

Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium (TPAC) Fall 2011

MAJOR CHANGES TO TPAC HANDBOOKS

The Stanford team (Andrea Whittaker, Kendyll Stansbury, Nicole Merino, and Ray Pecheone) has completed revisions to the pilot test handbooks. We took into consideration feedback from faculty and candidates, content reviews overseen by Pearson, reviews from NCATE Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) as well as input from the national Design team and content pedagogy experts. The following is a summary of the major changes from the pilot to the field test versions.

Format

- Suggestions from the national Design Team enriched the conceptual focus/purpose for the assessment and reduced redundancy.
- Content Reviews and critiques from NCATE SPAs suggested improvements to the subject-specific focus of each handbook as well as language from teaching standards from these professional associations.
- Hard copy handbooks were reconceptualized as interactive electronic versions that offer candidates more options for navigating through the handbook, with links from the overview chart and also within tasks to allow candidates to easily navigate through the handbook according to their own preferences and purposes.
- Words in the Glossary are linked to the definitions through mouseovers the first time the word appears in each task.
- The rubric was redesigned from a 4-point to a 5-point rubric, with Levels 1-3 of the new rubric usually representing Levels 1-2 of the 4-point rubric. This is to better distinguish the performances that were formerly borderline between Levels 1 and 2.
- There is a new section on Professional Responsibilities to explain why candidates need to remove all names that would identify individuals or institutions, obtain permissions for the videos, and cite sources of materials. We also invite them to collaborate with other educators.
- The structure of a Purpose and What Do I Need to Do? and Commentary Prompts framework to structure each task was changed to What to Think About, What Do I Need to Do? and What Do I Need to Write? framework. The new What to Think About section provides both the purpose and how to prepare for the task, with thinking about students and their learning at the center of each task.
- There are submission templates and page limits for commentaries to standardize them for review, with some commentaries including additional page limits for attached artifacts.
- Commentary prompts were revised to correspond more closely to the rubrics.
- Commentary prompts were restructured so that multi-part questions do not have a question in the stem, in addition to questions in each part.

Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium (TPAC) Fall 2011

MAJOR CHANGES TO TPAC HANDBOOKS

Planning Task

- The number of pages for artifacts to be submitted is limited to a maximum of 5 pages of instructional materials per lesson.
- The justification of plans was moved from the first to the second planning rubric.
- Benchmarks and criteria were dropped from the third planning rubric.

Instruction Task

- Instruction rubrics have a clear focus on features of subject specific pedagogy.
- The two rubrics are more distinctly focused and less overlapping/redundant than previously.
- There is a new requirement for evidence of opportunities for students to use the targeted academic language and for candidates to analyze the effectiveness of language supports. This evidence can be provided in the video clip(s) or in the student work samples in the Assessment task. Candidates have a choice between these two tasks to present their evidence.
- Analysis of successes and missed opportunities was dropped from the first instruction rubric, but could be used in the new Analysis of Teaching task.
- The first bullet in the first instruction rubric was divided into two bullets, with one focusing on strategies for engaging students, and the other focused on links from prior learning and experience to new learning.

Assessment Task

- The two focus students must now be chosen from among the three students whose work samples illustrated common themes with respect to understanding across the class.
- There is a new requirement for evidence of opportunities for students to use the targeted academic language and for candidates to analyze the effectiveness of language supports. This evidence can be provided within the student work samples if not provided in the video clip(s) in the Instruction task.
- The second assessment rubric was simplified by just stating level 1 descriptors for things that didn't change from Levels 2-4, e.g., the next steps had to be detailed enough to understand them.

Analyzing Teaching (formerly Retrospective Reflection) Task

- The Daily Reflections were dropped, upon feedback that most candidates do not write them daily, so the task represents their retrospective analysis as much as daily reflections.
- The retrospective reflection task was revised and renamed Analyzing Teaching. Candidates are to take notes using the former prompts for the daily reflections in any format they choose, and to use those notes to describe 2-3 changes they would make to improve instruction if they could teach the learning segment over, and justify why they believe that the changes would improve student outcomes.
- The new rubric has two big ideas: 1) the relationship of proposed changes to the standards & objectives and the variety of student needs addressed; and 2) support for proposed changes from evidence from teaching and learning in the learning segment reported by the candidate.

**Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium (TPAC)
Fall 2011**

MAJOR CHANGES TO TPAC HANDBOOKS

Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium (TPAC) Fall 2011

MAJOR CHANGES TO TPAC HANDBOOKS

Academic Language

- The focus was reduced to a key language demand that recurs throughout the learning segment, with closer ties between academic language and language demands and subject-specific learning.
- The academic language framework was simplified to language functions, language forms, vocabulary and instructional language (e.g., so students understand what they are expected to do when the teacher asks them to “Think-Pair-Share” or “Explicate a passage...”).
- The first academic language rubric was revised to reflect the new framework.
- The justification of strategies was changed to justification of the language demand chosen in terms of the content and student language development, and moved from the second academic language to the first.
- The second academic language rubric was split into two rubrics (Rubric 11 and Rubric 12). Rubric 11 evaluates the support candidates provide for students to develop and use academic language associated with the key language demand and learning outcomes. Rubric 12 examines the extent to which the candidate identifies evidence that students understand and use the academic language focus of the learning segment.
- The justification of instructional strategies in the second academic language rubric was replaced by evidence from either the video clip(s) or the student work samples that students had an opportunity to use the targeted academic language in ways that support their language development and content learning.