

Oregon Local Assessment Option Framework

A Guide for Oregon Educator Preparation Providers
Submitting a Local Assessment Option (LAO)



Table of Contents

Framework Overview.....	2
Acknowledgements.....	2
Definition	2
The Purpose of this Document	3
Scope.....	3
Assessment Procedures	4
The EPP will provide TSPC with the following evidence	4
Assessment Design Procedures Components.....	4
Assessment Implementation Components.....	4
Assessment Review Components	5
Reliability.....	5
The EPP will provide TSPC with the following evidence	5
Quality Evaluation Instruments Components	5
Scorer Selection Components.....	6
Scorer Training and Calibration Components	6
Assessment Components.....	7
The EPP will provide TSPC with the following evidence	7
Knowledge of Students and the Instructional Setting.	7
Learning Environment.....	8
Planning a Coherent, Research-based Instructional Experience.	8
Instruction.	9
Learning Analysis.....	9
Professional Responsibilities Reflection.....	9
TSPC Assurance Procedures.....	10
Procedures for submission and review of the Local Assessment Option (LAO).....	10

Framework Overview

Acknowledgements

In 2021, House Bill (HB) 3354 eliminated the requirement for teacher candidates to take and pass the edTPA prior to applying for teacher licensure. HB 3354 requires approved preparation programs to ensure that the candidate demonstrates the knowledge, skills, and competencies required by law, in addition to requiring teacher preparation programs to implement a procedure for evaluating and recommending candidates aligned with the recommended process developed by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC). Using this non-edTPA option for candidates does not preclude the TSPC waivers or multiple measures options currently available to EPPs.

Teacher Standards and Practices Commission would like to express its sincere appreciation to the following workgroup members their participation in the creation of the Oregon Local Assessment Option Framework: Dr. Aaron Imig (Corban University), Dr. Julie Kalnin (University of Portland), Dr. Katie Vincent (Warner Pacific University), Dr. Kendra Duncan (University of Oregon), Dr. Kristi Wheaton (George Fox University), Dr. Marie LeJeune (Western Oregon University), Dr. Melissa Peibly (Portland State University), and, Dr. Rae Ette Newman (Eastern Oregon University) for providing ongoing expertise and support for this work to be accomplished. Developed in collaboration with these eight Oregon Educator Preparation Providers (EPPs), and to be piloted by Oregon EPPs including K-12 partner feedback, during the 2022-23 academic year, this Framework serves as a preliminary draft to be re-evaluated at the end of the 2023 academic year by the original workgroup who created the Framework.

Update: June of 2023 the workgroup members reviewed data submitted by EPPs who participated in the pilot. The Framework was approved as is. Feedback on the TSPC created template for submission of the Local Assessment included some minor edits.

Note: The first two years of use of an EPP developed Local Assessment Option (LAO) is considered a pilot of the instrument, and the candidates' scores are non-consequential. Refer to the Procedures section of this document for more details.

Definition

The Oregon Local Assessment Option (LAO) is an application-focused, multi-faceted, contextualized, and authentic measure of a teacher candidate's ability to plan, implement, and assess instruction; embedding research-based pedagogical practices that reflect the knowledge, skills, and critical dispositions of a professional educator. The purpose of this assessment is to

ensure a candidate's readiness to provide meaningful instruction for PreK-12 students with diverse learning needs.

The Purpose of this Document

The purpose of this document is to serve as the framework for Oregon Educator Preparation Providers (EPPs) in the creation of their local teacher performance assessment option as required by HB 3354 and Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 584-400-0120. The EPP must make all Local Assessment Option (LAO) materials available to the Commission for review and approval, including materials that are proprietary to the EPP. This Local Assessment Option Framework is divided into four sections, (1) Assessment Procedures, (2) Reliability, (3) Assessment Components, and (4) TSPC Assurance Procedures. Sections 1-3 align with the Local Teacher Performance Assessment Option Submission Template. All Oregon EPPs must have their LAO aligned to this Framework, submitted to, and approved by TSPC prior to use with their teacher candidates.

Scope

The InTASC standards articulate core expectations for knowledge, skills, and dispositions in four domains of teaching. An Oregon Local Assessment Option must include components that clearly address the following domains and each of their associated standards:

Domain I. Learner and Learning

Standard 1: Learner Development

Standard 2: Learning Differences

Standard 3: Learning Environments

Domain II. Content Knowledge

Standard 4: Content Knowledge

Standard 5: Application of Content

Domain III. Instructional Practice

Standard 6: Assessment

Standard 7: Planning for Instruction

Standard 8: Instructional Strategies

The fourth InTASC domain – Professional Responsibility – may be included in the LAO but is not required.

The definition of an Oregon (LAO) emphasizes the importance of complex demonstrations of teaching. A LAO will, therefore, include components that address multiple InTASC domains and allow the candidate to apply their knowledge and skills in an authentic instructional situation. EPP course-based assessments that are independent of the clinical experience do not meet the guidelines of the framework. Refer to the Requirements section of this document for more details.

Assessment Procedures

The EPP will provide TSPC with the following evidence

Assessment Design Components

- a. PreK-12 partners are involved in reviewing and providing feedback on the TPA tasks.
- b. A content review is carried out to ensure the tasks are sensitive to cultural and linguistic differences and are fair for candidates from diverse backgrounds.
- c. Accommodations must be made for Bilingual candidates who are teaching in a language other than English as determined by the EPP. The accommodations may include but are not limited to, assistance with transcription of materials/video(s)/student work, that are submitted in a language other than English.
- d. Multi-level scoring rubrics are developed and communicated to candidates, faculty, and EPP supervisors.
- e. The EPP will develop multi-level scoring rubrics and assessor training procedures that focus primarily on teaching performance and that minimize the effects of candidate factors that are not clearly related to pedagogical competence, which may include (depending on the circumstances) factors such as personal attire, appearance, demeanor, speech patterns and accents, or any other bias that are not likely to affect job effectiveness and/or student learning.
- f. A process for establishing a cut score based on piloting of the tasks is outlined. PreK-12 partners are involved in establishing expected levels of proficiency. The EPP ensures equitable expectations so that standards for candidates represent adequate preparation for an entry-level teacher.

Assessment Implementation Components

- g. Faculty are oriented to assessment tasks and scoring rubrics to support curriculum alignment (initially and whenever the tasks change).
- h. Candidates are prepared for the assessment, with information about the tasks, scoring rubrics, submission processes and scoring procedures.

- i. Clear guidelines for acceptable/unacceptable levels of support are established and communicated to candidates, cooperating teachers (CTs), mentors, and EPP supervisors. These guidelines will include accommodations that preserve assessment validity while addressing issues of access for candidates with disabilities, learning needs, language supports, and others as identified.
- j. Candidates are provided with scoring results within three weeks of the submission of a task.
- k. The intended uses of the assessment (formative, summative, consequential) and implications of that use are clearly communicated.
- l. A retake policy must be established for candidates who do not meet the EPP determined cut score on the LAO, with clear guidance about the requirements, submission, and scoring process for the retake.

Assessment Review Components

- m. Score results are disaggregated (at minimum by inTASC domain 1-3 or standards 1-8) and are shared with faculty and EPP supervisors to support continuous improvement.
- n. Pass rates are periodically examined and disaggregated to determine they are equitable across student groups. A process for revising the assessment or preparation for it is outlined to remediate inequities.
- o. Feedback from teacher candidates will be considered in assessment review.
- p. The training of scorers is periodically evaluated to gather feedback for continuous improvement and interrater reliability.
- q. An annual report of candidates, scores, pass rates and appeals will be submitted to TSPC.

Reliability

The EPP will provide TSPC with the following evidence

Quality Evaluation Instruments Components

How has the EPP engaged in content review of their scoring criteria to ensure validity and fairness?

- r. In annual review, each EPP will explain how they ensured rubrics are clear and equitable.

- s. Have school partners (other EPPs and/or public/private-school partners) review rubrics for clarity (e.g., Lawshe method).
- t. Review rubrics after pilot study use for refinement and improvement; report changes and updates in annual review to TSPC.

Scorer Selection Components

What is the process that the EPP has followed to select qualified scorers?

- u. Ensuring that the scorer is a qualified individual as evaluated by the EPP (Ex: teaching/administrative license, content specialist and/or the EPP has evidence of qualification to score).
- v. Ensuring that the scorer is not the supervisor, or anyone directly involved in the student teaching placement or in lieu of this, develop a system for selected double scoring (ex, minimum 20 percent of sample). Rationale: in certain single subject areas or in areas like bilingual placements, an EPP may have a limited pool of additional scorers. Using back scoring can help make sure scoring is reliable.

Scorer Training and Calibration Components

How has the EPP trained scorers?

- w. Describing and documenting that all scorers have passed the established training, reported in annual review.
- x. Require annual training for new scorers and refresher training for returning scorers.

How has the EPP established inter-rater reliability? (Calibrated the scoring process)

- y. Having a qualification process with practice scoring and recalibration.
- z. Selective backreading and analysis (see recommendation above for minimum of 20 percent).
- aa. Post pilot: recommend training using actual past student samples.

How has the EPP assured that scoring is fair/unbiased?

These are options that an EPP could use when establishing their proposal protocols to TSPC,

- ab. Double scoring a random selection of submissions to check for interrater agreement (recommend 20 percent minimum and using blind scoring for the double scores).
- ac. Second scorer when the initial score is at or near the cut score.
- ad. Offering opportunities for other stakeholders to apply to score, if EPP chooses (ex: clinical teachers).

- ae. Allowing partnerships across EPPs to exchange submissions for scoring if desired.
- af. Creating a process for scoring fairly the retake submissions
- ag. Ensuring that this is not the original scorer
- ah. Blind scoring by a new scorer
- ai. Allowed to rework existing samples

Assessment Components

The EPP will provide TSPC with the following evidence

The Oregon Local Assessment Option (LAO) framework takes a systemic approach that emphasizes the importance of establishing equitable, culturally sustaining learning environments, and ensuring candidates are coordinating practices across key settings to enhance all students' social, emotional, and academic learning. While a diverse range of assessment practices can be supported by the framework, the performance assessment must incorporate elements that require candidates to demonstrate their ability to:

- a. Gather knowledge about students and the instructional setting and apply those understandings to planning, instruction and assessment purposefully,
- b. Integrate research-based practices and learning theories meaningfully in planning, teaching, and assessing a coherent learning experience of at least three consecutive lessons, and
- c. Analyze student learning outcomes and reflect on instructional experiences to strengthen future opportunities for student learning.

Each requirement is described in detail below.

Knowledge of Students and the Instructional Setting. Domain 1 (Standards 1, 2, 3) and Domain 3 (Standard 7)

- a. Candidates demonstrate a deep understanding of their students' learning needs incorporating multiple sources of data. This data can include observations, work samples, information collected from families, etc. and should be responsive to language and culture.

- b. Candidates identify the strengths and needs of all students in the focus classroom and provide specific evidence of how student strengths and needs shape instructional and assessment decisions. The identification of student needs and strengths may include:
- Students who are part of traditionally underserved educational groups
 - Students learning English as an additional language
 - Students receiving services under an IEP/504 plan
 - Students identified as Talented and Gifted (TAG)
 - Students needing targeted social-emotional support

Learning Environment. Domain 1 (Standard 3)

- c. Candidates develop a profile of the community, school, and classroom and provide evidence that this profile guides planning, instruction and assessment. Candidates should provide an analysis of the learning environment that identifies potential barriers and supports that impact student learning. These may include available resources such as technology, instructional grouping, required curricula, support staff, etc.

Planning a Coherent, Research-based Instructional Experience. Domains 1 (Standards 1, 2 and 3), Domain 2 (Standard 5) and Domain 3 (Standards 6, 7, and 8)

- d. Single-subject candidates must design a coherent instructional experience that demonstrates accurate content knowledge and integrates relevant pedagogical content knowledge.
- e. Multiple-subject candidates must design a coherent instructional experience that addresses both mathematics and literacy, demonstrates accurate content knowledge and integrates relevant pedagogical content knowledge. * *The EPP can determine how the candidate demonstrates competency in these areas; demonstrate in both content areas or in an integrated unit.*
- f. Special Education teacher candidates must design a coherent instructional experience that addresses both academic and functional/communication objectives, demonstrates accurate content knowledge and integrates relevant pedagogical content knowledge.
- g. The candidate will provide evidence of instruction in a setting related to their context and licensing area. The candidate is required to design an instructional approach tailored to students with a diverse range of learning needs utilizing the principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) in their planning, instruction, and assessment practices.
- h. The candidate will demonstrate cultural competency by incorporating the personal, social, and cultural strengths of learners in the classroom relative to the content being taught. The candidate will demonstrate attention to the role of language in learning (planning and instruction). This would include academic/disciplinary literacy for all

students, and specific approaches to supporting emergent bilinguals and any other students who need directed language support to access course content.

Instruction. Domain 1, (Standard 3) 2 (Standard 5) and Domain 3 (Standard 8)

The LAO must provide evidence of effective instruction. This evidence may include:

- h. A video, audio, or transcript of a structured debrief of an observation between the candidate and the EPP supervisor. The candidate will provide written reflection on the feedback.

OR

- i. A video of teaching with candidate commentary. The length of the recording may be specified by the EPP, but a structured feedback form and reflection must be included.

Learning Analysis. Domain 1 (Standard 1) and Domain 3 (Standards 6 & 8)

- j. The candidate must demonstrate the ability to purposefully assess student learning of instructional objectives and/or goals. Artifacts could include:

- Lesson Plans
- Copies of assessments/rubrics/scoring
- Checklists
- Task analyses
- Video clips

- k. The candidate must provide description and analysis of student learning outcomes, what the candidate learned from those data, and how they will use this information to improve future learning experiences. Artifacts could include:

- Pre assessments
- Formative assessment cycle(s)
- Summative assessment(s)
- Student work samples
- Descriptive evidence of student learning
- Interpretation of student learning gains
- Disaggregated analyses (e.g., narrative, graph, table, chart, or spreadsheet)

Professional Responsibilities Reflection. (Optional) Domain 4 (Standards 9, 10)

- l. The candidate may provide a narrative that could include a reflection and evaluation of:

- Their practice, particularly the effects of their choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts to practice to meet the needs of each learner,

- Their receptivity to feedback and constructive criticism, or
- Their role as a professional who collaborates with learners, families, colleagues, and other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.

TSPC Assurance Procedures

Procedures for submission and review of the Local Assessment Option (LAO)

- TSPC will review and approve EPP proposed LAO using the established Framework prior to use with their teacher candidates.
- The EPP will submit their LAO to TSPC for review using the Local Teacher Performance Assessment Submission Template.
- The EPP may submit their LAO to TSPC for review by June 1st to be considered for fall and November 1st to be considered for spring.
- EPPs will report LAO data including but not limited to, candidate scores, pass rates, appeals, and feedback from PreK-12 partners, in their annual TSPC report using the template that will be provided.
- EPPs must justify that the process determining the cut score of their instrument(s) was a reliable, fair, and equitable process.
- If the EPP LAO does not meet the guidelines set forth in this Framework, TSPC will provide feedback to the EPP for modification and resubmission until the LAO is approved.
- A minimum of two cycles of LAO data will be required in the annual report.
- The EPP will submit to TSPC a copy of or a link to their LAO, any scoring guides, and rubrics in their annual report.
- If modifications have been made to the EPP LAO after TSPC approval, the changes must be clearly noted in the annual report. A process for revising the assessment or preparation for it is outlined to remediate inequities.

Sources

The workgroup consulted and used, with permission, design elements articulated by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. We are grateful for this professional generosity.

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (2021). California teaching performance assessment design standards. Retrieved from https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/tpa-files/tpa-assessment-design-standards.pdf?sfvrsn=2e393153_15