



5-1-2023

Educative Teacher Performance Assessment: Perceptions of Similarities and Differences in a Teacher Education Program

Madison Hailey Pines
Butler Univeristy

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/ugtheses>

Recommended Citation

Pines, Madison Hailey, "Educative Teacher Performance Assessment: Perceptions of Similarities and Differences in a Teacher Education Program" (2023). *Undergraduate Honors Thesis Collection*. 702.
<https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/ugtheses/702>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Undergraduate Honors Thesis Collection at Digital Commons @ Butler University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Honors Thesis Collection by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Butler University. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@butler.edu.

BUTLER UNIVERSITY HONORS PROGRAM

Honors Thesis Certification

Please type all information in this section:

Applicant: Madison Hailey Pines

Thesis title: Educative Teacher Performance
Assessment:
Perceptions of Similarities and
Differences in a Teacher Education
Program

Intended date of commencement: May 5th, 2023

Read, approved, and signed by:

Thesis adviser(s): Dr. Catherine Pangan
Date 5/3/23

Reader(s): Dr. Catherine Pangan
Debbie Corpus – Proposal
Date: 5/3/23

Certified by: Dr. Jason S. Lantzer
Date: 5/4/23
Director, Honors Program

Educative Teacher Performance Assessment: Perceptions of Similarities and Differences in a
Teacher Education Program
Madison Pines
Butler University

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Literature Review.....	5
Focus of the Study.....	14
Research Design and Methods for Data Analysis	15
Data Analysis	17
Future Implications.....	23
References.....	25

Introduction

When I was little, I used to play school. My friends and I would transform the playground into our classroom. Sometimes we would take turns being the teacher, other times we would teach to a group of imaginary students. We would even take recycled worksheets with us as assignments for those students. With our imaginations soaring, the possibilities were endless.

When you are little, you are told you can do anything or be anyone when you grow up, and all I ever wanted to be was a teacher. When you are young, everything seems so far away, but it seems like it was only a few years ago that I was that eight-year-old on the elementary school playground. Now, I'm about to take the final steps in accomplishing that dream.

Everything I've done has been in preparation for this moment. I have worked tirelessly, partaking in all the opportunities that Butler University's College of Education has given. I want to ensure that I can give my students the highest quality and standard of education that I am able to afford to them.

The measure of a high-quality education system is the incorporation of responsive teaching for these individuals. In order for students to be successful in their classroom environments, the educator must make intentional decisions regarding the layout of their lessons, the way information is conveyed, the cultural practices and backgrounds of their students as well as the accessibility to materials and support systems in the classroom and the community. The Butler College of Education's mission statement is "to provide accessible, meaningful, and expansive professional preparation that enables educators to create conditions for individuals to reach their full potential and for schools and communities to thrive" (Butler College of Education). Throughout my Butler College of Education mentorship experience, I have been able

to gain valuable insight regarding how to produce the highest quality education that I can share with my students.

Beginning in my first class at Butler, I formed the belief that all students should have access to a high-quality education. This means a safe classroom environment, equitable opportunities for resources and support, culturally responsive teaching, scaffolding lessons, building upon prior knowledge, challenging curriculum, and student-centered learning experiences. Not only has this belief continued to grow with me as I have studied alongside notable professors and classroom teachers, but I've been able to learn how to include each of these aspects in my own classroom.

The culmination of my learning from the past three years is evaluated in the Educative Teacher Performance Assessment or edTPA. In this nationally accredited performance-based assessment, I applied the listed skills while student teaching to show expertise in my craft, thoughtful intentions, and ability to provide my students with a high quality of education.

As a teacher candidate, I was struck by the stark difference between my edTPA experience and the coursework that led up to it. The edTPA felt like an isolated and demanding process that was disconnected from the rest of my teacher education program. This disconnect left me questioning whether other teacher candidates had a similar experience and whether this was a widespread issue in teacher education. These questions inspired me to delve deeper into the topic and investigate whether there was a need to bridge the gap between teacher education coursework and the edTPA, ultimately leading to the conception of this study.

Literature Review

During the fall semester of 2022, I worked at Pleasant View Elementary in Ms. Compton's 4th-grade classroom. During this time, I completed the edTPA or Educative Teacher Performance Assessment. The edTPA or Education Teacher Performance Assessment is a process used to identify credible teachers who provide the highest quality of education to their students. Created by the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity, the edTPA Assessment Handbook states that the purpose of the nationally available performance-based assessment is to "measure novice teachers' readiness to teach both literacy and mathematics in the elementary grades. The assessment is designed with a focus on student learning and principles from research and theory" (Stanford University, 2022, p.2).

Specifically, the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity's edTPA is based on findings that successful teachers; "develop knowledge of the subject matter, content standards, and subject-specific pedagogy, develop and apply knowledge of varied students' needs, consider research and theory about how students learn, reflect on and analyze evidence of the effects of instruction on student learning as a performance-based assessment, edTPA is designed to engage candidates in demonstrating their understanding of teaching and student learning in authentic ways" (Stanford University, 2022, p.2).

The edTPA is split into four Tasks focusing on different aspects of planning, instruction, and assessment. Three Tasks focus on literacy (either comprehension or composition) and the fourth Task focuses on mathematics. In each of these sections submitted artifacts including unedited videos, student work, data analysis, and written reflections are used to assess teaching ability and inform practitioners' teaching practice.

Literacy Planning Task 1: Planning for Literacy Instruction and Assessment

Task 1 required that I planned, researched, created, taught, and analyzed three to five lessons “that build one upon another toward a central focus, with a clearly defined beginning and end” (Stanford University, 2022, p. 69). This is called a learning segment. In addition to this requirement, the lessons must be appropriate for a minimum of four students. I had several students who required accommodation/modifications as stated in their Individualized Education Program (IEP). For example, one of my students required visuals for the lessons. These visuals could consist of a graphic organizer that relates to the content or a picture of a student demonstrating the instruction. Part of ensuring that all my students receive free appropriate public education (as stated under section 504 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act) means making lessons that support all my students and not just the neurotypical students.

My lessons revolved around a central focus, or an overarching idea, and a literacy strategy for comprehending text or composing text that the children can use in their continuing academia. For example, in Ms. Compton's 4th-grade class the students are working on summarizing. Therefore, my central focus was to retell and my literacy strategy would be summarizing with a variety of different strategies.

The lesson objective, which is what the students should be able to do or learn by the end of the lesson, is influenced by the Indiana Department of Education’s (IDOE) predetermined standards. I then assessed the lesson objective through formative assessments. Formative assessments are low-stakes, informal assessments that inform the educator about the student's understanding of a topic. In addition, it allowed me to see the section of the lesson the students may be struggling with, so I could go back and reteach it in a way that makes more sense to the students.

Literacy Instruction Task 2: Instructing and Engaging Students in Literacy Learning

Task 2 reflects much of the same components as the first Task; however, it is focused on how I engaged with students in a classroom rather than the planning process as seen in Task 1. In addition to the central focus, literacy strategies, lesson objectives, standards, and assessments, I had to record myself teaching the lesson. The goal of this Task is to show how I connected with my students on an academic, cultural, and personal basis during the literacy lesson. This included demonstrating a positive classroom environment, providing positive specific feedback, taking into account cultural components of a student's learning, and continuing to help my class build on the knowledge they've previously obtained.

This Task offered me the unique opportunity to review the videos and reflect on both positive teaching moments and moments that I could have approached with a better strategy for the future. This allowed me to learn from my past teaching experiences in order to continue to provide my students with the highest quality of education in the future.

Literacy Assessment Task 3: Assessing Students' Literacy Learning

There are two types of assessments: formative and summative. Both types of assessments play an integral part in informing me about the students' understanding. These tests depict content that may need to be retaught or rephrased throughout a unit. According to assessment specialists, Catherine Garrison and Michael Ehringhaus (2007), "Summative assessments are given periodically, to determine at a particular point in time what students know and do not know relative to content standards. Examples might include chapter tests, unit tests, or culminating project" (Garrison, 2007, p. 1). However, in the collaborative process of Paul J. Black, Christine Harrison, Clare Lee, and Dylan Wiliam, these esteemed educators discuss the definition of formative tests. They've determined that "formative assessment can occur many times in every

lesson. It can involve several different methods for encouraging students to express what they are thinking and several different ways of acting on such evidence” (Black, 2003, p. 2). Overall, both assessments inform educators about the student's comprehension of a topic.

In Task 3, I used the evidence I've collected to provide meaningful feedback to my students as well as analyzed their learning by utilizing the information in the assessments. Specifically, I selected one assessment from my learning segment that I used to evaluate my students' developing knowledge and skills (Stanford University, 2022). This assessment had defined criteria that determined if the students meet the learning objective. For example, the learning objective read: The students will be able to identify, write down, and label key details in the text including the topic, author's purpose, who the passage is talking about and/or important events through the analysis of a nonfiction text. Based on this learning objective, I created specific, measurable, obtainable goals for students. Then, based on the assessments, I will be able to analyze which goals the students met and which goals need more intervention.

Mathematics Assessment Task 4: Assessing Students' Mathematics Learning

In Task 4, I stepped away from literacy and moved to show my mathematical teaching competence. In this Task, I “analyzed student work samples to identify a targeted learning objective/goal and plan and teach a re-engagement lesson focused on students' needs” (Stanford University, 2022, p. 43).

Similar to the literacy Tasks, I selected a minimum of four students to teach a learning segment with a central focus on mathematics supported by Indiana Department of Education standards and learning objectives. The central focus will “support students to develop conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and mathematical reasoning/problem-solving skills” (Stanford University, 2022, p. 43).

During the lesson, I gave the students formative assessments as content understanding markers and a summative assessment at the end to determine their overall learning. Based on the defined evaluation criteria (influenced by the content objective and IDOE standards), I analyzed student learning related to mathematical reasoning and problem-solving.

Following the analysis of the data, I identified the patterns of learning across students in the class. Based on this knowledge, I created a re-engagement lesson that targeted learning objectives that were based on the intervention students needs. The last step in this Task “evaluated the effectiveness of the re-engagement lesson and consider its impact on student learning” (Stanford University, 2022, p. 44).

Rubrics

The edTPA is assessed through a series of rubrics. Each Task correlates to a specific rubric with significant individual requirements pertaining to the specific Task. Since each Task assesses separate information, each Task must be completed separately from the others.

The Tasks are split into a series of assignments that document different artifacts and commentary. For example, Task 1’s rubric consists of five different assignments and specifications needed in each of those assignments. This includes: the file to submit, a list of supported files, the number of files, the response length, and any additional information. Generally, additional information includes font style, point-type size, spacing, margins, and how to label each document within the separate assignments. If any of these aspects are not formatted in the exact way of the rubric, the pre-service teachers fail and must resubmit.

In addition to documenting the required Tasks, pre-service teachers must also keep track of four separate rubrics and the separate requirements for reach of the assignments within the four Tasks.

Reliability of Research

In order to determine the reliability of research surrounding the edTPA, I analyzed recurring themes in three different articles of similar nature. The articles reviewed were "Assessing the assessment: Evidence of reliability and validity in the edTPA" by Gitomer, Martínez, Battey, and Hyland (2021), "The consequences of edTPA" by Greenblatt (2016), and "Something happened on the way to completing the edTPA: A case study of teacher candidates' perceptions of the edTPA" by Heil and Berg (2017). In each of these articles, the authors found that there was a marginal, if any, correlation between a pre-service teacher's edTPA score and their effectiveness in the classroom.

To further investigate this idea, the first step is to examine the scoring process. According to the edTPA website "A scorer views the entire teaching cycle, so that the integrated teaching and learning experiences are judged in totality, not in separate parts. Having the same scorer evaluate all three Tasks of the assessment (planning, instruction, and assessment) allows the scorer to obtain a comprehensive picture of the candidate's performance, understanding how decisions made in the context of planning around student needs are also relevant to subject-specific instruction and the assessment of student learning, for example" (edTPA, 2023, website). However, according to the researchers, humans are subjective in nature, and therefore, by having just one person scoring the assessment, the results are dependent on the perspective of one person.

According to "Assessing the assessment: Evidence of reliability and validity in the edTPA," this article highlights the need for ongoing research to further examine the validity of the edTPA in different contexts and for different populations. The article states:

Our analyses suggest that, for most relevant intents and purposes, the reliability and precision of edTPA scores remain unknown (see also Lalley, 2017) and, further, that there is reason to worry that edTPA scores contain substantially more measurement error than indicated in the annual reports.” (Gitomer, 2021, p. 23)

The article then proceeded to state the implications of having a single scorer. The authors raise the concern that “because many nontechnical readers and users will extrapolate the high reliabilities reported to indicate that a single score from one rater on one portfolio (the typical operational configuration of the assessment) is sufficient for dependable measurement and inferences about teacher candidates, while the documentation offers no evidence that this is the case” (Gitomer, 2021, p.23).

In addition to scorer subjectness, in an article titled “The consequences of edTPA” author Deborah Greenblatt (2016) brings to light that the edTPA test does not account for “real life.” She states “The edTPA requires teacher candidates to provide specific documentation about their focus students' learning during the learning segment. Lessons should be well connected, and focus students must be present for the entire segment. Student absences, scheduling changes, and safety drills have a detrimental effect on an edTPA portfolio. Real life gets in the way” (Greenblatt, 2016, p. 52). This statement is supported by the article “Something happened on the way to completing the edTPA: A case study of teacher candidates' perceptions of the edTPA.” In this article, authors' Heil and Berg (2017) state that when analyzing the data of a surveyed population of pre-service teachers, when “taken in total, they perceived this assessment to lack relevance to their development as teachers” (Heil, 2017, p. 191).

In addition to not being set up in a manner that is conducive with a school day, Greenblatt also addresses diversity, language, and socioeconomic factors that influence the edTPA score. She states:

There are also concerns that edTPA could further contribute to the lack of diversity in teaching. The test's language and writing demands are cumbersome—and even more so for those who are not native English speakers. For example, my teacher candidates spend a lot of time trying to figure out the difference between such terms as language function ("the content and language focus of the learning Task"); literacy strategy ("an approach selected deliberately by a reader or writer to comprehend or compose text"); and central focus ("description of the important understandings and core concepts that you want students to develop")—when sometimes all three are the same. . . Cost alone can prohibit individuals from low socioeconomic backgrounds from entering the profession. In addition to the \$300 charge for the assessment, schools of education have begun to add "edTPA fees" to pay for support workshops, edTPA coordinators, and online portfolio management systems. (Greenblatt, 2016, p. 53)

To summarize the implications of the aforementioned articles, in the same article by Heil and Berg (2017), the authors state:

At the same time, the experience of edTPA completion was affected by features of edTPA design that led to perceived inorganic timing of implementation and a disproportionate amount of time spent on the edTPA. Also, there were perceived disconnects between requirements of the project and messaging in prior music education methods and general education courses. Messaging disconnects stemmed from established program norms that included individuality, risk-taking, creativity and a high level of faculty interaction and

feedback. In addition, edTPA completion resulted in future-oriented learning related to professional preparation and heightened political and social consciousness about the status of education. (Heil, Berg, 2017, p. 192)

In conclusion, the edTPA these articles found that there are a plethora of external factors that could influence a pre-service educator's edTPA score, and therefore, it is not indicative of a teacher's classroom abilities.

Focus of the Study

Both Butler's College of Education and the edTPA focus on the incorporation of theories and research into conveying instructional methods, yet despite these fundamental similarities, there are some differences in how the content is taught and documented. The goal of this study is to investigate pre-service teachers' perceptions of similarities and differences between the edTPA and expectations of a teacher education program.

Research Design and Methods for Data Analysis

For this study, I investigated the major differences between the Butler College of Education preparation program and the edTPA expectations. At the core of Butler University's teacher preparation program are a set of shared commitments including: pursue a just and equitable society, learn from/ contribute to/ apply theory and research, and embody inclusive and responsive teaching, learning, and mentoring.

In order to document the similarities and differences of the edTPA process, I asked the 2023 graduating elementary education pre-service teachers to participate in a survey regarding their edTPA experience. These participants completed the edTPA during the 2022 fall semester. Each of the participants were placed in a separate classroom with differing student demographics and responsibilities; however, all of the participants completed the same version of the edTPA.

The participants were asked a series of questions including:

- 1) Thinking about Task 1, Task 2, Task 3, Task 4, how does the edTPA align with Butler University College of Education core values? If so, what values? If not, how does it differ?
- 2) What are some differences in the language used in the edTPA vs. the language that we use/hear in the College of Education
- 3) How was the edTPA similar to how the College of Education teaches lesson planning/ instruction?
- 4) How was the edTPA different to how the COE teaches lesson planning/ instruction?
- 5) How would you change the edTPA process?

From the survey and the questions asked, I analyzed common themes across the participants' responses. Specifically, I was looking for differences and similarities regarding technical vocabulary, use of specific instructional methods, and documentation of student comprehension regarding the approach of the Butler University's teacher preparation program and the edTPA.

Data Analysis

Based on the responses derived from the survey aforementioned, five themes occurred.

Language Differences

Based on the feedback provided, the vast majority of the language used in the EdTPA handbook and rubrics were perceived as difficult to read and understand, and did not align with the language used in Butler's College of Education method courses. This difference creates a barrier for understanding what is expected of the students. Specifically, one student wrote:

The language that is used in the handbook and rubrics is very difficult to read and digest. I think that it is written in language that we do not use in our college. I think that the language might be aligned more with the ivy league school that created it. I think that the language prevents us from fully understanding what is expected of us. I felt very overwhelmed and discouraged trying to read all of the language that they used.

(Participant 1)

Additionally, the language used in the EdTPA assessment is very specific and arbitrary. The main example that students mentioned was the difference between the way the College of Education teaches formative assessments and the way the expectations of formative assessment within the context of the edTPA. The edTPA uses formative assessment solely as a tool to create reengagement lessons whereas the Butler's College of Education uses formative assessments to monitor student progress regarding the student's understanding of the lesson.

However, it is mentioned that there may not be specific language usage within EdTPA that goes against or differs from the language used in the COE. Yet, participants agreed that the language used within the edTPA focused on analytics and scores, contradicting the COE's focus on practice, growth, and learning.

Overall, participants viewed the main issue with edTPA was the perceived difficulty of the language used in the EdTPA handbook and rubrics, and the rigid expectations and lack of individuality that the assessment imposes.

Usefulness

The data surrounding whether or not students perceived the usefulness of the EdTPA assessment varied significantly among different individuals.

Some found the content of their lessons to be valuable and felt that the evaluation process helped them to think more deeply about their teaching process and have a measurable impact on their future lesson planning, execution, and reflection. One student stated “It was useful to have to think so thoughtfully and intentionally about a lesson. It is important to keep all aspects of your class climate in mind while creating a lesson and edTPA forces that detail and expansiveness.” (Participant 6)

While some students thought that the assessment helped to emphasize the importance of being thoughtful and intentional in lesson planning, including considering all aspects of the class climate, others, however, did not find the assessment to be beneficial. One student can be quoted saying “I did not benefit very much from edTPA in comparison with the work that I put into it. The only area that I thought was impactful was creating and using rubrics.” Several students felt that the edTPA only added extra work on top of their teaching responsibilities.

Overall, it seems that the usefulness of the EdTPA assessment depended on individual perspectives and experiences, but there were certain aspects that can be seen as valuable, such as the focus on creating effective lesson plans and learning how to create and use rubrics.

Butler’s College of Education Core Values

Similar to the responses regarding participants' perceived usefulness, the answers participants provided generally differed based on the perception of the individual participant.

According to the participants' remarks, some EdTPA Tasks do align with some of Butler University's College of Education values, such as promoting responsive teaching, incorporating theory and research, and focusing on all learners' needs. One student expanded on this idea by explaining that the edTPA aligns with the College of Education values partially when it comes to:

applying theory and research as well as responsive teaching. EdTPA really forces you to think about every single aspect of your class and how that would or would not affect one specific lesson. It also makes you reflect and look at the bigger picture at the start of our student teaching experience. However, that way in which edTPA is graded and evaluated is not necessarily responsive or equitable. I would argue that the tedious rubric goes against the core values of COE. (Participant 6)

On the contrary, some students felt that the language used in EdTPA was difficult to understand and that it did not provide enough emphasis on culturally inclusive teaching. For example, one student believed that:

Butler focuses more on equitable and inclusive teaching practice that supports all learners. There are elements of that inherent in EdTPA (especially the all learners portion) but EdTPA is much more focused on a specific lesson framework and all aspects of it while the COE (and understandably so) is more on a wholesale view of your educator identity. (Participant 2)

The students that aligned themselves with the belief that the edTPA does not support the College of Education's core values, generally felt that the standardized nature of EdTPA did not align with COE's focus on growth, learning, and practice.

Overall, while there were some areas of alignment between EdTPA and COE's values, there were also areas where students felt that EdTPA fell short of fully embodying COE's beliefs.

Lesson Planning and Instruction

Based on the responses, there are a few key themes that emerge regarding the edTPA's lesson planning and instructional process.

First, there is a concern about the lack of focus on the actual students and their learning during the edTPA process. The detailed instructions on formatting and video lengths may have made it difficult for some to focus on the actual teaching and learning process. The edTPA process was also perceived as being very structured and limiting in terms of how lesson plans were formatted and executed, which may have resulted in a lack of flexibility and creativity. Participants expressed frustration with the emphasis on formatting and the rubric's evaluation of the physical qualities of the lessons, such as font and layout, rather than the actual teaching and student learning. One student stated:

edTPA was largely based on the formatting of the lesson plans. I thought that the stress on formatting took away from the main focus which is the teaching. I felt as though I was being assessed on my ability to follow confusing formatting directions rather than my actual teaching. I also thought that the COE allows us some flexibility based on how we want to do our lesson planning. I thought that edTPA really boxed us in and only allowed us to plan in one certain way. (Participant 1)

In this respect, the edTPA process is perceived as too specific and prescriptive, and does not allow for enough creativity in lesson planning. Participants suggested that the focus should be more on the content of the lesson and the teacher's ability to teach effectively, rather than adherence to strict formatting guidelines. One way to accomplish this is to make the process standardized and more flexible to allow for more creativity and variation in lesson planning.

On the other hand, some participants felt that the edTPA was more specific and thought-provoking than other classes they had taken, with an emphasis on teaching to multiple learners and reflecting on lesson execution. It was noted that the edTPA process emphasized how to teach to multiple learners and consider specific aspects of lesson planning, such as differentiation and scaffolding. Specifically, one student believed that the edTPA process “emphasized how to teach multiple learners” as well as “consider very specific aspects of lesson planning” and “reflect on the execution in a meaningful way that didn't happen with COE classes” (Participant 2). This suggests that the edTPA process is beneficial in terms of ensuring that teachers are taking these factors into account when planning and executing lessons.

Overall, it appears that there is some dissatisfaction with the edTPA and its emphasis on formatting and strict rubric, but some recognition of its potential benefits in terms of developing reflective teaching practices. The level of stress on formatting during the edTPA process was a concern for some individuals, and there may be room for more flexibility and creativity within the process. However, the focus on differentiating instruction and scaffolding may still make the edTPA process valuable for teacher preparation.

Suggested Changes in EdTPA

This feedback on the edTPA highlights several concerns and suggestions for improvement.

One major concern is the overall workload of the edTPA, which is deemed too time-consuming. The suggestion to complete the edTPA in parts with the whole class may help to alleviate this issue. Additionally, the suggestion to complete the edTPA during Core 3 instead of during student teaching may provide more time and flexibility for teacher candidates.

Another issue raised is the emphasis on formatting and physical qualities of the lesson plan. The feedback suggests that these factors do not necessarily affect a teacher's ability to teach and should not be evaluated as part of the rubric. Instead, there is a call to include an evaluation of culturally inclusive practices, which is an important aspect of effective teaching.

The feedback also suggests that the cost of the edTPA is a significant issue and may be a barrier to entry for some teacher candidates. Therefore, the suggestion is to make the edTPA less standardized and required within a strict layout.

Overall, the feedback suggests a need for changes to the edTPA, including reducing the workload, evaluating important aspects of teaching, and making the process more accessible and less expensive.

Future Implications

The Educative Teacher Performance Assessment requires student teachers to plan, instruct, and assess a learning segment while documenting their processes and reflecting on their teaching practices. While the edTPA was initially designed to be a readiness assessment for pre-service teachers, there is a growing concern among student teachers and educators alike that the current structure of the edTPA does not allow for a fair and accurate representation of a teacher's abilities.

One issue with Butler's participation in the edTPA process is the current timing of the edTPA class. The support class is scheduled at a time when student teachers have just finished a day of teaching and are already exhausted. Student teachers attend the class after completing a full day of teaching and their lab class. This leaves them with very little time to rest or before having to work through complex Tasks, which can lead to increased stress levels and lower-quality work. Changing the timing of the edTPA to a later point in the student teacher's coursework, such as CORE 3, would allow student teachers to fully focus on the assessment without the added stress of student teaching.

Furthermore, during CORE 3, many student teachers are still working with small intervention groups rather than teaching full classes. Since the edTPA requires teachers to teach to a small group rather than a full class, pre-service teachers would be able to complete their responsibilities for Block A and B while simultaneously completing the edTPA. By changing the timing of the edTPA to CORE 3, student teachers would have a better schedule that supported their edTPA requirement and their learning, making it easier for them to complete the assessment.

In addition, there are several other factors that make completing the edTPA potentially unnecessary. For instance, many states do not require the edTPA for licensure, and completing the assessment can be an additional burden for student teachers who are already balancing coursework, student teaching, and other responsibilities. Furthermore, teacher shortages and the need for more educators in the workforce make it more important to focus on graduating from an accredited institution and passing licensure tests rather than completing the edTPA.

While the edTPA has some beneficial components, such as post-lesson reflection, the sheer amount of work required and the standardized nature of the grading rubric leave little room for creativity and do not accurately represent a teacher's abilities. Instead, the edTPA process is rigid and can be a source of stress for student teachers.

In conclusion, changing the timing of the edTPA to CORE 3 would allow student teachers to focus on the assessment without the added stress of student teaching. Additionally, given the current demand for teachers and the other requirements for licensure, some states may need to reconsider the necessity of the edTPA. While there are some benefits to the edTPA, it is important to ensure that it accurately represents a teacher's abilities and does not become an unnecessary burden for student teachers.

References

Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B., & Wiliam, D. (2003). *Assessment for learning: Putting it into practice*. Berkshire, England: Open University Press.

Bloom, B. S. (1956). "Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: The Cognitive Domain." New York: David McKay Co Inc.

Butler University. (2018, October 31). *Vision, Mission, & Core Values*. Butler.edu.
<https://www.butler.edu/coe/mission-core-values>.

Garrison, C., & Ehringhaus, M. (2007). *Formative and summative assessments in the classroom*. Retrieved from
http://www.amle.org/portals/0/pdf/articles/Formative_Assessment_Article_Aug2013.pdf

Gitomer, D. H., Martínez, J. F., Battey, D., & Hyland, N. E. (2021). Assessing the assessment: Evidence of reliability and validity in the edTPA. *American Educational Research Journal*, 58(1), 3-31.

Greenblatt, D. (2016). The consequences of edTPA. *Educational Leadership*, 73(8), 51-54.

Heil, L., & Berg, M. H. (2017). Something happened on the way to completing the edTPA: A

case study of teacher candidates' perceptions of the edTPA. *Contributions to Music Education*, 42, 181-200.

Stanford University. *edTPA*. edTPA | Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity.
<https://scale.stanford.edu/teaching/consortium>.