

Teaching New Dogs New Tricks
Teacher Leadership in the Performance Assessment
for California Teachers (PACT)

Chase Nordengren
University of Washington

Much of the political tension in American education surrounds, directly or indirectly, questions about the nature of teaching as a profession. Institutions that work with teachers and teaching, from school districts to unions to preparation programs, find themselves under enormous pressure to define who teachers ought to be and what capabilities they ought hold, before outside forces define those ideas for them. Still, consensus is hard to find. The political problems faced by teacher education programs are “exacerbated by a lack of consensus in the profession about internal quality control” (Darling-Hammond, 2010b, p. 38). While other professions “manage reform” through mandatory accreditation and licensing, teaching does not control or require its own process of accrediting preparation programs or licensing teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2010b, p. 38).

Two movements in particular now wrestle in this tense space. Advocates of teacher performance assessments (TPAs), a set of formative and summative assessment tools for teacher candidates, argue the promotion of more complex instruments of evaluation can better shape and inform a public understanding of the complex nature of teaching and learning. Simultaneously, advocates and scholars of teacher leadership increasingly recognize how leadership includes a diverse set of changing skills and sets of knowledge. This article examines these movements at

Chase Nordengren is an instructor in the College of Education at the University of Washington, Seattle, Washington. chasen@uw.edu

their intersection, exploring how a common teacher performance assessment—the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT)—understands and evaluates skills for teacher leadership. Understanding the importance of training teachers to work together with and through adults, this study finds gaps in PACT’s focus on how teachers interact with one another, socially transmitting norms of professional practice.

Questions

This article poses the following questions:

1. How do summative evaluation documents for the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) describe working with and through colleagues?
2. How do those documents represent the concept of teacher leadership present in academic work on school leadership?

The Role of Teacher Performance Assessments

Interest in teacher performance assessments (TPAs) as an alternative to traditional standardized tests of teacher knowledge is once again increasing. TPAs, such as Connecticut’s now-defunct Beginning Educator Support and Training (BEST) or California’s PACT, ask candidates to gather or retain documentation of the first two years of their teaching (BEST) or their student teaching (PACT)—often lesson plans, videos, or similar materials—and submit these, along with other written materials, to judgment by evaluators. Proponents highlight the use of TPA data “to flag program needs, guide improvements, and track progress” (Darling-Hammond, 2010a, p. 23), promises similar to those advanced by proponents of portfolio-based assessment and work sample analysis before them. Additionally, they argue shifting to a process with a greater interpretive emphasis plays a role in shifting the professional emphasis of teacher preparation away from rote standardization (Darling-Hammond & Hyler, 2013).

PACT’s rapid development and broad support made it among the first statewide and state-mandated teacher performance assessments (Merino & Pecheone, 2013, p. 3). PACT includes two major components. A formative evaluation component—“Embedded Signature Assessments”—occurs within and is designed by preparation programs individually to provide candidates continual feedback. A summative component—the “Teaching Event”—is standardized across PACT institutions, and plays a role in final assessment of candidates for certification (Merino & Pecheone,

2013, p. 6). In the teaching event, candidates gather records of their practice and outcomes over a “segment” that includes roughly three to five teaching experiences. Records include lesson plans, teacher assignments, daily reflections, adaption of lessons, video clips of instruction, evidence of student learning, and reflective commentaries of instructional practices (Merino & Pecheone, 2013, p. 6). These artifacts are scored, using rubrics, on five major dimensions emphasized by PACT: planning, instruction, assessment, reflection, and teaching academic language (Darling-Hammond, 2010a, p. 17). Rubrics are scored on a 1-4 scale, where levels 2-4 indicate passing performance, and Level 4 is reserved for exceptional teaching (Merino & Pecheone, 2013, p. 9). California’s state credentialing agency requires reviewers to focus on teaching performance expectations (TPEs) in scoring, and precludes a focus on any other elements of teachers’ work. Trained raters evaluate individual candidates, and programs receive aggregated data by subject area and dimension of teaching (Darling-Hammond, 2010a, p. 17).

PACT’s assessment component has successfully passed several measures of validity and reliability, including high inter-rater reliability and tests that suggest it is largely free of discriminatory impact among teaching candidates of color (Pecheone & Chung, 2006). Based on this presumed success, a national coalition (TPAC), including five early adopter states and organizations like the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education and Council of Chief State School Officers (Hill et al., 2011, p. 19), are now implementing a national instrument (edTPA) based on PACT’s emphases and design. Following PACT’s example, edTPA will likely set the tone for the priorities of teacher preparation programs for decades to come.

While PACT sits alongside the development of other performance assessments of student teachers, such as the newly developed pre-service portfolio complimenting the Praxis exam, research on PACT past the instrument’s piloting stage is relatively slim. Quantitative studies during this period find high inter-rater reliability for PACT (Riggs, Verdi, & Arlin, 2009) and, among 14 first- and second-year teachers, assessment scores that significantly predict improved teacher value-added scores (Newton, 2010). A qualitative study finds positive relationships between PACT scores and instructional abilities in mathematics (Van Es & Conroy, 2009). Qualitative evidence also suggests that some programs involved in the development of PACT have successfully used the assessment to advance internal professional development, particularly highlighting areas where programs could do better (Peck & McDonald, 2013, p. 15).

Still, PACT’s development into a model for a national assessment has occurred rapidly, before a large body of research has grown on how PACT

affects teacher preparation programs or other policy efforts to develop stronger professional interactions among teachers. This is particularly true of any changes to PACT that have occurred since the pilot stage, or any major revisions that may come with edTPA. Some programs may not share PACT's particular emphases. Sandholtz and Shea (2011), using a sample of one PACT participating university's scores over two years, find the majority of preparation program instructors are incapable of successfully predicting PACT scores, particularly among the lowest and highest scoring candidates. Research to date has paid little attention, and perhaps has had too little time to attend to, how implementation of PACT relates to other policies designed to improve professional environments or promote the spread of knowledge in schools.

Teacher Leadership

The development of performance assessments has run parallel to another movement emphasizing teacher professionalization and the codification of a base of knowledge and skills for teachers: teacher leadership. Increasingly, the educational leadership field recognizes that many staff members within schools, including those not formally designated as leaders, can perform leadership or serve in leadership capacities (Harris, 2003, p. 318). As York-Barr and Duke (2004) write:

Sometimes teachers serve in formal leadership positions, such as union representatives, department heads, curriculum specialists, mentors, or members of a site-based management team. At other times, leadership is demonstrated in informal ways, such as coaching peers to resolve instructional problems, encouraging parent participation, working with colleagues in small groups and teams, modeling reflective practice, or articulating a vision for improvement. (p. 263)

Understanding these practices better is a tool not only for properly valuing the work teachers already do, but also for preparing teachers to conduct these roles more effectively.

Harris's work focuses on how leadership is defined and where it is located. "Leadership is part of the interactive process of sense-making and creation of meaning that is continuously engaged in by organisational members" (Harris, 2003, p. 314). While this idea appears fuzzy, creating meaning for members of the organization is critical to many of central values of teaching, including examining "perceptions, values, beliefs, information, and assumptions," as well as generating new ideas (Harris, 2003, p. 314). As the profession of teaching looks to codify its own conceptions of what it is, the profession must carefully consider how it defends and defines the work of teacher leaders.

From these ideas, Harris identifies four dimensions of teacher leadership (Harris, 2003). Teacher leaders should do the following:

Translate principles of school improvement into individual classrooms and individual practices, often the “means” of school improvement (the “broker”);

Promote and participate in teacher collaboration around problems of practice and school improvement (the “participant”);

Position themselves as sources of expertise and information on teaching and learning (the “mediator”);

And, forge close relationships with colleagues that emphasize mutual learning (the “learner”). (p. 316)

Though these terms are unique to Harris, the concepts identified are comparable to other work in teacher leadership, which emphasizes similar ideas to different extents (Silva, Gimbert & Nolan, 2000; York-Barr & Duke, 2004; Murphy, 2005). York-Barr and Duke understand teacher leadership efforts broadly as focused on “reculturing” schools in order to maximize teachers’ instructional tools (p. 260). Murphy synthesizes several dimensional frameworks for teacher work as encompassing two main emphases: helping and supporting fellow teachers and facilitating school improvement. Most importantly, while effective teaching is the most important pre-requisite for effective teacher leadership, teacher leadership is ultimately collaborative, community anchored, and part of a co-learning process between and among adults (Murphy, 2005).

The potentially informal nature of teacher leadership is essential. Teacher leadership scholars do not imagine that all teacher leaders are appointed to formal leadership roles, nor that their leadership practice begins after substantive training in addition to their teacher preparation and experience. Rather, they identify a real phenomenon in schools in which many teachers, with various levels of training and experience, engage in leadership activities with one another as the school’s needs and their own interests demand. While these activities may not take central roles in teacher preparation, student teaching, or initial teacher certification or assessment, they are, teacher leadership scholars believe, essential elements of teaching as a profession.

While the newest teachers may have little experience or authority to draw on as leaders, they also draw on a unique energy that can facilitate dramatic positive change. Additionally, as teacher leadership is increasingly practiced as a process of collaborative learning, at least some form of leadership practice is necessary to participate in a professional community at all. Despite the relative silence of teacher preparation

literature on leadership issues (Murphy, 2005), incoming teachers are vital to the growth of teacher leadership. Ideas about school improvement frequently come from those with the freedom from constraint that comes from newly approaching a career. As teacher preparation programs prepare innovative new instructional approaches, particularly for marginalized or otherwise disempowered students, their graduates are perhaps primarily responsible for acting as experts on these approaches, forming relationships with colleagues to supplement their existing training, and working with colleagues and school leaders on school improvement.

InTASC, a consortium of state educational agencies, national educational organizations, and the Council of Chief State School Officers, also recognizes the central role of teacher leadership in its Model Core Teaching Standards (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2013). Standard 10 calls on teachers to seek “appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning” (p. 45). The standard recognizes, as leadership activities, taking an active role on an instruction team, jointly planning and facilitating learning, building shared vision and culture, collaborating with students’ families, building community resources, engaging in professional learning, using technology, generating meaningful research on educational issues and policies, modeling effective practice, enacting system change, and taking on advocacy roles at all levels (CCSSO, 2013). The standard progresses gradually from expecting participation on an instructional team and gathering information on student learning at Level 1 toward introducing innovative practices and advocating for continual improvement at Level 3 (CCSSO, 2013). Although early career teachers may begin at Level 1, the progression of the standards illustrates one path through which teachers may use a leadership role with varying degrees of authority over time. In the standard, InTASC makes a direct link between classroom activities and the “frame factors” (Lundgren, 1972) of education; classroom practices, policies and politics, and research all play a part in taking responsibility for contributing to and advancing the profession (CCSSO, 2013, p. 5).

Working with other adults in the types of activities described by the leadership literature also shapes the goals of professionalization and non-routinization advanced by TPA proponents. Professions, write Darling-Hammond and Hyler (2013), have three features: a moral commitment to the welfare of clients, a shared set of knowledge and skills, and a set of standards of professional practice that are defined, transmitted and enforced. A rigorous assessment of knowledge and skills, designed and enforced by members of the teaching profession, proposes

to advance those goals. While teacher performance assessments place the student-teacher relationship [wisely] at the center, the features of other professions also suggest teachers require strong competencies in communicating and working with other adults, particularly other teachers. Among early career teachers, these may include balancing the constraints created by a cooperating teacher, school, or district with the desire to collaborate on the design of instruction or introduce transformative practices learned in student teaching. There is growing acknowledgement in the field that working collaboratively with adults, especially in large groups, is a fundamentally different skill set than working with children (Murphy, 2005, p. 158). In this respect, teacher performance assessments can advance the professionalization of teaching not only by normalizing a process of formative and summative evaluation of preparation practices, but by emphasizing for teacher candidates the importance of joining and participating in a professional community.

Importantly, however, little work has explored leadership competencies as they manifest in student teaching and the first few years of a teacher's work. Carver and Meier (2013) find that some early career teachers doubt their level of skills or experience are sufficient to accept leadership roles, while the same teachers express a strong desire for "collegial conversation" (p. 182). Study participants also reported specific instances where veteran staff engaged in "shunning, ignoring, and blaming" tactics that limited their ability to lead (2013, p. 183). New teachers may feel pressure to take on leadership roles before they are ready in schools where resources or time are tight (Anderson & Olson, 2006). In some conceptions of leadership, it may be impossible to replace the knowledge and skills that come from experience. However, as notions of teacher leadership become more complex and driven to a greater extent by professional collegiality and conversation, the potential risks of excluding new teachers from these practices grow. Without early and frequent opportunities to practice leadership, the profession of teaching may watch its leadership skills atrophy as prepared teacher leaders exit the profession.

Method

This research uses a qualitative document analysis method to analyze rubrics and handbooks used by PACT for criteria of successful preparation for teacher leadership. PACT was selected as a teacher performance assessment for analysis in this study because of its relatively mature level of development: unlike edTPA, evaluation procedures and rubrics for the PACT assessment are finalized and publicly available on PACT's website.

The primary data sources for this study are rubrics for evaluating the PACT teaching event (updated September 6, 2013) in all subjects (Performance Assessment for California Teachers, 2013). PACT provides separate rubrics in elementary literacy and mathematics (as well as separate bilingual rubrics in both subjects), concurrent middle school specializations in literacy and mathematics, and all secondary subjects certified by the state of California. PACT also provides rubrics for assessing elementary content area tasks (CATs) in elementary history/social science and elementary science. CATs include evaluation on three elements present in other rubrics (planning, instruction, and assessment) but exclude evaluations on reflection and developing academic language. CAT rubrics were also included here. Thirty-two total rubrics were evaluated. Teaching Event Handbooks, used to prompt candidates to successfully complete parts of the assessment, were also evaluated as a source of triangulating the emphases of the assessment.

The teacher leadership literature was used to prepare a descriptive coding (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014) scheme emphasizing prompts that prepare teachers for future leadership practice. These included the four dimensions identified by Harris (2003): broker, participant, mediator, and learner. This coding was followed by an open coding procedure that focused on allowing the text to inductively indicate potential leadership behaviors (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014).

The primary limitation of this approach is a focus on the summative, rather than the formative, elements of PACT. While scoring procedures for the teaching event, which are summative, are standardized across institutions, procedures for formatively evaluating candidates throughout the program vary across campuses, though assessments developed by institutions are shared through a database (Merino & Pecheone, 2013). This study is also limited by a lack of empirical information on how preparation programs prepare teaching candidates for leadership positions apart from what is assessed by PACT. This preliminary investigation explores elements of the PACT assessment campuses share in common, thereby establishing a baseline understanding of how programs in concert reinforce and assess teacher leadership. Future research should evaluate documents in the PACT database for their attention to these topics, as well as exploring how teacher leadership is taught in preparation programs.

Findings

In general, PACT rubrics focus on leadership opportunities alongside and embedded within differentiating instruction for students with

special needs and reflecting upon that instruction; however, they do not ask candidates to communicate their instructional vision or approach to their colleagues or generally relate their own instructional choices to improvement within a school.

As artifacts, PACT's rubrics across grade level and subject differ relatively little. With some notable exceptions—in particular, the focus of rubrics in bilingual subjects on academic language proficiency in both languages and the focus of rubrics in science on safety elements of recorded science activities—rubrics in both elementary and secondary subjects use the same criteria, slightly modifying each to accommodate language on student skills candidates are required to teach. Rubrics include the following:

- Three rubrics in the “Planning” domain: Establishing a Balanced Instructional Focus, Making Content Accessible, and Designing Assessments.
- Two rubrics in the “Instruction” domain: Engaging Students in Learning, and Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction.
- Three rubrics in the “Assessment” domain: Analyzing Student Work from an Assessment, Using Assessment to Inform Teaching, and Using Feedback to Promote Student Learning.
- Two rubrics in the “Reflection” domain: Monitoring Student Progress, and Reflecting on Learning (these are not included with elementary history/social science and elementary science).
- Two rubrics in the “Academic Language” domain: Understanding Language Demands’ and Resources, and Developing Students’ Academic Language Repertoire (these are not included with elementary history/social science and elementary science).

Across each rubric are four rating levels, where Levels 2-4 indicate passage, and Level 4 indicates exemplary proficiency.

Mediator

The structure of PACT best represents the “mediator” role for teacher leaders: positioning candidates as resources on teaching and learning. PACT, in general, emphasizes designing lessons with clear learning goals and existing evidence; these prompts are all at least implicitly related to the mediator role. However, PACT also specifically orients candidates toward describing and defending their instructional choices. These elements are particularly evident within the reflection domain, where candidates are asked to monitor and adjust for student learning, as well as use research, theory, and reflection to guide practice.

Regarding monitoring student learning (Rubric 9), candidates in Level 3 demonstrate competency by reflections which indicate “monitoring of student progress toward meeting standards/objectives for the learning segment.” Candidates in Level 4 add to this reflection by understanding “concepts and/or thinking practices” (elementary literacy). In Rubric 10, on using research to guide practice, Level 3 candidates write reflections that are “based on sound knowledge of research and theory”; Level 4 candidates link this knowledge directly to knowledge of students and knowledge of content. Notably in both cases, the use of standards, evidence, data, and other forms of external knowledge are exclusively the domain of the higher two levels.

Mediation activities are also contained within academic language prompts provided in bilingual subjects. Generally, rubrics in bilingual subjects call on candidates to include greater references to theory, ordinarily language theory. On Rubric 12, candidates are asked to connect “both languages, explicit models, opportunities for practice, and feedback for students” in exemplary planning of scaffolded lessons. Level 4 candidates also articulate “why the instructional strategies and language(s) chosen are likely to support specific aspects of students’ language development for the full range of language proficiency and projects ways in which the scaffolds can be removed as proficiency increases.” Even though articulation is present in Rubric 12 in other subjects, their requested features are less specific. These articulation prompts are notable for the extent to which they ask candidates to defend their instruction to adults, with reference to specific knowledge on effective teaching and learning. Level 3, while less rigorously adhering to this idea, calls on candidates to access productive and receptive modalities “to monitor student understanding”

In mediating teacher leadership, according to Harris (2006), teachers “position themselves as sources of expertise and information on teaching and learning” (p. 316). PACT is well positioned to provide candidates practice on utilizing their expertise in lesson planning, adaptation and assessment. PACT does not, however, assume candidates will position themselves within schools as experts, nor assume candidates will respond to learning problems presented them by other teachers. These communication skills, connected to leadership, can be represented in other elements of a preparation program, but are not parts of the instrument.

Broker

PACT’s focus on learning standards also has implications for the development of teacher leaders as brokers, those who translate principles of individual school improvement into classrooms. These ideas are par-

ticularly embedded in Rubric 6 (Assessment): “How does the candidate demonstrate an understanding of student performance with respect to standards/objectives?” Here, Level 3 and 4 candidates are asked to identify patterns of student errors and relate those errors to standards, making school improvement individualized to students. Similar ideas are present in Rubric 7 (Assessment), for which Level 4 teachers are asked to create responses to assessment results that reflect instructional standards and differentiation. In Rubric 10 (Reflection), Level 4 teachers make “specific and strategic” changes to practice which improve student understanding of standards.

Similar to mediation prompts, broker prompts are largely confined to higher levels of competency. Even though many PACT standards emphasize differentiation between students with various needs, rubrics consider differentiation that points to learning standards and objectives a competency of only exemplary teachers. Despite stressing these standards, neither rubrics nor handbooks ask candidates to consider individual school standards or objectives; as in the mediation role, differentiation and response to assessment are seen as classroom-wide, not school-wide, practices.

Learner and Participant: Relationships with Adults

While emphasis in PACT on planning and implementing effective lessons is strong, the assessment offers little reference to working with or for other instructional staff within the building. Excluding those rubrics that assess the mediating role, which imply defining and defending lessons for those familiar with strong teaching and learning, there is little emphasis on identifying or defending teaching strategies for other staff. This absence is similar in Teaching Event Handbooks offered for each subject area, which provide some guidance to candidates of questions on what types of content reflections or other documents should include, but rarely asks candidates to consider their instruction in relation to school-wide priorities or the needs of other teachers. Perhaps the only example of this kind of emphasis is contained within Teaching Event Handbooks for bilingual subjects, which asks candidates to describe in their instructional plan what additional staff resources are available to support bilingual instruction, including “bilingual aides, literacy coaches, [and] bilingual speech/language/hearing specialists” (p. 7). The handbook does not, however, ask candidates how they plan to use these resources.

In place of describing learning tasks and assessments to adults, PACT regularly asks candidates to convey understandings of learning objectives to their students. In Rubric 1 (Planning), Level 4 candidates use progressions of learning tasks and assessments to guide students to

“build deep understandings of the central focus of the learning segment.” Rubric 5 (Instruction) regards monitoring student learning and addressing students in response to that learning. Level 3 candidates “build on student input to guide improvement” of student abilities, while Level 4 candidates “elicit explanations of student thinking” and use these to “further the understanding of all students.” In Rubric 8 (Assessment), Level 3 candidates provide “specific and timely feedback” to students for their own improvement, while Level 4 candidates include feedback that prompts students to analyze their own performance. However, one might imagine candidates also drawing upon input of their colleagues to drive this improvement, or using teaching experiences as lessons for a staff as a whole, these are not suggested by the PACT rubrics.

Conclusions

This review explores PACT—a teacher performance evaluation designed to evaluate the quality of new teachers—for its connection to teacher leadership, a critical concept in the development of teaching as a profession. PACT, this review finds, focuses primarily on interactions between teachers and students without a corresponding focus on interactions between teachers and other adults that are present in frameworks of teacher leadership and serve as the link between individual teaching practice and school improvement. Further, those competencies that focus on leadership assess leadership skills only at Levels 3 and 4, while novice teachers may more likely be classified under Level 2. This review suggests a need for additional research on how preparation programs can prepare their candidates for teacher leadership in alignment with the edTPA and other standards initiatives.

Recently completing their preparation programs, new teachers may be ill prepared to practice teacher leadership to the same degree as veterans. However, without consistent formative and summative assessment of those skills, researchers and teacher educators can never know the nature of those potential skill deficits, and the extent to which they impact the success of new teachers. Researchers should explore qualitative and quantitative tools to assess the preparation of teacher candidates for leadership roles, drawing upon existing instruments and literatures on how teachers lead and modifying these when necessary. This should include data which links the performance of new teachers on leadership instruments with scores on a teacher performance assessment, including how candidates perform on the specific PACT competencies, identified in this study, that already address leadership. Qualitative studies should also explore reasonable and specific skills

which preparation programs can provide teacher candidates to enhance their leadership abilities and further aid in the development of specific teacher leadership standards. Wherever possible, collaborative work on these evaluations with preparation programs can ensure feedback is developed and disseminated in timely and relevant ways.

Teacher educators should consider preparing their candidates for leadership roles, particularly as they look to advance complex understandings of teaching and teachers as a professional community. PACT-affiliated preparation programs should, in particular, consider ways of shaping PACT's Embedded Signature Assessments to develop these skills. Although PACT provides great latitude in this area, the current accountability environment in teacher education provides little incentive for programs to customize ESAs to cover topics beyond those addressed by the summative assessment.

PACT is relatively effective, this study finds, at assessing candidates' mastery of the content required for new teachers to act as mediators and brokers. This focus is a strong asset of standards-based teacher preparation generally. However, PACT is weaker on assessing how candidates can relate to and work with other adults. Relating instructional objectives and priorities to students is a top priority for any educator. However, it should not exclude relating objectives and priorities to other teachers; indeed, communication strategies for these audiences should be quite different. Leadership in schools primarily regards the ability of adults to influence, advise, and support other adults. While PACT promotes a strong level of competency in the principles of effective teaching and learning, particularly for bilingual educators, it does not yet encourage candidates to practice or demonstrate skills in communicating that knowledge to fellow teachers or influence the process of whole school improvement.

Both PACT, collectively, and leadership programs, independently, should consider the development of skills and competencies for interaction with teachers and school leaders. This study does not speak to what preparation programs may or may not be teaching independent of the PACT assessment. However, this study does recognize such practices are critically under-documented and under-studied. Skills and competencies for leadership that can be taught by teacher preparation programs might include effective mechanisms of collaboration and compromise, major theories of school improvement and the implications of those theories for lesson development, conflict management and "critical friendship" skills, and others. Preparation programs that teach these skills now should be further studied, and information about them more widely disseminated. Although some teaching candidates may come to these skills naturally, they are also teachable: Preparation programs can look to the example

of other social service professions, such as nursing and social work, for instances where professional interaction skills are systemically taught and reinforced.

Including a new set of competencies is difficult in programs where space in the curriculum, resources, and time are already constrained. However, many changes need not be drastic. Preparation programs can benefit, for example, by incorporating more opportunities for collaborative talk into existing coursework and lesson planning exercises. Instructors in a variety of courses can consider school culture scenarios in which implementing leadership might be more difficult. Finally, programs should reinforce the self-confidence of candidates in their ability to lead, particularly on academic content and innovative instructional techniques. Newly completing preparation programs, new teachers may find themselves more connected to recent research and regularly evolving academic standards than veterans. As important, new teachers have the opportunity to bring fresh ideas to school organizations that may not experience regular teacher replacement or have frequent discourse with outside expertise.

For state and federal policy makers, the new nature of edTPA is an opportunity to build into the assessment a focus on social supports for leadership. TPAs can particularly benefit from this focus in their formative assessments, asking candidates to define and justify their instructional choices to adults, and explain how they would share information that inspired new lessons or techniques. Perhaps the most serious gap in PACT, however, is the assessment of how candidates tie individual lessons into school-wide goals, priorities and needs. This process does not necessarily require blind adherence to the improvement goals established by principals and administrators: Formative assessment can encourage candidates to learn how to collaborate and compromise on implementing school improvement through instruction.

As PACT begins to evolve into a national instrument, preparation programs must consider how it can step back from core teaching and learning to also include elements of professionalism and professional community in a new, nationalized, standard conception of what teaching is and what teachers do. To ignore this process in crafting consensus around the profession is to revert to the stereotypical closed door of the classroom, where the fundamental complexity of teaching is hidden from the broader world, and teachers are ill prepared to take advantage of the expertise, opinions, and support of their colleagues.

References

- Anderson, L., & Olsen, B. (2006). Investigating early career urban teachers' perspectives on and experiences in professional development. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(4), 359-377. doi:10.1177/0022487106291565
- Carver, C. L., & Meier, J. M. (2013). Gaining confidence, managing conflict: Early career conceptions of teacher leadership during graduate coursework. *The New Educator, 9*(3), 173-191. doi:10.1080/1547688X.2013.806723
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2013). *InTASC model core teaching standards and learning progressions for teachers 1.0*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010a). *Evaluating teacher effectiveness: How teacher performance assessments can measure and improve teaching*. Washington, DC: AACTE.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010b). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1-2), 35-47. doi:10.1177/0022487109348024
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Hyler, M. E. (2013). The role of performance assessment in developing teaching as a profession. *Rethinking Schools, 27*(4).
- Harris, A. (2003). Teacher leadership as distributed leadership: heresy, fantasy or possibility? *School Leadership & Management, 23*(3), 313-324. doi:10.1080/1363243032000112801
- Lundgren, U. P. (1972). *Frame factors and the teaching process: A contribution to curriculum theory and theory on teaching*. Stockholm, Sweden: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Merino, N., & Pecheone, R. (2013). The Performance Assessment for California Teachers: An introduction. *The New Educator, 9*(1), 3-11. doi:10.1080/1547688X.2013.751310
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: a methods sourcebook* (Third Edit.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Murphy, J. P. (2005). *Connecting teacher leadership and school improvement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Newton, S. (2010). *Preservice performance assessment and teacher early career effectiveness: Preliminary findings on the Performance Assessment for California Teachers*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.
- Okhremtchouck, I., Seiki, S., Gilliland, B., Ateh, C., Wallace, M., & Kato, A. (2009). Voices of pre-service teachers: perspectives on the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). *Issues in Teacher Education, 18*(1), 39-62.
- Pecheone, R. L., & Chung, R. R. (2006). Evidence in teacher education: The Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(1), 22-36. doi:10.1177/0022487105284045
- Peck, C. A., & McDonald, M. (2013). Creating "cultures of evidence" in teacher education: context, policy, and practice in three high-data-use programs. *The New Educator, 9*(1), 12-28. doi:10.1080/1547688X.2013.751312
- Performance Assessment for California Teachers. (2013). *Supporting documents for candidates*. Retrieved November 24, 2013, from http://www.pacttpa.org/_main/hub.php?pageName=Supporting_Documents_for_Candidates.
- Riggs, M. L., Verdi, M. P., & Arlin, P. K. (2009). A local evaluation of the reliability, validity, and procedural adequacy of the Teacher Performance Assessment

- Exam for teaching credential candidates. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 18(1), 13-38.
- Sandholtz, J. H., & Shea, L. M. (2011). Predicting performance: a comparison of university supervisors' predictions and teacher candidates' scores on a teaching performance assessment. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 63(1), 39-50. doi:10.1177/0022487111421175
- Silva, D. Y., Gimbert, B., & Nolan, J. (2000). Sliding the doors: locking and unlocking possibilities for teacher leadership. *Teachers College Record*, 102(4), 779-804. doi:10.1108/eb057097
- Van Es, E. A., & Conroy, J. (2009). Using the Performance Assessment for California Teachers to examine pre-service teachers' conceptions of teaching mathematics for understanding. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 18(1), 83-102.
- York-Barr, J., & Duke, K. (2004). What do we know about teacher leadership? Findings from two decades of scholarship. *Educational Research*, 74(3), 255-316.