based on cognitive development theories, and argued that by applying these theories to pre-service teacher development, teacher educators could better assess the candidates in their programs. Thus, Palmer (2012) posited that it was crucial for pre-service teachers to develop cognitive skills, and thus those skills should be assessed in order to measure pre-service teacher development. In their literature review investigating assessment in pre-service special education programs, McCall, McHatton, and Shealey (2014) sought to clarify the skills and knowledge pre-service special education teachers should have upon program completion. They posited that they should have a complex mix of knowledge and skills, covering a range of topics, such as content area, student behavior, colleague collaboration, and inclusion, and that these foundational skills should form the basis of a pre-service teacher assessment system. Clearly, these authors found a variety of skills to be foundational to teacher preparation. This variety underscores Milanowski, Heneman and Kimball's (2011) call for professional agreement on a framework which outlines specific teacher competencies or skills.

Several authors found the specific skill of reflection played a foundational role in pre-service teacher development and assessment (Al-Barakat & Al-Hassan, 2009; Astika, 2014; Barnes & Gillis, 2016; Bairral & dos Santos, 2012; Chaffin & Manfredo, 2010; Chitpin & Simon, 2009; Coffey, 2014; Cornish & Jenkins, 2012; Edward-Groves & Hoare, 2012; Li, Liu, & Steckelberg, 2010; Oner & Adadan, 2011; Plaisir, Hachey, & Theilheimer, 2011; Roberts, 2014; Yarbrough, 1995). In his theoretical article, Yarbrough (1995) overtly posited the assumption that teaching is by definition a reflective practice. Chaffin and Manfredo (2010) qualitatively investigated the perceptions of pre-service music teachers regarding effective feedback. They found that the written feedback provided by university supervisors on assessments did indeed lead to reflection by the pre-service teachers. Coffey (2014) qualitatively investigated a similar practice in which pre-service teachers were observed by university supervisors and video recorded teaching in a classroom, receiving formal written feedback on their performances. The author found that by viewing themselves teaching on video, the pre-service teachers were able to engage in reflection, which was "much more powerful than simply relying on written feedback alone" (Coffey, 2014, p. 94). He argued that reflection must play a crucial part of the assessment process as it plays a foundational role in pre-service teacher development. Edwards-Goves and Hoare (2012) made similar arguments in their qualitative study of stakeholders in one teacher preparation program, calling for teacher education programs to adopt policies which mandate the inclusion of activities which foster reflection. They posited that reflection was a foundational skill. Several authors directly connected a particular assessment type (portfolio) with reflection. Oner and Adadan (2011) qualitatively examined the web-based portfolio entries of pre-service teachers in one program, finding that the pre-service teachers were called upon to engage in reflection and that they did so. Similarly, Plaisir, Hachey, and Theilheimer (2011) relied on a mixed-methods examination pre-service teachers' perceptions of the usefulness of an electronic portfolio assessment in one teacher education program. They found that the pre-service teachers saw the opportunity for reflection as a key benefit of the assessment. These findings were echoed by Cornish and Jenkins (2012) in a case study of the assessment practices in one teacher preparation program. They found the pre-service teachers viewed reflection as a crucial skill, and posited that this directly led to increased motivation and growth (Cornish & Jenkins, 2012, p. 167). Roberts (2014) examined a similar assessment in his case study of another teacher education program. He found that reflection was a crucial skill around which the assessment was built, leading to the pre-service teachers becoming more effective practitioners. Astika (2014) conducted a case study of student teachers in one teacher preparation program, examining their written responses in a reflective journal. He posited that reflection was a key skill for pre-service teachers, and recommended that programs include an alternative assessment instrument designed to elicit it in order to encourage its development (Astika, 2014, p. 16). Barnes and Gillis (2016) conducted a case study of a particular assessment activity within a pre-service course. They found that the pre-service teachers acknowledged the crucial role of reflection, and the assessment activity under investigation promoted it. Each of these authors relied on qualitative methodology to find reflection to be a key skill in pre-service teacher development and thus foundational to assessment.

Other authors found a different skill to be foundational to pre-service teacher development and assessment: pedagogical content knowledge (Ellington, Whitenack, Inge, Murray, & Schneider, 2012; Haertel, 1990; Graham, 2011; Schmidt, Baran, Thompson, Mishra, Koehler, & Shin, T. 2009; Shulman, 1988; Voss, Kunter, & Baumert, 2012). Shulman’s (1988) theoretical article identified and defined pedagogical content knowledge as the crucial knowledge base mastered by good teachers. He posited that good teachers not only had great knowledge of the discipline(s) they would be teaching, but also had the skills to analyze the content in two ways. First, they were able to determine which aspects of the content were important building blocks for future learning in the subject. Second, they were able to determine which aspects of the content would "pose the greatest difficulties for the pupils' understanding" (Shulman, 1988, p. 37). Shulman (1988) posited that these analysis skills should form the basis for effective pre-service teacher assessment, and recommended performance assessment exercises as the best method for assessing them. Haertel (1990) concurred in his theoretical article, based on his field test of performance assessments. He asserted that "the development of an empirical and consensual knowledge base of teaching … should proceed concurrently with research and development on teacher assessment" (Haertel, 19990, p. 28). Schmidt, Baran, Thompson, Mishra, Koehler, and Shin (2009) conducted a pilot study to develop an instrument designed to assess pre-service teachers' pedagogical content knowledge, and Graham (2011) conducted a literature review to examine a theoretical framework for pedagogical content knowledge. All advocated the expansion of the foundational concept of pedagogical content knowledge to include technological knowledge, calling for a theoretical framework to be developed. Ellington, Whitenack, Inge, Murray, and Schneider, (2012) used the concept of pedagogical content knowledge as the theoretical framework for their quasi-experimental study exploring the development of pre-service elementary teachers, marking its importance. Based on all these findings, two implications can be drawn: there is a need for continuous development of pre-service teacher assessment, and a there is need for such assessment to be constructed so as to ascertain the level of the pre-service teacher's pedagogical content knowledge.

A third basic underlying assumption of assessment of pre-service teachers involved the process and nature of teacher development. Berg and Mikzsa (2010) conducted a case study in one teacher preparation program to investigate pre-service teacher concerns related to their development. Their findings suggested that pre-service teacher development is not necessarily linear, which carries implications for the structure and timing of pre-service teacher assessment. Crossouard and Pryor (2012) also conducted a case study, but of inservice teachers, investigating the role of theory in classroom teaching, particularly regarding assessment. They found that theory directly influences the development of teaching practices, and thus the development of teachers. Chaffin and Manfredo (2012) conducted a case study of four pre-service music teachers to investigate the use of feedback in their teacher preparation program. They found the receipt of written feedback to be a condition of pre-service teacher development; in other words, the feedback was shown to be an instrument of development. Sato (2014) investigated the underlying conceptions of a certain teaching performance assessment and found that it “leans toward a constructivist approach” (p. 7). Chiu (2014) wrote an opinion article recounting her own experience completing the edTPA as a preservice teacher. She was critical of that experience in that it drew her focus away from teaching for social justice in the classroom, a finding echoed by An (2016). These authors’ findings may appear disparate at first, but taken together, they underscore the idea that a conceptual understanding or theoretical framework of teacher development exists, and thus influences the assessment of pre-service teachers.

Purposes or Goals of Pre-service Teacher Assessment

The purposes or goals of pre-service teacher assessment were investigated by authors of various studies. Their findings can be synthesized into three general categories: accountability of the individual, accountability of program, and the dichotomy of formative and summative purposes. Each of these categories will be discussed in turn.

The primary purpose of pre-service teacher assessment has been found to be holding candidates for teacher licensure accountable as individuals (An, 2016; Bunch, Aguirre, & Tellez, 2009; Bunch, Aguirre, & Tellez, 2015; Chiu, 2014; Chung, 2008; Milanowski, Heneman, & Kimball, 2010; Noel, 2014; Okhremtchouk, Newell, & Rosa, 2013; Parker & Volante, 2009; Pecheone & Chung, 2006; Peck & McDonald, 2013; Riggs, Verdi, & Arlin, 2009; Sariscsany, 2010; Stiggins, 1990; Taut & Sun, 2014; Tshuma & Ndeble, 2015; Van Es & Conroy, 2009; Waggoner & Carroll, 2014; Wise, Darling-Hammond, & Purnell, 1988). As Wise, Darling-Hammond, and Prunell (1988) foretold in their mixed-methods investigation of five states' teacher testing policies, such assessments now play a pivotal role in determining who becomes a teacher. Riggs, Verdi, and Arlin (2009) conducted a quantitative validity study of one state's early version of a teaching performance assessment used as a condition for initial licensure, finding it a valid instrument for assessing individual pre-service teacher competence. Allan, Shane, Brownstein, Ezrailson, Hagevik, and Veal (2009) conducted a literature review and document analysis to investigate training of pre-service science teachers, positing that it was incumbent upon programs to provide evidence of pre-service teacher understanding. Taut and Sun (2014) conducted a case study of an inservice teacher assessment program mandated by the government in one country, and also examined the inherent connections to pre-service teacher assessment. They found a crucial aspect of the program was “the careful definition of its intended purposes, uses and effects” (Taut & Sun, 2014, p. 22), which they found to be clearly to ensure teacher quality. Chiu (2014) and An (2016) acknowledged this purpose of a nationally-distributed commercial assessment instrument (the edTPA), though they were both critical of the effects on pre-service teachers and programs. Through various methods, these authors established that various pre-service teacher assessments were implemented and used for the same purpose of individual accountability.

In his theoretical article, Soled (1995) posited two underlying views regarding the general goal of pre-service teacher assessment for individual accountability. He posited the first view of such assessment was solely to prevent “incompetence in the classroom” (Soled, 1995, p. 2), and thus pre-service teaching assessment would take on the role of local screening. He posited the second was to view pre-service teacher assessment as “one strand in a fabric of solutions for an educational system with problems” (Soled, 1995, p. 2). Holding this view, he found, would place individual accountability in broader context of reform. Chung (2008) concurred with this second view. She conducted a qualitative study in which she examined an early version of a certain pre-service teaching performance assessment, and found that while it was designed and implemented to hold individuals accountable for developing desired teaching skills, it also removed local control from the process. She argued that this was a limit of top-down reform.

Brookhart and Loadman's (1995) theoretical article examined the role of candidate accountability in pre-service teacher assessment on a broad scale. They found that assessment programs were being developed "because of the public outcry for accountability" (Brookhart & Loadman, 1995, p. 22). Though they were investigating the movement toward such assessment in its early stages, they posited two strands of outcomes. First, they posited that such assessment would "provide evidence to the public of a high-quality, educated teacher workforce" (Brookhart & Loadman, 1995, p. 14). Second, they posited that the assessments would provide data for state licensing authorities for certification purposes and local districts for hiring purposes. They argued that these outcomes would narrow the goal of the assessment to simply "weeding out incompetent teachers" (Brookhart & Loadman, 1995, p. 16). They argued for the adoption of three broader goals for pre-service teacher assessment: increased student achievement, elevated professional status for teachers, and upgraded standards for teacher preparation. Dover and Schultz (2016) acknowledged the prevailing press for individual accountability in teacher preparation. In their opinion article, they claimed that the development and implementation of the edTPA was a direct result of this press. They did not find fault with the concept of performance assessment itself, but directly criticized the particular assessment.

Based on their literature review focusing on assessment in special education teacher preparation, McCall, McHatton, and Shealey (2014) posited that pre-service teacher assessment should hold individuals accountable. They found "the need to assess special education teacher candidates to ensure they have the necessary skills, knowledge, and dispositions to be effective once they become teachers of record" (McCall, McHatton, & Shealey, 2014, p. 64). However, they began their study from the assumption that the special education teacher must have the skills necessary to succeed in "the divisive policy arena of contemporary public education" (McCall, McHatton, & Shealey, 2014, p. 52), and saw a dual purpose of holding individuals accountable: for their own sake and for their students' sake.

Several authors found that individual accountability could bring benefits. Frazier, Brown-Hobbs, & Palmer (2013) conducted a literature review and follow-up case study of one teacher preparation program which had developed benchmark assessments for evaluating pre-service teacher progress. They found these benchmarks provided "a basis for communicating expectations to teacher candidates" (Frazier, Brown-Hobbs, & Palmer, 2013, p. 44). Sandholtz (2012) conducted a follow-up case study in which she investigated high- and low-performing pre-service teachers drawn from a participant pool of a prior study. She found that through process of completing a mandatory teaching performance assessment, all the candidates' attention was focused on actual student learning, which she posited was a prime goal of teacher preparation. Dee (2012) conducted a case study of the implementation of a certain teaching performance assessment in one teacher preparation program, finding that it had the potential to "increase thinking about cultural competency, and thus improve pre-service teacher planning and practice" (Dee, 2012, p. 274). Falk (2013), writing an introduction to a journal issue exclusively containing studies that examined one certain pre-service teacher assessment, claimed that the assessment has allowed educators to take responsibility for their own accountability, and that the particular assessment "defines and communicates standards of practice for effective teaching that can be enforced in a reliable way for purposes of state licensure" (Falk, 2013, p. 1). Gallant and Mayer (2012) conducted a qualitative study of a certain pre-service teacher assessment in use in one program. They found that the particular assessment not only accurately determined the candidates' readiness for teaching, but helped make lasting connections between theory and practice. Through various methods, these authors found that accountability by assessment brought benefits to teacher candidates and ultimately to the profession of teaching.

Several authors took a different focus and investigated the role standards played as related to the goal of accountability. Sleeter's (2003) editorial article warned against limiting a definition of good teaching to only that which is codified by state standards, expressing outrage that a state would place more emphasis (through assessment) on individual accountability rather than address system inequities. Hudson (2009) surveyed pre-service teachers in one teacher preparation program to investigate the intersection of state-mandated teaching standards and professional development. He posited the need to assess pre-service teachers in ways which align with "advocated standards within university coursework units" (Hudson, 2009, p. 70), thus situating assessment within a context defined by external standards. Caughlin and Jiang (2014) posited the teacher preparation programs in one state that used a certain teaching performance assessment directly aligned their assessments with state teaching standards, and did so to "satisfy requirements of larger policy bodies" (Caughlin & Jiang, 2014, p. 5). This finding echoed the finding of Miller and Carney (2009), who found the same when investigating another state's pre-service teacher assessment practices. Duckor, Castellano, Tellez, Wihardini, and Wilson (2014) quantitatively studied the pre-service teacher assessment programs of two large state universities, and found the performance assessments which the programs used were valid instruments for measuring the candidate's achievement of the state's professional teaching standards. Waggoner and Carroll (2014) conducted a quantitative study investigating concurrent validity of multiple assessments in use at a teacher preparation program. They found some correlation between each measure of pre-service teachers' performance, but called for state-wide initiatives to ensure that the assessment instruments in use were aligned with clear standards to ensure that all the instruments were measuring the same constructs. Through various methods, these authors were able to draw clear connections between external standards and assessment, and advocated their clear alignment in teacher preparation programs.

Assessing pre-service teachers for accountability purposes has been found to be problematic. In his opinion article, Pasch (1995) warned that by adding any type of pre-service teacher assessment, teacher preparation programs must "grapple with the tensions that exists between the dual goals of … evaluation or accountability on the one hand and professional development [of candidates] on the other" (p. 184). Darling-Hammond (2006) conducted a case study of assessment strategies implemented by one university's teacher preparation program. While she found the assessment instruments in use to be useful for determining candidate's progress, she warned against the urge to "focus on single measures of teacher education outcomes" (Darling-Hammond, 2006, p. 135) and called for multiple measures which would "allow a comprehensive view of what candidates learn" (p. 135). In Clayton's (2013) literature review investigating teaching evaluation reforms in one state, she cautioned against certifying pre-service teachers based one single high-stakes assessment, calling for more data to be gathered on the factors that make such programs successful. Okhremtchouk, Newell, and Rosa (2013) conducted a survey of pre-service teachers to investigate one teacher preparation's implementation of a certain teaching performance assessment and found the need to make adjustments. They posited that there was a need to do more than simply "get the pre-service teachers through the program and to ensure that they pass all the steps necessary to be recommended for a teaching credential" (Okhrentchouk, Newell, & Rosa, 2013, p. 22). Lit and Lotan (2013) conducted a case study of one teacher preparation program's implementation of a certain teaching performance assessment, finding that it raised problems that came with including a high-stakes assessment in an ideally formative program offering multiple theories of teaching and learning. Noel (2014) posited the need for program support of pre-service teachers as they prepare for a mandatory teaching performance assessment. In her case study, she found the pre-service teachers in her university teacher preparation program faced challenges with logistics related to the teaching performance assessment, such as video recording. Coloma (2015) reported similar findings in his case study of the implementation of a commercially-developed teaching performance assessment. Rather than viewing any one pre-service teacher assessment as a panacea, these authors found that requiring candidates to pass high-stakes assessments actually raised issues or concerns needing further study. These authors relied on different methods, with only Okhremtchouk, Newell, and Rosa (2013) obtaining first-hand accounts from pre-service teachers.

In addition to candidate accountability, pre-service assessment has been recommended as one means to ensure program accountability. As a part of a theoretical article, Luster (2010) described one program's adoption of a certain teaching performance assessment. He recommended requiring a pre-service teaching performance assessment at the state-wide level. He argued that it could be used to "measure the progress of teacher credentialing institutions toward training highly-qualified beginning teachers" (Luster, 2010, p. 14). Various authors have studied the implementation of teaching performance assessments at various colleges and universities. Each found that pre-service teacher assessment data was useful for program evaluation and improvement (Bunch, Aguirre, and Tellez, 2009; Darling-Hammond & Snyder, 2000; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Frazier, Brown-Hobbs, & Palmer, 2013; Leaman & Kistler, 2009; Luster, 2010; Lys, L'Esperance, Dobson, & Bullock, 2014; Guagilianone, Payne, Kinsey, & Chiero, 2009; Pecheone & Chung, 2006; Sandholtz, 2012; Sloan, 2013; Snyder, 2014; Torgerson, Macy, Beare, & Tanner, 2009; Tshuma & Ndeble, 2015; Yarbrough, 1995). Perhaps Bunch, Aguirre, and Tellez (2009) stated it best. Their case study investigated one program's implementation of a certain teaching performance assessment, and found analyzing the results could "shine light on the spectrum of ways in which candidates across an entire class, cohort, or program are prepared" (Bunch, Aguirre, & Tellez, 2009, p. 123), thus directly paving the way for program improvement. Darling-Hammond, Newton, and Wei's (2010) case study examined a wide variety of pre-service teacher assessments in place at a certain teacher education program. They found that collecting and analyzing aggregate data proved valuable to program evaluation and improvement. They particularly recommended a teaching performance assessment as valuable in that it could provide data useful for developing better support for candidate achievement in the program. However, Cochran-Smith, Piazza, and Power (2012) warned that a teaching performance assessment may be "too narrow a gauge of program quality" (p. 17) based on document review. Though focus of these studies was on teacher preparation program improvement, only Cochran-Smith, Piazza, and Power (2012) included the voices of pre-service teachers. Overall, these studies have shown that programs rely on this type of assessment data as one way to ascertain program effectiveness and compliance.

In that vein, several authors drew explicit connections between pre-service teaching performance assessments and various program improvements. Peck and McDonald (2013) conducted a case study of three teacher preparation programs using the same teaching performance assessment. They found the implementation of the assessment led to a cultural change in the programs that used it. Specifically, they found the implementation of the assessment motivated and informed faculty-initiated program change. Their findings confirmed Selvester, Summers, and Williams' (2006) initial findings. After studying an early pilot program of a teaching performance assessment, those authors found that implementing the assessment provided "a rich context to open dialogue among faculty" (Selvester, Summers, & Williams, 2006, p. 34). Thus the authors of both studies found that including a pre-service teaching performance assessment in a teacher preparation program led to a more collaborative program culture. Again, the focus of the studies was on the program rather than the individuals in it.

Other authors found data collected by a pre-service assessment resulted in specific course changes (Ellington, Whitenack, Inge, Murray, & Schneider, 2012; Noel, 2014; Peck, Singer-Gabella, Sloan, & Lin, 2014). Ellington, Whitenack, Inge, Murray, and Schneider (2012) developed an assessment instrument for a course in mathematical teaching methods for elementary education candidates. They sought to measure the knowledge their students had gained as a result of taking the course, and conducted a quasi-experimental study to determine the usefulness of the assessment instrument. They found the instrument useful in measuring student achievement, but more importantly, they made changes to the course as a result of obtaining the assessment data. They described this as an "enlightening process that resulted in improvements to all aspects" (Ellington, Whitenack, Inge, Murray, & Schneider, 2012, p. 324) of the course, even though the faculty were not involved in the initial design of course materials. Thus, the particular pre-service assessment provided faculty with information that allowed them to engage in course development. Noel (2014) developed an assignment to embed in her early childhood education course which would be used by the pre-service teachers in a portfolio-style assessment. She called the experience challenging and interesting, and called for further study on the impact such course changes would make on programs and the development of pre-service teachers.

Peck, Singer-Gabella, Sloan, and Lin (2014) conducted a literature review to investigate the efficacy of a certain teaching performance assessment as a data source for teacher preparation programs. They found data from this assessment provided useful feedback to faculty and staff regarding specific courses, and found the assessment to be a reliable data source for program improvement efforts in general. The authors advocated for all programs to include a teaching performance assessment as a crucial component, finding it provided program-level benefits.

The authors of two different studies identified the same particular program-level benefit of pre-service teacher assessment: a common language of practice. Lit and Lotan (2013) conducted a case study of one program's implementation of a certain teaching performance assessment, and found that it provided what they called coherent language regarding teaching which "diffused throughout the program" (Lit & Lotan, 2013, p. 68) as a result of the systematic adoption of the assessment. Falk (2013) also mentioned this as direct result of the movement toward assessing pre-service teachers by means of a teaching performance assessment. She posited that the assessment itself defined the set of knowledge and skills common to teaching, on which all could agree, and thus became a vehicle for communicating this language to all involved. The focus of these studies was on the program or profession as a whole, not the individuals in it.

Some authors found current pre-service teacher assessments were serving both formative and summative purposes (Bunch, Aguirre, & Tellez, 2009; Chung, 2008; Clayton, 2013; Duckor, Castellano, Tellez, Wihardini, & Wilson, 2014; Gallant & Mayer, 2012; Lit & Lotan, 2013; Meuwissen & Choppin, 2015; Ohkremtchouk, Newell, & Rosa, 2013; Smagorinsky, 2014; Wilkerson, 2015; Yarbrough, 1995). Five authors overtly called for pre-service teacher assessment to take on more formative purposes. In their case study investigating the use of a certain teaching performance assessment in a teacher preparation program, Bunch, Aguirre, and Tellez (2009) argued that it had “the potential to provide important … feedback for teacher candidates themselves, individual teacher educators, and teacher education programs as a whole” (p. 106). In their case study examining the same teaching performance assessment, Whitaker and Nelson (2013) made the same argument as a result of their case study, calling for the assessment rubric to be adapted for use in the initial courses of a pre-service teacher preparation program as a means to give candidates formative feedback. Parker and Volante (2009), qualitatively examining student teacher evaluation in one teacher preparation program, called for it to be revised to be more formative and less summative in practice. Coffey (2014) echoed the call as a result of her case study. She found that pre-service teachers who analyzed videos of one of their student teaching episodes (which supervisors used as part of summative evaluation) benefitted from that formative exercise. Taking stock of the development of program-embedded teaching performance assessments in his literature review, Clayton (2013) noted that in all cases the purpose of an assessment should be made clear to all concerned, including faculty, student teaching supervisors, and candidates. Smagorinsky’s (2014) opinion piece made the same arguments for inservice teacher evaluation, which he posited could apply to pre-service teacher evaluation. Wilkerson’s (2015) case study investigated a particular teaching performance assessment adopted for use in one state. She found it was inherently summative, and thus only limited in usefulness to the programs or the pre-service teachers. She called for more formative assessment in the state assessment system for pre-service teachers. All of these authors based their findings on single cases, positing that a more formative use of assessment would be beneficial to both programs and individuals.

Assessment Methods

The fourth theme found in the research literature findings concerns the method of assessing pre-service teachers. Authors have found four assessment methods in general use in teacher preparation: multiple choice examination, performance assessment, observation, and portfolio. Various findings related to each method will be discussed in turn.

The first method of assessing pre-service teachers was by multiple choice examination. Two distinct views regarding this method can be seen in the literature. In his theoretical article, Mehrens (1990) argued that, if properly constructed, multiple choice examinations could be valid pre-service teacher assessment instruments. He posited that if the examinations were designed based on “those competencies that experts in the field thought necessary for beginning professionals to have” (Mehrens, 1990, p. 99) then they could be useful. (He also posited that this could be problematic, as he did not believe such competencies were clearly defined.) Later, he expanded his views. In Merhrens (1992), he evaluated the movement toward teaching performance assessments. He posited that their increasing use and popularity was due to a rejection of multiple choice examinations, based on what he called largely inaccurate criticisms. In their theoretical article, Brookhart and Loadman (1995) found usefulness but limits to multiple choice methodology, positing that multiple choice tests “are best for testing propositional knowledge, logical and factual knowledge that can be expressed within the structure of stems and options in multiple choice items" (p. 22). Ayvazo, Ward, and Stuhr (2010) conducted a case study of one physical education teacher preparation program, investigating the development of candidate content knowledge. They found that multiple choice examinations were a method of assessment in the program, and did play a role in the acquisition of content knowledge. They did not criticize the use of this type of assessment, but did posit that these examinations should be aligned with the current knowledge base of the field in order to increase the candidate's level of content knowledge. Voss, Kunter, and Baumert (2012) conducted two studies as part of their process to develop an assessment instrument for use in evaluating the pedagogical knowledge of pre-service teachers. They found that the instrument they developed (which included multiple choice items) was indeed a valid instrument. These authors investigated individual multiple choice examinations, generalizing that type of test as having limited usefulness, under certain conditions.

In contrast to this view of multiple choice examinations, other authors condemned this type of assessment as ineffective, particularly for licensure decisions, and posited that pre-service teachers should be assessed instead with a performance-based assessment. Soled (1995) opined that such an assessment method appeared to be "one of the more valid and reliable approached" (p. 4) to the assessment of pre-service teachers. Pecheone and Chung (2006) conducted two qualitative studies examining the validity of a certain state-required teaching performance assessment. They posited that this type of assessment provided more information to candidates and programs than multiple choice examinations. They argued that state licensing authorities should not base teacher licensing decisions “solely on the basis of standardized multiple choice tests of content and/or pedagogical knowledge” (Pecheone & Chung, 2006, p. 33). Instead, they argued for the inclusion of performance assessments, positing that their use would “ultimately contribute to the improvement of teacher quality” (p. 23). Other authors have followed suit, studying the same teaching performance assessment as implemented in various teacher preparation programs in one state. They found the performance assessment provided valuable feedback to programs and candidates (Bunch, Aguirre, & Tellez, 2009; Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2010; Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2013; Duckor, Castellano, Tellez, Wihardini, & Wilson, 2014; Peck & McDonald, 2013; Sloan, 2013; Van Es & Conroy, 2009). Selvester, Summers, and Williams (2006) and Riggs, Verdi, and Arlin (2009) qualitatively studied another performance assessment in the same state, with similar findings. Clayton (2013) echoed this view in her literature-review-based policy brief on assessment in teaching, but called for more study on this type of assessment, stating “the field sorely needs data on the conditions that promote successful teaching performance assessments” (p. 11).

A third method of pre-service teaching assessment was observation. Traditionally, pre-service teachers are observed periodically by university supervisors during student teaching (Brookhart & Loadman, 1995; Stiggins, 1990; Diez, Athanasio, & Mace, 2010). Chaffin and Manfredo (2010) conducted a case study of four participants in one music teacher preparation program, investigating the pre-service teachers’ perception of observation. They found that the pre-service teachers found observation to be formative and thus valuable, due to the written feedback supplied to them by the observer. In a case study of pre-service teacher assessment practices in another teacher preparation program, In their overall case study of assessment in one teacher preparation program, Darling-Hammond, Newton, and Wei (2010) found observations to be beneficial because they allowed the program to create “coherence around a set of themes” (p. 381) in terms of desired practices, and found that graduates of the program showed evidence of using these practices in their first year of teaching. However, in a collaborative case study investigating assessment in another teacher education program, Parker and Volante (2009) found that pre-service teacher questioned the value of observation, as the process seemed artificial. This led the authors to recommend shifting the focus of the observation protocol to make it more formative and less summative. Conducting a case study investigating observations in one teacher preparation program, Miller and Carney (2009) found that pre-service teachers viewed the observations as “artificial demonstrations” (p. 225), and the university supervisors appeared to make tenuous claims in feedback. The authors posited that the cause of this was the lack of professional development for supervisors and limited number of observations. They posited that a certain type of technology (video annotation software) could improve the observation in the program. Al-Barakat and Al-Hassan (2009) and Wilkins, Shin, and Ainsworth (2009) both conducted qualitative studies investigating peer-to-peer observation in separate programs, and found that this assessment was effective, especially as it promoted pre-service teacher reflection. However, the authors each strongly cautioned that peer observation should not replace observation by a university supervisor. Tshuma and Ndeble (2015) examined the observation of student teachers by assessors external to the teacher preparation program, as is mandated in an overseas country. Conducting a mixed methods study, they found that observers lacked a common observation evaluation instrument, and were sometimes observing students in a program they were connected to, resulting in threats to the validity of the assessment. These disparate findings based on studies of individual cases suggested that the effectiveness of observation varied.

A fourth method of pre-service teacher assessment studied by various authors was by means of a curated portfolio of artifacts, or work samples. This method of assessment is also traditional in teacher preparation (Bairral & dos Santos, 2012; Brookhart & Loadman, 1995; Chitpin & Simon, 2009; Cimer, 2011; Cochran-Smith, Piazza, & Power, 2012; Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2010; Darling-Hammond & Snyder, 2000; Darling-Hammond & Hyler, 2013; Denney, Grier, & Buchanan, 2012; Granberg, 2010; Meeus, van Petegem, & Engles, 2009; Noel, 2014; Pasch, 1995; Pecheone & Chung, 2006; Tur & Urbina, 2014). Authors have investigated various aspects of portfolio assessment and posited various findings, generally advocating for it as an effective method for several reasons.

Several authors found portfolios to be beneficial to pre-service teacher development. Bairral and dos Santos (2012) conducted a case study exploring the use of electronic portfolios as pre-service assessment in one program. They found that the use of the portfolio contributed to pre-service teacher development in certain ways. Specifically, the portfolio promoted knowledge construction and the capacity to integrate different concepts, and contributed to candidate motivation. The authors recommended the use of portfolios as a means to “improve learning at the intersection of [three] domains” (Bairral & dos Santos, 2012, p. 10): concepts, technology, and communication. Gallant and Mayer (2012) examined a portfolio assessment system adopted for use in one university teacher preparation program. They also found the system beneficial to pre-service teacher development, as it allowed for development of professional judgment and the connection of theory and practice. Meeus, van Petegem, and Engles (2009) conducted a literature review to investigate the validity and reliability of portfolio assessment. They found that such a system can be valid to an acceptable level, and useful for assessing the pre-service teacher’s capacity to “execute a self-regulated learning process” (Meeus, van Petegem, & Engles, 2009, p. 409). Okhremtchouk, Seiki, Gilliland, Ateh, Wallace, and Kato (2009) surveyed pre-service teachers in the teacher preparation programs at one university during a certain year. They found that the pre-service teachers reported that the portfolio assessment utilized by the programs contributed to their development. Plaisir, Hachey, and Theimheiler (2011) conducted a case study of portfolio assessment in one teacher preparation program. They found that assembling the portfolio helped pre-service teachers “take a step towards establishing professional identities” (Plaisir, Hachey, and Theimheiler, 2011, p. 167), and posited that portfolios helped pre-service teachers in this way provided that the pre-service teachers took ownership of the portfolio. Thus, case studies of specific portfolio assessments have led to findings that show this type of assessment contributed to pre-service teacher development.

Several authors found the portfolio to be beneficial to the development of one certain skill in pre-service teachers: reflection. Chitpin and Simon (2009) conducted a case study of pre-service teachers in one teacher preparation program who were required to complete a portfolio as an assessment. They found that the student teachers valued the opportunity for reflection that the assessment provided, and posited that the actual assessment fostered growth (Chitpin & Simon, 2009, p. 286). Oner and Adadan (2011) conducted a document study of one program's portfolio assessment system and found that the tasks provided evidence that the pre-service teachers were engaging in reflective thinking. Similarly, Sariscsany (2010) wrote a theoretical article positing that portfolio assessment pieces provided opportunities for pre-service teachers to develop reflection practices. Plaisir, Hachey, and Theilheimer (2011) also found that portfolios proved valuable as a reflection tool. Kaino (2014) wrote a theoretical paper describing a portfolio assessment system used in a mathematics teacher preparation program, finding that it contributed to the growth of the pre-service teachers as reflective practitioners. Roberts (2014) used a case study to investigate a particular electronic portfolio assessment system used in one teacher preparation program and found it facilitated reflection. By using case study, focusing in on specific portfolios, the authors were able to zero in on a specific way that portfolios affected pre-service teachers.

Portfolio assessments have been found to contribute to program development as well. Denney, Grier, and Buchanan's (2012) case study investigated the portfolio assessment system used in one university's teacher preparation program. They found the portfolios accurately connected candidate learning outcomes and core competencies as defined by the program. They also posited that programs using this method needed to provide explicit information to faculty and candidates regarding the connections between artifacts included in the portfolio, theory, and courses. Darling-Hammond, Newton, and Wei (2013) conducted a study investigating the predictive value of a certain portfolio assessment used in several teacher preparation programs in one state. They found that the data generated by this method of assessment was useful to programs, particularly if faculty were involved in the scoring process. Thus, qualitative methods have been used to ascertain that portfolios were beneficial as an assessment method in teacher preparation, based on individual instances (cases).

Validity and Reliability

A fifth theme in pre-service teacher assessment concerned the validity and reliability of instruments or methods. Several authors raised concerns regarding the validity and reliability of assessments in general, and posited the need for consensus on the matter. Others investigated the validity and reliability of particular instruments. Each of these strands will be discussed in turn.

Early on, several authors addressed the fundamental issue of assessment validity and reliability. Mehrens' (1990) theoretical article raised a concern over content validity of assessment of pre-service teachers. He posited that any assessment instrument used must have content validity, and posited that the way to ensure this would be to have a clear and appropriate instrument construction process. He posited that such as process must begin with a list of competencies to be assessed, which must be developed by experts in the field. In his theoretical article, Mitchell (1990) also raised similar validity concerns. He posited that a difference of opinion existed among professionals about what type of evidence would be acceptable in determining the validity of a pre-service teacher assessment instrument. He warned against the “great danger in oversimplifying the task” (Mitchell, 1990, p. 374). Stiggins’ (1990) theoretical article echoed this view, warning against assessing pre-service teachers using “ill-defined criteria” (p. 195). He posited four keys to ensuring valid and reliable data could be gathered by any assessment instrument: using a performance assessment when that method is best, basing performance criteria on exiting course outcomes, training assessors or evaluators to correctly apply the criteria, and collecting a substantive amount of data in the process. In his theoretical article, Medley (1990) found that the chief concern relating to validity and reliability of pre-service teacher assessment was the connection of the assessment tasks to a defined list of skills and knowledge expected. In his theoretical article, Haertel (1990) also found that the “set of exercises used should be representative of some definable domain” (p. 29) or skill set. In their theoretical article, Brookhart and Loadman (1995) also raised questions about what newly developed assessments would measure and if this would be “related to good teaching” (p. 21). These theoretical articles laid the basis for further investigation.

Along this line, Clayton’s (2013) qualitative study led him to caution that the high-stakes decisions resting on pre-service teacher assessment would “necessitate the construction of low-inference rubric tools” (p. 10). He warned that such a system would reduce teaching to a simple set of behaviors, ignoring its inherent complexity. He posited that the solution to this would be to train stakeholders, and “utilize protocols [for evaluating pre-service teachers] grounded in consensus view of good teaching" (Clayton, 2013, p. 26). All seven of these authors took the same general position: for pre-service teacher assessment to be valid and reliable, regardless of the method or instrument, exactly what is being assessed must be determined in advance and clearly articulated.

Several authors conducted validity studies of specific pre-service teacher assessment instruments. Torgerson, Macy, Beare, and Tanner (2009) investigated the validity of one program's self-designed performance assessment by means of a case study. They found inter-rater reliability was one key to its validity, and found that such reliability existed. Voss, Kunter, and Baumert (2012) conducted a quantitative validation study of the instrument they developed to assess pedagogical knowledge in pre-service teachers. They found "broad evidence for the validity of the instrument" (Voss, Kunter, & Baumert, 2012, p. 963), and they determined that the instrument "measures a crucial ingredient of instructional quality" (p. 965). Pecheone and Chung (2006) conducted a mixed methods validity study of a certain teaching performance assessment, finding that it had content validity, construct validity, and interrater agreement. Duckor, Castellano, Tellez, Whihardini, and Wilson (2014) conducted a subsequent quantitative validity study of the same instrument. While they found what they called internal structure validity evidence, they found this evidence did not support the claims of content validity put forth by the assessment designers. However, they posited that sufficient reliability existed to warrant continued use of the assessment. Sato (2014) investigated a version of the same assessment by conducting a qualitative document analysis, finding that it had face and content validity. Riggs, Verdi, and Arline (2009) conducted an exploratory study of the pilot version of a certain teaching performance assessment, and found it possessed adequate psychometric properties, though they called for further study. Wilkerson (2015) conducted a validity study of a certain teaching performance assessment adopted for use in one state. She found that while the assessment met "some of the psychometric standards" (Wilkerson, 2015, p. 8) to establish validity, it did not meet the standard of utility. She called for revision of the assessment. Bryant, Maarouf, Burcham and Greer (2016) conducted a validity study of two rubrics used to assess pre-service teachers developed by a particular teacher preparation program. All of these authors recognized the need for reliability and validity to be established for individual instruments in order for any results to be used correctly. They used different and mainly quantitative methods to gather evidence to show that specific instruments could be trusted as valid and reliable.

Conflicting recommendations regarding pre-service teacher assessment validity and reliability can be seen in the results of two studies. Caughlin and Jian (2014) investigated several observation instruments used by several teacher preparation programs, conducting a qualitative document review. They found that individual instruments reflected distinct and differing values of the programs in which they were developed. Instead of viewing this difference as detrimental, they praised this finding, noting that it allowed for more observer discretion and flexibility. They viewed this as a strength of the observation instruments. In contrast, Peck, Singer-Gabella, Sloan, and Li (2014) qualitatively investigated the utility of a teaching performance assessment used by several different teacher preparation programs in one state, and found the need for more standardization in order to ensure consistency. They viewed this as essential if the assessment were to be used as a source of data, particularly for program evaluation. These authors used similar methods and yet posited conflicting views regarding the conditions that would lead to validity and reliability of certain instruments.

Several authors focused on investigating the reliability of the portfolio method of assessment in pre-service teacher education. Though each case study was conducted in a separate program, each resulted in similar findings. Gallant and Mayer (2012) found that the portfolio assessment in use in a certain program was effective, and generalized that "structured professional portfolios appear to provide authentic means for assessing beginning teachers' readiness of teaching" (p. 305). Denney, Grier, and Buchanan (2012) made similar claims as a result of their qualitative validity study regarding one teacher preparation program's use of portfolio assessment. In their recent literature review, Taut and Sun (2014) found that the portfolio assessment "has proven to be the most technically robust" (p. 23) of several assessments they studied. All of authors endorsed the portfolio as a valid assessment instrument for use in teacher preparation.

Meeus, Van Petegem, and Engels (2009) conducted a literature review to investigate the reliability of three distinct types of portfolios in use as assessment instruments. They found that portfolio assessment was valid for evaluating the learning competencies of pre-service teachers, but posited that "portfolios are incapable of fulfilling the classic psychometric requirement of reliability … [because] portfolios and standardization are essentially incompatible" (Meeus, Van Petegem, & Engels, 2009, p. 411). However, they asserted that, with effort, it would be possible to bring the reliability up to an acceptable level, and posited five conditions which would need to be met. First, they posited that a uniform protocol for evaluating each portfolio be established. Second, they recommended clear criteria for evaluation be developed. Third, they recommended that evaluators use holistic marking strategies. Fourth, they recommended that evaluators be trained. Finally, they recommended a pool of evaluators be used. The authors posited that if these five conditions were met, the reliability of the portfolio assessment could be increased and the results could be used without concern.

Several studies reviewed here were quantitative validity studies of a particular assessment instrument, developed by an individual or developed and standardized by an outside agency (Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2013; Duckor, Castellano, Tellez, Wihardini, & Wilson, 2014; Pecheone, Shear, Whittaker, & Darling-Hammond, 2013; Schmidt, Baran, Thompson, Mishra, Koehler, & Shin, 2009; Voss, Kunter, & Baumert, 2012). These studies were conducted to investigate the usefulness of the assessment under examination, from the standpoint of a program, and relied on test scores or other secondary data. In other words, these authors were investigating the reliability of an instrument to provide data useful for the teacher preparation program. (None of these studies investigated the CalTPA, the assessment which is the focus of this study.) These methods allowed the researchers to investigate the usefulness of the assessments under examination. While it might have been possible for me to collect sufficient score data from the statewide users of the CalTPA, quantitative methodology would not have aligned well with the research question of this study, which sought to investigate factors relating to the development of pre-service teachers, an internal process not easily captured by a numeric score (Smagorinsky, 2014).

The Role of Assessment in Pre-service Teacher Development

Various authors have found that assessment did influence pre-service teacher development. In general, the outcomes of these influences can be separated into two categories: negative and positive. Each type will be discussed in turn.

In Denton's (2013) case study of pre-service teachers in one teacher preparation program who completed a certain teaching performance assessment, he found that the requirements of the assessment led the pre-service teachers to use certain strategies in completing the assessment. He found that among these strategies were those he called test-taking shortcuts. He found these to be useful in increasing the candidate's score on the mandatory, high-stakes assessment. He posited that this was evidence showing "that linking performance to consequences can result in negative outcomes" (Denton, 2013, p. 33) in regards to the development of the pre-service teacher. He posited that this represented a discrepancy between the intention of the assessment, which he asserted was, in part, to promote professional growth of the candidate, and its actual implementation or practice. He found this negative influence disconcerting, and called for further study. His findings were echoed in studies examining another teaching performance assessment (Coloma, 2015; Dover & Schultz, 2016; Hobbs, 2015; Margolis & Doring, 2013).

In contrast, several authors posited that assessment played a positive role in the development of pre-service teachers. Fenderson (2010) conducted a survey-based study of new teachers who were within the first 5 years of teaching. She posited that the experience of completing a certain teaching performance assessment as a part of their teacher preparation program led the teachers to use better practices in the classroom. Specifically, she found that the teachers were able to differentiate instruction, choosing specific teaching and learning strategies as a result of learning specific information about their students. (However, she found the assessment had no influence on the teachers' planning or collaboration.) Fenderson (2010) surveyed teachers who had completed the CalTPA, but did not plumb the specific ways the assessment contributed to their development. Darling-Hammond and Hyler (2013) posited that a certain teaching performance assessment discussed in their opinion article improved the teaching practices of the pre-service teachers completing it, though they did not specify which practices. These authors each posited a direct relationship between a teaching performance assessment and pre-service teacher development. Togerson, Macy, Beare, and Tanner (2009) posited an indirect relationship. Their case study of one program's self-designed teaching performance assessment led them to this finding. The faculty in the program analyzed the data collected by the assessment and determined the candidates needed improvement in the area of effective teaching practices for working with English learners. The faculty adjusted the program, and data collected from subsequent administrations of the assessment reflected improvement in this area. Thus, the authors argued, the assessment indirectly influenced the growth of pre-service teachers' skills in teaching English learners, though they were speaking on the program level, not looking at growth at the individual level. Bunch, Aguirre, and Tellez (2015) conducted a case study of eight pre-service teachers' responses on a teaching performance assessment and found a similar direct relationship between the assessment and the candidate's skill in teaching academic language of mathematics to English learners. Guagilianone, Payne, Kinsey, and Cheiro (2009) conducted a large survey-based study of a teaching performance assessment used by multiple programs in one state. They posited that the assessment had some benefit to the cognitive development of pre-service teachers. However, their study was "based on the perceptions of …state university administrators" (Guagilianone, Payne, Kinsey, & Cheiro, 2009, p. 130) and not on data drawn directly from pre-service teachers. Kilic (2016) conducted a case study of three assessment instruments used in a teacher preparation program overseas. He found that implementing these assessments could result in pre-service teachers "developing higher learning performance, higher presentation confidence, and essential competencies required for effective teaching" (Kilic, 2016, 141). He posited a direct cause and effect relationship between the assessments and development of these capacities in pre-service teachers.

Assessment in pre-service teacher programs directly resulted in pre-service teachers developing reflective skills, according to two authors. Okhremtchouk, Newell, and Rosa (2013) sought to examine pre-service teachers' perceptions of a certain teaching performance assessment. They surveyed pre-service teachers in one teacher preparation program, finding that the participants appeared to have gained knowledge from completing the assessment. Specifically, they found that "participants reported that their reflection skills on their own teaching practice and focus on various assessment strategies" (Okhremtchouk, Newell, & Rosa, 2013, p. 14) had improved. They posited that the "assessment did contribute to the development of the pre-service teachers' teaching practices" (Okhremtchouk, Newell, & Rosa, 2013, p. 20), referring specifically to the pre-service teachers' reflective ability. Plaisir, Hachey, and Theilheimer (2011) reported similar findings connecting assessment to the development of the skill of reflection. They conducted a case study investigating use of a portfolio assessment in an early childhood teacher preparation program. Participants reported that they used portfolios to both monitor their own progress and reflect on their learning. The authors posited that the portfolio assessment "enabled [pre-service teachers] to take steps towards establishing professional identities" (Plaisir, Hachey, & Theilheimer, 2011, p. 167) due to this reflective ability.

As additional benefit, assessment in pre-service teacher education has been found to afford opportunity for pre-service teachers to connect theory and practice. Gallant and Mayer (2012) examined the perceptions of pre-service teachers in one program who were required to complete a portfolio assessment, finding that the tasks "seemed to provide a stimulus for reflection" (Gallant & Mayer, 2012, p. 300), specifically helping the pre-service teachers to establish connections between theory and practice. Similarly, Jeffries and Maeder (2011) used a true experimental method to examine the impact of a certain assessment in a course in a teacher preparation program. The authors conducted an experimental study in which the intervention group of pre-service teachers completed a vignette assessment. This assessment required all the participants to analyze the same hypothetical teaching scenario, or vignette. The authors found that the assessment represented "an effective link between educational theory and pedagogical practice" (Jeffries & Maeder, 2011, p. 174). Though these authors posited that these assessments provided pre-service teachers with a means to connect theory and practice, their findings did not provide details about how the assessments provided these means.

The bulk of the studies reviewed here were qualitative in approach, with many relying on literature review, case study, or both. Several recent articles relied on literature review to investigate theoretical concepts related to assessment in pre-service teacher education (Clayton, 2013; Dover & Schultz, 2016; Everhart & Hogarty, 2009; Graham, 2011; Luster, 2010; McHall, McHattan, & Shealey, 2014; Meeus, van Petegem, & Engles, 2009; Miksza & Berg, 2013; Peck, Singer-Gabella, Sloan, & Lin, 2014; Taut & Sun, 2014). For these researchers, literature review provided the means to gather and synthesize results from already-published studies, providing an effective overview of what is known about the topic under study. A literature review would not have been effective for my study, as few previous studies have been conducted on this particular assessment (CalTPA). Many studies reviewed here relied on case study methodology (Ayvazo, Ward, & Stuhr, 2010; Bairral & dos Santos, 2012; Bartolome, 2013; Bunch, Aguirre, & Tellez, 2009; Campa, 2010; Chaffin & Manfredo, 2010; Chitpin & Simon, 2009; Cimer, 2011; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2010; Diez, Athanasio, & Mace, 2010; Darling-Hammond & Snyder, 2000; Fluckiger, Tixier y Vigil, Pasco, & Danielson, 2010; Harrison, 2013; Huxhold & Willcox, 2014; Kang, Bianchini, & Kelly, 2012; Kearney, Perkins, & Maakrum, 2014; Lit & Lotan, 2013; Miller & Carney, 2009; Miller, Thompson, & Xu, 2012; Noel, 2014; Pecheone & Chung, 2006; Peck & McDonald, 2013; Raven & Jurkiewicz, 2014; Roberts, 2014; Sanholz, 2012; Sariscsany, 2010; Sloane, 2013; Subramaniam, 2012; Torgerson, Macy, Beare, &

Tanner, 2009; Uzum, Petron, & Berg, 2014; VanEs & Conroy, 2009; Whitaker & Nelson, 2013). The researchers incorporated various sub-methods, such as observation, document review, and interview. The case study approach allowed the researchers to examine actual instances of a certain practice, such as a particular university teacher preparation program's implementation of a particular teaching performance assessment (Lit & Lotan, 2013; Whitaker & Nelson, 2013). None of these studies dealt with the CalTPA. The case study approach allowed researchers to obtain multiple types of data, thus facilitating triangulation and ensuring reliability. For this study, a case study approach did not adequately align with or answer the research question, which sought to understand individual development. In addition, multiple data types for each participant were not available due to time constraints and access issues; the study relied on participants who had already completed the experience.

Major Themes

Six themes were found in this section of the literature review related to assessment in pre-service teacher education: political motivations, foundational assumptions, goals or purposes, methods, validity and reliability, and the role of assessment in development. First, the findings demonstrated that the political motivation behind many initiatives in pre-service teacher assessment affected the assessment practices in teacher preparation programs. The result has been a general shift from assessment of basic skills to assessment of teaching performance. Second, the findings demonstrated that various assumptions undergirded the assessment of pre-service teachers, among which were cultural bias, various target skills, and a theoretical framework of development. Third, the findings demonstrated that pre-service teacher assessment was aimed at various goals, including individual and program accountability, and encompassed both formative and summative purposes. Fourth, the findings demonstrated that various assessment methods were generally employed in pre-service teacher education, including multiple choice examination, performance assessment, observation, and portfolio. Fifth, the findings demonstrated that validity and reliability in pre-service teacher assessment was a concern. Sixth, the findings demonstrated that assessment played a role in the development of pre-service teachers.

These six themes represent what is currently known in the discipline related to the assessment of pre-service teachers. The political influence on assessment was clear, carrying implications for preparation programs and ultimately individual pre-service teachers. Various foundational assumptions shaped pre-service teacher assessment, including a skill set and principles that define the process of development. The purposes or goals of pre-service teacher assessment centered on accountability, of both program and individual. Assessment has been found to be both summative and formative in purpose, which is connected to the overarching goal of accountability. Pre-service teacher assessment took various formats or methods. Certain methods have been shown to be more effective than others, and certain TPA instruments have been shown to have validity and reliability. Finally, assessment has played a role, positive or negative, in pre-service teacher development.

While these themes represent what was known, a gap existed in the literature regarding the inclusion of the perspective of those being assessed, the role assessment played in their development, and in particular the role of the CalTPA. Studies have overwhelmingly focused on pre-service teacher assessment from the perspective of the teacher preparation program. In other words, the studies investigated program-level use of the assessment, collected data at the program level, and posited implications and made recommendations for program practices. None of the studies reviewed here relied on the phenomenological approach, and few collected first-hand accounts of pre-service teachers as data. Though assessment has been shown to play a role in pre-service teacher development, both positive and negative roles have been found, leading to the question of what conditions or factors determine the role it will play. In addition, though several studies probed the use of certain assessment instruments, one particular teaching performance assessment (the CalTPA) has not been extensively or recently studied, though it is widely used across 55 teacher preparation programs in one state (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2013).

Summary

This chapter presented a review of the literature regarding experience and assessment of pre-service teachers. First, I described the literature search strategy used to locate relevant articles. Next, I described the conceptual framework used to review the literature, which consisted of a theory of experience and a theory of formative assessment. I identified four themes from the literature on pre-service teacher experience: types of experiences, effects on feelings or beliefs, skills learned, and contributing factors. I then identified six themes from the literature on pre-service teacher assessment: political motivation, foundational assumptions, purposes or goals, assessment methods, validity and reliability, and the role of assessment in pre-service teacher development.

Chapter Three will describe the methodology of this study. First, I will review the research design and rationale of the study, including the role of the researcher. Next, I will discuss the specific aspects of participant recruitment and selection, instrumentation, and data sources. I will then describe the data analysis plan and discuss issues of trustworthiness.

Chapter 3: Research Method

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of those who have successfully completed the CalTPA, a state-mandated teaching performance assessment, in their teacher preparation program. In particular, the study examined several particular aspects of the experiences: preparation, completion of the tasks, feedback, remediation, activities between tasks, and their overall experience. This chapter contains the following sections: research design and rationale, role of the researcher, methodology, issues of trustworthiness, and summary.

Research Design and Rationale

This qualitative phenomenological study sought to answer one research question:

RQ: How do CalTPA completers perceive and describe the process of completing the four tasks, with respect to preparation, completion of the tasks, feedback, remediation, activities between tasks, and their overall experience?

The central phenomenon of the study was the successful completion of the four tasks of the CalTPA. The particular teaching performance assessment is a standardized assessment developed by the state teacher licensing authority in conjunction with a national educational testing service. The assessment consists of four tasks, each of which has a set of open-ended questions that must be answered in writing. Pre-service teachers complete each task in sequence at predetermined milestones in their teacher preparation program. All the participants in the study successfully completed the four tasks and successfully completed the teacher preparation program.

This study relied on the approach known as empirical phenomenology (Moustakas, 1994). Phenomenology can be defined as the quest for understanding the lived experiences of participants (Creswell, 2007; Moustakas, 1994; Patton, 2002; Van Manen, 1990). The phenomenological approaches utilized by researchers today rest on key philosophical tenets as described by Husserl (1931/2012) and subsequent researchers. In seeking to describe his philosophy of phenomenology, Husserl (1931/2012) began by discussing foundational concepts of being and knowing. He posited that we exist in the natural world, and we interact with it to know it by means of sensory perception and overt acts of consciousness. He argued that the things we perceive, the act of perception, and the generated perceptions themselves are separate, but function together to produce meaning. In his view, the individual is constantly conducting acts of consciousness, which he termed intentionality, and in this way is able to come to know the world through living experience. Husserl (1931/2012) viewed acts of consciousness as comprised of two related factors: the act of thinking (noesis) and the resulting thoughts (noema). He believed that it was possible to deconstruct the noema in order to understand it. Other authors built on these philosophical underpinnings.

Chamberlin (1974) concurred with Husserl's (1931/2012) ideas, and articulated their relationship to education and educational research. He posited that the ideas (and therefore the methods) of phenomenology called for a different approach to determining an educational philosophy or theory than the traditional deductive one. Instead, he argued, educators must proceed inductively by first examining education itself, then deriving a theory, rather than determining a theory and then looking at the implications for education. Chamberlin (1974) also described Husserl's (1931/2012) factors in knowing and being as interdependent, functioning together to reveal meaning, and called on educators to set aside any preconceived ideas of education as an exact science. Thus, he argued, one should not employ the methods of natural science to study education, since we are called to look beyond behaviors and examine the meaning of them.

Vandenburg (1974) also built upon Husserl's (1931/2012) ideas to argue for a phenomenological approach when studying education. Focusing on methods, he posited that the intuitive approach is the most appropriate to education, and it requires the researcher to set aside preconceived ideas. He argued that this did not mean the researcher could have no prior experience with the phenomenon under study, but emphasized that the language used to describe the phenomenon must be devoid of any presuppositions. He further warned against total separation from the phenomenon, instead calling for the researcher to allow the phenomenon to address him or her. Thus, the focus of phenomenology is the phenomenon, then its meaning.

Bolton (1979) also concurred with Husserl's (1931/2012) ideas, and further posited that phenomenology actually combines two approaches to knowing: empirical and critical. He argued that phenomenology is extremely empirical in its focus on "the primitive data of experience" (Bolton, 1979, p. 247). He also posited that phenomenology is a critical philosophy as it attempts to interpret experience, and answer the question of what it means to be human. The combination of empirical and critical led Bolton (1979) to posit three characteristics of effective phenomenological research. First, the researcher must suspend all presuppositions. Second, the object of study must be manipulated to see which features do not change. Third, the researcher must reflect critically in order to arrive at unambiguous judgments. Bolton (1979) viewed phenomenology as the best way to arrive at existential truths about personal development, and claimed that phenomenology provided the best foundation for educational philosophy and educational research.

Moustakas (1994) based his methodology on these tenets. He agreed with Husserl's (1931/2012) concept of intentionality, also positing that noesis and noema integrate to form meanings, or essences, of experiences. He argued that the phenomenological philosophy "places ultimate knowledge in the reasons and powers of the self" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 41). Building on this view, he articulated a definition of the empirical phenomenological approach to research as one which seeks "to obtain comprehensive descriptions that provide the basis for reflective structural analysis that portrays the essence of the experience" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 13). He posited that the process of analysis should be an intuitive one, rather than a deductive one. These philosophical and methodological tenets informed the methodology of this study.

This study examined the experience of participants who have completed the tasks of the CalTPA by examining their perceptions and recollections. According to tenets of empirical phenomenology, the perceptions of people who undergo an experience or phenomenon are the foundations on which the essence or meaning is built (Moustakas, 1994). In the act of recalling or reflecting on an experience, an individual participates in the meaning-making. Thus, if the purpose of a study is to understand the meaning of an experience, the empirical phenomenological approach is crucial, as the perceptions of the people who have undergone the experience must be plumbed.

The empirical phenomenological approach was directly aligned with the problem and purpose of the study, which was to examine the first-hand accounts of those who have successfully completed the teaching performance assessment in an effort to understand its meaning in their development. The very wording of the research question for this study, which directly referenced an examination of perceptions and recollections, directly called for empirical phenomenological methodology. The quest for understanding the meaning of an experience relies on the examination of the perceptions and recollections of those who have undergone it (Moustakas, 1994; Van Manen, 1990).

Other qualitative approaches were ruled out for the following reasons. A grounded theory approach was not selected because it was not a fit for the study purpose. If the purpose of the study had been to discover theory, then a grounded theory approach would have be suitable; however, the purpose of this study was to examine an experience from the perspective of those who lived it, and arrive at its meaning. This directly aligned with Creswell’s (2007) explanation of the purpose of phenomenology, which he posited was “to understand several individual’s common or shared experiences” (p. 60). An ethnographic approach was also not a fit for the purpose of this study. Ethnography would be appropriate if the study sought to describe the values and behaviors of a culture group (Creswell, 2007), but this study did not seek to do that. A case study approach was not selected for similar reasons. Case study would be appropriate if a representative case or group of cases could be identified (Creswell, 2007). This would prove difficult, given the diversity of pre-service teachers' characteristics, such as gender, age, culture, and ethnicity. A narrative approach was also not selected. Creswell (2007) posited that a narrative approach is useful for "explor[ing] the life of an individual" (p. 78). This study was based on a different purpose.

Role of the Researcher

In this study, my role was that of observer. I was the sole data collector and analyst. However, I considered the participants to be co-researchers. This aligned with Moustakas' (1994) views of participants.. In this regard, I not only sought the perceptions and descriptions of the participants, but I also sought their opinions, beliefs, perspectives, and evaluations by means of open-ended interview questions. I engaged in member-checking with participants at several points throughout the data collection and analysis phases. I demonstrated respect for the participants' views by asking open-ended questions and designed interview protocols grounded in ethical and respectful collaboration.

Participants were once students in one or more of my classes, and I was the college supervisor for all but one participant when they were in student teaching. In order to mitigate any potential bias, at the start of each interview protocol I included language encouraging participants to speak freely, assuring them that I was seeking their honest description and opinions and that they would remain anonymous. I did not select any of my own current students as participants. It was possible to include participants who were not former students, in which case I would have no prior relationship with the participant, but the participants who were recommended and who consented to participate were former students.

Regardless of the state of my prior relationship with them, I worked to establish a collegial relationship with all participants. In each pre-interview protocol I explicitly stated that participants' views were welcomed, and mentioned that each participant would be treated as a colleague and co-researcher. I worked to establish a safe and welcoming environment for the interview, as posited by Moustakas (1994) and Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014). No incentives were offered for participation; participants were not compensated.

Prior to beginning work on this study, I engaged in the practice of Epoche—or bracketing— as described by Moustakas (1994). I intentionally listed in writing all the ideas I had about the teaching performance assessment, including my own beliefs, feelings, and perceptions. I based these on previous experiences as a TPA coordinator and assessor. I then set that writing aside when I designed this study. Van Manen (1990) and Moustakas (1994) posited that the words of the participants were crucial data. During data collection and analysis, I continued to set aside my own opinions and beliefs, focusing instead on the words of the participants To aid this, I ensured that accurate verbatim transcripts of interviews were created for use in data analysis by asking participants to check each of theirs for accuracy.

I invited participants to be interviewed in my workplace, or any other place that was convenient. I obtained permission from my college to use my office for interviews and any work related to this study. However, one participants preferred to hold the interview at another location that was more convenient, thus I conducted her interviews there. Two participants preferred to conduct their third interviews by phone. One participant was out of the country, and so all three of her interviews were conducted electronically. I offered to conduct interviews at whatever location and in whatever manner was most convenient so as to ensure participants were comfortable in the interview. In the participant invitations and pre-interview protocol, I informed participants of the goals of this study, explained that my role was one of researcher rather than college professor, and oriented participants to their role as co-researchers. These steps directly aligned with those posited by Moustakas (1994).

Methodology

In this section I will explain several elements of the methodology for this study. First, I will discuss participant recruitment, including sampling size and strategy. Then, I will explain instrumentation. Finally, I will explain procedures for data collection and analysis.

Participant Recruitment and Selection

Originally I sought to select 10 participants from the population for this study, namely individuals who had successfully completed the CalTPA, a four-task teaching performance assessment in a certain teacher preparation program within the past 2 years. The recency of completion was important to ensure that participants could recall sufficient details and perceptions of the experience. Because they had completed all four tasks, participants were able to not only describe and reflect on each task, but also the whole process overall. Though many teacher preparation programs utilize the same assessment tasks, there may be slight variations in implementation from program to program, and there will be variations in program size, philosophy, and content. For these reasons, the study participants were drawn from one teacher preparation program in order to ensure all participants have undergone the same experience. This is a crucial characteristic of a phenomenological study as posited by Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014), Moustakas (1994), and Van Manen (1990).

The purposeful sampling strategy known as reputational case selection was used, with participants chosen based on recommendations from experts in the field. For my study, the experts I relied on for recommendations were fellow faculty members from the teacher preparation program at which I work. I contacted faculty members and asked them to recommend potential participants they knew to have completed the teaching performance assessment tasks within the past two years and whom they knew to be capable of recalling and describing experiences in detail. This selective participant recruitment was used to draw participants from a single teacher preparation program in order to better ensure similarity of order of tasks, submission procedure, training, and assessor feedback. Again, this aligned with a crucial characteristic of phenomenology, similarity of all aspects of the experience, as posited by Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014), Moustakas, (1994) and Van Manen (1990).

Using this sampling strategy, I was assured that participants both fit the criteria of having lived the same experience or phenomenon (having successfully completed the CalTPA), and had sufficient skill to be able to recall and provide rich details about their experience (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014). I contacted 22 recommended participants by email and invited them to participate.

Study participants were selected based on the following criteria as set forth by Moustakas (1994). First, the participant must have experienced the phenomenon. By selecting participants from one program who were personally known by faculty members, I was assured that participants had successfully completed and passed the teaching performance assessment, and thus fit the first criteria. Additionally, selecting participants from one program ensured that they experienced the same aspects of the CalTPA process, such as timing, support from faculty, and feedback. Second, the participant must be interested in examining the phenomenon. Third, the participant must be willing and available for interviews and follow-up activities, including member-checking. By seeking faculty recommendations, and directly asking recommended participants about their interest and availability in the invitation to participate, I was assured that participants fit these criteria. Fourth, participants must grant permission for interviews to be recorded, personal information to be collected, and data to be collected and published by means of returning a consent form. I stated this in my invitation email, assuring potential participants of confidentiality and anonymity. Thus, I was assured that the selected participants fit study criteria.

I initially chose a sample size of 10 participants to allow for saturation. This followed recommendations as posited by Creswell (2007), Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014), Moustakas (1994), and Van Manen (1990). According to Creswell (2007), saturation occurs when collecting data from additional participants would not add any new insight, but would be repetitive. By selecting 10 participants, I would be able to conduct a multiple interviews with each participant, utilizing open-ended questions. I received consent forms from nine participants, of which eight completed the study. (One of the nine dropped out after the first interview.) Even so, I was able to collect sufficient data so as to ascertain the essence and meaning of the participants' experiences, a key study condition posited by Moustakas (1994) and Van Manen (1990). The sample size was large enough to ensure sufficient rich data was collected to reach saturation, but small enough for study feasibility in terms of time and depth.

Instrumentation and Data Sources

I utilized three self-created interview protocols to collect data from each of the eight participants. The protocols are found in Appendix A. The first protocol was a series of questions designed to elicit details of the participants' actions, feelings, beliefs, and opinions regarding the processes each undertook with each task of the CalTPA, prompting the participants to engage in detailed recollection, a key study activity posited by Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014). The questions were organized in categories, including background, preparation, task completion, feedback, remediation, between-task comparison, and overall description. It was anticipated that the initial interview would take 30-45 minutes, but the longest took just under 24 minutes. In general, the questions on this interview protocol were designed to prompt participants' recall of specific actions and perceptions regarding the teaching performance assessment tasks. At the end of the protocol, participants were invited to reflect and write down reflections prior to the next interview.

The second interview protocol asked participants if they had reviewed their initial interview transcripts, which I had sent by email. They all had. I then asked them to review codes from the transcripts, the results of my initial data analysis. These acts allowed participants to participate in member-checking. I then asked participants if they had any reflections to share since the first interview. Though none had written reflections, one did mention additional thoughts that had come to her since the first interview. After that, I asked each participant to review their own completed CalTPA tasks that I had (with their permission) accessed and provided them. Participants paged through each task and provided running commentary as they did. The second protocol was designed to prompt participants to recall details they may not have remembered in the first interview, thus allowing the participants to probe deeper into their recollections and perceptions, as it allowed them to think aloud reflectively while examining the tasks themselves. It also allowed the participant to review codes derived from the first interview transcripts and comment on them. At the end of the protocol, again I asked participants to reflect and write down their reflections before coming to the third interview.

The third and final interview protocol asked participants if they had reviewed their second transcripts, again sent to then by email, which all had. Again, I asked participants to review and comment on codes drawn from the transcripts, the results of a second round of analysis. This again provided participants the opportunity to engage in member-checking. In addition, the participants were asked if they had any reflections since the second interview. This would have allowed the participants to add additional details, feelings, or recollections, though none expressed any reflections since the second interview.

It was expected that each interview would last between 30 – 60 minutes. In actuality, interviews ranged between 4 – 40 minutes. Of the three, the second interviews took the longest, with the longest of those taking just over 41 minutes. By conducting three separate interviews and providing time for participant reflection in between, I was able to prompt participants to provide rich and detailed description, an important source of data posited as by Moustakas (1994). More detailed description of the use of the protocols for data collection, including member-checking will be given in the next section on procedures.

The interview protocols' questions were designed in alignment with the research question. Their purpose was to elicit rich, detailed description of participant recollections, including actions, beliefs, opinions, and feelings. The research question aligned with the phenomenological approach of the study, a crucial characteristic as posited by Creswell (2007), Moustakas (1994), and Van Manen (1990). These interviews lead to findings which are directly aligned with the study's research questions and phenomenological approach. The questions on all three interview protocols were open-ended, asking participants to describe specific perceptions of completing the teaching performance assessment tasks.

I designed and developed the initial interview protocol questions with assistance of two inservice teachers who had taken the CalTPA and thus were familiar with the phenomenon under investigation. I conducted a field test of the initial interview protocol by interviewing the two inservice teachers after ensuring they fit the participant criteria. One interview lasted 30 minutes and one lasted 45 minutes. Both teachers had completed a teacher preparation program utilizing the CalTPA within the past two years. I made a digital audio recording of both interviews. After securing verbatim transcripts of the interviews (from the transcription service TranscribeMe), I was able to evaluate the efficacy of the interview protocol in eliciting sufficiently descriptive data aligned with the research question for this study. At a follow-up meeting, I asked the two inservice teachers to comment on the efficacy of the interview protocol questions in light of the study's purpose and research question. The three of us engaged in a robust evaluative discussion of each interview protocol question. Based on my evaluation and the input of the inservice teachers, I made revisions to the interview protocol questions, as the three of us found the original questions did not help the two inservice teachers recall in sufficient detail. Working together, the two teachers and I devised more specific questions in order to better prompt participants, but kept the interview questions open ended so as to elicit their perceptions, following key interview question characteristics posited by Moustakas (1994) and Van Manen (1990). Thus, the revised initial interview questions provided a springboard for the study participants, leading to rich data which was analyzed to answer the study's research question.

In addition to participant interviews (which I had transcribed by TranscribeMe), I utilized other data sources. First, I accessed the actual archived CalTPA tasks completed by the participants (with their permission). Second, I took field notes as I conducted the interviews. (Though I asked participants to write down notes between interviews as they reflect, none did.) I analyzed the participants' tasks, my field notes, and interview transcripts. I had 24 digitally-recorded and transcribed participant interview transcripts with my field notes and 32 artifacts (each participant's four TPA tasks). These data allowed me to answer the research question, which called for an examination of participant perceptions and recollections about a phenomenon they had undergone. More details on data analysis will be given in a following section.

Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection

As previously mentioned, I recruited participants utilizing reputational case selection, a process posited by Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014). I contacted faculty members in my teacher preparation program and obtained their recommendations for participants to ensure they met study criteria. I received 22 names. I sent each of the 22 an invitation email. In the email I clearly communicated expectations, such as permission to use data, confidentiality, time commitment, and availability for follow-up interviews and member-checking activities. I received responses (including consent forms) from nine participants in 24 hours, and selected those nine as study participants. (If not enough participants were found by this first round, I would have returned to the faculty members for additional recommendations and would have conducted additional rounds.) After the first interview, I lost contact with one of the participants, and so dropped her from the study, destroying data collected from her first interview. Thus, eight participants completed the study.

As previously explained, I collected data primarily by means of three interviews of each participant, using the interview protocols found in Appendix A. During the interview I asked follow-up questions immediately if clarification or expansion was needed in service of participants' logical, systematic, and coherent reflection, thus eliciting crucial data in ways posited by Moustakas (1994). I conducted the interviews myself, and digitally recorded each interview separately. I ensured that participants had ample time to answer all the questions by allowing for and planning for between 30-60 minutes for each interview. While conducting each interview, I took field notes in which I noted non-verbal communication, such as tone, body language, and gestures. Participants were assigned a number and a pseudonym and will only be identified by that number or pseudonym. After obtaining a verbatim transcript of each interview from TranscribeMe, I sent each participant their transcript by email and asked them to check it for accuracy and notify me of any needed corrections. I then coded each transcript after adding my field notes to the transcripts.

Participants exited the study after the third interview. During that interview, each of the eight participants reported that they believed they had plumbed their recollections fully and had nothing more to add to the accounts of their experiences. I sent participants early results from the study and asked participants to provide any additional information or comments they wished at that time. More details are found in the following section on data analysis.

Data Analysis Plan

To analyze the data, I used NVivo software to code for essential themes directly related to the research question, aligning with the processes posited by Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014), Moustakas (1994), and Van Manen (1990). I used what Van Manen

(1990) referred to as a detailed reading approach, examining each sentence or sentence cluster in the written material in order to determine what it revealed about the phenomenon, or lived experiences of the participants. As themes emerged and recurred, I coded the material.

To discover themes, I utilized what Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014) called inductive descriptive coding in two cycles. For the first cycle, I summarized chunks of data by assigning a word or short phrase, or a code, which provided me with what Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014) called an "inventory of topics for indexing and categorizing" (p. 74). They posited that codes should "emerge progressively during data collection" (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014, p. 81) and the first cycle of data analysis. I followed their ideas and categorized the results of the first cycle of coding. For the second cycle, I generated pattern codes, sorting themes from the first cycle of data analysis, following Miles, Huberman, and Saldana's (2014) description of the next step of data analysis.

This data analysis approach aligned with Moustakas' (1994) recommendations. He outlined similar steps for data analysis, focusing on textual analysis of transcribed interviews. He advocated that the researcher should first list each transcript statement relevant to the phenomenon, considering them all equally, which he called horizontaling. Next, he called for identifying and clustering invariant meaning units to arrive at themes and individual textual descriptions of the phenomenon under study. Finally, he called for checking with each participant/co-researcher, and then developing a description of the essences and meanings of the phenomenon.

The data analysis approach outlined here aligned with the underlying constructs of empirical phenomenology. The analytical process was open and recursive in nature. Thus, the steps I used in data analysis were designed to align with Moustakas' (1994) description of "working through iterative cycles of induction and deduction to power the analysis" (p. 93). Any discrepant cases were noted and included in the results.

As mentioned, I utilized member-checking in the study as posited by Creswell (2007), Maxwell, (2013), and Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014). Though I was the sole researcher responsible for data analysis, I sought input on the analysis from participants. At the second and third interview, I had participants review codes from the previous transcripts (which I had coded in at least one cycle). I also let participants know I would contact them between interviews or following the final interview for clarification as needed, though I did not, as no clarification was needed. I asked for participants to give feedback on the preliminary results and findings. The participants became co-researchers in this data analysis process as described by Moustakas (1994). This view of participants is similar to that of action research, in which researchers collaborate, taking on the label of co-researchers. However, the purpose of action research is different than the purpose of this study, in that action researchers are seeking to directly change their own practice. Also, the cycle of action research begins with a plan for a change in practice, as posited by Kemmis & Wilkinson (2002), which this study did not do Thus, the role of the participant in this study as co-researcher is best described by Moustakas' (1994) use of the word.

Issues of Trustworthiness

In this section I will explain several key issues related to the trustworthiness of the study. First, the ways I ensured credibility will be discussed. Second, I will discuss transferability of findings. Third, the dependability of the study will be discussed. Fourth, I will discuss confirmability. Finally, I will describe how I ensured general ethical procedures.

Credibility, Transferability, Dependability, and Confirmability

Creswell (2007) defined study credibility as assurance that the results presented are "accurate interpretation of the participants' meaning" (p. 206). To ensure credibility, I utilized several strategies. First, I utilized member-checking; I sought participant feedback at key stages of data collection and analysis. This aligned with the ideas of Creswell (2007, Maxwell (2013), and Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014). Second, I attended to saturation, ascertaining whether or not participant data was adding new details or insight, or was repetitive. This followed Maxwell's (2013) recommendations for ensuring saturation.. Third, I utilized rich, thick description in presenting results, following the recommendations of Creswell (2007) and Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014). These strategies helped ensure study credibility.

Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014) posited that researchers must consider and account for transferability of study conclusions. In order to ensure clarity in this area, I utilized several strategies. First, I followed Miles, Huberman, and Saldana's (2014) recommendation that "the characteristics of the … sample of persons, settings, [and] processes … [be] sufficiently fully described" (p. 314) so as to be clear to any reader.

Second, I ensured that the study's findings were connected to theory as recommended by Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014). Third, I stated that results may not be generalized, as the participants were drawn from a very specific population (those who have completed a certain teaching performance assessment in one program). However, I ensured that the results section aligned with Miles, Huberman, and Saldana's (2014) recommendation to "include enough 'thick description' for readers to assess the potential transferability and appropriateness for their own settings" (p. 314). I also followed Miles, Huberman, and Saldana's (2014) precept to include "settings where the findings could fruitfully be tested further" (p. 314).

Creswell (2007) posited that researchers must attend to study dependability, which he defined as reliability. Miles, Huberman, & Saldana (2014) posited that researchers must see that the "process of the study is consistent" (p. 312), and that all steps of the study are done with transparency and care in order to ensure dependability. I digitally recorded interviews and utilized TranscribeMe to obtain verbatim transcripts. I sent participants each of their transcripts and asked them to check each for accuracy. I also read through each transcript while listening to the recording, ensuring accuracy. I took field notes during each interview which noted any gestures, facial expressions, or other non-verbal cues. I ensured intracoder reliability by keeping a code log and utilizing NVivo software to track and complete coding. I created an audit trail, recording details of all data collection and analysis activities in an Excel spreadsheet. I also documented the rationale for coding determinations.

Miles, Huberman, & Saldana (2014) posited that researchers must attend to the confirmability of studies. The authors defined the issue as one of "relative neutrality and reasonable freedom from unacknowledged researcher biases" (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014, p. 311). To ensure confirmability, I utilized several strategies. First, I have practiced Epoche, explicitly listing and then setting aside any preconceived ideas about the topic prior to collecting data, as posited by Moustakas (1994). Second, I explicitly described the study methodology so that readers would be able to have what Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014) called "a complete picture" (p. 311) of the study's participants, data collection procedures, and data analysis. Third, I ensured that conclusions were explicitly linked to rich, thick data as posited by Miles, Huberman, & Saldana (2014). Finally, I was reflexive and explicit about my background related to the study's topic in the study's written sections, aligning with principles posited by Creswell (2007) and Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014).

Ethical Procedures

I obtained a Letter of Cooperation from my college (where I work), authorizing me to use my work office for study activities, contact faculty to obtain participant recommendations, and utilize institutional information to contact prospective participants and their submitted tasks. A sample letter detailing this information can be found in Appendix B. The actual letter was submitted with the IRB application for this study. I obtained IRB approval prior to beginning any participant selection activities. The study IRB approval number is 11-05-15-0256037.

It was important to ensure participant recruitment was ethical. As previously mentioned, I utilized reputational case sampling. To obtain potential participants, I asked faculty to give me names of recommended participants. I forwarded each an email invitation to participate. In this email invitation, I explained the study purpose and participant expectations, including interview and follow up activities. I assured prospective participants of their anonymity and the confidentiality of all data. The invitation email asked prospective participants to contact me by replying to the email, indicating their consent to participate in that reply. The invitation email also explained details such as research purpose, potential risks, and benefits, study procedures, duration of participation, statement that participation is voluntary, my role as a researcher to mitigate conflict of interest, and description of how confidentiality will be maintained. I did have a professor-student relationship with participants; they were students in at least one of my classes, and I supervised all but one of them during student teaching. To mitigate potential bias I made sure to inform all prospective participants of my role as researcher rather than professor. I also assured them of anonymity, and invited them to be open and honest as co-researchers during pre-interview protocol, aligning with the tenets of Moustakas (1994).

I mitigated potential risks as follows. I did not recruit minors, residents of any facility, mentally or emotionally disabled people, my own subordinates or students, individuals less than fluent in English, or individuals who are in crisis, economically disadvantaged, or elderly. To prevent perceived coercion to participate, in the invitation I clearly stated my role as a researcher and not as a professor, stated that invited individuals have the option to refuse to participate without ramifications or penalty, and stated that participants may withdraw from the study at any time without ramifications or penalty. To prevent unintended disclosure of confidential information such as educational records, interview transcripts, assessment scores, or actual assessment tasks, I did attach names or other identifying indicators to any documents. Study participants were only identified by number or pseudonym in audio digital recording and transcripts of interviews and any written records, such as field notes or study findings. One of the participants was dropped from the study after I lost contact with her after the first interview, and data collected from her (one interview transcript and field notes) was destroyed and not used in the study findings.

To prevent undue psychological stress (greater than what one would experience in daily life), I arranged for interviews to be held at times convenient for participants and at a location of their choosing, though I did offer my office as a location to help mitigate the possibility of unwanted intrusion of others. I set a conversational, collegial tone in the interviews and followed an established protocol for each. As seen in Appendix A, at the beginning of each participant interview, I read a protocol reminding everyone of participant anonymity, assuring the confidentiality of their responses, inviting them to speak freely, and informing them of their right to withdraw from the study at any time. I reminded participants that they could stop the interview (and even withdraw from the study) with no ramifications. By following the protocol I was able to mitigate the possibility of unintended attention to personal information irrelevant to the study. I did not conduct an experiment, so I did engage in experimental deception. The study did not include activities that would put participants at risk for injury or adverse health effects.

To ensure confidentiality of collected data, I attended to the security of both electronic files and paper documents. No identifying names or other information was kept with the data in either format. Participants were only identified in all records by number or pseudonym. All electronic data such as digital recordings, interview transcripts, notes, and email correspondence will be kept in password-protected files on a flash drive for five years. Hard copies of data will be kept in a locked file for five years. After five years, all data materials will be destroyed. These safeguards will also help guard against social or economic loss to participants.

Summary

This chapter presented several key ideas related to the methodology of this study. The study relied on an empirical phenomenological approach. I was the sole researcher responsible for data collection and analysis, though participants were co-researchers as called for by Moustakas (1994). I practiced Epoche in order to be able to examine the phenomenon without preconceived ideas also as called for by Moustakas (1994), and I carefully documented participant selection procedures. I attended to careful processes to ensure I engaged in ethical data collection and analysis, following a traditional interview-based phenomenological plan. The study design helped ensure credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability of study findings.

In Chapter 4, I will present the results of this study. First, I will describe the setting and participant demographics. Then, I will describe data collection and analysis procedures, including the resulting codes and themes. Finally, I will present the common elements of the process of the participants' experience and the overarching themes which emerged.

Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of those who had successfully completed the CalTPA, a state-mandated teaching performance assessment, in their teacher preparation program in order to better understand its meaning and role in their development. In particular, the study examined several aspects of the experience as stated in the research question: How do CalTPA completers perceive and describe the process of completing the four tasks, with respect to preparation, completion of the tasks, feedback, remediation, activities between tasks, and their overall experience? Results indicated that participants experienced a multipart CalTPA process with specific common features, which had a significant impact on their development as teachers. Study results were organized and analyzed by process aspects (preparation, completion of the tasks, feedback, remediation, activities between tasks, and overall experience) in search of common essences or themes. This chapter contains the following sections: setting, participant demographics, data collection, data analysis, evidence of trustworthiness, results, and summary.

Setting

This study was conducted with participants who were alumni of the college where I am employed. The participants in this study were graduates of the college's teacher preparation program, and thus they knew me as a professor in the program. The teacher preparation program is a full time, two semester, on ground program taken as a fifth year of college (after the candidate has earned a bachelor's degree). Over the past 3 years, program enrollment has run between three candidates per cohort to 14 candidates per cohort. Multiple subject (elementary) and single-subject (secondary) candidates are counted together in one cohort, taking several classes together, and taking specific methodology classes separately. The first semester of the program consists of 16 units of coursework at the college and fieldwork in local public school classrooms at two different grade levels in turn. The second semester consists of full-day student teaching in public school classrooms (again, at two different grade levels in turn). All the study participants successfully completed the program within the past two years and are currently employed as teachers. As part of the program's completion requirements, study participants had to successfully complete (pass) the CalTPA. Further information about the participants is given in the following section.

Demographics

A total of eight participants completed this study. Each participant either chose a pseudonym or I assigned them one. All completed the same teacher preparation program within the past two years, and thus all successfully completed the CalTPA within the past two years. All are currently employed as teachers in some capacity in public or private schools within driving distance of the college, except for one who is teaching in another country. I had every participant in at least one class during their teacher preparation program, and I was the student teaching supervisor for all but one of the participants (Jo).

The following table provides details about each participant relevant to this study.

Table 1

Study Participants

	Age	Gender	Completion Year/ Teaching Credential	Current Teaching Position
Anne	25	Female	2014/ Single Subject: English and Social Science	Public school, Junior high English, English Learner Coordinator
Jasmine	25	Female	2015/ Single Subject: English	Public school, Junior high English
Christina	24	Female	2014/ Single Subject: World Languages (Spanish)	Private school, Elementary & junior high Spanish
Noel	23	Female	2015/ Single Subject: Science	Public school, Long-term substitute (junior high science, with special education focus), high school cross country coach
Reggie	35	Male	2014/ Single Subject: Science	Public school, High school science, freshman football coach
Amanda	24	Female	2014/ Multiple Subject	Private school, 2nd grade
Susan	25	Female	2014/ Multiple Subject	International school (overseas), 5th grade
Jo	24	Female	2014/ Single Subject: Science	Private school, Junior high science

All participants were women in their early 20s, except for one man who was roughly 10 years older. Six of the eight participants completed the program as part of the 2013-14 cohort, and the remaining two were in the 2014-15 cohort. Two participants trained for and teach all subjects in self-contained classrooms at the elementary level. The other six participants trained for and teach single subjects, primarily at the junior high and high school level, though one participant's single subject (Spanish) position also includes elementary grades in addition to junior high.

Anne entered the teacher preparation program directly after completing her undergraduate degree in English at the same college. In addition to earning a credential in English, Anne completed an extra course and took an additional subject matter exam to earn a second credential in social studies. Though Anne is not bilingual, her current position centers on teaching students who are designated as English learners in a public junior high school. She is part of the English Language Development (ELD) teaching team dedicated to serving English learners at her school. In addition, as the designated program coordinator for the school, she oversees all the activities associated with programs for English learners, including compliance matters and community relations. She obtained this position as a first-year teacher.

Jasmine entered the program directly after completing her undergraduate degree in English at the same college. She commutes 1 hour each way to her public school junior high teaching position. Her school is designated a Title I school, meaning the student population is of a lower socio-economic level and thus receives special federal funding for programs.

Christina entered the program directly after completing her undergraduate degree in classics from a different college (a large, public university). She speaks Arabic and English as her primary languages. Christina learned Spanish in order to become a teacher. She chose to teach at her faith-based private school in part because the position included teaching Spanish as a second language to elementary-aged students as well as those in junior high.

Noel entered the program directly after completing her undergraduate degree in biological sciences at the same college. Though she was offered two full-time teaching positions, she chose to work as a substitute teacher in a local public district and coach cross country at a local public high school. She is currently working as a long-term substitute at a public junior high. In that position she is part of the teaching team dedicated to serving students with special needs.

Reggie entered the teaching profession as a second career. He entered the program after completing his undergraduate degree in management through a degree completion program at the same college. Prior to teaching, Reggie held a position as a project manager in the IT field, but then lost the position due to company downsizing. Reggie is married to a junior high English teacher, and both he and his and his wife teach in the same public school district. Reggie recently began coaching football in addition to his teaching duties in the science department at his public high school.

Amanda entered the program directly after completing her undergraduate degree in liberal studies with an emphasis in teacher education at the same college. She chose to teach at a faith-based private elementary school. Amanda spent her first year as an assistant teacher, working alongside a veteran lead teacher, and was promoted to lead teacher in her second year.

Susan entered the program directly after completing her undergraduate degree in communications at the same college. During the program, she explored the option of teaching overseas in international schools. Upon completing the program, she took a position at an international school in a populous Asian country. Susan is learning the local language, but teaches in English.

Jo entered the program directly after completing her undergraduate degree in biological sciences at the same college. She chose to teach at the middle school/junior high level at a faith-based private school. In addition to her science courses, she also teaches a history class. Jo has also served as an instructor in courses in the college's degree completion program.

Data Collection

Data collection followed the methodology and procedures stated in Chapter 3. A total of eight participants engaged in this study. I originally began the study with nine participants, but lost contact with one participant after the initial interview, and thus dropped that participant from the study, destroying the data I had collected from her. I interviewed each of the remaining eight participants three times, following the three interview protocols I developed (found in Appendix A), for a total of 24 interviews. The 24 interviews spanned a 4 month period. The first interviews ranged in length from approximately 13 to 23 minutes. The second interviews ranged in length from approximately 28 to 41 minutes. The third interviews ranged in length from approximately 4.5 to 18 minutes. A majority of the interviews took place face to face in my office, with a few exceptions. All three of Susan's interviews were conducted using remote technology as she is located in another country. Two of Jo's interviews were conducted face to face in her classroom, at her request, and her final interview was conducted by phone. Noel's final interview was also conducted by phone. I digitally audio-recorded each interview on my phone, saving the recordings as individual MP4 files, and I took hand written field notes during the interview. I uploaded the audio-recording of each interview to the transcription service TranscribeMe immediately following the interview in order to obtain verbatim transcripts. I saved each recording and transcript in digital files, and saved field notes in paper files. In addition, I saved the copies of each participant's completed assessment tasks in digital files.

Data Analysis

I utilized NVivo 11 software in the data analysis phase. I uploaded all the interview transcripts to the software program as soon as I received them, beginning with the initial or first interview transcripts, each of which had been reviewed for accuracy by the participant and myself. I coded the first transcripts prior to conducting the second interviews, as part of the second interview protocol called for participants to review their coded transcripts. I uploaded the second interview transcripts after each had been reviewed by the participant and myself, and coded those prior to conducting the third interview, as part of the third interview protocol called for participants to review their coded transcripts. Finally, I uploaded the third interview transcripts after each had been reviewed by the participant and myself and coded those. More specific information about data coding and analysis follows.

Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014) posited a two-cycle coding and analysis process in any type of qualitative research. Moustakas' (1994) described more specific processes for phenomenological studies. These scholars all advocated the same inductive, recursive approach to data analysis. First, the researcher identifies related segments of data, or segments of text, and labels each with a summary theme or code. Next, the researcher groups related codes into broader themes, noting any outliers or discrepant cases. The broader themes would then form the basis of the study results. Moustakas' (1994) specifies that at this point the researcher must then "construct for each co-researcher [or participant] an individual textural description" (p. 121) and an individual structural description of the experience being studied. The researcher would then merge the two descriptions together, forming a "textural-structural description of the meanings and essences of the experience" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 121) for each participant. Finally, based on these individual descriptions, the researcher would then develop a composite description "of the meanings and essences of the experience, representing the group as a whole" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 121). I followed Moustakas' (1994) process when analyzing the data I collected, as will be explained next.

To begin the data analysis process I read through each verbatim transcript of the initial interviews. I marked all segments of text in each of the transcripts relevant to experience of completing the CalTPA tasks, what Moustakas' (1994) called horizontalization. While doing this, I looked for a priori codes to emerge as I read. After the first reading of all the initial interview transcripts, I had generated a preliminary list of codes. I read each initial transcript again, including any field notes, and either confirmed codes already marked or applied codes that had emerged after I had read the transcript the first time. I then reviewed each coded transcript with the participant at the start of the second interview, also reviewing the code list in general. I directly asked participants if they concurred with the list as is or would recommend other codes. Each participant confirmed the list of codes, and offered no additions. I determined I had an accurate code list with which to proceed.

I repeated the coding, re-reading, and member-checking process for the second and third interview transcripts. During this process, two new codes were suggested. (One participant suggested “puzzle” and a different participant suggested “ambiguous”.) During the member-checking process, the other participants concurred with using the word “puzzle”, so I added it to the code list. I also combined “ambiguous” with a similar code on the list (“uncertainty”). Each participant affirmed this decision. Thus, the entire data analysis process resulted in a list of 49 codes with multiple associated text passages. The codes are shown alphabetically in Table 2 below.

Table 2

Code List

aware	overall
careful	overwhelming
challenges	peers
clear	positive
concern	preparation
confidence	purpose
connection to real life	purposeful
connections	puzzle
creative	qualified
details	qualities of successful response
development as a teacher	rationale
differences	reflective
discouragement	relevant
easy	relief
effective	remediation
effort	repetitive
emotions	response to scores
evidence	rigorous
experience between the tasks	similarities
feedback	terrified
frustrating	thorough analysis
good experience	time
ineffective	uncertainty/ambiguity
level of difficulty	learning from the experience
	writing

I examined the codes to find what Moustakas (1994) called overarching themes or what Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014) called pattern codes. Some of the codes indicated segments of the process of completing the CalTPA, based upon the structure of the first interview and the research question: preparation, writing (completion of the tasks), feedback, remediation, experience between the tasks, and overall. Using these as a general outline, I was able to draft and confirm a description of the common features of the experience of the participant group as a whole as recommended by Moustakas (1994).

Each item of data associated with these process codes was also associated with other codes. In examining all the coded data, I found four overarching themes: emotions, perceptions of tasks, key success factors, and overall influence of the experience. Table 3 shows how I grouped all the codes into overarching themes.

Table 3

Overarching Themes

Theme	Codes
Emotions	Concern
	Discouragement
	Frustrating
	Overwhelming, terrified
	Relief, confidence, positive
Perceptions of aspects	Aware, purpose, purposeful, qualified, careful, clear
	Experience between tasks, remediation
	Challenges, easy, difficult
	Writing: details, puzzle, creative
	Writing: thorough analysis, connections, similarities, differences
	Writing: qualities of successful response – rationale, evidence, repetitive, reflective, relevant
	Writing: rigorous, effort, time
	Uncertainty/ambiguity
Key success factors	Peers
	Connection to real life
	Preparation (effective vs ineffective)
	Feedback, response to scores
Overall influence	Development as a teacher
	Learning from the experience
	Overall

Evidence of Trustworthiness

To ensure credibility as planned in Chapter 3, I carried out the following steps. First, I made sure to conduct member-checking at the second and third interview by reviewing the coded transcript of the prior interview with each participant. By asking participants for feedback, as posited by Creswell (2007), Maxwell (2013), and Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014), I was able to assure that the results were accurate. Second, I ensured that I reached saturation by continuing to ask each participants about their experiences over the span of three interviews until I determined that the data was beginning to be repetitive, and participants themselves reported that they had nothing new to add. This directly followed the description of saturation given by Maxwell (2013). Finally, I presented results in this chapter using rich, thick description, including participants' own words as posited by Creswell (2007) and Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014). These steps helped ensure credibility.

To ensure transferability as planned in Chapter 3, I carried out the following steps. First, I described the study participants and setting earlier in this chapter in sufficient detail to be very clear to the reader, as posited by Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014). Second, I connect the study results to theory in Chapter 5, linking the findings to previous research and to the conceptual framework as posited by Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014). Finally, although I have directly stated that results may not be generalizable as participants come from a specific population and setting, I have included sufficient details and rich, thick description of the study for readers to be able to determine if transferability is appropriate, as posited by Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014). In Chapter 5 I will include suggestions for further research, including suggestions of settings where findings of this study could be confirmed, or what Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014) described as "fruitfully … tested further" (p. 314). These steps helped ensure transferability.

To ensure dependability and reliability, I carried out the following steps. First, all steps of the study were done with transparency and care as posited by Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014). I kept the participants well-informed of each step in the study by reading protocols (found in Appendix A) at the start of each interview, communicating next steps by email, and answering their questions. Second, I digitally recorded each interview and used TranscribeMe to obtain verbatim transcripts, which I sent to each participant by email so that the participant could review each for accuracy. To further ensure accuracy, I read through each of the transcripts myself while listening to the recording. I also took field notes during each interview, noting any non-verbal cues. Finally, I ensured intracoder reliability by keeping a code log and utilizing NVivo 11 software to code transcripts. I also kept a spreadsheet of steps in the data collection process, creating an audit trail.

To ensure confirmability, I carried out the following steps. First, I followed Moustakas' (1994) recommendation and practiced Epoche prior to beginning the study, writing out and then setting aside preconceived ideas I had about the CalTPA. Second, I clearly explained my own background related to the CalTPA and the participants in Chapter 1, as posited by Creswell (2007) and Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014). Third, I thoroughly and explicitly described the methodology of the study in Chapter 3 so that readers would be able to have a full account of each aspect, including study participant recruitment, data collection procedures, and data analysis strategies, as called for by Miles, Huberman, & Saldana (2014). Finally, I provided rich, thick data, including participants' own words, in order to support findings in this chapter, as posited by Miles, Huberman, & Saldana (2014).

Results

The research question for this study was:

RQ: How do CalTPA completers perceive and describe the process of completing the four tasks, with respect to preparation, completion of the tasks, feedback, remediation, activities between tasks, and their overall experience?

I designed the research question to specifically state six specific components representative of general steps in the CalTPA process, and developed questions in the first interview protocol in that order. I designed the questions that way to prompt participants' recollections of their CalTPA experience. (As mentioned, after I had rehearsed more general first interview questions with two CalTPA completers who were not study participants, we further developed them together, specifying the six elements as listed in the research question.) I originally thought that I would organize and present all the results according to these components, as the participants' recollections were indeed prompted by the questions that were organized in an outline under these components, and the data from the first interview logically fell into those categories. However, during subsequent data collection and analysis I found that thematic codes crossed between the six elements of the process. Participants confirmed this during the member-checking process. This led me to organize the results in two ways. First, I grouped coded results into descriptive process segments of the experience: preparation, completion of the tasks, feedback, remediation, between tasks, and overall. Second, I grouped coded results into four overarching themes of perception, which emerged as essences of the participants' experience. I called these themes emotions, perceptions of aspects, key success factors, and overall influence of the experience. This two-pronged approach to organizing results aligned with Moustakas' (1994) process of constructing a general description of the experience and determining essences of meaning. In the following section I will discuss each of the results in turn.

Process

The CalTPA was specifically designed to be a formative assessment as well as a summative assessment (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2013). Thus, the CalTPA consists of four separate tasks which candidates complete in sequence, over time. While the sequence of tasks is prescribed and the program provides a seminar to support candidates through the process, the participants spent significantly more time completing the tasks on their own. Part of the impetus for this research study was to address the gap in information about the CalTPA experience. The data revealed the following commonalities regarding the steps in the candidates' experience of the CalTPA process. The participants' perceptions related to these steps will be further discussed by theme in a following section.

Preparation. Each participant enrolled in and attended a course in which part of the sessions were dedicated to support completion of the CalTPA. Thus, preparation done during the sessions was common to all participants. This included orientation to the overall purpose, submission, and scoring process for each task, instructions for downloading the task, and reviewing each task, including review activities involving the study of sample tasks. Amanda commented on the content of the seminar, saying, “It provided a framework, basically, to understand what was expected on the actual task.”

Participant preparation outside the sessions commonly consisted of further study of the sample tasks, gathering classroom demographics and information about students, drafting lesson plans, and discussing ideas with peers. The participants’ recollection of the amount of time they spent in preparation on their own time ranged widely, from eight hours (Amanda) to 60 hours (Jasmine) per task. Each participant reported that they prepared in a similar way for each of the four tasks, except for Noel. When asked whether she had prepared similarly for each task, she responded, “Probably not.” She went on to say that she was drawing a distinction between her preparation activities for the first task of case studies and her preparation activities for the tasks that were based on work with real students, saying the first task was “kind of hypothetical [while] the other ones were much more real life-based.” Thus, though she viewed the tasks themselves as similar, to the point of repetition as will be discussed later, she recalled the preparation as different specifically because of the difference in the tasks using case studies or actual students. She was the only participant to report differences in her preparation for each task.

Completion of the tasks. The participants completed each task by writing answers in a Word document and uploading the document as an assignment to the class portal of the college’s learning management system. When asked to describe their experience of completing the tasks, participants reported that this was best described as a lengthy writing process. Though of course interviewed separately, Amanda, Reggie, and

Anne each immediately responded to this interview question with the exact same words, exclaiming, “So much writing!” as the first response. Noel described “study groups with the other girls in the credential program” at a local coffee shop in which they would sit together, but write individually and independently. The other participants reported writing alone. Jo described the completion of a task as a typical, recursive writing process, saying, “You’d sit there and you’d read it, and then you’d sit there and you’d read it, and you’d go back, and then you’d add, and then you’d go back, and you would add.” Susan said she spent writing time alone “doing outlines, inputting information, and actually working on the actual completion.” The participants described completing the tasks in terms related to writing, rather than in terms of teaching-related activities.

Feedback. The participants received numeric scores as feedback on each task, on a scale of one to four. Five participants (in the 2013-14 cohort) reported that they also received another form of written feedback from the assessor. They described this supplemental feedback as a “checklist” (Susan), “comments” (Amanda, Anne, and Reggie), or “written feedback” (Jo). Jo reported she only received the additional written feedback on some of the tasks. Noel and Jasmine (who were in the 2014-15 cohort) reported that they received only their numeric score as feedback, with no supplemental feedback. Each participant recalled receiving the score and feedback within two weeks after submitting the task.

Remediation. Seven of the eight participants received passing scores on all their tasks, so they did not experience any remediation. Only Christina went through the remediation process, and only once, as she received a non-passing score on the second of the four tasks. She was given written feedback from a professor who had read both her task and the record of evidence (rubric) completed by the assessor. Based on that feedback, Christina was able to revise and resubmit the task. She received a passing score on the revised version of the task. Christina described the fact that she had not passed the task on the first attempt with the words “disheartening” and “discouraging.” However, she added, “But it was a good experience, because I definitely worked harder on the next, well, three [tasks], because I had to redo that one plus [complete tasks number] three and four.” And, she added, “I could see that I deserved the [non-passing] score I got.”

Between tasks. The participants did not think about or work with prior tasks during the period of time between task due dates, which was between six to seven weeks. Participants prepared for, wrote, submitted, and received feedback on a task prior to beginning to work on the next one. Thus, there were gaps in the chain of tasks during which participants did not do any activities connected to the CalTPA. When participants began to work on the next task, they did not review or consider prior tasks. Amanda explained this by saying she was “content to just keep moving on” and she “definitely didn’t want to think about [the next task] real quick after the first one.” Susan echoed this, also saying she “wanted to be able to move on.” Noel said, “There wasn’t a whole lot of carryover” from working on one task to another. Reggie described his desire to “go to the next one.” Thus, the participants compartmentalized the tasks into four discreet events.

Overall. Though they treated the tasks as separate events during the process, the participants were able to reflect back on the overall experience of completing the tasks as a whole event. Participants each reported that the overall CalTPA experience was a significant component in their teacher preparation program. They were able to recall specific details of the experience, and describe how the experience influenced their development. Amanda summed the experience up, saying, “It’s definitely challenging, but afterwards, you’re glad it’s done and you do learn through it.” In the following section, I present four themes which emerged from the participants’ reflections on their CalTPA experience.

Themes

I developed four overarching themes as they emerged during the process of data collection and analysis. I followed Miles, Huberman, and Saldana’s (2014) recommendation of a recursive, two-cycle coding process and Moustakas’ (1994) specific process of analyzing text to discover the themes. I also conducted member-checking with participants, each of whom confirmed these themes.

Emotions. Participants described feeling predominantly negative emotions during the course of their CalTPA experience. Upon first learning about the CalTPA in the seminar, participants were overwhelmed by the size of the tasks, having only seen the first task. Four participants used that very word (overwhelmed) to describe their initial reaction to seeing the first CalTPA task, while the rest described reactions that could be easily described as overwhelmed. Christina stated, “When I first found out that I had four extra tests [the CalTPA tasks], I was kind of taken aback. And then when I found out that [the first task] was already 25 pages long of questions then that gave me a heart attack as well." In addition, Jasmine reported that her sense of being overwhelmed was accompanied by fear. She stated, "I was terrified that I would fail, and that I would have to do it again, get kicked out of the program. Like, all of the worst case scenarios were just flying through my brain. I was overwhelmed and terrified." Amanda echoed this sentiment, saying that just learning about the CalTPA was overwhelming and stressful. She explained the source of her feeling, saying, "You want it to be perfect because that's the only snapshot they get of me, basically." Jasmine also traced the source of her emotion to the realization of the high-stakes nature of the CalTPA, saying, "The nature of the tasks is really overwhelming and can be discouraging." The participants experienced strong negative emotions from the beginning.

As the participants continued on through the CalTPA experience, working on the tasks in sequence, their emotions turned to worry or concern. The participants worried that they were not successfully completing the first task as they were doing it. Jo reported thinking, "Is this going to be enough? Is this going to be enough for what they're going to be looking for?" Susan reported thinking, "Well, what in the world am I going to say about this?" The concern revolved around both the quantity and quality of written responses. In addition, the participants were concerned due to uncertainty of success. This sense of worry was summarized by Reggie, who said, "I remember feeling frustrated ... this is your assessment … turn it in, into the darkness." Christina said, "After you submit it, you just hope and pray." Rather than being paralyzed by negative emotions, the participants all persevered in completing the tasks; no one reported the urge to quit. Anne sought to change her emotional response, seeing this as a crucial step to success. She reported thinking, "If I'm going to do this, I want to have a better attitude about it, so I'll go [work on] a section I want to do or felt the most motivated to do." Thus, all carried on in spite of their emotions.

While working on the later tasks, participants also had strong negative emotions. Even though all received passing scores on the first task, some reported a sense of futility taking over. Noel stated, "We're just like, 'I don't want to work on this anymore, I'm done.'" Jasmine stated, "I became apathetic towards the end … it was discouraging and it took so much to complete." Three participants reported feeling frustrated by the need to complete four tasks. Three participants reported even stronger negative emotions when working on the final task, which included a video recording of the participant teaching a lesson. When looking at his final task, Reggie commented, "This was nerve-wracking … just the preparation [for the recorded lesson] and then knowing it was one shot." Jo reported that it was "mentally exhausting" to go through the final task. She reported that upon finishing, she thought "Okay, I'm just done. I have to be done now because I cannot look at this thing anymore." Jasmine bluntly stated, "I hated it." Susan reported her strongest negative emotion came when one of her tasks received a non-passing score on the initial evaluation. She stated, "I remember being so, so frustrated and so sad about that." (The task was evaluated a second time by a different assessor and received a passing score, so Susan did not need to revise the task.) The source of the negative emotions varied, but again, participants persevered in spite of them.

A few participants reported feeling some positive emotions at certain points in the experience. Three participants' emotions were buoyed by success on a task. Upon receiving the report that she had received a passing score on the first task, Christina said she felt "a sense of relief." She reported that she said to herself, "Okay, I can do this three more times." Reggie stated, "Once I had success ... now I had some sort of certainty as to what they expect." Susan stated, "When I did the second task I felt much more confident in it." Two participants reported feeling relief when they were finished with the CalTPA experience as a whole. Amanda stated, "I think I was just really, really relieved when I turned [the last task] in." After completing the last task, Susan remembered thinking, "I think my biggest thing is, I'm glad it's done." Noel used the word "fun" to describe a particular aspect of her third task. She was able to design a science assessment from scratch, and she chose to have students use creative writing as their assessment instrument. She reported that the students had fun completing it. So, some positive emotions stemmed from various aspects of the experience.

Perceptions of aspects. The participants described their perceptions of various aspects related to experience of completing the CalTPA. These perceptions stemmed from memories of events and review of their tasks (work samples). The following sections present the perceptions of the CalTPA experience with respect to purpose of the CalTPA, the connections between tasks, challenges the participants faced, and the writing of the tasks.

When asked what they understood the purpose of the CalTPA to be, five out of the eight participants described the summative purpose of assessing candidate competence. Amanda responded that the CalTPA's purpose was "assessing teacher readiness" to enter the profession. Jo viewed the CalTPA as the instrument that determined whether candidates who were seeking a credential were "even remotely competent at what they [were] trying to accomplish," specifically if they understood "basic elements of teaching." Noel reported that she understood that the purpose was "to see how qualified new teachers are to actually teach." Anne described the purpose as testing whether candidates were "ready to enter the profession" and "to maybe weed out people." Jasmine described the CalTPA as a "means of assessment and also a kind of thorough analysis of our ability." Reggie commented, "I know that it was high-stakes, for sure." The participants reported that they received this information from the program. Two participants also mentioned a different purpose of the CalTPA. Christina mentioned that she believed the "purpose of the CalTPA was to get us teachers-to-be to start thinking about why we're doing what we're doing." While Susan reported that she understood the CalTPA as "a task I need[ed] to complete in order to get my credential," then went on to say she "was told it was also important for me to – just to better understand how to teach well." While most participants immediately mentioned the summative, gatekeeping purpose of the CalTPA, two participants also understood a formative, developmental purpose.

Participants also described their perceptions of the four tasks. Most criticized the first task (consisting of four case studies) and used the word hypothetical. Jo stated, "This was my least favorite TPA because it was all hypothetical kids and I've never been good with a hypothetical situation." She commented that the first task was thus the hardest one, and recalled thinking, “What in the world do you want me to be doing with that first case study?” Noel also reported that the first task was hard “because it was so hypothetical.” She went on to describe “writing things just to fill in the answers.” Regarding the first task, Amanda stated, “You’re put in a box and asked to live there.” However, Anne saw the first task’s content (case studies) as a positive, saying “This one seemed more guided.” She commented that the first task “was a better intro into the other ones.” So, participant views on the first task were largely negative.

Participants expressed slightly more favorable views of tasks two, three, and four for being, as Noel stated, “much more real life based … like what would I actually do in the classroom with these students.” Most participants did not perceive that the level of difficulty increased with each subsequent task, but believed each succeeding task did require more time and effort. Noel stated, “It definitely got more time-consuming and more in-depth with each one.” Reggie also commented that, while not more difficult, tasks two, three, and four were “significantly more time consuming.” Jo stated that she believed the tasks “build on each other,” recognizing a positive connection between tasks, but all the other participants described the similarity between the four tasks negatively, by using some variation of the word repetitive. Upon reviewing her completed tasks, Amanda commented, “I’m like cycling through the same things, repeating things a lot, trying to connect it all.” Anne stated that the tasks were “asking for repetition.” Reggie mentioned an emotional response, saying he was “frustrated by having to repeat myself because I’ve already written this.” SUSAN reported, “I often found that I had to …

copy,paste [information] somewhere else." Jasmine summed up this perception of repetitiveness by saying:

> There was so much repeating of information to make sure that you had it in a lot of different places, and you had repeated everything necessary many times so that the reviewer knew that you were getting the point of the assessment. The only problem with that is it became tedious and kind of a repetitive task that was frustrating at times because of the thoroughness required.

Repetition was one aspect in which participants were unanimous in their criticism of the tasks.

Participants also described what they found easy about completing the tasks, and discussed challenges they faced. When asked what he perceived to be the easiest part of completing the tasks, Reggie bluntly stated, "None of it was easy." On the other hand, Jasmine commented that the repetition she felt was necessary actually made the tasks "relatively easy," stating that "it didn't take a lot of brain power, necessarily, just a lot of time." Other participants found certain aspects of the task to be easy. Christina praised the format of the tasks as being clear, saying it was "easy … to understand where to put the answers." She also felt choosing lesson ideas to use was easy, because, as she stated, "I'm passionate about my subjects." She also commented that it was easier when she was able to include information about real students and use a lesson she had actually taught in a classroom. Jo and Anne also commented that the portion of the tasks in which candidates were required to design lessons seemed easy, because it was a familiar activity; they felt prepared for that aspect of the task. Noel found that the task sections in which candidates were required to find and provide information about students was easy, “especially for the last three [tasks] when they were a little bit more real world, because you’re thinking of the student in mind that you have in class or that you're observing.”

Participants also described challenging aspects of completing the tasks. Four participants mentioned the repetitive aspect of the task as a challenge, believing that it went against what they believed they had learned about good writing. Anne commented:

> I had just come from being an English major, and been told very strictly to stop repeating myself. You can't do that when it's asking for repetition and showing the variation but you're telling me the same thing and reinforcing the same ideas. So, just the approach of writing that I had to shift was a little bit more challenging for me, because I'm like, "Oh, it's going against what all of my professors told me to not repeat myself and use the same evidence." But you have to do that when they're asking to show how you can connect all the different areas. So, that was pretty challenging.

Susan commented, “What's challenging is wondering as you're putting information together, I feel like I'm saying the same thing again. So just wondering, am I being repetitive or am I being connective?”

Four participants mentioned that finding time to complete the tasks in addition to other required coursework proved to be challenging. SUSAN said, “It's something that you're completing while also doing a lot of other coursework, and also doing other things with student teaching. There's just a lot on your plate.” Christina described the struggle she had trying to find time to write the tasks in addition to coursework (and responsibilities at home). Noel summed this challenge up, saying, “The hardest thing was just trying to plan out when am I actually going to work on this on top of everything else I have to do.” Participants saw the CalTPA tasks as additional work on top of, not integrated into, their program.

Five participants also mentioned having difficulty identifying and describing students to use as focus students in the tasks. The second, third, and fourth tasks ask candidates to identify a student with special needs and a student who is an English learner, then describe how they would address the needs of each student when teaching. Christina reported, “Either sometimes we didn’t have the information [about students] or access, because we weren’t the teacher of record.” Reggie reported that he had difficulty identifying an English learner, because the classes he was observing were honors classes, and no English learners were identified. Anne reported a similar situation. She was observing classes at a school in which students with special needs were included in regular classes, but not the ones she was observing. Reggie, Jasmine, Jo, Christina, and Anne reported that they had to invent and describe fictitious students in order to complete the tasks.

Three participants reported challenges with what might be called technical details, or procedures not connected to actually writing the tasks. To prepare for the fourth task, which includes a video of the candidate teaching a lesson, candidates must secure a parent permission slip for students to be video recorded. Christina reported that not all her students returned the permission slips, so she had to re-group students at the time of recording to ensure only students who had permission were visible on camera. Jo reported the same challenge, and also mentioned she faced challenges formatting the CalTPA documents. Noel reported difficulty scanning student work as is required for the third and fourth task. She wanted to include a booklet created by students, but could not use certain ones as they had decorations that made them too difficult to scan on the flatbed scanner. The participants had to overcome these challenges prior to actually writing the task, which drew their attention away from the content of the task.

In addition to the perceptions described above, participants also had similar perceptions regarding the qualities of the writing they believed was required to be successful on the CalTPA. One perception common to all participants was that the responses had to be very detailed, which was a criticism and not a compliment. Christina recalled her tasks as “just very detailed; very, very detailed.” Amanda stated, “This was an experience of details.” Jo described a successful response as having “a lot of redundant detail where it felt like you were just saying the same thing over and over again in different ways.” Jasmine asserted that the word details “would be one of the most overarching themes for all of the TPAs.” But participants recognized that simply listing details was not sufficient. Amanda, Christina, Susan, and Noel mentioned the need to ensure details were connected across the responses in a task. Susan noted, “The word that I remember hearing over and over was connectedness, connectedness.” Amanda was in favor of the connectedness, saying, “I did definitely like trying to connect the developmental needs and other things to my instructions. Like I've mentioned, it's kind of like a puzzle.”

The next perception about writing common to all participants centered on the concept of rationale. The participants recalled needing to include rationale for each detail they wrote about in their tasks. Christina described the qualities of a successful task response, saying “the successful ones … went into every step. Even taking out a pencil; they had a rationale for that … The lesson plan with the rationale was so, so detailed.” Amanda recalled that she “had to give a rationale for each of the specific parts of my lesson.” Reggie described his second task response as “what are you doing, and then why?” Noel chuckled when she reviewed her second task response, saying, “Rationale. I remember thinking, why do I have to explain every single thing I’m doing?”

Anne summed up this perception when she said:

> It was all about rationale and evidence … Because I think I was more prepared in all of my classes just to create a good lesson and the CalTPA was more, "Can you explain why you chose those [lesson plan components]? ... The tasks would require more thought and more rationale and connections to why you’re doing things.

While the participants were initially critical of the need for detail and rationale, they appreciated the need for reflection as a component in their task responses. When reviewing her final task, Christina noted, “Even though it was so long and detailed, they got you thinking about reflection.” Noel commented that it was good to reflect as part of writing the tasks. Susan noted “the importance of reflection upon what you’ve done.” Jasmine made a similar comment when reviewing her final task, saying:

> This one was helpful because it required more specific reflection on my part. And so when I reflected on the lesson and also on the video, I had to see what I was doing and acknowledge what I was doing well. But to a much greater extent, acknowledge how I needed to change.

Key success factors. Participants described four common factors as crucial to their successful CalTPA experience. Seven of the eight participants immediately mentioned peer support as a crucial factor in their success, though each was quick to say that they knew they could not show their specific task responses to one other. Jasmine reported that she was “terrified of cheating, so [she] did not work with peers.” However, later she recalled that she did discuss the score on her first task with peers, in an informal debriefing session, the result of which was that she decided to scale back the amount of effort she put in the next task. The other seven participants reported that they relied on peers as emotional support and as sounding boards for general ideas. Amanda mentioned discussion sessions in the CalTPA seminar, during which participants reviewed and critiqued high-scoring example tasks in groups. She said that the discussion with peers “actually really helped both reduce the stress of the task and to really bounce ideas off each other and think [the sample task] through.” Christina said, “We just tossed ideas around.” Anne said her experience was “more working with peers on feedback of what will the expectations be ... and I think I discussed with my peers [after receiving scores], like, why did they mark you down?” Amanda commented that peer feedback and support were “definitely really helpful for me during the process.”

Participants identified a second factor that contributed to their success: having access to a real classroom, including a master teacher and students. Several reported being able to use real students as focus students, and use a lesson they actually taught as the lesson on the task made the process more educationally valuable. Amanda said, “I think it started clicking more when I wasn’t given [hypothetical students and lessons]…we were actually in a classroom.” She reported talking to her master teacher about the lessons she was teaching in the classroom, which helped her prepare for the task. She stated, “You could really see the practical connection.” Anne echoed this, saying that the work she was doing in the classroom helped her view the task “like you’re kind of solving a problem.” She reported that she was able to take what she saw and experienced in the classroom and apply it directly to the task. Even when reviewing her first task, which consisted of case studies, Christina commented, “This was nice because I actually had observed a class that had [the case study lesson], and I got to teach one or two lessons, so it had a real life influence.” Jasmine commented that it positively affected her preparation “when the [task responses] were supposed to be based on real students in real classrooms.” Jo also drew a connection between the tasks she scored highest on and her classroom placement. She said, “It is interesting, [noticing] the corresponding scores. Looking at who I was working with and the age group that I was working with at that time, and how that played out.” She credited the feedback she received on her teaching from her master teacher with helping her more effectively complete the task, saying “This [task] I got a [score of] four on, but again, I was getting the support from somebody who knew what they were doing." Noel also credited support from the master teacher, saying:

> That was where I would get a little bit of help from the master teacher, just to get a little more information on things that they've actually done with that student. And so, that was probably the most effective thing [leading to success].

When reviewing his tasks, Reggie noted his successful responses correlated with the times he was able to write about real students, and have "extensive conversations with the teacher." He specifically noted one lesson in which he "took a [lesson] that already existed and kind of morphed it to fit the needs of the TPA." SUSAN also mentioned her successful task responses were based on "something that you could really, tangibly get your hands around and then be able to apply the things you've been learning."

Two participants described the opposite scenario, being placed in a classroom without identified English learners and/or students with special needs. Jasmine reported that this was the opposite of a success factor, but that she was able to use other skills to be successful. She said:

> It was a weird straddle between reality and creative writing, as it were … I was trying to get information from the real students so I could create like a really authentic experience, but I couldn't access that information so I had to make it up … I couldn't find those situations they were requiring of me in real life. So as a result, I had to create a hypothetical student for a hypothetical lesson with a hypothetical goal. So all of those things, being so totally displaced from what was

> happening in the classroom, I think every step you took with those hypotheticals reduced the effectiveness of the TPA.

Jo also noted a more creative solution as a success factor. She stated, “What I [needed for the task was] an EL student, and I didn't have one [in class]. So … we found one in another classroom where I never actually taught, because that's what the TPA required.” These two participants were able to overcome the obstacle, but stated that they believed they had more success with the tasks when their classroom placements better matched the task requirements.

Every participant reported that being able to read through sample tasks that had received passing scores was the most effective preparation for writing their own tasks. Amanda commented that this “provided a framework, basically, to understand what was expected on the actual task.” Anne noted that she would analyze the samples and ask, “Why is this one passing?” Christina reported a similar process for analyzing the sample tasks, trying to get at the thinking of the author. Jasmine reported it was “helpful to have to think through, what does it look like?” Jo commented that reviewing the sample tasks was crucial, saying, “Because I know that for me I often have to see something before I get it.” Noel stated that it “was actually really helpful to see the depth of response required.” Reggie noted the examples inspired him, saying, “I wanted to emulate … the backbone of what a success response was … I wanted to emulate those kinds of things.” Similarly, Susan reported that the sample tasks were the vehicles through which she was “given the big picture of what we’re doing.”

Participants were divided in their views on the effectiveness of feedback from task assessors. Participants who were in the 2013-14 cohort received a rubric in addition to a numeric score from the assessor. Some found the feedback to be an effective component in their success. Anne said, “It was completely understandable and easy to see why they [the assessor] said certain things … it was good for me; good to see someone else’s perspective.” Jo said, “I did read them [written comments], and I know I appreciated them.” Although he received the same feedback, Reggie stated, “I don’t remember spending a whole lot of time on it. I passed and that was pretty much good enough for me.” Similarly, Susan recalled, “I don’t think I utilized [the feedback] very much.” She went on to state that she would have liked more than written feedback. She wanted in-person feedback, saying, “It would have been helpful … to process through my TPA with someone.” Amanda commented, “The feedback I received from the TPA assessor was definitely lacking in detail and specificity, because it didn't really give me any clear ideas on how I could develop further as a teacher.” Noel and Jasmine, who were in the 2014-15 cohort, only received numeric scores from assessors. They both viewed the feedback as understandable, but ineffective. Jasmine stated, “It was understandable in that it was a number. It was not effective, in that it was not meant to be informative response, I think. It was just to give us a grade and have us move on to the next [task].” Noel concurred, stating:

> It's pretty understandable. You got a three or a four or something less, but the feedback itself was ineffective, because it was just a score. It didn't tell me how to

improve my answers for the next one, or what areas to think about or what areas I needed more work on.

Overall influence. Participants each reported that though arduous and at times unpleasant, the experience of completing the tasks of the CalTPA had a positive influence on their development as a teacher. Amanda stated, “Looking back, it was helpful but it was also a painful process.” Christina said, “I wasn’t thankful for it at the time … [but] it got me to have this mindset that I have now,” referring to a student-centered philosophy of teaching. Jo saw the experience as “good preparation,” but still described the CalTPA as “a hurdle you have to jump or a hoop you’ve got to get through to be a teacher.” Noel commented that while she did experience a boost in confidence through the process of completing the tasks, “I didn’t really feel like it prepared me to teach any more than anything else I had done … [and] it definitely seemed like some busywork.” Reggie called the experience “somewhat beneficial” twice in the same interview response, but also “very, very tedious.” Anne also reported several benefits of her experiences, but stated, “I don’t look back on them fondly.” SUSAN also found the experience to have formative value, calling it a “stepping stone in terms of some of the professional development” she needed, but also saw it as “a hoop you need to jump through.” Jasmine summed up participants’ ambivalent view of the CalTPA by saying:

> I do think that I thought through things more thoroughly than perhaps I would've, but I think there could have been much more effective ways of me developing as an educator than this crazy long document.

Participants reported developing several key skills as a result of completing the tasks. The first key skill was the ability to plan effective lessons with rationale. Though participants had been critical of the need to include rationale when recalling the tasks themselves, they noted it as a relevant skill they developed. Five participants mentioned developing this skill as a positive outcome. Amanda commented, “The rationale and having to have a reason for things and understand the [teaching and learning] process was helpful.” Christina stated that the experience trained her to ask, “Why am I having [students] do this worksheet? Is it actually good for them? What’s the rationale behind it? It got us thinking about planning.” Jasmine reported that she was able “to get the [planning] process internalized” by completing the tasks including reationale. Jo stated, “You spend a whole lot more time thinking through why am I doing this? [The CalTPA] teaches you how to plan. I’m mentally doing something similar as I’m teaching kids now.”

The second skill participants reported developing through the CalTPA experience was the ability to differentiate instruction for English learners and students with special needs. Amanda stated, “I certainly felt stretched in my ability to … plan instruction to best suit [student] needs [and] make adaptations.” Referring to differentiation, Jo stated, “[The tasks] force you to think about aspects of teaching that you may or may not have ever considered before.” Noel reported that through the CalTPA experience she came to understand the validity of differentiation, that “it’s totally okay to make adaptations, even in the same class period, for different kids.” Now, she said, “This is how I want to teach. Making adaptations and making it fun and exciting.” Reggie commented:

> [As a teacher], my day-to-day involves preparing for English language learners and [students with] special needs as I plan the lessons for all of my students. So that would be … probably the greatest effect of the CalTPA in my development.

Seven participants reported developing the skill of reflection through the CalTPA experience. Amanda described developing an increased ability to "reflect on what it took to be a better teacher." Anne concurred, stating, "[the CalTPA experience] definitely made me stronger with reflection … it really forcefully trains you to be reflective." Christina commented that this was a "nice aspect of [the CalTPA]" and that it was "so good because it got you thinking about what went wrong and what went right" in teaching. Jasmine especially pointed out the final task, with its requirement to video record a lesson, as being the most helpful in this because "it required more specific reflection on my part." She further described this, saying:

> [It moved me] away from that level of just typing a lot of words and throwing a lot of words at an issue, and into more of a reflective, "How do I help this student in this situation in my real class that I'm actually student teaching in?".

Noel also mentioned the specific questions on the tasks, recalling, "One of the last questions usually was, 'What did you like?' or 'What would you change for next time?'" She also mentioned reviewing the video on the final task, saying, "It was good, to, again reflect and see how I related to kids that were not necessarily doing what they should have been doing." Susan stated that the whole experience "was something that caused me to be a little more reflective in terms of …why is [a strategy] a good teaching practice, and why is it a good teaching practice for this specific group of students."

When asked to describe their overall perception of the CalTPA experience now that they have been teaching, participants responded with the following statements. Amanda said, “It was definitely a process of growth. [It] did help shape my thinking as an educator, but it was more the way that my professors integrated what we were learning in the class that made it valuable.” Anne said, “Why I don’t look back on [the experience] fondly is probably the reason why I do better as a teacher now: I had to think so much. It forced me to be very purposeful.” Reflecting on her experience, Christina stated:

> It was a bumpy road; frustrating, but in the long run, good … It helped me broaden my horizons. It gets you thinking like a teacher. It was one of the most challenging pieces of academic work I've ever done.

Jasmine said, “Most people have [told me] it was something they had to complete and did complete but would never want to do again.” Jo said two words: persistence and perseverance. Noel said:

> It's hard, and it takes a lot of time and effort, but definitely by the time you're done, it's like, wow, I just did that, and I think that was some awesome work. Maybe completing each one gives me a little bit more of a glimpse of what it will actually be like as a teacher.

Reggie stated:

> I believe that the thoroughness of each one of the tasks is relevant to my current teaching. I think there was some shell shock about the magnitude of what we were

> doing, but [we were] not quite understanding the magnitude of what it means to be a teacher.

Susan noted:

> It's just a process that needs to be done, but it's not going to define you as a teacher. It's just a formative thing … And why we're all willing to go through the [experience] is because we love to teach.

Response to the Research Question

This study sought to answer the following research question: How do CalTPA completers perceive and describe the process of completing the four tasks, with respect to preparation, completion of the tasks, feedback, remediation, activities between tasks, and their overall experience? The study results indicated that participants experienced common elements of the process. Participants' experience of the preparation for the tasks varied in terms of the time each spent on the tasks, but their approach to preparation for each task was virtually similar, though the tasks differed in content. Participants' experience of completing the tasks revolved around the writing process, rather than on elements connected to teaching. Only one participant experienced remediation on one task, marking this element as not common to participant experience. Regarding feedback, participants who received written comments in addition to scores perceived those to be more valuable than numeric scores. Participants compartmentalized each task, viewing each separately, rather than connecting all four, though they identified and criticized the repetition in each task. Of the four tasks, participants found more value in tasks two, three, and four as being more relevant and less hypothetical. Overall, the

CalTPA experience played a key role in the development of the participants as teachers, particularly leading to growth in certain skills, with key success factors contributing to participants' growth.

Summary

In this chapter I presented details of the study. I began with a review of the research question, and then described the setting of the study. I described the participants, giving pertinent demographic details related to the study parameters. I discussed the data collection procedures and data analysis strategies I used, and described evidence of trustworthiness for these. Finally, I presented the results of the study in two sections. In the first section, I described the process participants experienced in completing the CalTPA with regards to preparation, completion of the tasks, feedback, remediation, activities between tasks, and overall. In the next section, I described four themes which emerged during data collection and analysis: emotions of the participants, perceptions of aspects (including purpose, the four tasks themselves, ease and challenge of completing tasks, and qualities of effective responses), key success factors, and the overall influence of the experience (including skills learned).

In Chapter 5, I will present my interpretation of these findings. In addition, I will describe the limitations of the study. I will also discuss recommendations for further research. I conclude the chapter by describing implications of the study (including positive social change), implications for knowledge in the discipline, and recommendations for practice.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to examine the perceptions of completers of the CalTPA, a four-task teaching performance assessment, with the aim of understanding the meaning of the experience and its influence on their development. I conducted a series of three interviews with each of eight participants, during which they recalled details of their experience with the CalTPA. After analyzing the data, I developed a description of the common process of the experience, including preparation, completions of the tasks, feedback, remediation, activities between tasks, and overall experience. Then, I developed four themes that emerged: emotions of the participants, perceptions of aspects of the CalTPA, key success factors, and the overall influence of the experience, including skills participants learned.

Interpretation of the Findings

In this section I analyze and discuss the ways the findings of this study confirm, disconfirm, or extend findings of previous research and knowledge in the discipline. Participants described the CalTPA experience as a multi-part process, composed of preparation for each task, completing the tasks, receiving feedback, nonattention between tasks, and overall recognition of the CalTPAs role in their teacher preparation program and their development. Participants perceived the CalTPA experience as playing a role in their development as teachers. As described in the previous chapter, four themes emerged from the collected data: emotions, perceptions of aspects, success factors, and overall influence. I will compare the study’s findings (themes) to the literature reviewed in Chapter 2, both on experience and assessment. Then, I will compare them to the conceptual framework also presented in Chapter 2.

Comparison to Literature on Experience and Assessment

The first significant finding of this study centered on the theme of emotions. Participants described having predominantly negative emotions throughout the CalTPA experience, from fear and worry to a sense of being overwhelmed. Thus, negative emotions were shown to be a significant component of the CalTPA experience, even though participants were ultimately successful at completing all the tasks, and developed as a result. This confirms and extends findings of prior researchers, who found very similar negative emotions associated with the experience of pre-service teachers with other assessments that were similarly high-stakes accountability measures (Chiu, 2014; Coloma, 2015; Hobbs, 2015; Meuwissen & Choppin, 2015; Selvester, Summers, & Willaims, 2006). The findings of this study regarding negative emotions differ from those of Barnes and Gillis (2016), who studied a different type of assessment experience, one which was course-based, formative, and collaborative rather than high-stakes and summative. Barnes and Gillis (2016) found that participants in their study had positive emotions looking back on that assessment experience, though they did not examine the participants' emotions that arose during the experience.

The second group of significant findings of this study are seen in the theme of perception of aspects. These findings focused on participants' perceptions of various aspects of the CalTPA experience. Participants overwhelmingly identified the purpose of the CalTPA as a gatekeeping measure, clearly focusing on its summative function. (Only two participants mentioned formative aspects.) This finding confirms and extends the findings of prior researchers who found that the primary reason for assessing pre-service teachers is to hold them accountable for being ready for licensure (An, 2016; Bunch, Aguirre, & Tellez, 2009; Bunch, Aguirre, & Tellez, 2015; Chandler-Olcott, Fleming, & Nieroda, 2016; Chiu, 2014; Chung, 2008; Milanowski, Heneman, & Kimball, 2011; Noel, 2014; Okhremtchouk, Newell, & Rosa, 2013; Parker & Volante, 2009; Pecheone & Chung, 2006; Peck & McDonald, 2013; Riggs, Verdi, & Arlin, 2009; Sariscsany, 2010; Stiggins, 1990; Taut & Sun, 2014; Tshuma & Ndeble, 2015; Van Es & Conroy, 2009; Waggoner & Carroll, 2014; Wise, Darling-Hammond, & Purnell, 1988).

It should be noted that those studies examined various assessments in various programs from the perspective of those implementing the assessments, not taking them. The studies' purposes ranged from examining implementation practices to determining the validity of assessments, or examining other program-centered problems. Participants in this study were former pre-service teachers, who reported the summative, accountability purpose of CalTPA as a given, and did not question or criticize it. In fact, one participant overtly praised it. This disconfirms the findings of authors who previously found fault with such assessment purpose (Chiu, 2014; Dover & Schultz, 2006; Madeloni & Gorlewski, 2013). It confirms the findings of Williams, Evans, & King (2016), who posited that having a measure of pre-service teacher quality assurance is helpful to both programs and candidates.

In related findings, participants criticized several characteristics of the CalTPA tasks themselves. First, the participants criticized the first task for being hypothetical, viewing it as more narrow and thus less relevant or beneficial than the other three tasks. This finding extends the research of Riggs, Verdi, and Arlin (2009), who found “a lack of factorial validity” (p. 26) with the first CalTPA task, explaining that it may only measure one construct, and not the multiple constructs as intended. Second, participants criticized each task for being too time consuming and repetitive. Though the CalTPA has not been widely studied, recent research has examined other TPA instruments and made similar findings (Williams, Evans, & King, 2016).

Other researchers have criticized other TPA instruments in various studies. An (2016) found fault with one teaching performance assessment, arguing that her self-study results indicated that the tasks had a hidden curriculum, promoting certain subject areas to the detriment of others. The findings of this study relate to An’s (2016) findings only in that participants are similarly critical of the tasks. Other researchers, such as Chiu (2014), Coloma (2015), Elder (2015), Margolis and Doring (2013), and Madeloni and Gorlewski (2013) have found flaws and leveled criticism at certain TPAs, but the criticism was centered on program effects, implementation practices, or other issues, not on the construct or content of the tasks.

It is important to mention this study’s findings with regard to the particular aspects of perceptions the CalTPA tasks. First, participants reported that they did not consider prior tasks greatly when beginning the next task, indicating a disconnection in the experience, or a segmenting of the overall experience into discrete events. As little research has been done on the CalTPA, a comparison to related research in this regard is limited. Selvester, Summers, and Williams (2006) examined the impact that the early version of the TPA had on faculty, and only reported on completers tangentially, noting that completers acknowledged the TPA was formative in that it had an impact on their development. Similar results were reported by Fenderson (2010). Riggs, Verdi, and Arlin (2009) conducted a validity study, not addressing the experience of completers. Thus, this finding of a segmentation of the CalTPA experience lends new insight into the experience from the perspective of the completers.

Additionally worthy of note, participants described the experience of completing the tasks in terms of a writing exercise, rather than a teaching exercise. This raises questions about the significant role writing skill plays in the CalTPA experience, which may raise questions regarding the alignment of the assessment's purpose (to assessing teaching performance) and the format of the assessment (written tasks). Again, Riggs, Verdi, and Arlin's (2009) validity study found no issues with validity, with the exception of the first task. However, their study focused on content alignment with the standards to be measured, not the alignment of the purpose and the method. The finding of this study regarding writing has implications for candidate preparation and support. This will be discussed further in a later section.

A third group of significant findings can be seen in the theme of success factors. Participants in this study reported several particular factors that contributed to their successful completion of the CalTPA. First, they credited peer support and interaction. This finding confirms and extends the findings of Wilkins, Shin, and Ainsworth (2009). They found that incorporating peer feedback into the student teaching experience of pre-service teachers increased their development by providing opportunities for reflection in conditions less stressful than official university supervision and evaluation. Kilic (2016) found similar results in his study of peer assessment as support for candidate growth in a teacher preparation program. This study's findings also confirm findings of Li, Liu, and Steckelberg (2010), who found that peer review was a key component of success on a project in their teacher preparation program. The findings of this study confirm these findings regarding the benefit of peer support, and extend the prior findings to include the benefits of peer support in a standardized assessment experience, which is traditionally a solitary, individual experience.

Participants reported that a second factor in their successful CalTPA experience was access to sample successful tasks. They reported that examining the qualities of the successful tasks and using them as models for their own work was crucial. This confirms and extends the findings of Okhremtchouk, Newell, and Rosa (2013), who studied the perceptions of completers of another TPA. They found that lack of access to high-quality sample tasks proved problematic to their participants, and that participants wished they had good models to follow. Thus, the importance of high-quality model tasks is seen as crucial to success.

A third significant factor in the participants' successful CalTPA experience was access to a K-12 classroom with a qualified master teacher and students who matched the characteristics of the focus students as described on the tasks (specifically English learners and students with special needs included in the regular education classroom). Taking the CalTPA tasks out of the realm of the hypothetical and linking them to other pre-service teacher experiences, or fieldwork, was a key component of the candidate's success, as candidates could directly draw from their K-12 fieldwork experiences to complete the CalTPA tasks. Participants whose fieldwork classrooms did not match the CalTPA requirements reported more difficulty completing tasks, as they had to attend to creating hypothetical students, or finding example focus students in other classrooms. This finding confirms and extends Clayton's (2013) findings that "the field sorely needs data on the conditions that promote successful teaching performance assessments" (p. 11) by providing insight into one such condition. This finding has clear implications for practice, as will be discussed later.

A fourth group of significant findings is seen in the theme of influence on development. Participants in the study reported that, though not a pleasant experience, the CalTPA experience was a learning experience, and it played a positive role in their development as teachers. This confirms and extends the limited but similar findings of Selvester, Summers, and Williams (2006), who studied an early version of this TPA, and extends similar findings of Okhremtchouk, Newell, and Rosa (2013), who found pre-service teachers learned from completing another TPA. It disconfirms the findings of Denton (2013), who examined a different TPA, and found it to be detrimental to the positive development of the pre-service teachers taking it. It also disconfirms a similar claim made by Chiu (2014), who also examined a different TPA. However, this study's finding confirms and extends the specific findings of other authors related to this theme, as will be discussed next.

Specifically, the findings of this study showed that the CalTPA experience helped the candidates develop skills in three specific areas. First, participants were better able to develop effective lesson plans with solid rationale for their instructional choices. This finding extends findings of previous authors who studied different pre-service teaching assessment methods and found they enabled completers to make connections between theory and practice (Gallant & Mayer, 2012; Jeffries & Maeder, 2011). The findings of this study are more specific, centered on the skills of applying rationale to instructional choices.

Second, participants were better able to differentiate instruction for English learners and students with special needs included in the regular classroom. This second finding confirms the finding of Fenderson (2010), who posited the CalTPA experience led teachers to use better differentiation practices in the classrooms. It also confirms and extends the findings of Bunch, Aguirre, and Tellez (2015), who examined another TPA to determine the extent to which completers were considering the needs of English learners (only one population) in the responses, and found they were only increasing vocabulary support (only one method of differentiation). It confirms and extends the findings of Okhremtchouk, Newell, and Rosa (2013), who studied completer perceptions of a different TPA, but found it contributed to their development in the area of lesson planning.

Third, participants in this study reported that the CalTPA experience led them to develop better skills in reflection. This confirms and extends the findings of previous authors who examined different TPAs and made similar conclusions about the growth in completer’s reflection skills (Okhremtchouk, Newell, & Rosa, 2013; Williams, Evans, & King, 2016). It confirms and extends the findings of Barnes and Gillis (2016), who examined another assessment experience in pre-service teacher preparation, and found it fostered reflection, and the findings of Plaisir, Hachey, and Theilheimer (2011) who examined a portfolio assessment and drew similar conclusions.

Literature of the Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this study was a dual framework. I thus reviewed prior literature through two interrelated lenses. The first lens was the theory of experience, as described by Dewey (1938) and later expanded by Kolb (1984). The second lens was the theory of formative assessment as described by Black and Wiliam (2009) and expanded by Clark (2012). I will compare findings of this study to both frameworks in turn.

The findings of this study indicate that the CalTPA experience did indeed have an influence on the development of participants. Participants in this study were changed in that they developed concrete skills of reflection and differentiation. Dewey (1938) posited that experiences affect individuals who undergo them by changing them (developing them). Specifically, he posited two ways this occurs: by continuity and by interaction. Dewey's (1938) idea of continuity in experience posits that each experience is like a link in a chain of experiences, and that the experiences work in concert. Participants situated their CalTPA experience in the broader context of the teacher preparation program, noting interplay between other program experiences (such as student teaching and seminars). Participants also recognized how the CalTPA experience informed their current differentiated teaching practice, making direct connections between that past experience and present experiences. Dewey's (1938) concept of interaction in experience posits that external and internal factors are at work. Participants credited an external factor, interaction with others, as a key component in their CalTPA experience. These external others included peers, master teachers, and K-12 students. In addition, participants clearly described the internal factor of emotions as a major factor in their CalTPA experience.

Kolb (1984) posited that reflection played a pivotal role in one's chain of experiences. The findings of this study also support this, given that participants reflected on what they had done to be successful on beginning tasks of the CalTPA in order to approach later tasks, and they did view the tasks as separate experiences. This illustrated Kolb's (1984) view of the cycle of learning, in which the act of reflection becomes part of the experience, and enables the experience to have influence on the development of the person who undergoes it.

Black and Wiliam's (2009) theory of formative assessment posited that an assessment experience will have an educational impact on those who undergo it. The findings of this study echo this; participants reported that the CalTPA experience did result in skill development. Black and Wiliam (2009) argued that three agents interacted in this process: the learner, the teacher, and the learner' peer. While the participants focused mainly on their own role in the CalTPA experience, the role of peers was also a key factor in the success of the candidate. In addition, faculty and master teacher influences were commonly mentioned as important in the preparation for the tasks. Black and Wiliam (2009) posited five strategies which comprise successful formative assessment. First, they posited that the objectives for and criteria of success must be clearly articulated. Participants reported that they were unsure of the criteria for success on the first task, though they received sample responses and a rubric. However, once they had achieved success on the first task (received a passing score), they reported clearer understanding. Second, in order to have successful formative assessment, those involved must design and implement effective activities that will elicit evidence of learning. In the case of their CalTPA experience, participants reported that having sample tasks to view and a seminar in which they received information was an important factor, as was peer support and reflection. The third strategy for successful formative assessment is effective feedback. This was posited by Black and Wiliam (2009) and heavily emphasized later by Clark (2012). Participants reported that receiving narrative feedback in addition to scores was both desired and effective. They also sought out feedback from peers in an informal way, discussing their results. Participants also discussed general ideas for their task responses with peers, aligning with Black and Wiliam's (2009) fourth strategy of activating students as peer-to-peer learning resources. The fifth strategy for successful formative assessment posited by Black and Wiliam (2009) is ensuring that students take ownership of their learning. The findings of this study somewhat align with this strategy. Participants did complete all tasks independently, but certainly not of their own volition; they did so because they were required to. Participants did not view the CalTPA experience as something completely under their control.

Summary of Interpretation of Findings

The findings of this study confirmed and extended the findings of previous research in several areas. First, they confirmed several findings related to pre-service teacher experience. Of interest here is the fact that this study examined an assessment experience, which is different from the experiences examined by previous researchers, yet similar findings were made to those regarding other types of experiences. Second, this study's findings confirmed and extended several findings related to pre-service teacher assessment, and disconfirmed some. Of interest here is that this study examined pre-service teacher assessment from the perspective of the completer, yet similar findings were made to those in studies which examined assessment from other perspectives, such as faculty or others involved in implementation. Finally, the findings of this study aligned with the literature of the study's conceptual framework, including concepts related to transactional experience and formative assessment. Of interest here is the alignment of the CalTPA experience with the type of transactional experience as theorized by Dewey (1938) and Kolb (1984). Of further interest is the alignment of aspects of the CalTPA experience with the formative assessment features as posited by Black and Wiliam (2009) and Clark (2012), with one notable exception: self-directed learning. The CalTPA experience did not share this characteristic.

Limitations of the Study

This study's limitations were as follows. First, only one particular TPA was examined (the CalTPA), excluding all other TPA instruments that are authorized for use in the state, as the goal of the study was to examine the influence of the CalTPA specifically. The CalTPA consists of a sequence of tasks completed and submitted for evaluation individually, over time, rather than as a one-time event. This structure sets it apart from other state-approved TPAs. While other TPA instruments are aligned with and seek to measure achievement of the same Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs), their formats are different and the way they are implemented varies, leading to different candidate experiences. This study's focus on only one TPA allowed for a more specific definition of the phenomenon under study (the CalTPA experience versus any or all TPAs), but also makes generalizing study results difficult. This study did not address the role other instruments may play in the development of pre-service teachers.

Second, the study had participant-related limitations. Participants were limited to those who had successfully completed one particular teacher preparation program within the past two years, to the exclusion of all others who may have completed other programs or who had completed the same program in different years. This ensured participants would have experienced the same phenomenon, with more common factors of the experience assured. All but one of the selected participants were female, and all were employed as teachers. These factors may have influenced participant perceptions. In addition, the study relied on participants to recollect their experiences and describe perceptions after the fact. Having multiple interviews and specific interview protocols helped deter the possibility of inaccuracy.

Third, this study had researcher-related limitations, as I was the sole researcher. I was responsible for collecting and analyzing data, and I had experience with the CalTPA and knew participants as former students. I engaged in Epoche, conducted member checking, and clearly involved participants as co-researchers to mitigate this limitation (Moustakas, 1994). Though the findings of this study can be compared to other studies' findings, these limitations make generalization difficult.

Recommendations

As mentioned previously, the CalTPA itself has not been widely studied beyond an initial validation study (Riggs, Verdi, & Arlin, 2009) and a dissertation study (Fenderson, 2010). Thus, possibilities for future research involving the CalTPA are numerous. This study's findings suggest further research could be conducted in the following ways.

This study could be replicated with participants who completed another teacher preparation program which utilized the CalTPA. Such a study could examine influences of differing implementation factors such as timing, type of support, size of program, and so on. Again, the focus of that study would be on participant experience. That study could strengthen the findings of this study and help aid in generalization. Alternately, this study could be replicated with participants from another program who completed another form of TPA. The focus of that study to examine the influence of that TPA on completers, and make comparisons to this study's findings. Or, this study could be replicated with a mix of participants from a variety of programs, examining effects of different program features (and therefore different experience features). Any of these studies could help confirm and extend the findings of this study.

This study examined the CalTPA experiences of successful completers. Further research could be done one the experiences of unsuccessful CalTPA candidates (those who had not successfully completed one or more tasks). Participants could be drawn from one program in order to ensure common features of their experiences. The focus of that study could be to examine factors that hindered participant success. The results could aid programs in designing support systems and could benefit future candidates.

This study examined the CalTPA experiences of recent program graduates. The recency of their experience was crucial to ensuring the accurate recollections of participants. Further research could be done with these same participants to examine their teaching practices in the future. Or, new participants could be recruited who were recent program completers, and then those participants followed over time in a longitudinal study. These studies would be focused on identifying and describing any lasting effects of the CalTPA experience.

This study was qualitative in design, relying on phenomenological methods. Different research designs might be employed to examine the CalTPA experience. A quantitative survey of CalTPA completers might be conducted to gather information about the experience on a broader scale, drawing a large number of participants from multiple programs. That study would aid in determining salient features of the experience in general, regardless of program. Additionally, quantitative studies could be conducted to examine relationships of early task scores to later task scores. The goal of those would be to ascertain if predictive relationships exist between successful early task scores and later task scores. These studies may inform when, where, and how programs would focus specific efforts to support candidates in order to better ensure their success.

Implications

This study examined the CalTPA experience from the perspective of those who completed it, with the goal of understanding its role in their development. The results of the study indicate the CalTPA did play a role in the development of the pre-service teachers who took it. The findings of this study carry implications for positive social change on several levels: individual, organizational, and policy. Each will be discussed in turn, with recommendations for practice included. Finally, theoretical implications will be discussed.

The findings of this study carry implications for positive social change at the individual level. Through their responses, participants revealed personal growth and development as teachers. By participating in this study, they were able to examine their own growth and bring it into their own awareness. On more than one occasion, participants volunteered that they were glad for the opportunity for self-reflection, believing that it benefitted them personally. The findings of this study also have the potential to help ensure positive growth in future pre-service teachers as individuals. I recommend that candidates who will complete the CalTPA in the future attend to several factors in advance. First, as this study's results emphasized the importance of writing skills in the successful completion of the CalTPA, candidates should examine their own writing abilities, seeking help if they are lacking in any area related to writing. Second, as this study's results revealed the importance of peer support, candidates should seek out peer support systems, connecting personally with others who are also competing the CalTPA. Finally, as this study's results revealed that candidates would need to deal with negative emotions, future candidates would need to attend to their ability to process negative emotions in order to prevent such emotions from hindering their success. By recognizing these factors and undertaking these recommended practices, future individuals can better ensure a successful, positive CalTPA experience, leading to personal growth and improved teaching ability.

The findings of this study carry implications for positive social change at the organizational level. Currently, 55 teacher preparation programs utilize the CalTPA as the teaching performance assessment their pre-service teachers must successfully complete as a condition of initial teacher licensure (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2013). The results of this study indicate that this experience plays a role in the development of those who complete it, making it incumbent on teacher preparation programs to recognize its significance, and attend to the support of pre-service teachers in this regard. I recommend that programs who utilize the CalTPA attend to the following. First, programs must ensure that pre-service teachers are provided meaningful and intentional opportunities to develop skills in both writing and reflection, as these were found to be significant factors of a successful CalTPA experience. Second, programs must ensure that pre-service teachers are provided with meaningful and intentional opportunities to develop supportive peer relationships, as this was found to be a beneficial factor in candidate success. Third, programs must ensure that pre-service teachers are provided with access to K-12 classrooms in which students who are English learners and students with special needs are included, as this was found to be a beneficial factor in candidate success. Fourth, programs must ensure that pre-service teachers are provided with access to high-quality sample CalTPA tasks, as these model tasks were found to be a beneficial factor in candidate success. Fifth, programs must ensure that candidates receive timely written feedback on each submitted task of the CalTPA, as this was found to be a beneficial factor in candidate success. In short, it is incumbent upon programs which utilize the CalTPA to evaluate, and as necessary, improve its implementation in order to contribute to the success of candidates. This may result in changes within programs, which would be positive social changes at the organizational level.

The findings of this study carry implications for positive social change at the societal or policy level. More states are requiring candidates for initial teacher licensure to pass teaching performance assessments of some kind (Dover & Schultz, 2016). This has been a requirement in California for years, and thus it is incumbent on state authorities to understand the experience of completing a TPA from the perspective of those who complete it in order to develop policies which support rather than hinder candidate success. For example, the findings of this study indicated that review of sample tasks was a factor which contributed to the candidate success. I recommend that the state evaluate any new policies surrounding the implementation of the CalTPA to ensure that programs can continue to share high-quality sample tasks. I also recommend the state evaluate any new policies surrounding completion and submission of the tasks in order to facilitate assessor feedback, which was found to be a crucial factor in the CalTPA experience. Finally, I recommend the state evaluate any new policies surrounding the support which programs are allowed to and/or required to provide their candidates. These recommendations may lead to policy changes in support of increased candidate success, which would be positive social change at the policy level. Increased candidate success the CalTPA will lead candidates to employ better teaching practices in the field, which will improve K-12 education, an example of positive social change at the societal level.

The findings of this study also have theoretical implications. In working to develop a theory of formative assessment, Black and Wiliam (2009) and Kolb (1984) sought to describe the function of assessment in the learning cycle. They followed the traditional view of assessments as sorted by purpose into one of two categories: formative or summative. Recent research underscored the tension this dichotomy creates in all those involved in the assessment (Meuwissen & Choppin, 2015). Black and Wiliam (2009) posited that further research would be needed on ways summative assessments function formatively. This study's findings contribute insight into the intersection of a summative assessment (the CalTPA) and the development of those who take it (a formative purpose), opening the door to the possibility that the presupposition that assessment must be either formative or summative (but not both) may not be completely accurate.

In addition, the findings of this study raise important questions for further research on the nature of assessment and its practices. First, the study's findings raise questions about the characteristics or components of assessments that contribute to or detract from their ability to benefit those who take them. These questions call for investigating specific features of assessments that are beneficial to students, versus those that are not beneficial, and investigating strategies to ensure that those who undergo the assessment experience are cognizant of these features. Standardized assessments used in pre-service teacher preparation are high-stakes in that licensure depends on the outcome. Questions related to this particular topic call for investigation into ways assessments are providing benefit to pre-service teachers or are hindering their development, ways the assessments might be designed and implemented so that the experience of completing them is positive, both emotionally and in terms of development, and ways programs can implement assessments to ensure that those who take them are aware of any influence on their development. Aspects of assessment purpose, form, and implementation practices are worthy of further investigation.

Finally, this study's findings also carry implications for further use of one aspect of study methodology. To collect data for this study, I employed a particular strategy in which participants examined artifacts (their completed CalTPA tasks) and reflected on their experience completing them. Questions arise regarding ways this particular research strategy might be used in other research in order to prompt reflection, ways researchers might design and implement artifact review to help probe the memory of participants, and ways other strategies might be developed and employed to help aid in participant reflection, thus helping researchers collect data which is only found in participant memory. These questions are worthy of further research.

Conclusion

This study examined the perceptions of completers of a four-task teaching performance assessment, the CalTPA. As this high-stakes assessment was embedded in

55 teaching credential programs in California, it clearly has become a significant feature of teacher preparation in the state (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2013). The goal of this study was to understand the influence of this assessment experience on the development of those who took it, and thus better understand its meaning. The findings of this study clearly indicate that the experience of completing the CalTPA had a significant influence on participants' development as teachers, enabling them to acquire certain skills beneficial to teaching due to certain factors which contributed to candidate success and in spite of other factors which hindered it. Though study results give insight into the meaning of the CalTPA experience, questions remain. What changes might be made to the CalTPA to improve the candidate experience? What of differing candidate experiences, such as those of candidates in other programs, or those who are not successful at completing the CalTPA? What might be gleaned from examining those experiences? Questions also arise regarding ways the CalTPA experience compares to or differs from experiences with other TPAs of differing formats. Do completers of other TPAs undergo similar development? What can be discovered about the ways summative assessment functions formatively? What specific features of assessment are beneficial to development, and how can these be made clear to all involved? Further research can examine these questions.

As described in the previous section, the findings of this study carry direct implications for social change at several levels. The results directly inform stakeholders involved in teacher preparation (at the individual, program, and policy levels) about a key experience significantly affecting the development of a large number of pre-service teachers. Those involved in programs that utilize the CalTPA can consider this study's findings, implications, and recommendations for practice as they seek to evaluate their current experience with or implementation of the CalTPA with the goal of supporting candidate success and positive personal growth. This study can provide assistance to all stakeholders in teacher preparation who seek to foster the growth of pre-service teachers as they develop into effective teachers, a key component to improving educational quality for the benefit of their future students.

References

Al-Awidi, H.M., & Alghazo, I.M. (2012). The effect of student teaching experience on pre-service elementary teachers' self-efficacy beliefs for technology integration in the UAE. *Education Technology Research Development, 60*, 923-941. doi: 10.1007/s1142301292394

Al-Barakat, A., & Al-Hassan, O. (2009). Peer assessment as a learning tool for enhancing student teachers' preparation. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(4), 399-413. doi: 10.1080/13598660903247676

Allan, E., Shane, J., Brownstein, E., Ezrailson, C., Hagevik, R., & Veal, W. (2009). Using performance-based assessments to prepare safe science teachers. *Journal of Science Teacher Education, 20*(6), 495-500. doi: 10.1007/s10972-009-9150-y

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (2013). *The changing teacher preparation profession: A report from AACTE's professional education data system (PEDS)*. Retrieved from http://www.aacte.org

An, S. (2016). Teaching elementary school social studies methods under edTPA. *The Social Studies*, *107*(1), 19-27. doi: 10.1080/00377996.2015.1094724

Astika, G. (2014). Reflective teaching as alternative assessment in teacher education: a case study of pre-service teachers. *TEFLIN Journal: A publication on the teaching and learning of English*, *25*(1), 16-32. Retrieved from www.teflin.org

Ayvazo, S., Ward, P., & Stuhr, P. (2010). Teaching and assessing content knowledge in pre-service physical education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance*, *81*(4), 40-44. doi: 10.1080/07303084.2010.10598463

Bairral, M., & Santos, R. (2012). E-Portfolio improving learning in mathematics pre-service teacher. *Digital Education Review,* (21), 1-12. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ972712

Bahr, D., Monroe, E.E., & Shaha, S.H. (2013). Examining pre-service teacher belief changes in the context of coordinated mathematics methods coursework and classroom experiences. *School Science and Mathematics*, *113*(3), 144-155. doi: 10.1111/ssm.12010

Barnes, N., & Gillis, A. (2016). Assessment 360: A promising assessment technique for preservice teacher education. *The Teacher Educator, 50*(4), 288-304. doi: 10.1080/08878730.2015.1071904

Bartolome, S.J. (2013). Growing through service: Exploring the impact of a service-learning experience on pre-service educators. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 23*(1), 79-91. doi: 10.1177/1057083712471951

Berg, M., & Miksza, P. (2010). An investigation of pre-service music teacher development and concerns. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 20*(1), 39-55. doi: 10.1177/1057083710363237

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability (formerly: Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education), 21*(1), 5-31. doi: 10.1007/s1109200890685

Bolton, N. (1979). Phenomenology and education. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 27*(3), 245-258. doi: 10.1080/00071005.1979.9973552

Brookhart, S., & Loadman, W. (1995). The role of assessment in teacher education. In

S.W. Soled (Ed.), *Assessment, testing, and evaluation in teacher education* (pp. 1-7). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Bryant, C. L., Maarouf, S., Burcham, J., & Greer, D. (2016). The examination of a teacher candidate assessment rubric: A confirmatory factor analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *57*, 79-96. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2016.03.012

Bunch, G., Aguirre, J., & Téllez, K. (2009). Beyond the scores: Using candidate responses on high stakes performance assessment to inform teacher preparation for English learners. *Issues in Teacher Education, 18*(1), 103-128. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gove/?id=EJ851544

Bunch, G., Aguirre, J., & Téllez, K. (2015). Integrating a focus on academic language, English learners, and mathematics: Teacher candidate's responses on the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). *The New Educator, 11*(1), 79-103. doi 10.1080/1547688X.2015.989796

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2013). *California teaching performance assessment implementation manual*. Retrieved from http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/TPA-files/CalTPA-implementation-manual.pdf

Campa, B. (2010). A feminist critical study of a master's exam in teacher education. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 43*(2), 173-187. doi: 10.1080/10665681003715622

Caughlin, S., & Jiang, H. (2014). Observation and teacher quality critical analysis of observational instruments in pre-service teacher performance assessment. *Journal* *of Teacher Education (Online)*, pp. 1-14. doi: 0.1177/0022487114541546

Chaffin, C., & Manfredo, J. (2010). Perceptions of pre-service teachers regarding feedback and guided reflection in an instrumental early field experience. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 19*(2), 57-72. doi: 10.1177/1057083709354161

Chamberlin, J.G. (1974). Phenomenological methodology and understanding education. In D. Denton (Ed.), *Existentialism and phenomenology in education: Collected essays* (pp. 119-137). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Chandler-Olcott, K., Fleming, S. M., & Nieroda, J. L. (2016). Perhaps these are not poetic times at all": Using poetry to cope with and critique a high-stakes teacher performance assessment. *English Education*, *48*(3), 237. Retrieved from http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Journals/EE/0483-apr2016/EE0483Perhaps.pdf

Chang, N. (2011). Pre-service teachers' views: How did e-feedback through assessment facilitate their learning? *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching \& Learning, 11*(2), 16-33. Retrieved from http://josotl.indiana.edu/

Chitpin, S., & Simon, M. (2009). ‘Even if no-one looked at it, it was important for my own development’: Pre-service teacher perceptions of professional portfolios. *Australian Journal of Education, 53*(3), 277-293. Retrieved from http://aed.sagepub.com/content/53/3/277.short

Chiu, S. (2013). edTPA: An assessment that reduces the quality of teacher education. *Teachers College, Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, *14*. Retrieved from http://tesoldev.journals.cdrs.columbia.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/12/2015/04/3.3-Chiu-2014.pdf

Chung, R. (2008). Beyond assessment: Performance assessments in teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly,* 7-28. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ810640.pdf

Çimer, S. (2011). The effect of portfolios on students' learning: student teachers' views. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 34*(2), 161-176. doi: 10.1080/02619768.2011.552183

Clark, I. (2012). Formative assessment: Assessment is for self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychology Review, 24*(2), 205-249. doi: 10.1007/s1064801191916

Clayton, C. (2013). *Understanding current reforms to evaluate teachers: A literature review on teacher evaluation across the career span*. Prepared for the New York Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Retrieved from http://www.nyacte.org

Cochran-Smith, M., Piazza, P., & Power, C. (2012). The politics of accountability: Assessing teacher education in the United States. *The Educational Forum, 77*(1), 6-27. doi: 10.1080/00131725.2013.739015

Coffey, A. M. (2014). Using video to develop skills in reflection in teacher education students. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(9), 86-97. Retrieved from http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol39/iss9/6

Coggshall, J., Max, J., & Bassett, K. (2008). *Key issue: Using performance-based assessment to identify and support high-quality teachers* (Agreement No.

S283B050051). Retrieved from the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality website: http://www.ecs.org/html/educationissues/teachingquality/NCLB-HQTP/NCCTQ_db_intro.asp

Coloma, R. S. (2015). Students are once again ‘numbers’ instead of actual human beings”: Teacher performance assessment and the governing of curriculum and teacher education. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, *13*(1), 5-35. Retrieved from www.yorku.ca

Cornish, L., & Jenkins, K. (2012). Encouraging teacher development through embedding reflective practice in assessment. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(2), 159-170. doi: 10.1080/1359866X.2012.669825

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Crossouard, B., & Pryor, J. (2012). How theory matters: formative assessment theory and practices and their different relations to education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 31*(3), 251-263. doi: 10.1007/s11217-012-9296-5

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Assessing teacher education the usefulness of multiple measures for assessing program outcomes. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(2), 120-138. doi: 10.1177/0022487105283796

Darling-Hammond, L., & Hyler, M. E. (2013). The role of performance assessment in developing teaching as a profession. *Rethinking Schools*, *27*(4). Retrieved from http://www.rethinkingschools.org/archive/27_04/27_04_darling-hammond_hyler.shtml

Darling-Hammond, L., Newton, X., & Wei, R. C. (2010). Evaluating teacher education outcomes: A study of the Stanford Teacher Education Programme. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *36*(4), 369-388. doi: 10.1080/02607476.2010.513844

Darling-Hammond, L., Newton, S., & Wei, R. (2013). Developing and assessing beginning teacher effectiveness: the potential of performance assessments. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, *25*(3), 179-204. doi: 10.1007/s1109201391630

Darling-Hammond, L., & Snyder, J. (2000). Authentic assessment of teaching in context. *Teachng and Teacher Education*, *16*(2000), 523-545. Retrieved from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0742051X00000159

Dee, A. (2012) Evidence of cultural competence within teacher performance assessments. *Action in Teacher Education, 34*(3), 262-275. doi: 10.1080/01626620.2012.694785

Denney, M., Grier, J., & Buchanan, M. (2012). Establishing a portfolio assessment framework for pre-service teachers: A multiple perspectives approach. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *17*(4), 425-437. doi: 10.1080/13562517.2011.640997

Denton, D. (2013). Responding to edTPA: Transforming practice or applying shortcuts? *AILACTE Journal*, *X*(2013), 19-36. Retrieved from www.ailacte.org

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York, New York: Touchstone.

Dickson, M. & Kadbey, H. (2014). ‘That’s not the way I was taught science at school!’ How pre-service primary teachers in Abu Dahbi, United Arab Emirates are affected by their own schooling experiences. *Science Education International, 24*(3), 332-350. Retrieved from: http://www.icaseonline.net/seiweb

Diez, M., Athanasiou, N., & Mace, D. (2010). Expeditionary learning: The Alverno College teacher education model. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 42*(6), 18-24. doi: 10.1080/00091383.2010.523402

Dorn, S. (2010). The political dilemmas of formative assessment. *Exceptional Children*, *76*(3), 325-337. doi: 10.1177/001440291007600305

Dover, A. G., & Schultz, B. D. (2016). Troubling the edTPA: Illusions of objectivity and rigor. *The Educational Forum*, 80(1), 95-106. doi: 10.1080/00131725.2015.1102368

Dover, A.G., Schultz, B.D., Smith, K., & Duggan, T.J. (2016). edTPA, localized knowledge and the outsourcing of teacher evaluation. *Teachers College Record, 30 March 2015.* Retrieved from www.tcrecord.org

Duckor, B., Castellano, K. E., Téllez, K., Wihardini, D., & Wilson, M. (2014). Examining the internal structure evidence for the performance assessment for California teachers: A validation study of the elementary literacy teaching event for tier I teacher licensure. *Journal of Teacher Education (Online),* pp. 1-19. doi: 10.1177/0022487114542517

Edwards-Groves, C., & Hoare, R. (2012). "Talking to learn": Focusing teacher education on dialogue as a core practice for teaching and learning. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(8), 6. doi: 10.14221/ajte.2012v37n8.8

Elder, R. (2015). *A mixed-method investigation of the Missouri pre-service teacher* *assessment pilot program at a private Midwestern university* (Doctoral dissertation.) Retrieved from ProQuest Database. (ProQuest Number 3738097).

Ellington, A., Whitenack, J., Inge, V., Murray, M., & Schneider, P. (2012). Assessing K-5 teacher leaders' mathematical understanding: What have the test makers and the test takers learned? *School Science and Mathematics, 112*(5), 310-324. doi: 10.1111/j.1949-8594.2012.00148.x

Everhart, B., & Hogarty, K. Supporting the preparation of beginning teachers with online assessment products. *Education, 129*(3), 400-412.

Falk, B. (2013). Lessons from the performance assessment of California teachers (PACT). *The New Educator, 9*(1), 1-2. doi: 10.1080/1547688X.2013.751308

Fenderson, S. (2010). *Instruction, perception, and reflection: Transforming beginning teachers' habits of mind* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation Database. (ProQuest number 734662871).

Fleet, A., & Kitson, R. (2009). Rethinking assessment in an indigenous specific program. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 55*(3) 397-413. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ859659

Fluckiger, J., Tixier y Vigil, Y., Pasco, R., and Danielson, K. (2010). Formative feedback: Involving students as partners in assessment to enhance learning. *College Teaching, 58*, 136-140. doi: 0.1080/87567555.2010.484031

Frazier, L., Brown-Hobbs, S., & Palmer, B. (2013). Developing benchmarks to measure teacher candidates' performance. *AILACTE Journal, X*(2013), 37-54. Retrieved from http://www.ailacte.org/images/uploads/general/AILACTE_Journal_Fall_2013.pdf#page=47

Freire, P. (1970/2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. (M. Ramos, Trans.) New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Gainsburg, J., & Ericson, B. (2015). (Relatively) smooth sailing: How a large state university successfully adopted the PACT teaching event. *The New Educator, 11*(1), 24-36. doi 10.1080/1547688X.2015.989769

Gallant, A., & Mayer, D. (2012). Teacher performance assessment in teacher education: an example in Malaysia. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *38*(3), 295-307. doi: 10.1080/02607476.2012.668330

Graham, C. R. (2011). Theoretical considerations for understanding technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK). *Computers & Education*, *57*(3), 1953-1960. doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2011.04.010

Granberg, C. (2010). E-portfolios in teacher education 2002--2009: the social construction of discourse, design and dissemination. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 33*(3), 309-322. doi: 10.1080/02619761003767882

Guaglianone, C., Payne, M., Kinsey, G., & Chiero, R. (2009). Teaching performance assessment: A comparative study of implementation and impact amongst California State University campuses. *Issues in Teacher Education, 18*(1), 129-148. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ851545

Heafner, T., & Petty, T. (2016). Measuring candidate learning outcomes associated with program delivery models: Comparisons of online and face-to-face (F2F) using edTPA. In *Proceedings of Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference 2016* (pp. 1071-1078). Chesapeake, VA: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education. Retrieved from https://www.learntechlib.org/p/171823

Haertel, E. (1990). Teacher-performance assessments: A new kind of teacher examination. In J. Mitchell, S. Wise, & B. Plake (Eds.), *Assessment of teaching: Purposes, practices, and implications for the profession* (pp.15-35). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Harrison, L. (2013). Service learning and its impact on middle level pre-service teachers' learning from field experiences. *Middle Grades Research Journal*, *8*(3), 23-38. Retrieved from: http://www.infoagepub.com/middle-grades-research-journal

Hobbs., E. (2015). *The edTPA experience: Student teachers' perceptions and reflections on the edTPA assessment* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Database. (ProQuest Number 3746484).

Hourigan, R. (2009). Pre-service music teachers' perceptions of fieldwork experiences in a special needs classroom. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 57*(2), 152-168. doi: 10.1177/0022429409335880

Hudson, P. (2009). How can pre-service teachers be measured against advocated professional teaching standards? *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *34*(5), 65-73. doi: 10.14221/ajte.2009v34n5.6

Husserl, E. (2012). *Ideas: General introduction to pure phenomenology*. New York, NY: Routledge Classics. (Original work published 1931)

Huxhold, D. & Willcox, L. (2014). Synthesizing experiences in arts methods courses: Creating artists' maps in pre-service elementary teacher education. *Art Education, 67*(4), 19-26. Retrieved from: http://www.arteducators.org/research/art-education

Jeffries, C., & Maeder, D. W. (2011). Comparing vignette instruction and assessment tasks to classroom observations and reflections. *The Teacher Educator, 46*(2), 161-175. doi: 10.1080/08878730.2011.552667

Jones, J., McDonald, C., Maddox, A., & McDonald, S. (2011). Teacher candidate success on state mandated professional tests: One predictive measure. *Education, 131*(4), 905-920. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/educ_fac_pubs/191/

Jong, C. & Hodges, T. (2013). The influence of elementary pre-service teachers' mathematical experiences on their attitudes towards teaching and learning mathematics. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education, 8*(2-3), 101-122. Retrieved from: http://www.mathedujournal.com/

Kaino, L. M. (2014). Mathematics teaching practice assessment using student-teacher portfolios. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 5*(15), 267. doi: 10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n15p267

Kang, E., Bianchini, J., & Kelly, G. (2012). Crossing the border from science student to science teacher: Pre-service teachers' view and experiences learning to teach inquiry. *Journal of Science Teacher Education, 24,* 427-447. doi: 10.1007/s10972-012-9317-9

Kearney, S., Perkins, T., & Maakrun, J. (2014). A transformative experience: A short-term cross-cultural service-learning immersion to Kenya. *Issues in Educational Research*, *24*(3), 229-240. Retrieved from: http://www.iier.org.au/iier24/kearney.html

Kemmis, S. & Wilkinson, M. (1998). Participatory action research and the study of practice. In B. Atwah, S. Kemmis, & P. Weeks (Eds), *Action research in practice: Partnerships for social justice in education* (pp. 21-36). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kilic, D. (2016). An examination using self-, peer-, and teacher-assessment in higher education: a case study in teacher education. *Higher Education Studies*, *6*(1), 136-144. doi: 10.5539/hes.v6n1p136

Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Lachuk, A. J., & Koellner, K. (2015). Performance-based assessment for certification: Insights from edTPA implementation. *Language Arts*, *93*(2), 84. Retrieved from www.ncte.org

Lane, J., Mollica, J., & Windjue, S. (2013). Ensuring teacher education program success through formative assessments: An overview of the Wisconsin K-12 energy education program. *Middle Grades Research Journal, 8*(2), 51-62. Retrieved from https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1P3-3132317431/ensuring-teacher-education-program-success-through

Leaman, H., & Kistler, S. (2009). Improving learning through performance assessment in a social studies methods course for pre-service elementary teachers. *SRATE Journal, 18*(2), 70-79. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ948680

Lincove, J., Osborne, C., Dillon, A., & Mills, N. (2013). The politics and statistics of value-added modeling for accountability of teacher preparation programs. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *65*(1), 24-38. doi: 10.1177/0022487113504108

Lit, I. W., & Lotan, R. (2013). A balancing act: Dilemmas of implementing a high-stakes performance assessment. *The New Educator*, *9*(1), 54-76. doi: 10.1080/1547688X.2013.751314

Li, L., Liu, X., & Steckelberg, A. (2010). Assessor or assessee: How student learning improves by giving and receiving peer feedback. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 41*(3), 525-536. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8535.2009.00968.x

Lin, Y., Chiu, Y., & Lai, P. (2014). Experience of teacher education students in taking the course of adolescent psychology. *College Student Journal, 48*(4), 578-588. Retrieved from: http://www.projectinnovation.com/college-student-journal.html

Lin, C., Ko, Y., & Kuo, Y. (2014). Changes in pre-service teachers' algebraic misconceptions by using computer-assisted instruction. *International Journal for Technology in Mathematics Education*, *21*(3), 89-101. Retrieved from: http://www.researchinformation.co.uk

Lombardi, J. (2011). Positive effects of brain-based education on teacher performance assessment outcomes. *Education as Change, 15*(2), 225-238. doi: 10.1080/16823206.2011.619143

Luster, J. (2010). Why states should require a teaching performance assessment and a subject matter assessment for a preliminary teaching credential. *Research in Higher Education Journal, 8*, 1-16. Retrieved from http://m.www.aabri.com/manuscripts/10477.pdf

Lys, D. B., L'Esperance, M., Dobson, E., & Bullock, A. A. (2014). Large-scale implementation of the edTPA: Reflections upon institutional change in action. *Current Issues in Education*, *17*(3). Retrieved from www.asu.edu

Madeloni, B., & Gorlewski, J. (2013). Wrong answer to the wrong question: Why we need critical teacher education, not standardization. *Rethinking Schools*, *27*(4), 16-21. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1014949

Margolis, J., & Doring, A. (2013). National assessments for student teachers: Documenting teaching readiness to the tipping point. *Action in Teacher Education*, *35*(4), 272-285. doi: 10.1080/01626620.2013.827602

Maxwell, J. (2013). *Qualitative research design* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

McCall, Z., McHatton, P. A., & Shealey, M. W. (2014). Special education teacher candidate assessment: A review. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*, *37*(1), 51-70. doi: 10.1177/0888406413512684

McCarthy, D. L. (2015). A science fair partnership: An active learning experience for teacher candidates. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, *45*(2), 36-40.

McPhail, J. (1995). Phenomenology as philosophy and method: Applications to ways of doing special education. *Remedial and Special Education, 16*(3), 159-165. doi:

10.1177/074193259501600305

Medley, D. (1990). Improving teaching through the assessment process. In J. Mitchell, S. Wise, & B. Plake (Eds.), *Assessment of teaching: Purposes, practices, and implications for the profession* (pp. 37-76). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Meeus, W., Van Petegem, P., & Engels, N. (2009). Validity and reliability of portfolio assessment in pre-service teacher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 34*(4), 401-413. doi: 10.1080/02602930802062659

Mehrens, W. (1990). Assessing the quality of teacher assessment tests. In J. Mitchell, S. Wise, & B. Plake (Eds.), *Assessment of teaching: Purposes, practices, and implications for the profession* (pp. 77-136). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Merino, N., & Pecheone, R. (2013). The Performance Assessment for California Teachers: An introduction. *The New Educator*, *9*(1), 3-11. doi: 10.1080/1547688X.2013.751310

Meuwissen, K. W., & Choppin, J. M. (2015). Preservice teachers' adaptations to tensions associated with the edTPA during its early implementation in New York and Washington states. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *23*(103). doi: 10.14507/epaa.v23.2078

Miksza, P., & Berg, M. (2013). Transition from student to teacher: Frameworks for understanding pre-service music teacher development. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 23*(1), 10-26. doi: 10.1177/1057083713480888

Milanowski, A. T., Heneman III, H. G., & Kimball, S. M. (2011). *Teaching assessment for teacher human capital management: Learning from the current state of the art.* WCER Working Paper No. 2011-2 for the Wisconsin Center for Education Research. Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov

Miles, M., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Milford, T. & Tippett, C. (2013). Pre-service teachers' images of scientists: Do prior science experiences make a difference? *Journal of Science Teacher Education, 24*(4), 745-762. doi: 10.1007/s10972-012-9304-1

Miller, M., & Carney, J. (2009). Lost in translation: Using video annotation software to examine how a clinical supervisor interprets and applies a state-mandated teacher assessment instrument. *The Teacher Educator, 44*(4), 217-231. doi: 10.1080/08878730903180200

Miller, M., Carroll, D., Jancic, M., & Markworth, K. (2015). Developing a culture of learning around the edTPA: One university's journey. *The New Educator*, *11*(1), 37-59. doi: 10.1080/1547688X.2014.966401

Miller, P. & Mikulec, E. (2014). Pre-service teachers confronting issues of diversity through a radical field experience. *Multicultural Education, 21*(2), 18-24. Retrieved from: http://www.caddogap.com/periodicals.shtml

Miller, N. C., Thompson, N. L., & Xu, J. (2012). In the middle: Elementary education pre-service teachers' experiences, efficacy, and interest in the education of young adolescents. *Middle Grades Research Journal*, *7*(4), 15. Retrieved from:

http://www.infoagepub.com/middle-grades-research-journal

Mitchell Jr, J. (1990). The assessment of teacher assessment: Concluding thoughts and some lingering questions. In J. Mitchell, S. Wise, & B. Plake (Eds.), *Assessment of teaching: Purposes, practices, and implications for the profession* (pp. 347-376). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Murley, L. D., Gandy, S. K., & Huss, J. M. (2016). Teacher candidates research, teach, and learn in the nation's first net zero school. *The Journal of Environmental Education 2016,* 1-9. doi: 10.1080/00958964.2016.1141747

Napoles, J., & MacLeod, R. B. (2013). The influences of teacher delivery and student progress on pre-service teachers' perceptions of teaching effectiveness. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 61*(3), 249-261. doi:10.1177/0022429413497234

Noel, A. (2014). Teacher performance assessment (edTPA): An instructor's development and evaluation of an embedded signature assessment in an early childhood literacy course. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 35*(4), 357-372. doi: 10.1080/10901027.2014.968299

Okhremtchouk, I., Newell, P., & Rosa, R. (2013). Assessing pre-service teachers prior to certification: Perspectives on the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 21*(56), 1-27. doi: 10.14507/epaa.v21n56.2013

Okhremtchouk, I., Seiki, S., Gilliland, B., Ateh, C., Wallace, M., & Kato, A. (2009).

Voices of pre-service teachers: Perspectives on the performance assessment for California teachers (PACT). *Issues in Teacher Education, 18*(1), 39-62. Retrieved from http://www1.chapman.edu/ITE/public_html/ITESpring09/08okrhemtchouketal.pdf

Oner, D., & Adadan, E. (2011). Use of web-based portfolios as tools for reflection in pre-service teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *62*(5), 477-492. doi: 10.1177/0022487111416123

Palmer, C. (2012). Intellectual development of pre-service and novice music educators: A review of two models and their use in the literature. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, *22*(1), 50-62. doi: 10.1177/1057083711422566

Parker, D., & Volante, L. (2009). Responding to the challenges posed by summative teacher candidate evaluation: A collaborative self-study of practicum supervision by faculty. *Studying Teacher Education, 5*(1), 33-44. doi: 10.1080/17425960902830385

Pasch, S. (1995). Assisting and assessing the development of pre-service teachers in academic and clinical settings. In S.W. Soled (Ed.), *Assessment, testing, and evaluation in teacher education* (pp. 1-7). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Pecheone, R., & Chung, R. (2006). Evidence in teacher education: The Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). *Journal of Teacher Education,* *57*(1), 22-36. doi: 10.1177/0022487105284045

Pecheone, R., Shear, B., Whittaker, A., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2013). *2013 edTPA field test: summary report.* Retrieved from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education website: https://secure.aacte.org/apps/rl/res_get.php?fid=827&ref=

Peck, C. A., & McDonald, M. (2013). Creating “cultures of evidence” in teacher education: Context, policy, and practice in three high-data-use programs. *The New Educator*, *9*(1), 12-28. doi: 10.1080/1547688X.2013.751312

Peck, C. A., Singer-Gabella, M., Sloan, T., & Lin, S. (2014). Driving blind: Why we need standardized performance assessment in teacher education. *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, *8*(1), 8-30. doi: 10.3776/joci.2014.v8n1p8-30

Plaisir, J., Hachey, A., & Theilheimer, R. (2011). Their portfolios, our role: Examining a community college teacher education digital portfolio program from the students' perspective. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 32*(2), 159-175. doi: 10.1080/10901027.2011.5722311

Popham, W. J. (1990). Face validity: Siren song for teacher testers. In J. Mitchell, S. Wise, & B. Plake (Eds.), *Assessment of teaching: Purposes, practices, and implications for the profession* (pp. 1-14). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Popham, W.J. (2013). Tough teacher evaluation and formative assessment: oil and water? *Voices from the Middle, 21*(2), 10-14. Retrieved from http://www.ncte.org/journals/vm/issues/v21-2

Ratner, A. R., & Kolman, J. S. (2016). Breakers, benders, and obeyers: Inquiring into teacher educators' mediation of edTPA. E*ducation Policy Analysis Archives, 24*(35), 1-29. doi: 10.14507/epaa.v24.2112

Raven, S. & Jurkiewicz, M. (2014). Pre-service secondary science teachers' experiences and ideas about bullying in science classrooms. *Science Educator*, *23*(1), 65-72. Retrieved from: https://www.questia.com/library/p138901/science-educator

Reagan, E. M., Schram, T., McCurdy, K., Chang, T. H., & Evans, C. M. (2016). Politics of policy: Assessing the implementation, impact, and evolution of the performance assessment for California teachers (PACT) and edTPA. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *24*(9), 1-27. doi: 10.14507/epaa.v24.2176

Riggs, M., Verdi, M., & Arlin, P. (2009). A local evaluation of the reliability, validity, and procedural adequacy of the teacher performance assessment exam for teaching credential candidates. *Issues in Teacher Education, 18*(1), 13-38. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ851540

Roberts, P. (2014). Design principles for an ePortfolio-based learning environment to enhance reflection in pre-service teachers. In *Proceedings of World Conference on Educational Multimedia, Hypermedia and Telecommunications 2014* (pp. 769-774). Chesapeake, VA: AACE. Retrieved from http://www.editlib.org/

Sancar-Tokmak, H., Surmeli, H., & Ozgelen, S. (2014). Pre-service science teachers' perceptions of their TPACK development after creating digital stories. *International Journal od Environmental & Science Education*, *6*(3), 247-264. doi:10.12973/ijese.2014.214a

Sandholtz, J. H. (2012). Predictions and performance on the PACT teaching event: Case studies of high and low performers. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 39*(3), 103-126. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1001440

Sariscsany, M. J. (2010). Using teacher work samples to develop and assess best practices in physical education teacher education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance, 81*(1), 34-35, 39. doi: 10.1080/07303084.2010.10598413

Sato, M. (2014). What is the underlying conception of teaching of the edTPA?. *Journal of Teacher Education* (*Online)*, p. 1-14. doi: 10.1177/0022487114542518

Schmidt, D., Baran, E., Thompson, A., Mishra, P., Koehler, M., & Shin, T. (2009). Technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK): The development and validation of an assessment instrument for pre-service teachers. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 42*(2), 123-149. Doi: 10.1080/15391523.2009.10782544

Selvester, P., Summers, D., & Williams, E. (2006). Costs and benefits of accountability: A case study of credential candidates' performance assessment. *Issues in Teacher Education, 15*(1), 21-36. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ796289

Shulman, L. S. (1988). A union of insufficiencies: Strategies for teacher assessment in a period of educational reform. *Educational Leadership*, *46*(3), 36-41. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/archived-issues.aspx

Simic-Muller, K. (2015). Mathematizing perceptions: Pre-service teachers' use of mathematics to investigate their relationship to the community. *REDIMAT:*

Journal of Research in Mathematics Education, *4*(1), 30-51. doi: 10.4471/redimat.2015.58

Sleeter, C. (2003). Reform and control: An analysis of SB 2042. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 19-30. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/23478415?sid=21106045303893&uid=3739920&uid=2&uid=4&uid=3739256

Sloan, T. (2013). Distributed leadership and organizational change: Implementation of a teaching performance measure. *The New Educator*, *9*(1), 29-53. doi: 10.1080/1547688X.2013.751313

Soled, S. (1995). The role of assessment in teacher education. In S.W. Soled (Ed.), *Assessment, testing, and evaluation in teacher education* (pp. 1-7). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Smagorinsky, P. (2014). Authentic teacher evaluation: A two-tiered proposal for formative and summative assessment. *English Education, 46*(2), 165-173. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/9156912/Smagorinsky_P._2014_._Authentic_teacher_evaluation_A_two-tiered_proposal_for_formative_and_summative_assessment._English_Education_46_2_165-185

Snyder, D. W. (2014). How have music student teachers done on the edTPA so far? *Illinois Music Educator*, *75*(1), 60-61.

Stiggins, R. (1990). Measuring performance in teacher assessment. In J. Mitchell, S.

Wise, & B. Plake (Eds.), *Assessment of teaching: Purposes, practices, and implications for the profession* (pp. 183-207). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Subramaniam, K. (2012). Examining the content of pre-service teachers' reflections of early field experiences. *Research in Science Education, 43*(5), 1851-1872. doi: 10.1007/s11165-012-9337-7

Taut, S. & Sun, Y. (2014). The development and implementation of a national, standards-based, multi-method teacher performance assessment system in chile. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 22* (71). doi: 10.14507/epaa.v22n71.2014

Tellez, K. (2003). Three themes on standards in teacher education: Legislative expediency, the role of external review, and test bias in the assessment of pedagogical knowledge. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 9-18. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/23478413?sid=21106045303893&uid=3739920&uid=3739256&uid=2&uid=4

Torgerson, C., Macy, S., Beare, P., & Tanner, D. (2009). Fresno assessment of student teachers: A teacher performance assessment that informs practice. *Issues in Teacher Education, 18*(1), 63-82. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ851542

Tshuma, R., & Ndebele, C. (2015). Investigating the extent to which the external quality assessment of final year student teachers in Zimbabwe's 2-5-2 teacher education model enhances continuous improvement and accountability of the teaching practice program. *International Journal of Educational Science*, *8*(2), 387-401. Retrieved from www.krepublishers.com/02-journals/IJES-08-0-000-15-Web

Tur, G., & Urbina, S. (2014). Blogs as eportfolio platforms in teacher education: Affordances and limitations derived from student teachers' perceptions and performance on their eportfolios. *Digital Education Review*, 1-23. Retrieved from http://revistes.ub.edu/index.php/der/article/view/11578

U.S. Department of Education. (2001). *No Child Left Behind overview, part IIA, section 2101*. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg20.html.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2013). *Preparing and credentialing the nation's teachers: The secretary's ninth report on teacher quality* (Contract No. ED-OPE-11-C-0024. Retrieved from the U.S. Department of Education website: http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/teachprep/index.html

Uzum, B., Petron, M., & Berg, H. (2014). Pre-service teachers' first foray in the ESL classroom: Reflective practice in service learning project. *TESL-EJ*, 18(3), 1-15. Retrieved from: http://www-writing.berkeley.edu/TESL-EJ/

Vandenburg, D. (1974). Phenomenology and educational research. In D. Denton (Ed.), *Existentialism and phenomenology in education: Collected essays* (pp. 183-220). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Van Es, E., & Conroy, J. (2009). Using the performance assessment for California teachers to examine pre-service teachers' conceptions of teaching mathematics for understanding. *Issues in Teacher Education, 18*(1), 83-102. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ851543

Van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy.* Albany, NY: The State University of New York Press.

Voss, T., Kunter, M., & Baumert, J. (2011). Assessing teacher candidates' general pedagogical/psychological knowledge: Test construction and validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 103*(4), 952. doi: 10.1037/a0025125

Waggoner, J. & Carroll, J. (2014). Concurrent validity of standards-based assessments of teacher candidate readiness for licensure. *SAGE Open Access, October-December 2014,* 1-12. doi: 0.1177/2158244014560545

White, M. C. (2011). Predicting success in teacher certification testing: The role of academic help seeking. *The International Journal of Educational and Psychological Assessment*, *7*(1), 24-44. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED536706

Whitenack, D., & Swanson, P. (2013). The transformative potential of boundary spanners: A narrative inquiry into pre-service teacher education and professional development in an NCLB-impacted context. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 21*(57). doi: 10.14507/epaa.v21n57.2013

Whittaker, A., & Nelson, C. (2013). Assessment with an “end in view”. *The New Educator*, *9*(1), 77-93.

Wilkens, C., Eckdahl, K., Morone, J., Cook, V., Giblin, T., & Coon, J. (2014). Communication, community, and disconnection: Pre-service teachers in virtual school field experiences. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 43*(2), 143-157. doi: 10.2190/ET.43.2.c

Wilkins, E., Shin, E.-K., & Ainsworth, J. (2009). The effects of peer feedback practices with elementary education teacher candidates. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 79-93. doi: 10.1080/1547688X.2013.751315

Wilkerson, J. (2015). The need for instructional sensitivity and construct clarity in PACT: A commentary on "examining the internal structure evidence for the Performance Assessment for California Teachers". *Journal of Teacher Education,1-9.* doi: 10.1177/0022487114561029

Williams, J., Evans, C., & King, L. (2016, March). edTPA assessment in distance education: Implementation, results, and lessons learned in a special education program. In *Proceedings of Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference 2016* (pp. 1374-1377). Chesapeake, VA: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education. Retrieved from https://www.learntechlib.org/p/171870

Wise, A., Darling-Hammond, L., & Purnell, S. (1988). Impacts of teacher testing: State educational governance through standard-setting. *The RAND Corporation*, Report NIE-G-83-0023. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED300350.pdf

Yarbrough, D. (1995). Theoretical foundations of pre-service teacher evaluation. In S.W. Soled (Ed.), *Assessment, testing, and evaluation in teacher education* (pp. 1-7). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Yavetz, B., Goldman, D., & Pe'er, S. (2014). How do pre-service teachers perceive ‘environment’ and its relevance to their area of teaching? *Environmental Education Research, 20*(3), 354-371. doi: 10.1080/13504622.2013.803038

Appendix A: Interview Protocols

Initial Interview Protocol

Introduction:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research study. The purpose of the study is to understand pre-service teachers' experiences with the CalTPA – to understand the experience from the candidate's perspective. By participating, you are making a significant contribution to the field of pre-service teacher preparation.

Please be assured of the confidentiality of your responses. No identifying information about you will be included in the study. Please feel free to speak openly and freely. My role as the researcher is to accurately represent your responses, so I will be recording this interview for transcription. If at any time you feel uncomfortable being recorded, you may ask for the recording to stop. You may withdraw from the study at any time; if you do so, your answers will be discarded and all recordings destroyed.

Please consider yourself a valued co-researcher in this study. In addition to narrative description, your thoughts and opinions are welcomed.

This is the first of three interviews in which you will be asked to participate. Each interview may take up to an hour. You will be asked to review of the transcripts of your interviews for accuracy, which may take up to 30 minutes each. You will also be asked to review the initial interpretations or findings for accuracy, and this also may take up to 30 minutes. You will be invited to attend a debriefing meeting at a later time which could take up to an hour.

By continuing with this interview, you acknowledge that you are participating in this study voluntarily and have consented to the above.

Initial Interview Questions

Background

1. When did you complete your credential program (month/year)?
2. What credential(s) did you earn?
3. What were your scores on each task?

#1 – SSP	#2 – DI	#3 - AL	#4 - CTE

4. Are you employed as a teacher? If so, where? What grades/subjects do you teach?

Preparation

1. How would you describe your understanding of the purpose of the CalTPA?
2. How would you describe the qualities of a successful CalTPA response?
3. Describe how you prepared to complete the tasks of the CalTPA:
   a. Embedded assignment in a course? Separate seminar?
   b. Did you use a prep book or other materials? Was it helpful, and if so, how?
   c. For how many hours did you prepare for each task?
4. Did you work with other people (peers or faculty) prior to submitting the tasks?
   a. Who?
   b. How?
   c. If so, was that helpful?
5. How effective was your preparation for the tasks?
   a. Did you prepare the same way for teach task?
   b. Why?
   c. What was most/least effective?
   d. Looking back, how would you prepare differently, if at all?
6. Is there anything else you would like to add regarding your preparation experiences?

Completing the tasks

7. What challenges did you face while completing the tasks?
8. What concerns did you have while completing the tasks?

9. What was easiest about completing the tasks?
10. What did you learn from the experience of completing the tasks?
11. Is there anything else you would like to add regarding your experience completing the tasks?

Feedback

12. What was your experience with feedback you received about your tasks?
    a. How did you receive it, what form did it come in, and how quickly did you receive it?
13. How understandable and effective was the feedback? Why?
14. How did you utilize the feedback, if at all?
    a. Did you discuss your results with anyone, either formally or informally? If so, who?
15. What additional feedback would have been helpful, and why?
16. Is there anything else you would like to add about your experiences with feedback on the tasks?

Remediation

17. What was your experience with remediation, if any?

Between tasks

18. How did your experience with the first task affect your experiences with second/third/final task?
19. How did the subsequent tasks compare with the first, in terms of difficulty? Why? What portions were more difficult, less difficult, about the same?

Overall

20. Overall, how would you describe your experiences with the CalTPA?
21. Overall, how would you describe the effects of your experiences with the CalTPA on your development as an educator?

Closing:

Do you have anything else you would like to add at this time? Do you have any questions?

For next time:

Please take time to reflect on your experiences, writing down any reflections in notes. Please bring any of these to the next interview.

This concludes the first interview. Once again, thank you for participating in this research study.

Second Interview Protocol

Introduction and Transcript Review

Thank you again for participating in this study. Please be assured of the confidentiality of your responses. No identifying information about you will be included in the study. Please feel free to speak openly and freely. My role as the researcher is to accurately represent your responses, so I will be recording this interview for transcription. If at any time you feel uncomfortable being recorded, you may ask for the recording to stop. You may withdraw from the study at any time; if you do so, your answers will be discarded and all recordings destroyed.

Please consider yourself a valued co-researcher in this study. In addition to narrative description, your thoughts and opinions are welcomed.

First I would like you to review your last interview transcript for accuracy if you have not done so already. Have you already reviewed your transcript and is it accurate? [Participant either acknowledges they have reviewed it, or reviews it then.] I would like you to comment on the annotated or coded transcript. You will see that I have made notes on it.

1. Do you have any comments about the annotations?
2. Do you have any questions?

Read-Through

Now, I would like us to look at your CalTPA tasks together. As we look through each task, I would like you to talk about what you recall about your experience completing it. I may ask you questions as you go along. I will be recording the session.

[Participant examines each task, starting from the beginning, recalling details and commenting as he or she pages through each document.]

Closing:

Do you have anything else you would like to add at this time? Do you have any questions?

For next time:

Please take time to reflect on your experiences, writing down any reflections in notes. Please bring any of these to the next interview.

This concludes the second interview. Once again, thank you for participating in this research study.

Third Interview Protocol

Introduction and Transcript Review

Thank you again for participating in this study. Please be assured of the confidentiality of your responses. No identifying information about you will be included in the study. Please feel free to speak openly and freely. My role as the researcher is to accurately represent your responses, so I will be recording this interview for transcription. If at any time you feel uncomfortable being recorded, you may ask for the recording to stop. You may withdraw from the study at any time; if you do so, your answers will be discarded and all recordings destroyed.

Please consider yourself a valued co-researcher in this study. In addition to narrative description, your thoughts and opinions are welcomed.

First I would like you to review your last interview transcript for accuracy if you have not done so already. Have you already reviewed your transcript and is it accurate? [Participant either acknowledges they have reviewed it, or reviews it then.] I would like you to comment on the annotated or coded transcript. You will see that I have made notes on it.

1. Do you have any comments about the annotations?
2. Do you have any questions?

Interview Questions

Now, I would like you to respond to a couple of open-ended questions about your experience with the CalTPA. You will see your earlier transcripts and the CalTPA tasks here; feel free to refer to them as you think about your answers. I will be recording the session.

1. Overall, how would you describe your experiences with the CalTPA?

2. What specific aspects of the process lead you to describe in this way?

3. How would you describe the effects of your experiences with the CalTPA on your development as a teacher?

4. What aspects helped you arrive at these conclusions?

5. Do you have anything else you would like to add at this time? Do you have any questions?

This concludes the third and final interview. I will be sending you this transcript to verify once it is created and I have annotated (or coded it). I invite you to reflect on your experiences once again, writing any notes, which you may include with your final transcript verification. I will be inviting you to a meeting at which I will discuss the findings of this study. Once again, thank you for participating in this research study.

Appendix B: Draft of Institutional Letter of Cooperation

College Name

Contact Information

Date

Dear Jordan Morton,

Based on my review of your research proposal, I give permission for you to conduct the study entitled The Perceptions of Completers of a Four-Task Teaching Performance Assessment within the College. As part of this study, I authorize you to:

1. Contact current Teacher Education faculty for participant recommendations and use faculty to disseminate participant recruitment invitations

2. Select and interview credential program completers (college alumni)

3. Conduct member-checking by follow-up interview

Individuals' participation will be voluntary and at their own discretion.

We understand that our organization's responsibilities also include providing a room (your office) for interviews as needed. We reserve the right to withdraw from the study at any time if our circumstances change.

You, the student, will be responsible for complying with our site's research policies and requirements, which consist of obtaining permission as outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

I confirm that I am authorized to approve research in this setting and that this plan complies with the organization's policies.

I understand that the data collected will remain entirely confidential and may not be provided to anyone outside of the student's supervising faculty/staff without permission from the Walden University IRB.

Sincerely,

Signature of Academic Dean

Contact Information

Appendix C: CalTPA Task – Subject-Specific Pedagogy (SSP)

This is the first task in the series of four. The SSP task varies in content depending on the type of credential the candidate is pursuing, but the task structure is the same for all. The task contains four case studies, and candidates respond to questions about each. The following is the SSP task for prospective elementary teachers (who would be pursuing a multiple subject teaching credential); prospective secondary teachers complete tasks designed specifically for the subjects they would teach.

All CalTPA tasks and rubrics are available publicly on the website of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, and are copyrighted by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Case Study 1: Subject-Specific and Developmentally Appropriate Pedagogy

A. Contextual Information for Case Study 1

1. Elements of a Learning Experience in a Unit

Grade:	Third
Content Area:	Language Arts
Subject Matter:	Reading and writing
Time Period for the Learning Experience:	Two 30-minute sessions in two consecutive days

State-adopted Academic Content Standards for Students

<u>Reading</u>: Comprehension and Analysis of Grade-Level Appropriate Text

2.5 Distinguish the main idea and supporting details in expository text

<u>Writing</u>: Organization and Focus

1.1 Create a single paragraph:

a. Develop a topic sentence
b. Include simple supporting facts and details

Learning Goals for the Learning Experience

Students will be able to do the following with a focus on reading and writing:

Identify the main idea of an expository text
Identify three supporting details from the expository text
Summarize the expository text using the main idea and three supporting details in one paragraph

Instructional Resources Available
Age-appropriate expository text and writing journals

2. **Class Description**
Students are in a self-contained third grade class. The school is located in a middle-level, socio-economic community. It is the middle of the academic year. Most of the students are eight years old. They particularly need opportunities to learn content in different ways and to revisit content. Many of the students enjoy the school environment and like to socialize with each other. Most of the students are active in after-school activities, including sports, clubs, tutoring, and other community activities, which leaves little time for homework.

3. Developmental Needs of the Students in Grade 3
Experience a structured day
Develop age-appropriate literacy skills
Participate in hands-on experience

B. Questions for Case Study 1

1. **Given the contextual information for Case Study 1, think about a lesson you might use with these students that addresses the subject matter learning goals and the developmental needs of the students described. In the columns below describe:**
    - **Instructional strategies**
    - **Student activities**
    - **Instructional resources**

Note: Instructional strategies are what the teacher does during instruction and student activities are what the students do during the lesson. Include how you would use the instructional resources as you describe your strategies and student activities.

Instructional Strategies	Student Activities

2. **Based on your knowledge of the subject-specific content and of student development, explain why the instructional strategies, student activities, and resources you listed in question 1:**

• **are appropriate for this class**	

• **address the developmental needs of these students**	
• **help these students make progress toward achieving the state-adopted academic content standards for students in this content area**	

— END OF CASE STUDY 1 —

Case Study 2: Assessment Practices

A. Contextual Information for Case Study 2

1. Elements of a Learning Experience in a Unit

Grade:	Second
Content Area:	Mathematics
Subject Matter:	Money
Time Period for Whole Unit:	Three weeks

State-adopted Academic Content Standards for Students

Number Sense

5.0 Students model and solve problems by representing, adding, and subtracting amounts of money.

5.1 Solve problems using combinations of coins and bills

Mathematical Reasoning

1.0 Students make decisions about how to set up a problem.

1.2 Use tools, such as manipulatives or sketches, to model problems

Learning Goals for Whole Unit

Students will be able to do the following:

Identify and describe coins (pennies, nickels, dimes, quarters, half-dollar) and bills (one and five dollar)

Add two or more coins of different values

Identify multiple ways to show a specific amount

Use coins and bills or sketches to model addition of two amounts

2. Teacher Reflection on Student Assessment for This Unit

"I am not satisfied with the assessment plan I used for the last unit of study. I gave the students a diagnostic test at the beginning of the unit, two quizzes during the unit, and a final test, all of which came from the teacher's guide. I feel, though, that I need additional information on what students really know and understand, their misconceptions, what they learned during the instruction, and their progress toward achieving the learning goals. I am looking for ways to improve my assessment plan so I can have a more complete understanding of how well these students learned the subject matter."

3. Assessment Plan

	Day 1	Day 6	Day 11	Day 15
Goals Assessed	***Identify the value of coins and bills***	***Add two or more coins of different values***	***Use coins and bills or sketches to model addition of two amounts***	***Identify multiple ways to show a specific amount***
Type	**Formal diagnostic test from curriculum guide; multiple choice; formative**	**Formal quiz from the textbook; multiple choice; formative**	**Formal quiz from the textbook; multiple choice; formative**	**Formal final chapter/unit exam from textbook; multiple choice and fill in the blank; summative**
Purpose	**Assess previous knowledge and skills**	**Assess acquired concepts and skills**	**Assess acquired skills and concepts**	**Assess acquired knowledge and skills from instructional unit**
Implemen-tation	**Individual assessment; paper and pencil; teacher corrects with an answer key**	**Individual assessment; paper and pencil; teacher corrects with an answer key**	**Individual assessment; paper and pencil; teacher corrects with an answer key**	**Individual assessment; paper and pencil; teacher corrects with an answer key**
Feedback Strategies	**Tell students of scores and inform students of correct and incorrect items**	**Inform students of correct and incorrect items**	**Inform students of correct and incorrect items**	**Inform students of correct and incorrect items**
Informing Instruction	**To determine what needs to be reviewed and where to begin teaching**	**To determine who has learned the material presented**	**To determine who has learned the material presented**	**To determine the level of each student's achievement toward the goals**

B. Questions for Case Study 2

1.a.	**Identify one strength in the assessment plan and explain why it is a strength in relation to the learning goals of the unit.**	
1.b.	**Identify one weakness in the assessment plan and explain why it is a weakness in relation to the learning goals of the unit.**	

2. Suppose you found the following additional assessment in a supplementary resource. Think about how the additional assessment could improve the teacher's assessment plan.

Additional Assessment

Each student is given a box of plastic coins and bills. The box contains examples of each type of coin and bill. Students will use various coins and bills to demonstrate the sum of two given amounts. In addition, students will use coins and bills to show two different ways to make a given value.

Explain to the teacher how the assessment might be used to improve the plan by answering the following questions:

2.a.	**When in the plan would you use the assessment?**	
2.b.	**What goals would be assessed by the assessment?**	

2.c.	**What type of assessment would it be?**	
2.d.	**What would be the purpose of the assessment?**	
2.e.	**How would you implement the assessment?**	
2.f.	**What feedback strategies would you use?**	
2.g.	**How would the results of the assessment inform instruction?**	

3. Explain how using the additional assessment as you described in question 2 improves the teacher's assessment plan and what specific information would be gained about what the students understand about the content area, their misconceptions, and their progress toward achieving the learning goals.

— END OF CASE STUDY 2 —

Case Study 3: Adaptation of Subject-Specific Pedagogy for English Learners

A. Contextual Information for Case Study 3

1. Elements of a Learning Experience for 2 Days in a Unit

Grade:	Fourth
Content Area:	Science
Subject Matter:	Earth Science
Time Period for Whole Unit:	Three weeks

State-adopted Academic Content Standards for Students

Earth Science

4. The properties and minerals reflect the processes that formed them. As a basis for understanding this concept, students know:
   a. how to differentiate among igneous, sedimentary, and metamorphic rocks by referring to their properties and methods of formation (the rock cycle)
   b. how to identify common rock-forming minerals (including quartz, calcite, feldspar, mica, and hornblende) and ore minerals by using a table of diagnostic properties
   c. moving water erodes landforms, reshaping the land by taking it away from some places and depositing it as pebbles, sand, silt, and mud in other places (weathering, transport, and deposition)

Learning Goals for Whole Unit

Students will be able to do the following with a focus on Earth science:
Identify and classify igneous, sedimentary, and metamorphic rocks
Use diagnostic properties to identify rock-forming minerals
Define the following vocabulary: weathering, transport, and deposition
Describe the process of erosion including weathering, transport, and deposition

Relationship to Preceding and Subsequent Learning Experiences

Science-process skills are important investigation tools, and opportunities for developing them are provided throughout the unit. Some of the skills, such as observation and investigation, have been covered in other scientific units and will again be used in the next unit on ecosystems and living organisms.

2. Outline of Plans for Days 1 and 2

The following outline addresses some of the academic content standards and unit goals, but it is not expected that the students will achieve them during the two days.

Instructional Strategies

On Day 1, students will be divided into small cooperative groups. Each group will be assigned one type of rock (igneous, sedimentary, or metamorphic). Groups will identify defining characteristics of their assigned rock using the science textbook, Internet, and supplementary library resources.

On Day 2 students lead a discussion by presenting the defining characteristics of igneous, sedimentary, and metamorphic rocks. The whole class will create a chart listing the characteristics of each type of rock. Cooperative groups will be given ten rocks to sort into categories based on their characteristics. Students will draw an appropriate picture and write a corresponding paragraph in their science journals about the characteristics of igneous, sedimentary, and metamorphic rocks.

Student Activities

Read the textbook about rock characteristics. Use library resources, encyclopedias, or the Internet to research the characteristics of the assigned type of rock (igneous, sedimentary, or metamorphic).

Participate in a group discussion. Groups generate a list of defining characteristics of the assigned type of rock.

Groups share findings with the whole class. The class will generate a chart comparing their characteristics.

Students will draw and write in individual science journals.

Progress Monitoring

Teacher will use class discussions, oral presentations, journal writing, quizzes on scientific terms, and written test to determine level of learning.

Students will receive written and oral feedback from the teacher and oral feedback from peers.

3. Student Description

Guillermo is a 10-year-old fourth-grade English learner. He is from Guatemala and lives with a single mother, three younger brothers, and a younger sister. His mother works long hours and is often not home when he returns from school. His extended family in the United States includes aunts, uncles, and cousins. His grandparents live in Guatemala. Guillermo's family immigrated to the United States three years ago. His oral Spanish is fluent, but he is unable to read or write in Spanish. Guillermo reads English two years below grade level. He has difficulty using correct grammar when writing or speaking. Guillermo is somewhat shy socially but is well liked and works well in small groups. He is seldom absent from school. The CELDT results indicate an overall score in the early intermediate range, and he has been identified as an English learner.

Student's Written Response to: "What is your favorite family day?"

A Special Family Celebration

My grandparents have special celebration. They have married 45 year. My mother, my brothers and sister and me make long trip to Guatemala to celebrate. We carry a special gift it is a picture of all family. My tio, tia and primos going to. We like to visit our grandparents and especial celebration. Our family cooks special food of Guatemala for celebration. I remember we all had good time together. I miss my abuelita and abuelito. That is the name we say for grandparent in my country. The celebration is fun we see *friends and play. My grandparents very happy. I want to stay in Guatemala but my Mom say we come back to America.*

Transcript of Student's Oral Response to: "Tell me about your soccer game."

I like to play soccer. Saturday I go to field to play with friends. We put uniform on for games. I play center field and goal. It is fun to hit ball. My brothers play. I like it.

B. Questions for Case Study 3

1.	**Identify two specific learning needs the student has as an English learner, based on the student description and the responses.**	
2.a.	**Identify one instructional strategy or student activity from the outline of plans that could be challenging for the student.**	
2.b.	**Explain why the strategy or activity you chose could be challenging for the student. Use your knowledge of English learners and your analysis of the student's learning needs in your explanation.**	
3.a.	**Describe how you would adapt the strategy or activity you identified above to meet the learning needs of the student. Consider specific subject matter pedagogy when writing your description.**	
3.b.	**Explain how your adaptation would be effective for the student in making progress toward the learning goals of the lesson.** *(In your explanation of the adaptation, refer to specific aspects of the*	

	student description and to the samples of proficiency in English.)	
3.c.	**Explain how your adaptation would be effective for the student in making progress toward English language development.** *(In your explanation of the adaptation, refer to specific aspects of the student description and to the samples of proficiency in English.)*	
4.a.	**Which progress monitoring assessment based on the lesson plan would you choose to monitor this student's progress toward achieving the learning goal(s)?**	
4.b.	**Give a rationale for your choice of progress monitoring assessment. Use your knowledge of content in this unit, and this student's English language abilities in your rationale.**	
5.	**Based on what you learned about this student's English proficiency, what would be your next steps in planning to facilitate his English language development? Consider specific information from the student description and his written and oral language samples when responding.**	

— END OF CASE STUDY 3 —

Case Study 4: Adaptation of Subject-Specific Pedagogy for Students with Special Needs

A. Contextual Information for Case Study 4

1. Elements of a Learning Experience for 3 Days in a Unit

Grade:	Fifth
Content Area:	History/Social Science
Subject Matter:	American Revolution
Time Period for Whole Unit:	Three weeks

State-adopted Academic Content Standards for Students

United States History and Geography: Making a New Nation

5.6 Students understand the course and consequences of the American Revolution.

1. Identify and map the majority of military battles, campaigns, and turning points of the Revolutionary War, the roles of the American and British leaders, and the Indian leaders' alliances on both sides.
4. Understand the personal impact and economic hardship of the war on families, problems of financing the war, wartime inflation, and laws against hoarding goods and materials and profiteering.
5. Explain how state constitutions that were established after 1776 embodied the ideals of the American Revolution and helped serve as models for the United States Constitution.

Learning Goals for Whole Unit

Students will be able to do the following with a focus on the American Revolution

Locate the major military battles on a map of pre-Revolutionary America

Identify the turning points of the American Revolution

Describe the roles of the American, British, and Indian leaders involved in the American Revolution

Compare state constitutions created after 1776 to the United States Constitution

Relationship to Preceding and Subsequent Learning Experiences

The American Revolutionary War will be covered in a manner similar to other historical events. Events are being studied in chronological order. Map-reading skills were covered during the study of other historical events. Following this unit, students will study the United States Constitution more in depth.

2. Outline of Plans for Days 3, 4, and 5

The following outline addresses some of the academic content standards and unit goals, but it is not expected that the students will achieve them during the three days.

Instructional Strategies

On Day 3 the teacher will present information about what life was like for a 12-year-old boy or girl during pre-Revolutionary time by reading aloud text from biographies and other primary sources. As a whole class, students will create a chart to list the defining characteristics of life during pre-Revolutionary War time. Students will write a journal entry to compare their own life with the life of children who lived in the pre-Revolutionary War time.

On Day 4 the teacher will ask students to work in small cooperative groups to read biographies and other primary sources about what life was like for a 12 year-old boy or girl during the Revolutionary War. The small groups will generate a list of five characteristics that they will then share with the whole class. The whole class will create a chart that lists the defining characteristics of life during Revolutionary War time. Then students will use the class-generated charts to individually complete a Venn diagram comparing the defining characteristics of life during pre-Revolutionary War times and Revolutionary War times.

On Day 5 students will work in small cooperative groups. Each group will choose one change in life between pre-Revolutionary War time and Revolutionary War time. Then the group will use primary resources, the textbook, the Internet, and other resources to draw conclusions about what led to this particular change. The groups will then present these causes to the whole class. Then students will individually write an essay that explains three causes of lifestyle changes for a 12 year-old boy or girl between pre-Revolutionary and Revolutionary War times.

Student Activities

Students will listen to excerpts from biographies and other primary sources. They will participate in class discussions and help to create a chart listing defining characteristics of life during the pre-Revolutionary War times. Students will individually complete a written journal.

Students will work in small cooperative groups to create a chart listing defining characteristics of life during Revolutionary War times. Then students will work as a whole class to generate a complete list of characteristics. Students will individually complete a Venn diagram comparing the two lists of characteristics.

Students will work in groups to identify the causes of one change in lifestyle between the pre-Revolutionary War time and Revolutionary War time. The cooperative groups will present to the whole class. Students will individually write an essay that demonstrates their understanding of what aspects of life changed between pre-Revolutionary and Revolutionary times.

Progress Monitoring

To monitor student progress, the teacher will use class discussions, written reflections, cooperative group work, and presentations.

Students will receive written and oral feedback, peer review, and feedback on group work, as well as individual conferencing with the teacher when needed.

3. Student Description

Julie is an 11 year-old girl in the fifth grade. She has difficulty focusing, which has an impact on her ability to complete course work and classroom activities. In the first grade, Julie was diagnosed with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder by her family physician. She receives prescribed medication three times per day for ADHD. During first grade, an Individualized Education Plan was developed to meet Julie's needs. Since then, Julie has been receiving special education support primarily in the regular education classroom. She is included and participates in all general education curriculum. The special education teacher provides two hours of in-class support. She is able to independently read text at grade level. She struggles with both written and oral communication skills and is currently performing at a second-grade level. She often tries to dominate whole-class discussions and group learning situations. On the playground, she attempts to dominate games, and she struggles with organization. Her peers are often frustrated by her behavior.

B Questions for Case Study 4

1.a.	**Identify one instructional strategy or student activity from the outline of plans that could be challenging for the student, considering the description of the student's learning disability.**	
1.b.	**Explain why the strategy or activity you chose could be challenging for the student, based on specific aspects of the student description.**	
1.c.	**Describe how you would adapt the strategy or activity you identified to meet the needs of the student.**	
1.d.	**Explain how your adaptation would be effective for the student in making progress toward achieving the learning goal(s) of this unit.**	
2.a.	**Identify one additional instructional strategy or student activity from the outline of plans that could be challenging for the student, considering the student's other learning needs.**	

2.b.	**Explain why the strategy or activity you chose could be challenging for the student, based on specific aspects of the student description.**	
2.c.	**Describe how you would adapt the strategy or activity you identified to meet the needs of the student.**	
2.d.	**Explain how your adaptation would be effective for the student in making progress toward achieving the learning goal(s) of this unit.**	
3.a.	**What progress monitoring assessment would you choose to obtain evidence of the student's progress toward a learning goal(s)?**	
3.b.	**Give a rationale for your choice of assessment. Use your knowledge of academic content in this unit and this student's learning needs in your rationale.**	

— END OF CASE STUDY 4 —

Scoring Rubric for Subject-Specific Pedagogy Task

Score Level 4: The response provides evidence that clearly, consistently, and convincingly demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to understand the connection between information about a class and designing subject-specific and developmentally-appropriate activities; to understand and use a variety of assessments to determine students' progress and to plan instruction; and to adapt lessons for an English learner and for a student with special needs, based on information given about these students. The preponderance of evidence provided for each of the following domains is appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed. Evidence is purposefully connected and reinforced across the response.

Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning - TPE 4, 6, 7
The candidate uses and adapts strategies and activities for instruction, as evidenced by:
- incorporating relevant subject-specific and developmentally-appropriate instructional strategies, student activities, procedures, and experiences that address state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework(s)
- knowing and applying relevant and appropriate instructional practices for English Language Development
- adapting relevant and appropriate instructional strategies to provide access to the state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework(s) for all students

Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students - TPE 1
The candidate knows the state-adopted student academic content standards or state-adopted framework(s), as evidenced by:
- demonstrating relevant, detailed, and accurate understanding of subject-specific pedagogical skills for teaching the state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework(s) to all students

Assessing Student Learning -TPE 3
The candidate uses assessment to inform instruction and feedback strategies, as evidenced by:
- understanding clearly and accurately the purposes and relevant uses of different types of assessment, including entry level, progress-monitoring, and summative assessments, to plan instruction
- demonstrating an appropriate and relevant understanding of multiple measures that can be used to assess students' knowledge, skills, and behaviors

Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students - TPE 9
The candidate uses student information to plan instruction, as evidenced by:
- planning relevant and appropriate instruction in relation to the content area and subject matter to be taught and in accordance with state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework(s)

- selecting or adapting relevant and appropriate instructional strategies and student activities that assist students to achieve learning goals and meet all students' needs

Score Level 3: The response provides evidence that clearly demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to understand the connection between information about a class and designing subject-specific and developmentally-appropriate activities; to understand and use a variety of assessments to determine students' progress and to plan instruction; and to adapt lessons for an English learner and for a student with special needs, based on information given about these students. The preponderance of evidence provided for each of the following domains is appropriate, relevant, or accurate. Evidence is connected across the response.

Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning -TPE 4, 6, 7
The candidate uses and adapts strategies and activities for instruction, as evidenced by:
- incorporating subject-specific and developmentally-appropriate instructional strategies, student activities, procedures, and experiences that address state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework(s)
- knowing and applying appropriate instructional practices for English Language Development
- adapting appropriate instructional strategies to provide access to the state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework(s) for all students

Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students - TPE 1
The candidate knows the state-adopted student academic content standards or state-adopted framework(s), as evidenced by:
- demonstrating accurate understanding of subject-specific pedagogical skills for teaching state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework(s) to all students

Assessing Student Learning - TPE 3
The candidate uses assessment to inform instruction and feedback strategies, as evidenced by:
- understanding accurately the purposes and uses of different types of assessment, including entry level, progress-monitoring, and summative assessments, to plan instruction
- demonstrating a relevant understanding of multiple measures that can be used to assess students' knowledge, skills, and behaviors

Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students - TPE 9
The candidate uses student information to plan instruction, as evidenced by:
- planning appropriate instruction in relation to the content area and subject matter to be taught and in accordance with state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework(s)

- selecting or adapting appropriate instructional strategies and student activities that assist students to achieve learning goals and meet students' needs

Score Level 2: The response provides evidence that partially demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to understand the connection between information about a class and designing subject-specific and developmentally-appropriate activities; to understand and use a variety of assessments to determine students' progress and to plan instruction; and to adapt lessons for an English learner and for a student with special needs, based on information given about these students. The preponderance of evidence provided for each of the following domains is minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous. Evidence is weakly connected across the response and may be inconsistent.

<u>Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning - TPE 4, 6, 7</u>
The candidate minimally uses and adapts strategies and activities for instruction as, evidenced by:

- incorporating instructional strategies, student activities, procedures, and experiences that address state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework(s) in an ambiguous or minimal manner
- a limited knowledge and/or ambiguous application of instructional practices for English Language Development
- adapting instructional strategies to provide access to the state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework(s) in an ambiguous or inconsistent manner

<u>Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students - TPE 1</u>
The candidate knows the state-adopted student academic content standards or state-adopted framework(s), as evidenced by:

- demonstrating cursory or limited understanding of subject-specific pedagogical skills for teaching the state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework(s) to students

<u>Assessing Student Learning - TPE 3</u>
The candidate minimally uses assessment to inform instruction and feedback strategies, as evidenced by:

- a minimal or vague understanding of the purposes and uses of different types of assessment, including entry level, progress-monitoring, and summative assessments, to plan instruction
- demonstrating a cursory or limited understanding of multiple measures that can be used to assess students' knowledge, skills, and behaviors

<u>Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students - TPE 9</u>
The candidate minimally uses student information to plan instruction, as evidenced by:

- planning instruction that is not clearly or coherently related to the content area and subject matter to be taught and/or is minimally in accordance with state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework(s)

- selecting or adapting instructional strategies and student activities that minimally assist
- students in achieving learning goals or that are inconsistent in meeting students' needs

Score Level 1: The response provides evidence that does little or nothing to demonstrate the teacher candidate's ability to understand the connection between information about a class and designing subject-specific and developmentally-appropriate activities; to understand and use a variety of assessments to determine students' progress and to plan instruction; and to adapt lessons for an English learner and for a student with special needs, based on information given about these students. The preponderance of evidence provided for each of the following domains is inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing. Evidence is unconnected across the response.

Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning - TPE 4, 6, 7
The candidate insufficiently uses and adapts strategies and activities for instruction as evidenced by:
- incorporating developmentally inappropriate or no instructional strategies, student activities, procedures, and experiences that address state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework(s)
- knowing and applying inappropriate or no instructional practices for English Language Development
- adapting inappropriate or no instructional strategies to provide access to the state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework(s)

Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students - TPE 1
The candidate knows the state-adopted student academic content standards or state-adopted framework(s), as evidenced by:
- demonstrating inaccurate or no understanding of subject-specific pedagogical skills for teaching the state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework(s)

Assessing Student Learning - TPE 3
The candidate insufficiently uses assessment to inform instruction and feedback strategies as evidenced by:
- understanding inaccurately or not at all the purposes and uses of different types of assessment, including entry level, progress-monitoring, and summative assessments, to plan instruction
- demonstrating an irrelevant or no understanding of multiple measures that can be used to assess students' knowledge, skills, and behaviors

Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students - TPE 9
The candidate insufficiently uses student information to plan instruction as evidenced by:
- planning inappropriate or no instruction related to the content area and subject matter to be taught and/or not in accordance with state-adopted student academic content

- standards for students or state-adopted framework(s)
- selecting or adapting inappropriate or no instructional strategies and student activities that assist students to achieve learning goals or meet students' needs

Appendix D: CalTPA Task – Designing Instruction (DI)

This is the second task in the series of four. The DI task is the same for all candidates, regardless of the type of credential they are pursuing. This task consists of five sections, or steps.

Step 1: Academic Content Selection and Learning about Students

Directions:
An important step in planning instruction is to learn about your students. Select one class, one content area, and the state-adopted academic content standards or state-adopted framework (if your single subject content area does not have content standards) for this task. Respond to the questions below about this class, unit of study, and how you learn about the students.

A. Academic Content Selection

Grade Level: ___________________________

Content Area: ___________________________

Subject Matter: ___________________________

1. **List the state-adopted academic content standards or state-adopted framework that you will cover for this unit of study.**

2. **Describe the unit of study that addresses those standards.**

3. **What is (are) the academic learning goal(s) for this unit of study?**

Class Information

Age range of students: ______________ **Number of male students:** ________

Total number of students: ___________ **Number of female students:**_______

B. Student Characteristics

<u>**Linguistic Background**</u>

1. **What information that may influence instruction do you want to learn about your students?**

2. **How will you learn about your students? Describe the methods you will use and why you have chosen to use those particular methods.**

3. **How will you use this information in planning academic instruction in your selected content area?**

<u>**Academic Language Abilities, Content Knowledge, and Skills**</u>

1. **What information that may influence instruction do you want to learn about your students?**

2. **How will you learn about your students? Describe the methods you will use and why you have chosen to use those particular methods.**

3. **How will you use this information in planning academic instruction in your selected content area?**

<u>**Physical, Social, and Emotional Development**</u>

1. **What information that may influence instruction do you want to learn about your students?**

2. **How will you learn about your students? Describe the methods you will use and why you have chosen to use those particular methods.**

3. **How will you use this information in planning academic instruction in your selected content area?**

<u>**Cultural and Health Considerations**</u>

1. **What information that may influence instruction do you want to learn about your students?**

2. **How will you learn about your students? Describe the methods you will use and why you have chosen to use those particular methods.**

3. **How will you use this information in planning academic instruction in your selected content area?**

<u>Interests and Aspirations</u>

1. **What information that may influence instruction do you want to learn about your students?**

2. **How will you learn about your students? Describe the methods you will use and why you have chosen to use those particular methods.**

3. **How will you use this information in planning academic instruction in your selected content area?**

Step 2: Learning about Two Focus Students

Directions:
Select two focus students from the class you identified in Step 1. Select one student who is an English learner and one student who presents a different instructional challenge. Use some of the methods you described in Step 1 to learn about these two students. Consider your selected content area and subject matter when describing what you learned about the two focus students. Complete the section below. In each box below include:

- *a description of what you learned about each of the students*
- *an explanation of how the information will influence your academic instructional planning.*

Note: *Single subject candidates for a credential in Languages Other Than English who* *are delivering instruction entirely in the target language may choose another student with a different instructional challenge rather than an English learner.*

Student 1: An English learner

Gender: __________

Age: _____________

1. **Why did you select this student?**

2. **What did you learn about this student's linguistic background?**

3. **What did you learn about this student's academic language abilities in relation to this academic content area?**

4. **What did you learn about this student's content knowledge and skills in this subject matter?**

5. **What did you learn about this student's physical, social and emotional development relevant to this academic content area?**

6. **What did you learn about this student's cultural background, including family and home relevant to this academic content area?**

7. **What did you learn about this student's special considerations, including health issues relevant to this academic content area?**

8. **What did you learn about this student's interests and aspirations relevant to this academic content area?**

9. **Describe other information relevant to this academic content area that you learned about the student (e.g., attendance, extracurricular activities).**

Student 2: A Student Who Presents a Different Instructional Challenge

Gender: __________

Age: _____________

1. **Why did you select this student?**

2. **How is the instructional challenge that he or she presents different from that of the other student?**

3. **What did you learn about this student's linguistic background?**

4. **What did you learn about this student's academic language abilities in relation to this academic content area?**

5. **What did you learn about this student's content knowledge and skills in this subject matter?**

6. **What did you learn about this student's physical, social and emotional development relevant to this academic content area?**

7. **What did you learn about this student's cultural background, including family and home relevant to this academic content area?**

8. **What did you learn about this student's special considerations, including health issues relevant to this academic content area?**

9. **What did you learn about this student's interest and aspirations relevant to this academic content area?**

10. **Describe other information, relevant to this academic content area that you learned about the student (e.g., attendance, extracurricular activities).**

Step 3: Planning for Academic Instruction for the Whole Class

Directions:
Consider your academic content selection in Step 1 and what would you want the students to learn. As you begin to think about a lesson that falls within the selected unit of study, respond to the questions below about your plan for academic instruction for the whole class.

1. **At what point in the sequence of the unit is this lesson?** *Put an X next to one:*
   ______At the beginning of the unit of study
   ______Between the beginning and the end of the unit of study
   ______At the end of the unit of study

2. **List the state-adopted academic content standard(s) or state-adopted framework you will address in the lesson.**

3. **What is (are) your academic learning goal(s)? What specifically do you expect students to know or be able to do as a result of the lesson?**

4. **How is (are) your academic learning goal(s) related to the state-adopted academic content standards or state-adopted framework?**

5. **How will the content of the lesson build on what the students already know and are able to do?**

6. **How will the content of the lesson connect to the content of preceding and subsequent lessons?**

7. **What difficulties do you anticipate students could have with the lesson content and why do you think these difficulties might arise?**

8. **What evidence will you collect during the lesson or at the end of the lesson that will show the extent to which the students have learned what you intended?**

9. **Think about how you will sequence your instruction of the academic content to be covered in this lesson. Describe your plan for instruction in the order in which it will be implemented. Address each of the following prompts and provide a rationale for each of your decisions:**

Communicating the academic learning goal(s) to the students

Instruction Plan	Rationale

Instructional strategies

Instruction Plan	Rationale

Student activities

Instruction Plan	Rationale

Student grouping

Instruction Plan	Rationale

Materials, technology, and/or resources, including the use of instructional aides, parents, or other adults in the room

Instruction Plan	Rationale

Progress monitoring of student learning

Instruction Plan	Rationale

10. **Given the difficulties you anticipate students could have with the content, what additional steps would you take to foster access and comprehension for all students?**

11. **How would you share the results of student academic learning with students and families?**

Step 4: Lesson Adaptations for the Two Focus Students

Directions:
Consider what you have learned about the two focus students in Step 2, along with the implications for instruction that you identified for each of them. For the two students, determine what adaptations you will make to this lesson you have planned for the whole class. Describe those adaptations for each of the two focus students. If you determine that no adaptations are needed for a part of the plan for instruction, indicate and explain that decision. In each box below, include:

- *Your decisions about lesson adaptations*
- *A rationale for those decisions*

Student 1: An English Learner

1. **Academic learning goal(s) or your expectations of what the student should know or be able to do as a result of this lesson**

2. **Evidence of student learning you will collect during the lesson and/or at the end of the lesson**

3. **Communicating the academic learning goal(s) and/or expectations to the student**

4. **Instructional strategies**

5. **Student activities**

6. **Student grouping**

7. **Materials, technology, and/or resources, including the use of instructional aides, parents, or other adults in the room**

8. **Progress monitoring of student learning**

9. **Sharing results of the student learning with the student and/or the family**

Student 2: A Student Who Presents a Different Instructional Challenge

1. **Academic learning goal(s) or your expectations of what the student should know or be able to do as a result of this lesson**

2. **Evidence of student learning you will collect during the lesson and/or at the end of the lesson**

3. **Communicating the academic learning goal(s) and/or expectations to the student**

4. **Instructional strategies**

5. **Student activities**

6. **Student grouping**

7. **Materials, technology, and/or resources, including the use of instructional aides, parents, or other adults in the room**

8. **Progress monitoring of student learning**

9. **Sharing results of the student learning with the student and/or the family**

Step 5: Reflection on Connecting Instructional Planning to Student Characteristics

Directions:
Read your responses to the questions in Steps 1-4. Think about what you have learned by completing this task, including the characteristics of the two focus students, your instructional planning for the whole class, and your adaptations for the focus students. Respond to the questions below:

1. **What information that you collected for the whole class and/or for the two focus students most influenced your planning for this lesson? In your response, describe how and why the information was influential and why you found it to be so.**

2. **How will you use what you have learned regarding connecting instructional planning to student characteristics in the future?**

Scoring Rubric for the Designing Instruction Task

Score Level 4. The response provides evidence that clearly, consistently, and convincingly demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to plan a developmentally-appropriate lesson based on state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework; learn about students; plan for instruction; make adaptations to the plan to meet student needs; and reflect on the instructional planning. The preponderance of evidence provided for each of the following domains is appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed. Evidence is purposefully connected and reinforced across the response.

<u>Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students - TPE 8, 9</u>
The candidate learns about her or his students and uses this information to plan instruction, as evidenced by:

- establishing clear and appropriate goals for student learning, based on state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework
- using relevant and appropriate methods to obtain information about selected students that may influence instruction
- obtaining detailed and relevant information about selected students such as linguistic background; academic language abilities; content knowledge and skills; physical, social, and emotional development; cultural and health considerations; and interests
- planning relevant and appropriate instruction in relation to the content area and subject matter to be taught and in accordance with state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework
- selecting or adapting relevant and appropriate instructional strategies, grouping strategies, and instructional materials to assist students to achieve learning goals and meet all students'needs

<u>Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning - TPE 4, 6, 7</u>
The candidate uses and adapts strategies and activities for instructional planning, as evidenced by:

- using relevant and developmentally-appropriate strategies and activities according to purpose and lesson content
- making relevant and appropriate plans for students who have special needs or abilities
- drawing upon detailed and relevant information about students' backgrounds and prior learning, including students' assessed levels of literacy in English and their first language, as well as their proficiency in English, for planning, and allowing students to express meaning, including in their first language
- knowing and applying relevant and appropriate instructional practices for English Language Development

<u>Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students - TPE 1</u>
The candidate knows the state-adopted content standards for students or state-adopted

framework, as evidenced by:

- demonstrating a detailed and accurate understanding of subject-specific pedagogical skills for teaching the state-adopted academic content standards or state-adopted framework to all students

Developing as a Professional Educator - TPE 13

The candidate reflects on connecting learning about students to instructional planning, as evidenced by:

- providing detailed and relevant reflection on the results of the instructional planning and adaptations made in order to improve planning skills and teaching effectiveness

Score Level 3. The response provides evidence that clearly demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to plan a developmentally-appropriate lesson based on state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework; learn about students; plan for instruction; make adaptations to the plan to meet student needs; and reflect on the instructional planning. The preponderance of evidence provided for each of the following domains is appropriate, relevant, or accurate. Evidence is connected across the response.

Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students - TPE 8, 9

The candidate learns about her or his students and uses this information to plan instruction, as evidenced by:

- establishing appropriate goals for student learning, based on state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework
- using appropriate methods to obtain information about selected students that may influence instruction
- obtaining relevant information about selected students such as linguistic background; academic language abilities; content knowledge and skills; physical, social, and emotional development; cultural and health considerations; and interests
- planning appropriate instruction in relation to the content area and subject matter to be taught and in accordance with state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework
- selecting or adapting appropriate instructional strategies, grouping strategies, and instructional materials to assist students to achieve learning goals and meet students' needs

Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning - TPE 4, 6, 7

The candidate uses and adapts strategies and activities for instructional planning as, evidenced by:

- using developmentally-appropriate strategies and activities according to purpose and lesson content
- making appropriate plans for students who have special needs or abilities

- drawing upon relevant information about students' backgrounds and prior learning, including students' assessed levels of literacy in English and their first languages, as well as their proficiency in English, for planning, and allowing students to express meaning, including in their first language
- knowing and applying appropriate instructional practices for English Language Development

Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students - TPE 1

The candidate knows the state-adopted content standards for students or state-adopted framework, as evidenced by:

- demonstrating an accurate understanding of subject-specific pedagogical skills for teaching the state-adopted academic content standards or state-adopted framework to all students

Developing as a Professional Educator - TPE 13

The candidate reflects on connecting learning about students to instructional planning, as evidenced by:

- providing relevant reflection on the results of the instructional planning and adaptations made in order to improve planning skills and teaching effectiveness

Score Level 2. The response provides evidence that partially demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to plan a developmentally-appropriate lesson based on state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework; learn about students; plan for instruction; make adaptations to the plan to meet student needs; and reflect on the instructional planning. The preponderance of evidence provided for each of the following domains is minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous. Evidence is weakly connected across the response and may be inconsistent.

Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students - TPE 8, 9

The candidate minimally learns about her or his students and uses this information to plan instruction, as evidenced by:

- establishing some appropriate and some inappropriate goals for student learning, based minimally or ambiguously on state-adopted academic content standards for students or framework
- using limited methods to obtain information about selected students that may influence instruction
- obtaining cursory information about selected students such as linguistic background; academic language abilities; content knowledge and skills; physical, social, and emotional development; cultural and health considerations; and interests
- planning instruction that is not clearly or coherently related to the content area and subject matter to be taught and/or is minimally in accordance with state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework

- selecting or adapting instructional strategies, grouping strategies, and instructional materials that minimally assist students in achieving learning goals or that are inconsistent in meeting students' needs

Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning - TPE 4, 6, 7
The candidate minimally uses and adapts strategies and activities for instructional planning as, evidenced by:

- using ambiguous or inconsistent strategies and activities according to purpose and lesson content
- making inconsistent or minimal plans for students who have special needs or abilities
- drawing upon minimal or cursory information about students' backgrounds and prior learning, including students' assessed levels of literacy in English and their first languages, as well as their proficiency in English, for planning, and/or allowing students to express meaning, including in their first language
- a limited knowledge and/or ambiguous application of instructional practices for English Language Development

Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students -TPE 1
The candidate knows the state-adopted content standards for students or state-adopted framework, as evidenced by:

- demonstrating a cursory or limited understanding of subject-specific pedagogical skills for teaching the state-adopted academic content standards or state-adopted framework to students

Developing as a Professional Educator - TPE 13
The candidate minimally reflects on connecting learning about students to instructional planning, as evidenced by:

- providing cursory or limited reflection on the results of the instructional planning and adaptations made in order to improve planning skills and teaching effectiveness

Score Level 1. The response provides evidence that does little or nothing to demonstrate the teacher candidate's ability to plan a developmentally-appropriate lesson based on state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework; learn about students; plan for instruction; make adaptations to the plan to meet student needs; and reflect on the instructional planning. The preponderance of evidence provided for each of the following domains is inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing. Evidence is unconnected across the response.

Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students -TPE 8, 9
The candidate insufficiently learns about her or his students and uses this information to plan instruction, as evidenced by:

- establishing inappropriate or no goals for student learning that may not be based on state-adopted academic content standards for students or framework
- using inappropriate or no methods to obtain information about selected students that may influence instruction
- obtaining irrelevant or no information about selected students such as linguistic background; academic language abilities; content knowledge and skills; physical, social, and emotional development; cultural and health considerations; and interests
- planning inappropriate or no instruction related to the content area and subject matter to be taught and/or that is not in accordance with state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework
- selecting or adapting inappropriate or no instructional strategies, grouping strategies, and instructional materials that assist students to achieve learning goals and meet students' needs

Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning -TPE 4, 6, 7

The candidate insufficiently uses and adapts strategies and activities for instructional planning, as evidenced by:

- using developmentally-inappropriate or no strategies and activities according to purpose and lesson content
- making inappropriate or no plans for students who have special needs or abilities
- drawing upon irrelevant or no information about students' backgrounds and prior learning, including students' assessed levels of literacy in English and their first languages, as well as their proficiency in English, for planning, and/or allowing students to express meaning, including in their first language
- knowing and applying inappropriate or no instructional practices for English Language Development

Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students - TPE 1

The candidate knows the state-adopted content standards for students or state-adopted framework, as evidenced by:

- demonstrating an inaccurate or no understanding of subject-specific pedagogical skills for teaching state-adopted academic content standards or state-adopted framework to students

Developing as a Professional Educator - TPE 13

The candidate insufficiently reflects on connecting learning about students to instructional planning, as evidenced by:

- providing irrelevant or no reflection on the results of the instructional planning and adaptations made in order to improve planning skills and teaching effectiveness

Appendix E: CalTPA Task – Assessing Learning (AL)

This is the third task in the series of four. The AL Task is the same for all candidates, regardless of the credential being pursued. This task consists of six steps, or sections.

Step 1: Assessment Selection and Planning for the Whole Class Directions

To plan classroom assessment, a teacher determines his or her current point within the instructional sequence of a unit of study and identifies the student academic learning goals to measure.

> "*Ideally, assessment and instruction are linked inextricably within any curriculum. The key to using assessment effectively and efficiently in a program of instruction is to recognize above all that different types of assessment tools must be used for different purposes.*" (Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools, 1999, page 215)

Select one class, a content area, and a unit of study to work with as you complete this performance task. Respond to the prompts below about the unit of study and its assessment.

A. Academic Content Selection

Grade Level: ____________________________

Content Area: ____________________________

Subject Matter: ____________________________

1. List the state-adopted academic content standards or state-adopted framework you will cover in this unit.

2. Describe the unit of study that addresses those standards.

3. What is (are) the academic learning goal(s) for this unit of study?

4. At what point in the sequence of the unit are you teaching? Check one:

	At the beginning of the unit of study
	Between the beginning and the end of the unit of study
	At the end of the unit of study

B. Assessment Planning

*If you are at the beginning of your unit, you will give your students an **entry level** assessment. If you are moving through the unit of study, you will use **progress-monitoring** assessments. If you are at the end of the unit of study, you will use a **summative** assessment. (For more information about these three kinds of assessment, see the* "Assessing Learning" *chapter of the* Candidate Handbook, *and* Frameworks for California Public Schools, *published by the California Department of Education.)*

5. For what purpose will your assessment be used within this unit of study? Choose one:

	Entry-Level
	Progress-monitoring
	Summative

6. Identify and describe the type of assessment (verbal response, multiple choice, short essay, oral presentation, performance task, and the like).

7. What will your students need to know and/or be able to do to complete the assessment?

8. What evidence of student learning will you collect?

9. In what ways will the evidence document student achievement of the academic learning goal(s)?

10. How will the student assessment evidence be measured or scored?

11. Think about how you will sequence your implementation of the assessment. Describe your plan for implementing the assessment in the order in which it will occur. Address each of the following and provide a rationale for each of your decisions:

- **Teaching strategies including, communicating the purpose of the assessment, the scoring criteria, and the procedures for completing the assessment**
- **Student activities**
- **Student grouping**
- **Materials, technology, and/or resources, including the use of instructional aides, parents, or other adults in the room**

Assessment Implementation Plan	Rationale

12. In what ways will you use the assessment results?

13. In what ways will you share the assessment results with students, families, other colleagues, and support personnel, when appropriate?

14. Is your assessment one that you developed, you adopted, or you adapted from another source, such as a district, publisher, Internet, or another teacher?

	Developed by you
	Adopted or adapted from another source.
	Identify the source:

15. Submit a copy of the assessment and, if available, submit the assessment directions, answer key, rubric, scoring guide, and the like.

Step 2: Learning about Students: Whole Class and Two Focus Students

Directions:
An important step in planning assessment is to learn about your students. Provide information about the whole class in the box below.

Class Information

Age Range of Students:	**Number of Female Students:**
Total Number of Students:	**Number of Male Students**:

Directions:
Select two students from the class you described above. Select one student who is an English learner and one student who has an identified special need. Consider your selected content area when describing what you learned about the two focus students. In each of the boxed areas below, provide:

- *A description of what you learned for each of the students*
- *An explanation of how the information will influence your academic instructional planning, including assessment*

Note: *Single subject candidates for a credential in Languages Other Than English who are delivering instruction entirely in the target language may choose another student with a different instructional challenge rather than an English learner.*

A. Student 1: An English Learner

Gender: ___________
Age: _____________

1. **Why did you select this student?**

2. **What did you learn about this student's linguistic background?**

3. **What did you learn about this student's academic language abilities in relation to this academic content area?**

4. **What did you learn about this student's content knowledge and skills in this subject matter?**

5. **What did you learn about this student's physical, social, and emotional development relevant to this academic content area?**

6. **What did you learn about this student's cultural background, including family and home, relevant to this academic content area?**

7. **What did you learn about this student's special considerations, including health issues, relevant to this academic content area?**

8. **What did you learn about this student's interests and aspirations relevant to this academic content area?**

9. **Describe other information relevant to this academic content area that you learned about the student (e.g., attendance, extracurricular activities, and the like).**

B. Student 2: A Student with an Identified Special Need

Gender: ___________
Age: _____________

1. **Why did you select this student?**

2. **How is the instructional challenge that he or she presents different from that of the other student?**

3. **What did you learn about this student's linguistic background?**

4. **What did you learn about this student's academic language abilities in relation to this academic content area?**

5. **What did you learn about this student's content knowledge and skills in this subject matter?**

6. **What did you learn about this student's physical, social, and emotional development relevant to this academic content area?**

7. **What did you learn about this student's cultural background, including family and home, relevant to this academic content area?**

8. **What did you learn about this student's special considerations, including health issues, relevant to this academic content area?**

9. **What did you learn about this student's interests and aspirations relevant to this academic content area?**

10. **Describe other information relevant to this academic content area that you learned about the student (e.g., attendance, extracurricular activities, and the like).**

Step 3: Assessment Adaptations for Two Focus Students

Directions:
Consider your plan for assessment in Step 1, what you learned about the two focus students, and the implications for instruction and assessment that you identified in Step 2. Respond to the questions below about the two students.

1. What will Student 1 need to know and be able to do to complete this assessment?

2. What will Student 2 need to know and be able to do to complete this assessment?

For the two students, determine what adaptations you will make to this assessment that you have planned for the whole class. Describe those adaptations for each of the two focus students. If you determine that no adaptations are needed for a part of the plan for assessment, explain that decision. Respond to the prompts below. For each include:

- *Your decisions about assessment adaptations*
- *A rationale for those decisions*

A. Adaptations for Student 1: An English Learner

1. Evidence of student learning you will collect

Decision	Rationale

2. How the student assessment evidence will be measured or scored

Decision	Rationale

3. The implementation of the assessment, including:

- **Teaching strategies for communicating the purpose of the assessment, the scoring criteria, and the procedures for completing the assessment**
- **Student activities**
- **Student grouping**
- **Materials, technology, and/or resources, including the use of instructional aides, parents, or other adults in the room**

Decisions	Rationale

4. Ways you will use the assessment results.

Decision	Rationale

5. Ways you will share the assessment results with students, families, other colleagues, and support personnel, when appropriate.

Decisions	Rationale

B. Adaptations for Student 2: A Student with an Identified Special Need

1. Evidence of student learning you will collect.

Decision	Rationale

2. How the student assessment evidence will be measured or scored.

Decision	Rationale

3. The implementation of the assessment including:

- **Teaching strategies for communicating the purpose of the assessment, the scoring criteria, and the procedures for completing the assessment**
- **Student activities**
- **Student grouping**
- **Materials, technology, and/or resources, including the use of instructional aides, parents, or other adults in the room**

Decisions	Rationale

4. Ways you will use the assessment results.

Decisions	Rationale

5. Ways you will share the assessment results with students, families, other colleagues, and support personnel, when appropriate.

Decisions	Rationale

Step 4: Giving the Assessment to the Whole Class, Including Two Focus Students

Directions:
Give the assessment to your class. Collect and score all the evidence of student learning from the assessment. Consider all the assessment responses and select three responses of students other than your two focus

students that represent the range of achievement within the class. Label these responses as Student 3, Student 4, and Student 5. Label the two focus students' assessment responses as Student 1 and Student 2.

Submit all five assessment responses. Review carefully the evidence of student learning you are submitting.

Briefly, explain why you selected each of the following responses to represent the range of responses in the class:

Student 1 **(EL focus student)**	
Student 2 **(SN focus student)**	
Student 3	
Student 4	
Student 5	

Note: If the assessment is oral or represents a student performance, provide your description of the students' responses and your written assessment of those responses, including the class as a whole, the three responses that represent the range of achievement in the class, and the two focus student responses.

Step 5: Analyzing Evidence of Student Academic Learning and the Assessment

Directions:
Consider your responses in Steps 1 through 4. Think about the evidence of student academic learning from the assessment. Answer the questions below for the whole class and for the two focus students. Remember to cite specific evidence from the five responses that you have submitted. (This includes responses from the two focus students and from the three students you selected to represent the range of achievement with the class).

A. For the Class as a Whole

1. **What did you learn overall about the students' progress toward achievement of the academic learning goal(s) for this part of the unit?**

2. **Describe the extent to which the assessment that you planned allowed students to demonstrate achievement of the academic learning goal(s) for this part of the unit.**

3. **Would you make any changes to the directions or to the format of the assessment? Why?**

4. **Would you collect different or more evidence if you were to do this assessment again? Why?**

5. **Was the implementation and timing of this assessment appropriate for this class? Why?**

6. **In what ways would a different type of assessment (e.g., verbal response, multiple choice, short essay, oral presentation, performance task) than what you used allow students to demonstrate their achievement of the academic learning goal(s) for this unit?**

B. For Student 1: An English Learner

1. **To what extent were the assessment directions and format clear and easy to follow for the student? How do you know?**

2. **To what extent did the student achieve the academic learning goals for this part of the unit?**

3. **How well did the student's assessment response correspond to the work the student does on a daily basis? (Was the response that you expected from the student?)**

4. **What different or additional type of evidence might you need to collect for the student?**

5. **What does the student's response tell you about his or her academic strengths and/or needs?**

6. **Based on the student's response, describe next steps you would take with the student to further his or her academic achievement in the content area.**

7. **Describe the ways in which specific adaptations you made to your assessment plan did or did not work.**

8. **In what ways did the assessment support this student's language abilities?**

9. **If you were to give the assessment to the student again, what changes, if any, would you make? Why?**

10. **What would be your next steps in planning to facilitate this student's English Language Development?**

C. Student 2: A Student with an Identified Special Need

1. **To what extent were the assessment directions and format clear and easy to follow for the student? How do you know?**

2. **To what extent did the student achieve the academic learning goals for this part of the unit?**

3. **How well did the student's assessment response correspond to the work the student does on a daily basis? (Was the response that you expected from the student?)**

4. **What different or additional type of evidence might you need to collect for the student?**

5. **What does the student's response tell you about his or her academic strengths and/or needs?**

6. **Based on the student's response, describe next steps you would take with the student to further his or her academic achievement in the content area?**

7. **Describe the ways in which specific adaptations you made to your assessment plan did or did not work.**

8. **In what ways did the assessment support this student's language abilities?**

9. **If you were to give the assessment to the student again, what changes, if any, would you make? Why?**

Step 6: Reflection on Assessment Implementation and Student Learning

Directions:
Read your response for Steps 1 to 5. Consider what you have learned through the Assessing Learning *task about your students, what you wanted them to learn, their responses to the assessment, and your analysis of the evidence of student learning. Respond to the prompts below.*

1. **If you were given an opportunity to use the assessment again, what part(s) would you keep and what part(s) might you change? Why?**

2. **If you were given an opportunity to implement the assessment again, what would you do the same and what would you do differently? Why?**

3. **What additional information about your students did you learn as a result of this assessment experience?**

4. **How will you use what you have learned from this assessment experience when you plan instruction and assessment in the future?**

5. **What are your goals for increasing your knowledge and skill in assessment? How will achieving these goals help you become a more effective teacher?**

Scoring Rubric for the Assessing Learning Task

Score Level 4. The response provides evidence that clearly, consistently, and convincingly demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to select a developmentally-appropriate assessment, based on state-adopted academic content standards for students, or state-adopted framework, to measure student learning; plan its implementation; learn about students and make adaptations to the plan based on that information to meet student needs; analyze student evidence and the assessment; and reflect on the assessment experience. The preponderance of evidence provided for each of the following domains is appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed. Evidence is purposefully connected and reinforced across the response.

<u>Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students - TPE 8, 9</u>
The candidate learns about her or his students and uses this information to plan assessment, as evidenced by:
• establishing clear and appropriate goals for student learning, based on state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework
• obtaining detailed and relevant information about selected students such as linguistic background; academic language abilities; content knowledge and skills; physical, social, and emotional development; cultural and health considerations; and interests
• planning a relevant and appropriate assessment in relation to the content area and subject matter to be taught and in accordance with state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework
• appropriately adapting the selected assessment to assist students to achieve learning goals and meet all students' needs

<u>Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning -TPE 6, 7</u>
The candidate uses and adapts strategies for assessment, as evidenced by:
• using relevant and developmentally-appropriate assessment practices
• making relevant and appropriate plans for students who have special needs or abilities
• drawing upon detailed and relevant information about students' backgrounds and prior learning, including students' assessed levels of literacy in English and their first language, as well as their proficiency in English, for planning assessment, and allowing students to express meaning, including in their first language
• knowing and applying relevant and appropriate instructional practices for English Language Development

<u>Assessing Student Learning - TPE 3</u>
The candidate uses assessment to obtain information about student learning and to plan further instruction, as evidenced by:
• using assessment results accurately and appropriately to determine student progress and to plan instruction
• providing detailed and accurate feedback, to students and/or to their families about student academic strengths and areas for growth in relation to the learning goals

<u>Developing as a Professional Educator TPE 13</u>
The candidate reflects on the assessment experience and student learning, as evidenced by:

• providing detailed and relevant reflection and feedback on the results of the assessment and adaptations made in order to improve assessment skills and teaching effectiveness

Score Level 3. The response provides evidence that clearly demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to select a developmentally appropriate assessment, based on state-adopted academic content standards for students, or state-adopted framework, to measure student learning; plan its implementation; learn about students and make adaptations to the plan based on that information to meet student needs; analyze student evidence and the assessment; and reflect on the assessment experience. The preponderance of evidence provided for each of the following domains is appropriate, relevant, or accurate. Evidence is connected across the response.

<u>Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students - TPE 8, 9</u>
The candidate learns about her or his students and uses this information to plan assessment, as evidenced by:
• establishing appropriate goals for student learning, based on state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework
• obtaining relevant information about selected students such as linguistic background; academic language abilities; content knowledge and skills; physical, social, and emotional development; cultural and health considerations; and interests
• planning an appropriate assessment in relation to the content area and subject matter to be taught and in accordance with state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework
• appropriately adapting the selected assessment to assist students to achieve learning goals and meet students' needs

<u>Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning - TPE 6, 7</u>
The candidate uses and adapts strategies for assessment, as evidenced by:
• using developmentally-appropriate assessment practices
• making appropriate plans for students who have special needs or abilities
• drawing upon relevant information about students' backgrounds and prior learning, including students' assessed levels of literacy in English and their first language, as well as their proficiency in English, for planning assessment, and allowing students to express meaning, including in their first language
• knowing and applying appropriate instructional practices for English Language Development

<u>Assessing Student Learning - TPE 3</u>
The candidate uses assessment to obtain information about student learning and to plan further instruction, as evidenced by:
• using assessment results appropriately to determine student progress and to plan instruction
• providing accurate feedback to students and/or to their families about student academic strengths and areas for growth in relation to the learning goals

<u>Developing as a Professional Educator - TPE 13</u>
The candidate reflects on the assessment experience and student learning, as evidenced by:
• providing relevant reflection and feedback on the results of the assessment and adaptations made in order to improve assessment skills and teaching effectiveness

Score Level 2. The response provides evidence that partially demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to select a developmentally-appropriate assessment, based on state-adopted academic content standards for students, or state-adopted framework, to measure student learning; plan its implementation; learn about students and make adaptations to the plan based on that information to meet student needs; analyze student evidence and the assessment; and reflect on the assessment experience. The preponderance of evidence provided for each of the following domains is minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous. Evidence is weakly connected across the response and may be inconsistent.

Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students - TPE 8, 9
The candidate minimally learns about her or his students and uses this information to plan assessment, as evidenced by:
• establishing some appropriate and some inappropriate goals for student learning, based vaguely on state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework
• obtaining cursory information about selected students such as linguistic background; academic language abilities; content knowledge and skills; physical, social, and emotional development; cultural and health considerations; and interests
• planning assessment that is not clearly or coherently related to the content area and subject matter to be taught and/or is minimally in accordance with state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework
• minimally adapting the selected assessment to assist students in achieving learning goals, or using an adaptation that inconsistently meets students' needs

Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning - TPE 6, 7
The candidate minimally uses and adapts strategies for assessment, as evidenced by:
• using ambiguous or inconsistent assessment practices
• making inconsistent or minimal plans for students who have special needs or abilities
• drawing upon minimal or cursory information about students' backgrounds and prior learning, including students' assessed levels of literacy in English and their first languages, as well as their proficiency in English, for planning assessment, and/or allowing students to express meaning, including in their first language
• a limited knowledge and/or ambiguous application of instructional practices for English Language Development

Assessing Student Learning - TPE 3
The candidate minimally uses assessment to obtain information about student learning and to plan further instruction, as evidenced by:
• using assessment results sometimes appropriately and sometimes inappropriately to determine student progress and to plan instruction
• providing minimal or limited feedback, to students and/or to their families, about student academic strengths and areas for growth in relation to the learning goals

Developing as a Professional Educator - TPE 13
The candidate minimally reflects on the assessment experience and student learning, as evidenced by:
• providing cursory or limited reflection and feedback on the results of the assessment and adaptations made in order to improve assessment skills and teaching effectiveness

Score Level 1. The response provides evidence that does little or nothing to demonstrate the teacher candidate's ability to select a developmentally-appropriate assessment, based on state-adopted academic content standards for students, or state-adopted framework, to measure student learning; plan its implementation; learn about students and make adaptations to the plan based on that information to meet student needs; analyze student evidence and the assessment; and reflect on the assessment experience. The preponderance of evidence provided for each of the following domains is inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing. Evidence is unconnected across the response.

Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students - TPE 8, 9
The candidate insufficiently learns about her or his students and uses this information to plan assessment, as evidenced by:
• establishing inappropriate or no goals for student learning, based on state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework
• obtaining irrelevant or no information about selected students such as linguistic background; academic language abilities content knowledge and skills; physical, social, and emotional development; cultural and health considerations; and interests
• planning inappropriate or no assessment related to the content area and subject matter to be taught and/or assessment that is not in accordance with state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework
• inappropriately adapting, or not adapting, the selected assessment to assist students to achieve learning goals and meet students' needs

Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning - TPE 6,7
The candidate insufficiently uses and adapts strategies for assessment, as evidenced by:
• using developmentally-inappropriate or no assessment practices
• making inappropriate or no plans for students who have special needs or abilities
• drawing upon irrelevant or no information about students' backgrounds and prior learning, including students' assessed levels of literacy in English and their first language, as well as their proficiency in English, for planning assessment, and/or allowing students to express meaning, including in their first language
• knowing and applying inappropriate or no instructional practices for English Language Development

Assessing Student Learning - TPE 3
The candidate insufficiently uses assessment to obtain information about student learning and to plan further instruction, as evidenced by:
• using assessment results inappropriately or not at all to determine student progress and to plan instruction
• providing inaccurate or no feedback to students and/or to their families about student academic strengths and areas for growth in relation to the learning goals

Developing as a Professional Educator - TPE 13
The candidate insufficiently reflects on the assessment experience and student learning, as evidenced by:

• providing irrelevant or no reflection and feedback on the results of the assessment and adaptations made in order to improve assessment skills and teaching effectiveness

Appendix F: CalTPA Task – Culminating Teaching Experience (CTE)

This is the final task in the series of four. The CTE Task is the same for all candidates, regardless of the credential the candidate is pursuing. The task consists of six sections, or steps.

Step 1: Learning about Students in the Whole Class and Two Focus Students

Directions:
An important step in planning instruction is to learn about your students. Select one class, one content area, subject matter within that content area, and two focus students to work with as you complete this task. Respond to the questions about the whole class and the two focus students below.

A. Class Information

Grade Level: ____ **Age range of students:** ____

Content Area: ____ **Total number of students:** ____

Subject matter: ____ **Number of Male Students:** ____

Number of Female Students:

Percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch: _____

Areas in which students live *(check all that apply)* ____ **Urban** ____ **Suburban** ____ **Rural**

Ethnicity of students (provide numbers)	___ African American or Black ___ American Indian/Alaskan Native ___ Asian or Pacific Islander ___ White, not Hispanic ___ Hispanic or Latino ___ Other (Specify) ______________

Language proficiency of students (provide numbers)	___ Fluent English Proficient ___ English Learner(s) ___ English only (native speakers)
Identified special need categories represented (provide numbers)	___ Specific Learning Disability ___ Speech/Language Impaired ___ Hard of HearingVisually Impaired ___ Deaf ____ Orthopedically Impaired ___ Deaf-Blind ____ Emotionally Disturbed ___ Other Health Impaired ____ Mental Retardation ___ Multiple Disabilities ____ Autistic ___ Brain Injury ____ Established Medical ___ Gifted/Talented Disability (0-5 years)

B. Learning About the Whole Class

Student Characteristics

Directions:
Provide a general description of what you learned about the general characteristics of students in this class, and describe how you will use this information in planning academic instruction in your selected subject matter.

Linguistic background

Provide a general description of what you learned about students' linguistic background.	Describe how you will use this information in planning academic instruction in your selected subject matter.

Academic language abilities, content knowledge, and skills related to this subject matter

Provide a general description of what you learned about students' academic language abilities, content knowledge, and skills related to this subject matter.	Describe how you will use this information in planning academic instruction in your selected subject matter.

Cultural and health considerations

Provide a general description of what you learned about students' cultural and health considerations.	Describe how you will use this information in planning academic instruction in your selected subject matter.

Interests and aspirations

Provide a general description of what you learned about students' interests and aspirations.	Describe how you will use this information in planning academic instruction in your selected subject matter.

Developmental Factors That May Influence Instruction.

Directions:

Provide a general description of developmental factors that may influence instruction of students within this age range and in the selected class. Indicate how you will use this information regarding developmental factors in planning academic instruction for this class in your selected subject matter.

Physical Development

Provide a general description of developmental factors that may influence instruction of students within this age range and in the selected class.	**How will you use this information regarding developmental factors in planning academic instruction for this class in your selected subject matter?**

Social Development

Provide a general description of developmental factors that may influence instruction of students within this age range and in the selected class.	**How will you use this information regarding developmental factors in planning academic instruction for this class in your selected subject matter?**

Emotional Development

Provide a general description of developmental factors that may influence instruction of students within this age range and in the selected class.	**How will you use this information regarding developmental factors in planning academic instruction for this class in your selected subject matter?**

C. Focus Students

Directions:
Select two students from the class you just described above. Select one student who is an English learner and one student who presents a different instructional challenge. Consider your selected content area when describing what you learned about the two focus students. In the boxed areas below, provide:

- *a description of what you learned about each of the students*
- *an explanation of how the information will influence your academic instructional planning, including assessment.*

Note: *Single subject candidates for a credential in Languages Other Than English who are delivering instruction entirely in the target language may choose another student with* *a different instructional challenge rather than an English learner.*

Student 1: An English Learner

Gender: ________________

Age: ___________________

1. **Why did you select this student?**

2. **What did you learn about this student's linguistic background?**

3. **What did you learn about this student's academic language abilities related to this subject matter?**

4. **What did you learn about this student's content knowledge and skills in this subject matter?**

5. **What did you learn about this student's physical, social, and emotional development relevant to this academic content area?**

6. **What did you learn about this student's cultural background, including family and home, relevant to this academic content area?**

7. **What did you learn about this student's special considerations, including health issues, relevant to this academic content area?**

8. **What did you learn about this student's interests and aspirations related to this academic content area?**

9. **Describe other information relevant to this academic content area that you learned about the student (e.g., attendance, extracurricular activities, etc.).**

Student 2: A Student Who Presents A Different Instructional Challenge

Gender: ________________

Age: ___________________

1. **Why did you select this student?**

2. **How is the instructional challenge that he or she presents different from that of the other student?**

3. **What did you learn about this student's linguistic background?**

4. **What did you learn about this student's academic language abilities related to this subject matter?**

5. **What did you learn about this student's content knowledge and skills in this subject matter?**

6. **What did you learn about this student's physical, social, and emotional development relevant to this academic content area?**

7. **What did you learn about this student's cultural background, including family and home, relevant to this academic content area?**

8. **What did you learn about this student's special considerations, including health issues, relevant to this academic content area?**

9. **What did you learn about this student's interests and aspirations related to this academic content area?**

10. **Describe other information relevant to this academic content area that you learned about the student (e.g., attendance, extracurricular activities, and so on).**

Step 2: Learning Environment and Academic Instructional Planning for the Whole Class

A. Information about the Learning Environment

Directions:
Consider what you learned about your students in Step 1. Respond to the prompts below about the learning environment. For each response include:

a description of what you do to establish and/or maintain an effective environment for learning
a rationale for why the decisions are appropriate for the class.

1. **In what ways do you establish and maintain a positive climate for learning?**

2. **In what ways do you establish and maintain rapport with all students and their families?**

3. **In what ways do you encourage students to take responsibility for their own learning and to work responsibly with others and independently?**

4. **In what ways do you establish clear expectations for academic and social behavior and respond to behavior that does not meet those expectations?**

5. **Discuss the classroom routines and procedures that you use, including how you establish and maintain them.**

B. Information about Academic Instructional Planning

Directions:
As you begin to think about the lesson that you will present to this class of students, consider what you learned about them and what you want them to learn in the lesson. Respond to the questions below regarding your plan for instruction for the whole class.

1. **At what point in the sequence of the unit is this lesson? Check one:**

	At the beginning of the unit of study
	Between the beginning and the end of the unit of study
	At the end of the unit of study

2. **The video is a 20 minute portion of a _____ minute lesson.**

3. **List the state-adopted academic content standard(s) or state-adopted framework you will address in this lesson.**

4. **What is (are) the academic learning goal(s)? What specifically do you expect students to know or be able to do as a result of this lesson?**

5. **How is (are) the academic learning goal(s) related to the state-adopted academic content standards or state-adopted framework?**

6. **How will the content of the lesson build on what the students already know and are able to do?**

7. **How does the content of this lesson connect to the content of preceding and subsequent lessons?**

8. **What difficulties do you anticipate students may have with the lesson content? Why do you think these will be areas of difficulty?**

9. **What evidence will you collect during the lesson and/or at the end of the lesson that will show the extent to which the students have made progress toward the academic learning goal(s)?**

10. Think about how you will sequence your instruction of the academic content to be covered in this lesson. Describe your plan for instruction in the order in which it will be implemented. Address each of the following and provide a rationale for each of your decisions:

Communicating the academic learning goal(s) to the students
Instructional strategies
Student activities
Student grouping
Materials, technology, and/or resources, including the use of instructional aides, parents, or other adults in the room
Monitoring of student learning

Instructional Plan	Rationale

11. Discuss the specific classroom routines and procedures you will use in this lesson to maximize instructional time.

12. In what ways will you ensure the active and equitable participation of all students during the lesson?

13. Given the difficulties you anticipate students may have with the content, what additional steps might you take to foster access and comprehension for the students?

14. In what ways will you share the results of the instruction with students and/or families?

Step 3: Lesson Adaptations for the Two Focus Students

Directions:

Consider what you have learned about the two focus students in Step 1, and the implications for instruction that you identified for each of them. For the two students, determine what adaptations you will make to this lesson that you have planned for the *whole class. Describe those adaptations for each of the two focus students. If you determine that no adaptations are needed for a part of the plan for instruction, explain that decision.*

A. Adaptation for Student 1: An English Learner

1. What adaptations to the instructional plan will you make for the student?

2. Why are these adaptations appropriate for the student?

3. For the part(s) of the plan for instruction that you are not adapting, why are they appropriate for the student as planned?

B. Adaptation for Student 2: A Student Who Presents A Different Instructional Challenge

1. What adaptations to the instructional plan will you make for the student?

2. Why are these adaptations appropriate for the student?

3. For the part(s) of the plan for instruction that you are not adapting, why are they appropriate for the student as planned?

Step 4: Teaching and Video Recording the Lesson: Whole Class, including Two Focus Students

Directions:
Make a twenty-minute video of you teaching the lesson to this class of students.

Before beginning the lesson, review chapter 7 of the Candidate Handbook. Check to make sure you have permission slips for any student and/or adult who will be visible on the video. Students who do not have permission to be videoed may participate in the lesson off-camera.

Provide a succinct description of your teaching context; include what you believe would be helpful for assessors to know when viewing the video. Consider including details of any state or district mandates that may shape your teaching (e.g., required curricula, standardized tests, pacing, texts). You might also include information regarding the degree to which you have access to current technologies.

Attach a simple floor plan of your classroom at the back of your completed response.

Step 5: Analyzing the Lesson

Directions:
Review the video of this lesson and consider all the assessment responses. Select three responses of students other than your two focus students that represent the range of achievement within the class. Label these responses as Student 3, Student 4, and Student 5. Label the two focus students' assessment responses as Student 1 and Student 2. Submit all five assessment responses. Review carefully the evidence of student learning you are submitting. Answer the questions below.

1. **Did you teach this lesson as planned? If not, what changes did you make to the lesson and why?**

2. **How appropriate were your time allocations for the students, the content, and the planned instructional strategies and student activities? Cite specific examples.**

3. **To what extent did the class as a whole achieve the academic learning goals of the lesson?**

4. **In what ways did the environment in the classroom, including climate, rapport, routines, and procedures, contribute to student learning?**

Think about the components of the lesson and the evidence of student academic learning that you see in your video. Respond for your whole class, and for each of the two focus students.

A. For the Whole Class

1. **In what ways was your lesson effective and what might you do differently to improve the lesson?**

2. **How well did the lesson connect with the students' background and developmental information? Cite specific examples.**

3. **What will you do for the student(s) who did not achieve the academic learning goals?**

4. **What are your next steps with the class?**

B. For Student 1: An English Learner

1. **In what ways was your lesson effective and what might you do differently to improve the lesson?**

2. **How well did this lesson connect with the student's background and developmental information? Cite specific examples.**

3. **To what extent did the student make progress toward the academic learning goals? Cite specific examples from the evidence of student learning that you reviewed.**

4. **What will you do for the student(s) who did not achieve the academic learning goals?**

5. **What are your next steps with this focus student?**

6. **What would be your next steps in planning to facilitate this student's English Language Development?**

C. For Student 2: A Student Who Presents A Different Instructional Challenge

1. **In what ways was your lesson effective and what might you do differently to improve the lesson?**

2. **How well did the lesson connect with the student's background and developmental information? Cite specific examples.**

3. **To what extent did the student make progress toward the academic learning goals? Cite specific examples from the evidence of student learning that you reviewed.**

4. **What will you do for the student(s) who did not achieve the academic learning goals?**

5. **What are your next steps with this focus student?**

Step 6: Reflection after Instruction

Directions:

Review your responses for Steps 1 to 5. Consider what you have learned through the Culminating Teaching Experienc*e task about the lesson, the student learning as a result of the lesson, and your analysis of the lesson and the student learning. Answer the questions below.*

1. **Given your analysis of this lesson and the student learning that resulted, how will you use this information to guide your planning for future lessons?**

2. **After reflecting upon this instructional experience, what have you learned about the need for making adaptations as you plan for differentiated instruction? Cite specific information about the students, your plan for instruction, and the analysis of the lesson to explain your answer.**

3. **What are your goals for increasing your knowledge and skill in implementing instruction? How will achieving these goals help you become a more effective teacher?**

Scoring Rubric for the Culminating Teaching Experience Task

Score Level 4. The response provide written and video evidence that clearly, consistently, and convincingly demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to learn about students; create and maintain the classroom environment; plan for instruction; make adaptations to the plan to meet student needs; teach the lesson; assess student learning; analyze the evidence of student learning and the effectiveness of the lesson; and reflect on the instructional experience. The preponderance of evidence provided for each of the following domains is appropriate, relevant, accurate, and clear or detailed. Evidence is purposefully connected and reinforced across the response.

<u>Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students - TPE 8, 9</u>
The candidate learns about her or his students and uses this information to plan instruction and assessment, as evidenced by:

- establishing clear and appropriate goals for student learning, based on state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework
- obtaining detailed and relevant information about the class as a whole and about selected students, including linguistic background; academic language abilities; content knowledge and skills; physical, social, and emotional development; cultural and health considerations; and interests
- planning relevant and appropriate instruction in relation to the content area and subject matter to be taught and in accordance with state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework
- selecting or adapting relevant and appropriate instructional strategies, grouping strategies, and instructional materials to assist students to achieve learning goals and meet all students' needs

<u>Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning - TPE 10, 11</u>
The candidate establishes a climate for learning and uses instructional time appropriately, as evidenced by:

- allocating instructional time appropriately
- establishing clear and appropriate procedures for routine tasks and managing transitions to maximize instructional time
- developing and maintaining clear and appropriate expectations for academic and social behavior
- creating and maintaining a positive climate for learning

<u>Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning - TPE 4, 5, 6, 7</u>
The candidate uses and adapts strategies and activities for instruction and learning, as evidenced by:

- using relevant and developmentally-appropriate instructional strategies and activities according to purpose and lesson content
- making relevant and appropriate plans for students who have special needs or abilities

- drawing upon detailed and relevant information about students' backgrounds and prior learning, including students' assessed levels of literacy in English and their first language, as well as their proficiency in English, for planning, and allowing students to express meaning, including in their first language
- knowing and applying relevant and appropriate instructional practices for English Language Development
- ensuring the active and equitable participation of all students

<u>Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students - TPE 1</u>
The candidate knows the state-adopted content standards for students or state-adopted framework, as evidenced by:

- demonstrating a detailed and accurate understanding of subject-specific pedagogical skills for teaching the state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework to all students

<u>Assessing Student Learning - TPE 2, 3</u>
The candidate uses assessment to obtain information about student learning and to plan further instruction, as evidenced by:

- using progress monitoring appropriately at key points during instruction to determine whether students are progressing adequately and providing detailed and accurate feedback to students
- using classroom assessments appropriately and analyzing student work accurately

<u>Developing as a Professional Educator - TPE 13</u>
The candidate reflects on the instructional experience and student learning, as evidenced by:

- providing detailed and relevant reflection and feedback on the results of the instruction and adaptations made in order to improve teaching effectiveness

Score Level 3. The response provides written and video evidence that clearly demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to learn about students; create and maintain the classroom environment; plan for instruction; make adaptations to the plan to meet student needs; teach the lesson; assess student learning; analyze the evidence of student learning and the effectiveness of the lesson; and reflect on the instructional experience. The preponderance of evidence provided for each of the following domains is appropriate, relevant, or accurate. Evidence is connected across the response.

<u>Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students - TPE 8, 9</u>
The candidate learns about her or his students and uses this information to plan instruction and assessment, as evidenced by:

 establishing appropriate goals for student learning, based on state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework
 obtaining relevant information about the class as a whole and about selected students, including linguistic background; academic language abilities; content knowledge and skills; physical, social, and emotional development; cultural and health considerations; and interests

 planning appropriate instruction in relation to the content area and subject matter to be taught and in accordance with state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework
 selecting or adapting appropriate instructional strategies, grouping strategies, and instructional materials that assist students to achieve learning goals and meet students' needs

Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning - TPE 10, 11
The candidate establishes a climate for learning and uses instructional time appropriately, as evidenced by:

- allocating instructional time appropriately
- establishing appropriate procedures for routine tasks and managing transitions to maximize instructional time
- developing and maintaining appropriate expectations for academic and social behavior
- creating and maintaining a positive climate for learning

Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning TPE 4, 5, 6, 7
The candidate uses and adapts strategies and activities for instruction and learning, as evidenced by:

- using developmentally-appropriate instructional strategies and activities according to purpose and lesson content
- making appropriate plans for students who have special needs or abilities
- drawing upon relevant information about students' backgrounds and prior learning, including students' assessed levels of literacy in English and their first language, as well as their proficiency in English, for planning, and allowing students to express meaning, including in their first language
- knowing and applying appropriate instructional practices for English Language Development
- ensuring the active and equitable participation of most students

Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students - TPE 1
The candidate knows the state-adopted content standards for students or state-adopted framework, as evidenced by:

- demonstrating an accurate understanding of subject-specific pedagogical skills for teaching the state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework to all students

Assessing Student Learning - TPE 2, 3
The candidate uses assessment to obtain information about student learning and to plan further instruction, as evidenced by:

- using progress monitoring appropriately at key points during instruction to determine whether students are progressing adequately and providing accurate feedback to students
- using classroom assessments and analyzing student work accurately

Developing as a Professional Educator - TPE 13

The candidate reflects on the instructional experience and student learning, as evidenced by:

- providing relevant reflection and feedback on the results of the instruction and adaptations made in order to improve teaching effectiveness

Score Level 2. The response provides written and video evidence that partially demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to learn about students; create and maintain the classroom environment; plan for instruction; make adaptations to the plan to meet student needs; teach the lesson; assess student learning; analyze the evidence of student learning and the effectiveness of the lesson; and reflect on the instructional experience. The preponderance of evidence provided for each of the following domains is minimal, limited, cursory, inconsistent, and/or ambiguous. Evidence is weakly connected across the response and may be inconsistent.

Planning Instruction and Designing Learning and Experiences for Students - TPE 8, 9

The candidate minimally learns about her or his students and uses this information to plan instruction and assessment, as evidenced by:

- establishing some appropriate and some inappropriate goals for student learning, based on state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework
- obtaining cursory information about the class as a whole and about selected students, such as linguistic background; academic language abilities; content knowledge and skills; physical, social, and emotional development; cultural and health considerations; and interests
- planning instruction that is not clearly or coherently related to the content area and subject matter to be taught and/or is minimally in accordance with state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework
- selecting or adapting instructional strategies, grouping strategies, and instructional materials that minimally assist students in achieving learning goals or that are inconsistent in meeting students' needs

Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning - TPE 10, 11

The candidate minimally establishes a climate for learning and uses instructional time appropriately, as evidenced by:

- sometimes appropriately and sometimes inappropriately allocating instructional time
- establishing inconsistent or minimal procedures for routine tasks and management of transitions
- developing and maintaining ambiguous or inconsistent expectations for academic and social behavior
- creating a climate that is sometimes appropriate for learning

Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning - TPE 4, 5, 6, 7

The candidate minimally uses and adapts strategies and activities for instruction and learning, as evidenced by:

- using ambiguous or inconsistent strategies and activities according to purpose and lesson content
- making inconsistent or minimal plans for students who have special needs or abilities
- drawing upon minimal or cursory information about students' backgrounds and prior learning, including students' assessed levels of literacy in English and their first language, as well as their proficiency in English, for planning, and/or allowing students to express meaning, including in their first language
- a limited knowledge and/or ambiguous application of instructional practices for English Language Development
- ensuring the active and equitable participation of some students

<u>Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students - TPE 1</u>
The candidate minimally knows the state-adopted content standards for students or state-adopted framework, as evidenced by:

- demonstrating a cursory or limited understanding of subject-specific pedagogical skills for teaching the state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework to students

<u>Assessing Student Learning - TPE 2, 3</u>
The candidate minimally uses assessment to obtain information about student learning and to plan further instruction, as evidenced by:

- using progress monitoring sometimes appropriately and sometimes inappropriately during instruction to determine whether students are progressing and/or providing minimal or limited feedback to students
- using ambiguous classroom assessments and cursory or inconsistent analysis of student work

<u>Developing as a Professional Educator - TPE 13</u>
The candidate minimally reflects on the instructional experience and student learning, as evidenced by:

- providing cursory or limited reflection and feedback on the results of the instruction and adaptations made in order to improve teaching effectiveness

Score Level 1. The response provides written and video evidence that does little or nothing to demonstrate the teacher candidate's ability to learn about students; create and maintain the classroom environment; plan for instruction; make adaptations to the plan to meet student needs; teach the lesson; assess student learning; analyze the evidence of student learning and the effectiveness of the lesson; and reflect on the instructional experience. The preponderance of evidence provided for each of the following domains is inappropriate, irrelevant, inaccurate, or missing. Evidence is unconnected across the response.

Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students - TPE 8, 9

The candidate insufficiently learns about her or his students and uses this information to plan instruction and assessment, as evidenced by:

- establishing inappropriate or no goals for student learning based on state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework
- obtaining irrelevant or no information about the class as a whole and about selected students, including linguistic background; academic language abilities; content knowledge and skills; physical, social, and emotional development; cultural and health considerations; and interests
- planning inappropriate or no instruction related to the content area and subject matter to be taught and/or instruction not in accordance with state-adopted academic content standards for students or state-adopted framework
- selecting or adapting inappropriate or no instructional strategies, grouping strategies, and instructional materials that assist students to achieve learning goals and do not meet students' needs

Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning TPE 10, 11

The candidate insufficiently establishes a climate for learning and uses instructional time appropriately, as evidenced by:

- allocating instructional time inappropriately
- establishing inappropriate or no procedures for routine tasks and management of transitions
- developing and maintaining inappropriate or no expectations for academic and social behavior
- creating a climate that is inappropriate for learning

Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning - TPE 4, 5, 6, 7

The candidate insufficiently uses and adapts strategies and activities for instruction and learning, as evidenced by:

- using developmentally-inappropriate or no instructional strategies and activities according to purpose and lesson content
- making inappropriate or no plans for students who have special needs or abilities
- drawing upon irrelevant or no information about students' backgrounds and prior learning, including students' assessed levels of literacy in English and their first language, as well as their proficiency in English, for planning, and/or allowing students to express meaning, including in their first language
- knowing and applying inappropriate or no instructional practices for English Language Development
- ensuring the active and equitable participation of few or no students

Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students - TPE 1

The candidate insufficiently knows the state-adopted content standards for students or state-adopted framework, as evidenced by:

- demonstrating an inaccurate or no understanding of subject-specific pedagogical skills for teaching the state-adopted academic content standards or state-adopted framework to students

<u>Assessing Student Learning - TPE 2, 3</u>
The candidate insufficiently uses assessment to obtain information about student learning and to plan further instruction, as evidenced by:

- using progress monitoring inappropriately or not at all during instruction to determine whether students are progressing and/or providing inaccurate or no feedback to students
- using inappropriate or no classroom assessments and inaccurate or no analysis of student work

<u>Developing as a Professional Educator - TPE 13</u>
The candidate insufficiently reflects on the instructional experience and student learning, as evidenced by:

- providing irrelevant or no reflection and feedback on the results of the instruction and adaptations made in order to improve teaching effectiveness