



The Impacts of edTPA on P-20 Educational Systems

*Nai-Cheng Kuo, Augusta University
Stuart Carroll, & Louise Ammentorp, The College of New Jersey
Kenneth V. Anthony, Mississippi State University*

Abstract

Preparing high-quality teachers is supposed to be the responsibility of state Departments of Education and university teacher education programs, yet the mandated Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) is operated by Pearson, a private corporation. Standing on the frontline to implement edTPA, faculty have witnessed equity issues within the system that cause concern. Furthermore, faculty are essentially mandated to work for a private corporation. In this paper, we address the impacts of edTPA across p-20 education, including pilot studies of edTPA by university faculty across states to confront the privately copyrighted teacher performance assessments. We argue that allowing a private corporation to operate such an important assessment is against the value of U.S. public education, and has failed many capable teacher candidates. In conclusion, we provide recommendations for stakeholders to eliminate edTPA to ensure equitable access to high-quality education.

Keywords: *edTPA, P-20 education, teacher performance assessments, teacher education*

Preparing high-quality teachers is supposed to be the responsibility of state Departments of Education and university teacher education programs, yet Pearson, a private corporation operates the mandated Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA). In 2019, the Thomas J. Dodd Research Center at the University of Connecticut published concerns about edTPA: 1) diminishment of candidate learning, 2) perpetuation of inequitable systems, and 3) application of developmentally inappropriate standards (Bernard, Kaufman, Kohan, & Mitoma, 2019). For states which do not have state teacher performance assessments in place, it is easier for them to simply adopt edTPA rather than to spend time and money on developing the state's own, non-profit teacher performance assessments. Many educators in the field stay silent because they view having an assessment for teacher candidates as better than having no assessment, or they see themselves as powerless or too precariously positioned to do anything about it. There are many people who feel disenfranchised, so they do not act or speak up. For example, adjunct professors who teach in education departments as well as students who feel powerless about what systems they have to move through. The lack of research evidence on their state-created teacher performance assessments also makes educators reluctant to judge the quality of edTPA.

Developed by measurement scholars at the Stanford Center for Assessment (SCALE), supported by the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE), and operated by Pearson, the edTPA's use has been mandated in eighteen states (SCALE, 2019). The Council for

the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) also supports the adoption of the edTPA over state-created teacher performance assessments. However, many questions have arisen about the power being granted to edTPA and Pearson. Standing on the frontline of implement edTPA, university faculty have witnessed many equity concerns about edTPA across p-20 education. What faculty are mandated to do has crossed lines of doing the work for a private corporation.

In this paper, we aim to continue dialogues that confront edTPA and address the impacts of edTPA across p-20 education. We include university faculty's pilot studies of edTPA in the states of Vermont and Mississippi. Finally, we provide recommendations for state governors, university faculty members, p-12 educators, and teacher candidates to eliminate the use of edTPA to ensure equitable access to quality education in p-20 education.

Impacts at the P-12 School Level

Impact 1. Strained School-University Relationships

Many researchers point to the need for university-based teacher educators to respect the experience and knowledge of classroom teachers as crucial to the development and education of preservice teachers (Feiman-Nemser & Beasley, 2007; Zeichner, 2010). The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) calls for "turning teacher education on its head" by shifting the focus of teacher education to school-based clinical experience (NCATE, 2010). Quality clinical preparation requires reciprocal discussions between university teacher educators and school-based teacher educators on how to best prepare preservice teachers (Bullough, 2005; Young, Bullough Jr., Draper, Smith, & Erickson, 2005). As the Association of Teacher Education (ATE) *Standards for Field Experience in Teacher Education* (2000) stress, clinical experience should be planned and deliberate, and collaboratively developed and implemented by both the institutions of higher education and the schools. This recommended approach, however, is the opposite of how edTPA has been enacted. P-12 schools and teachers had no part in the decision-making process of adopting edTPA. It is yet another external mandate forced upon them.

As a result, in order to abide by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA), more and more school districts reject hosting teacher candidates who need to do edTPA with children in their schools. Take New Jersey as an example: At one college, faculty were told by administrators that sixty school districts have made it clear that they will not take any teacher candidates who need complete edTPA in their schools. Districts are concerned that teacher candidates' thoroughly-written commentaries and videotapes put children's privacy at risk. Teacher candidates' edTPA portfolios are stored in Pearson's database, shared with Pearson employed edTPA national scorers, and can be used by anyone who SCALE deems appropriate for conducting "education-related" activities. All of these create risks for the children's confidential information to be revealed or used by people outside the children's schools. Teacher candidates' intellectual property is also left unprotected. People who have access to edTPA portfolios can easily take advantage of teacher candidates' thoroughly-written lesson plans and activities for profit or for "education-related" training.

Impact 2. Inequities in Level of Support

Meuwissen and Choppin's (2015) study notes that the amount of support teacher candidates received from their cooperating teachers in p-12 classrooms varies widely. Teacher candidates whose cooperating teachers have received professional development about the edTPA do better than those whose teachers have not (Kissau, Hart, & Algozzine, 2019). This privileges students whose colleges have the resources to train cooperating teachers and otherwise provide technical and conceptual assistance.

However, in some situations, teacher candidates had to teach their cooperating teachers in P-12 classrooms about edTPA and settle for whatever help cooperating teachers could offer. Moreover, cooperating teachers may not be familiar with the language used in edTPA (though edTPA claims it is the language of the field), which can undermine the cooperating teacher's role as a more knowledgeable and experienced mentor. All of these factors can damage the student teaching relationship, given that edTPA has transformed student teaching from a formative learning experience to one that is "immediately, and prematurely, high stakes and summative" (Dover & Schultz, 2016, p. 97). Inequities also arise from teaching in various settings in which cooperating teachers have different levels of knowledge of the edTPA and different ability or willingness to adapt existing curriculum to allow candidates to complete edTPA tasks as specified (Meuwissen, Choppin, Cloonan, & Shang-Butler, 2016).

Impact 3. Narrowing the Student Teaching Experience: A One-Way Roundabout

With the edTPA requirement, teacher candidates must follow one set of rubrics to plan, teach, and assess p-12 students in order to leave the so-called "Pearson roundabout" (Kuo, 2018) successfully and become certified teachers. If teacher candidates, in states which have mandatory edTPA policies in place, do not follow the set of rubrics and fail edTPA, they must choose to retake edTPA (and pay for it) and cycle back through the roundabout—or choose another career. To help teacher candidates pass edTPA, one mechanism used by most universities is to remove teacher candidates from their school placements to allow for more time to work on their edTPA submissions (e.g., a series of edTPA boot camps). Removing teacher candidates from their placement to prepare for lengthy edTPA portfolios takes away from their time in the field. It also forces schools to adjust schedules for teacher candidates to go back to their campuses for edTPA training. This aspect interferes with the whole purpose of student teaching. It takes teacher candidates' hours to find, cut, and convert the best portion of their teaching videos for edTPA. They spend countless hours evaluating every rubric, comparing responses across piles of documents, tweaking their thoughts to align with the rubrics, and compiling lengthy documents (approximately 80 pages plus video clips) that completely disconnected from the realities of being a teacher. Teacher candidates often express that there is not meaningful learning happening during these trainings precisely because the focus is on formatting and uploading.

Impact 4. Unnatural Fit for the Real-life Classroom

edTPA does not fit in naturally with school programs and curricula. Taking special education edTPA as an example, the maximum pages that each teacher candidate needs to write are 84 pages plus videos and unlimited pages for relevant data during their student teaching semester, which interfere with their other teaching responsibilities. Because edTPA is consequential and

costly, most teacher candidates exhaust themselves to do the maximum, hoping to pass the assessment and thinking that more equals better. Ironically, as Gilbert and Kuo (2019) state: “With asking teacher candidates to write and prepare so much for edTPA portfolios but only providing them with abstract numbers as feedback, there is inconsistency between what edTPA scorers expect teacher candidates to do for students and what edTPA scorers do to teacher candidates” (p. 9). Conflict between the demands of edTPA and school curriculum can make the edTPA a miseducative experience, which becomes an overwhelming one for the candidates and cooperating teachers alike (Reagan, Schram, McCurdy, Chang, & Evans, 2016). Completing the edTPA during the semesters when children are taking standardized tests is even more difficult because cooperating teachers need to hold themselves accountable (Greenblatt, 2018).

Researchers have found that cooperating teachers who have had to make great efforts to accommodate edTPA completion are less likely to accept teacher candidates in subsequent years. To continue with the special education edTPA as an example, schools must allow each teacher candidate to work only with one focus learner throughout the semester to complete their edTPA portfolio. Several principals and cooperating teachers express that in the real world, no school can afford to hire one special education teacher who only works with one student, and thus such a training requested by edTPA is not practical (Gilbert & Kuo, 2019). edTPA not only is an inauthentic representation of teacher work—an assessment that leads teaching and learning to a decontextualized set of skills, but also dismisses the view that acknowledges teaching complexity or artistry (Greenblatt & O’Hara, 2015; Price, 2016).

Impact at the Higher Education Level

Impact 5. Disempowering Teacher Candidates

In his study of pre-service candidates across programs, Coloma (2015) found that the vast majority (93%) of students do not believe that the edTPA is a fair assessment of their ability to teach. They feel that edTPA scores as “reflective of how well (teacher candidates) can meet Pearson’s requirements under pressure” (Coloma, 2015, p. 25). Teacher candidates across the nation keep expressing their frustration about edTPA either through face-to-face meetings with administrators or via public discussion platforms. However, before being certified teachers, they are in a vulnerable situation and must succumb to the state’s top-down policy of edTPA. Instead of helping teacher candidates convey their concerns to the state government, teacher educators ask students to accept edTPA because it is a top-down policy.

Impact 6. Threats to Teacher Educators’ Academic Freedom

Many teacher educators are first exposed to edTPA through mandatory training workshops in which edTPA is a given, not subject to debate. Some faculty members have been explicitly told by university administrators that their annual evaluation on teaching will be based on teacher candidates’ edTPA performance (Gilbert & Kuo, 2019). Because edTPA has become one reason to punish university faculty when teacher candidates fail, malpractices inevitably sprout to ensure teacher candidates will pass edTPA. Some universities, especially Tier 2 and Tier 3 universities, use edTPA passing rates as a means for advertising their programs. Several states send edTPA data to school districts to help them compare the quality of teacher education programs. All of these

cause edTPA rubrics to become the default curriculum for teacher education and forces university faculty to “teach to the test” to ensure that their institutions have a high pass rate for edTPA.

There are cases where university administrators are strong proponents of edTPA and that they do not allow their faculty to conduct research studies that can possibly uncover the negative aspects of edTPA. Furthermore, university faculty, p-12 educators, and teacher candidates are afraid of sharing their true voices for fear of retribution. Preventing faculty from engaging in intellectual debate about edTPA clearly violates academic freedom and is an abuse of power by administrators. More seriously, university faculty and K-12 educators, who are considered state government full-time employees, are now become part-time employees of Pearson to serve as edTPA scorers and to sell edTPA on campus, which involves ethical and legal concerns in the U.S. education system.

Impact 7. Narrowing Curriculum in Teacher Education

Since edTPA scores are used as a proxy for quality teaching, teacher educators must revise curriculum and instruction to achieve better scores that presumably demonstrate teacher quality and impact (Coloma, 2015). When universities are concerned with producing high achievers on edTPA, education becomes a transmission of a body of technical knowledge based on presumed rubrics. Professor-and-teacher candidate dialogue on a deep level of knowledge, self-actualization, creativity, and freedom of inquiry are disappearing. Greenblatt and O'Hara (2015) summarize this well:

The lengthy and tightly structured edTPA requirements have changed the focus of the student teaching experience and seminar from preparing for the first year of teaching to preparing to pass a test and create lessons under constraints that make the test an authentic assessment. (p. 59)

Teaching should be tailored to meet students' needs, instead of being tailored to meet a set of edTPA rubrics. Unfortunately, when teacher candidates do not strictly follow the edTPA rubrics to plan their lessons, teach, and assess students, they will encounter huge challenges when they are asked to answer commentary questions. This is because all commentary questions are closely tied to the edTPA rubrics and thus teacher candidates must provide evidence to indicate that they abide by the rubrics to plan, teach, and assess, regardless of their teaching contexts.

Take the Elementary edTPA as an example, the literacy tasks are overly complex and highly specific. There are many concepts involved: central focus, essential literacy strategies, language functions, language demands, language supports, syntax and discourse. Teacher candidates spend many hours learning the language of the edTPA, which is arbitrary and unrelated to how practicing teachers and literacy specialists talk about literacy. Teacher candidates also spend an inordinate amount of time and energy creating a literacy segment that meets the expectations of the edTPA and fits into their curriculum.

The expectation of edTPA for elementary literacy lessons is strategy-based. While the National Reading Panel's influential report (National Reading Panel, 2000) includes strategy training as a component of a balanced reading program, it has several other emphases and never gives strategy training the primacy as research has highlighted that reading comprehension is heuristic, not just the use of strategies (Willingham, 2006, Guthrie, et al., 2004, Elleman & Compton, 2017). By forcing a strict “strategies first” approach on the edTPA learning segment, its designers force

teacher educators to compromise their own beliefs and comply with a top-down mandate, and compel their own students to do the same. Similar problems have arisen with the edTPA in foreign languages education (Russell & Davidson Devall, 2016), performing arts education (Parkes & Powell, 2015), special education (Othman, Robinson, & Molfenter, 2017), and TESOL education (Chiu, 2014).

edTPA is largely a writing assessment, not a teaching performance assessment. Teacher candidates spend a lot more time writing than teaching and only receive numeric feedback from edTPA scorers, which is the least effective. Furthermore, teacher candidates need to watch their teaching videos many times in order to find pieces of evidence for their commentary questions. In this way, they will be able say, for example, in Video 2 at 3:28, "I did such and such. This approach creates a "gold-mining" attitude in candidates as they watch their teaching videos, diminishing the power of authentic self-reflection. This kind of a learning attitude leaves no room for creative and critical thinking. It is evident that edTPA negatively impacts the teacher candidates' approach to their teaching. According to Chiu (2014):

Pearson's proven record of blurring the line between non-profit charity and for-profit business, as well as their perpetuation of casual, outsourced labor with no job protections, demonstrates their untrustworthiness. Teacher candidates are less likely to take risks in their teaching, such as using progressive, critical pedagogies, for fear of losing points for deviating from teaching ideologies and practices that have been described in the edTPA rubrics and that are already widely accepted and used by the teaching community. (p. 29)

Teacher candidates, focusing on meeting edTPA rubric requirements, lose the ability and willingness to plan creatively or to pursue their own visions of quality teaching. For example, at the College of New Jersey, elementary education teacher candidates expressed that persuasive writing tasks fit most neatly in the upper elementary grades, while "how to books" and similar sequencing activities fit best in the primary grades. The sameness of their lessons is shocking and not indicative of the pursuit of quality. This phenomenon continues growing as more and more faculty and edTPA trainers use former students' edTPA submissions as samples for new teacher candidates, who, while careful not to plagiarize, will use these as templates for meeting the complex layers of requirements that the unwieldy edTPA places upon them.

Teacher educators also lose time to discuss field experiences and student well-being issues. They lose control of curriculum as they are forced to teach what Pearson scorers will be looking for and tips for successfully passing the assessment. Some colleges have responded to the edTPA mandate by drastically reshaping their programs to increase edTPA scores. In one instance, student teaching placements are changed so that students will be in a single school for all major placements—professional development for cooperating teachers geared to edTPA requirements as well as students being required to complete a full mock edTPA prior to completing the task itself (Burns, Henry, & Lindauer, 2015). Non-traditional teacher certification programs can play this game just like traditional teacher certification programs. Taking Georgia as an example, Georgia Professional Standards Commission states:

Beginning in Fall 2015, traditionally prepared teacher candidates will be required to earn a passing score on the edTPA before they can become eligible for an induction teaching certificate in Georgia; non-traditionally prepared candidates must earn a passing score prior to program completion. Across the state, Educator Program Providers (EPPs) are diligently

examining their curriculum and program frameworks to ensure that their candidates are prepared to complete the assessment successfully. (GaPSC, 2014)

Regardless traditional or non-traditional teacher certifications programs, teacher candidates need to pass edTPA. If feedback and measures from university faculty, school principals, and classroom teachers no longer matter and teacher candidates' performance in universities do not count, there is no need for teacher candidates to go through traditional teacher preparation. By passing edTPA, teacher candidates in non-traditional teacher certification programs can become certified teachers faster than those in traditional teacher certification programs. They can also save more tuition and fees than their counterparts in traditional teacher certification programs.³²

Impact 8. Educational Inequities in Higher Education

edTPA and its implementation magnifies existing inequities and promotes dishonesty. Inconsistent guidelines, the lack of accountability, the focus on passing and not improvement, the heavy writing requirement, and the online submission are just some of the factors that foster inequity and dishonesty. Teacher candidates with cultural capital such as access to expert peers, teachers, or to the work of their predecessors have advantages of those with fewer connections. Those who commute to campus or have part-time jobs may have fewer resources at their disposal than those living in residence. Teacher candidates whose colleges provide more extensive and intensive training have an advantage over those in colleges that do not have the resources to invest in test preparation on top of their core functions.

Similar educational inequities in p-12 schools also occur when on-campus faculty and field supervisors have different interpretations of what help they can offer (Ratner & Kolman, 2016), leaving some students with little help and others receiving assistance that is clearly beyond what SCALE deems acceptable. Students in alternative routes or on-line programs, who have little contact with faculty, may be particularly vulnerable.

Faculty members are limited to use the SCALE/Pearson official website to prepare teacher candidates with edTPA. However, the website *PassedTPA* (<http://www.passedtpa.com/>), generally considered as the “most helpful” website by teacher candidates across the nation, actually prepares teacher candidates on how to prepare a successful edTPA portfolio. This phenomenon indicates that teacher educators are undermined when teacher candidates pay thousands of dollars in college tuition and fees, yet feel better prepared by a free website. Or worse, they turn to *Teachers Pay Teachers* which have edTPA submissions for sale, or even worse, approach the services that offer to write the entire edTPA on their behalf (Dover & Schultz, 2016).

The issue of accountability and the potential for cheating are problematic. When teacher candidates have to complete other mandated state content testing, they must report to a facility and have two forms of identification. If not, they are not allowed to take the exam. There is no such verification with edTPA. There is no way to know if a teacher candidate is submitting their own work. It could be argued that the video prevents submitting someone else's work. However, teacher candidates can merely mirror the edTPA portfolio they have purchased. Teacher candidates can also employ others to write their edTPA submissions. There is no oversight for this form of cheating. Even researchers who are optimistic about teaching performance assessments are concerned

32. As of July 1, 2020, Georgia no longer requires the edTPA.

that the use of these tests as an accountability measure in a political context can reduce their authenticity and ability to improve instruction (Meuwissen & Chopin, 2015; Wei & Pecheone, 2010). There is a strong potential for candidates to focus on gaming the test situation in order to pass the test, rather than improve their practice through full engagement.

Further, there is no oversight in other forms of assistance. Family members, close friends, or trustful colleagues who are experienced teachers or have already passed edTPA are particularly helpful to these teacher candidates. Those who are the first generation to go to college or do not know people who have passed edTPA do not have access to free assistance in editing the portfolios. In addition, the edTPA costs teacher candidates \$300 to take the first time, which is in addition to the costs of additional certification tests and of the certification process itself. The time demands of edTPA mean that some students have to forego income in order to complete it (Greenblatt, 2018). Students who fail the edTPA the first time around have to pay one hundred dollars per section that they re-submit, and given that students do not receive individualized feedback on rubric items, this choice amounts to a gamble on their parts. Pearson stands to profit from test retake fees, reducing its incentive to make the edTPA more transparent and manageable (Singer & Thompson, 2017). In her study of the edTPA experiences of candidates of color, Souto-Manning (2019) identified three candidates who declined to take the test, either because they were intimidated by it or concerned about videotaping children who were undocumented immigrants. This indicates that the “failure rate” of students of color may be higher than SCALE’s numbers indicate. Although the reasons for the edTPA achievement gap remain unclear, Gilbert and Kuo (2019) express concern about the risk of stereotyping in the videotaped edTPA submissions, where the teacher candidate is visible to the scorer.

Universities Examine edTPA

Several states have called for university faculty to reexamine edTPA before adopting it. Much of the work can also be found in refereed journals such as: *Critical Education, Educational Policy, Equity and Excellence Education, Social Justice, Teachers College Record, Teacher Education and Special Education, Teacher Performance Assessment and Accountability Reform, and The Education Forum*. There are states, such as Connecticut, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Vermont, in which many university faculty and administrators question the use of edTPA. In the following section, we use Vermont and Mississippi as examples.

Vermont

Several universities in Vermont collaboratively examined edTPA and have deemed edTPA as inadequate teacher performance assessments. For example, McGough, Tinkler, and Bedell’s (2019) study compared and contrasted edTPA and Vermont’s Licensure Portfolio (VLP). They point out that edTPA is expertise-based, designed and managed by measurement scholars. It requires all procedures to be coalesced precisely based on the manual and hands off control of teacher performance assessments to SCALE and Pearson. The implementation of edTPA is generic regardless of context. In contrast, VLP is judgement-based, designed and managed by practicing professionals. VLP focuses its assessment on interdependent post hoc reviews through collaborative dialogues across stakeholders. The implementation of VLP is customized, attentive to individual, institutional, community, and cultural contexts.

In addition, the validity and reliability of edTPA aims for objectivity, using psychometrics. To run statistical results, edTPA only provides numerical feedback to teacher candidates based on snapshots of one-time constructed and scripted performances to comply with indicators. Because the audience of teacher candidates in edTPA are critics of teacher education, teacher candidates' performances in edTPA become artificial, striving for what is necessary to pass. Ultimately, edTPA cultivates utilitarian and indifferent teachers. In contrast, VLP acknowledges subjectivity, contextualization, and judgement. VLP involves methods of self-assessment for continuous improvement of practices. Because the audience of teacher candidates in VLP are learners, university faculty, classroom teachers, administrators, and policy makers, their performance is authentic, seeking opportunities to grow and advocate the quality of teacher education. Ultimately, VLP cultivates virtue teachers who are willing to advance in collaboration with their mentors and peers.

Additionally, teacher candidates need to pay extra money over the top of tuition and fees to Pearson (on average \$300 to \$500 per person). edTPA's scorers are recruited and paid by Pearson, involving university faculty and p-12 educators using their regular work hours to earn extra money from Pearson (\$75 per portfolio). In contrast, teacher candidates do not need to pay any extra fees to take VLP and grading VLP is embedded in faculty workloads as part of teacher educators' responsibilities (McGough, Tinkler, and Bedell, 2019).

Mississippi

Similar efforts are also found in Mississippi. One teacher education program in Mississippi considered using edTPA, but ultimately decided against it. Like many universities, pressure from external accreditation agencies to use independent, valid, and reliable evaluation instruments, was the main reason the university considered adopting edTPA. They had seen other universities and state departments of education adopt edTPA to address accreditation requirements. The university contacted edTPA, held a series of workshops and meetings, and conducted a pilot with elementary preservice teachers in 2017. Ultimately the teacher education program decided against edTPA because of concerns over additional costs to the teacher candidates, the lack of a role for the classroom mentor teacher and university faculty in the evaluation process, and the fact that the Mississippi Department of Education indicated that it would not adopt edTPA as a licensure requirement.

Faculty in the teacher education program participated in edTPA training and in the pilot as university supervisors for seven teacher interns. In addition to the concerns above, these faculty members had concerns about academic freedom. They asked, "Who is teaching? Our faculty or edTPA?" They were concerned that adopting edTPA would result in significant changes to the nature of their education program. Creating a program that would support candidates passing edTPA would require a loss of academic freedom for both faculty and program. The program would cease to be independent and would teach students to pass edTPA, failing to consider the needs of the candidates and the schools in which they will eventually teach.

Finally, faculty members identified significant theoretical and practical differences in the way edTPA requires students to teach and the way their program prepares preservice teachers—most notably in literacy and mathematics. The faculty members felt that their current instruction was better informed by best practices and research than the requirements of edTPA. The teacher education program still had to address the external accreditation requirement for an instrument to evaluate preservice teachers and teacher interns. To address this issue, the university found another way. The state had previously adopted a statewide evaluation instrument, the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) and it was determined that the best response was for all public and

private teacher education programs to work together to establish validity and inter-rater reliability for the instrument. The teacher education program participated in these efforts.

In 2018, the Mississippi Department of Education and the teacher education programs in the state (public and private) created a statewide common assessment module for the TIAI that all interns, university supervisors, and classroom mentor teachers must pass with a score of 80%. The purpose of the assessment module is to create a common understanding of the TIAI and support rater reliability. Everyone included in the assessment process using the instrument (including interns) knows the assessment process. In short, this teacher education program chose to help modify an existing statewide assessment that all teacher education programs used rather than adopt edTPA. This satisfies the requirements of the external accrediting agency as well as allows the teacher education programs in the state to maintain independence and create programs that produce teachers that meet the needs of the schools in the state.

Conclusion

EdTPA undermines the professionalism of university faculty members, p-12 educators, and teacher candidates. Privately copyrighted materials should not be used as consequential exams for teacher licensure. Policy makers cannot allow private firms to control U.S. teacher licensure examination on a business model aimed at profit over quality (e.g., only assigning one scorer instead of multiple scorers for grading one teacher's portfolio). It is evident that edTPA treats educators as technicians, not professionals. Teacher candidates who do not follow one set of rubrics to plan, teach, and assess students cannot become teachers. The arbitrary rubrics and numerical feedback of edTPA are far insufficient to cultivate well-rounded teacher candidates to respond to today's diverse classrooms.

The edTPA promotes coercion, corruption, and cheating behaviors. With the value of education being distorted in p-20 education, it will inevitably impact society at large. We argue education must neither become a tool to secure grants like *Race to the Top* nor become an economic agenda for state governments to shift their financial burden of developing states' own, high-quality assessments for teacher candidates. The ultimate goals of teacher education are to cultivate teacher candidates who genuinely care about their students' learning and growth. Future educators should not be focusing on what to do in order to pass edTPA.

In conclusion, state governments should be involved in examining edTPA, instead of accepting the data provided by SCALE, Pearson, or national edTPA scorers. These people are either developers or seller of the instrument and have a bias of promotion. Moreover, even the most rigorous research methods cannot mediate design flaws. The "helpers" of teacher candidates' edTPA portfolios (e.g., families, friends, and online materials) have made it difficult to examine the effectiveness of the assessment tool. Therefore, the design of edTPA must be investigated and practitioners' voices from university faculty, cooperating teachers, and teacher candidates must be considered. Allowing such an important assessment to be operated by a private corporation is against the value of public education in the United States and fails many capable teacher candidates.

References

- Behizadeh, N. & Neely, A. (2018). *Testing injustice: Examine the consequential validity of edTPA*. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 51 (3-4), 242-264. [https://doi.org/ 10. 1080 /10665684.2019.1568927](https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2019.1568927)
- Bernard, C., Kaufman, D., Kohan, M., & Mitoma, G. (2019). *Confronting the edTPA in Connecticut: Recommendations for teacher candidate quality, sustainability, and empowerment*. Retrieved from <https://thedoddcenter.uconn.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/319/2019/03/Confronting-the-edTPA-in-Connecticut.pdf>
- Bullough, Jr. R. V. (2005). Being and becoming a mentor: School-based teacher educators and teacher educator identify. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 143-155.
- Burns, B. A., Henry, J. J., & Lindauer, J. R. (2015). Working together to foster candidate success on the edTPA. *Journal of Inquiry and Action in Education*, 6, (2), pp. 18-37.
- Chiu, S. (2014). edTPA: An assessment that reduces the quality of teacher education. *Teachers College, Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, 14(1), 28-30. Retrieved from <https://tesolal.columbia.edu/>
- Coloma, R. S. (2015). Students are once again number 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.
- Dover, A. G., & Schultz, B. D. (2016). Troubling the edTPA: Illusions of objectivity and rigor. *The Educational Forum*, 80(1), 95-106. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/utef20>
- Elementary Education edTPA Assessment Handbook (2018). Submission guidelines. Retrieved from <http://www.edtpa.com/>
- Feiman-Nemser, S., & Beasley, K. (2007). Discovering and sharing knowledge: Inventing a new role for cooperating teachers. In D. Carroll, H. Featherstone, J. Featherstone, S. Feiman-Nemser, & D. Roosevelt (Eds.), *Transforming teacher education: Reflections from the field* (pp. 139-160). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education press.
- Georgia Professional Standards Commission, GaPSC (2014). *edTPA fall technical assistance event supporting candidates, faculty, and P-12*. Retrieved from https://www.gapsc.com/Commission/Media/Downloads/2014_edTPA/ConferenceAgenda.pdf
- Gilbert, K. A., & Kuo, N-C. (2019). Ethical, legal, and pedagogical issues in edTPA. *Critical Education*, 10(8), 1-17. Retrieved from <http://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/criticaled/article/view/186418>
- Greenblatt, D. & O'Hara, K. E. (2015). Buyer beware: Lessons learned from edTPA implementation in New York State. *Thought & Action*, Summer, 57-67. Retrieved from <http://www.nea.org/home/1821.htm>
- Greenblatt, D. (2018). Neoliberalism and teacher certification. *Policy Futures in Education*, 16, (6), pp. 804-827.
- Kissau, S., Hart, L., & Algozzine, B. (2019). Investigating the impact of edTPA professional development on classroom practice and student teaching experience. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 70(2), pp. 102-114.
- Kuo, N. C. (2018). Revamping edTPA or considering other alternatives. *Teachers College Records*. Retrieved from <https://www.tcrecord.org/>
- McGough, D., Tinkler, B., & Bedell, C. (2019). The mismeasure of education preparation: A critique of policy narratives about teacher performance assessment. *2019 American Education*

- Research Association (AERA) Conference, Session 35.078-4, High Stakes, Suspect Scores: Teacher Quality and Performance Exams.* Retrieved from <http://www.aera.net>.
- Meuwissen, K. W. & Choppin, J. (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), <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v23.2078>.
- Meuwissen, K., Choppin, J., Cloonan, K., & Shang-Butler, H. (2016). *Teaching candidates' experiences with the edTPA as an initial certification test in New York and Washington states: Survey results from the second year of a two-year study.* [Published by the Warner School of Education, University of Rochester]
- Othman, B. L., Robinson, R., & Molfenter, N. F. (2017). Emerging issues with consequential use of the edTPA: Overall and through a special education lens. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 40(4), 269-277. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406417718251>
- Parkes, K. A. & Powell, S. R. (2015). Is the edTPA the right choice for evaluating teacher readiness? *Arts Education Policy Review*, 116, 103-113. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/vaep20>
- Price, T. A. (2016). Curricular reflections in the USA: Teaching teachers the edTPA. *Euro-JCS*, 3(1), 377-386.
- Ratner, A. R. & Kolman, J. S. (2016). Breakers, benders, and obeyers: Inquiring into teacher educators' mediation of edTPA. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24(35), 1-26.
- Reagan, E. M., Schram, T., McCurdy, K., Chang, T., & Evans, C. (2016). Politics of policy: Assessing the implementation, impact, and evolution of the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) and edTPA. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 24(9). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v24.2176>
- Russell, V., & Davidson Devall, K. F. (2016). An examination of the edTPA portfolio assessment and other measures of teacher preparation and readiness. *Foreign Language Annals*, 49(3), 479-501. doi:10.1111/flan.12209
- SCALE (2019). Participation map. Retrieved from <http://edtpa.aacte.org/state-policy>
- Singer, A. & Thompson, E. (2017). *Pearson and the neo-liberal global assault on public education.* Retrieved from <https://www.huffpost.com/>
- Souto-Manning, M. (2019). "Good teaching" and "good teachers" for whom?: Critically troubling standardized and corporatized notions of quality in teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 121 (10). Retrieved from <https://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentId=22762>
- Wei, R. C., & Pecheone, R. (2010). Assessment for learning in preservice teacher education: Performance-based assessments. In M. Kennedy (Ed.), *Teacher Assessment and the Quest for Teacher Quality*, pp. 69-132. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Young, J. R., Bullough Jr., R. V., Draper, R. J., Smith, L. K., & Erickson, L. B. (2005). Novice teacher growth and personal models of mentoring: Choosing compassion over inquiry. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 13(2), 169-188.
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 89-99.

Louise Ammentorp, is an Associate Professor of Elementary and Early Childhood Education at The College of New Jersey. Her teaching and research focus on school-university partnerships and best practice in the clinical experiences of preservice teachers. She is also interested in innovation

in teacher preparation and p-6 classrooms, with a focus on the integration of nature and the arts in the curriculum, and outdoor education.

Kenneth V. Anthony, is an Associate Professor of Social Studies at Mississippi State University. His research is on rural education, preservice teachers' knowledge and ability to teach social studies disciplines, using primary sources in the classroom, and homeschooling.

Stuart Carroll, is an Associate Professor of Elementary and Early Childhood Education at The College of New Jersey. His research is on the meaning that preservice teachers make of their field experiences and associated assignments, including the edTPA.

Nai-Cheng Kuo, is an Associate Professor of Teacher Education and Special Education at Augusta University. Her research interest includes teacher quality, quality of teaching, and educational policies.