Cooperating Teachers
Stakeholders in the edTPA?

Clancy M. Seymour
Barbara A. Burns
Julie J. Henry
Canisius College

Introduction

The educative Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) is a performance-based assessment designed for beginning teachers to demonstrate their readiness to teach (SCALE, 2014). As more states come to adopt this assessment, many facets of its implementation need to be reviewed. One component is the role of the cooperating teacher in the implementation of the edTPA. Since the assessment is completed during the culminating clinical experience for teacher candidates, it seems logical to assume that the cooperating teachers who host student teachers during this field experience are "stakeholders" in the edTPA. Cooperating teachers are also members of the teaching profession and may feel that they have a stake in determining who is ready to enter their profession.

If teachers have a stake in the edTPA, the array of dictionary definitions invites us to ponder what kind of stake. If one has a stake in something, one will get advantages if it is successful and feels an important

Clancy M. Seymour is an assistant professor and director of Physical and Health Education Teacher Education, Barbara A. Burns is a professor and department chair at Canisius College, and Julie J. Henry is a professor and department chair at Buffalo State College, all in Buffalo, New York. Their email addresses are seymourc@canisius.edu, burns1@canisius.edu, & henryjj@buffalostate.edu

connection with it. If something one values is *at stake*, one feels a sense of loss if the plan is not successful. A *stake* can be a pointed stick, and it's possible to "*pull up stakes*" and leave ("stake", n.d.).

This provocative set of definitions provides possible lenses to use to examine the role of the cooperating teacher in the work of the edTPA. The purpose of this study was to examine the role of cooperating teachers as stakeholders in the edTPA, to determine their beliefs about the edTPA, to discuss ways to support cooperating teachers with the edTPA and to examine how the edTPA has influenced the student teaching experience from the cooperating teachers' perspectives. The researchers also sought advice from cooperating teachers about how best to structure the student teaching experience given the addition of the edTPA.

Background

The Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity (SCALE), in partnership with the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) developed the edTPA to measure teacher candidates' readiness to teach. The edTPA is the first nationally available, educator-designed performance assessment for teachers entering the profession (SCALE, 2014). The edTPA was designed to improve the assessment of teacher candidates and ultimately reform and distinguish teaching as a profession. It is expected that candidates who score well on the edTPA will be more likely to be effective teachers in the future. The edTPA also allows teacher preparation programs the opportunity to assess program effectiveness. Some teacher education leaders are optimistic about the development of a standardized performance assessment which includes authentic tasks to use for teacher candidate performance and teacher preparation program review, noting that by evaluating teaching authentically, performance assessments "represent the complexity of teaching and offer standards that can define an expert profession" (Darling-Hammond & Hyler, 2013, p. 13).

The edTPA draws on experience gained from other performance-based assessments of teaching, including the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (Sato, 2014). The edTPA has been developed in twenty-seven different fields based on licensure areas. This comprehensive assessment includes artifacts demonstrating candidates' abilities to plan, instruct and assess particular learning segments of 3-5 lessons during student teaching. The three tasks (planning, instructing, and assessing) allow candidate work to be scored using a series of 15 rubrics, five rubrics per task for most versions. The rubrics are based on a 5 point score, $1 - 5$,

which rates candidates' work along a continuum from not ready to teach (depicted by a teacher focused, whole class, fragmented or indiscriminate presentation of work) scored as a 1, to a highly accomplished beginner teacher (evidence of student focused, individual or flexible groups, integrated, intentional and well executed presentation of work) scored as a 5. In the United States, teacher preparation programs in 40 states and the District of Columbia are using edTPA at different levels (AACTE, n.d.). The edTPA is used in several ways: some states are piloting the use of the edTPA; some use the edTPA as part of program completion without a state cut score; and other states are setting minimum scores for certification; a high-stakes use of the edTPA. In these high-stakes situations, the scores from the rubrics associated with the tasks are tallied and a final score is compared to a cut score established by the state to determine whether a candidate passes the edTPA; those who do not pass the edTPA are not eligible for certification (New York State Education Department, 2013). At the time of submission of this manuscript, twelve states have formally adopted the edTPA for statewide use to license new teachers or approve teacher preparation programs (AACTE, n.d.).

Consequently, candidate preparation for the edTPA is designed to be an integral part of teacher education programs because of the authenticity of the tasks candidates complete. Not only an assessment, the edTPA is intended to be an inquiry process where candidates' practice is examined both locally and nationally. Candidate performance on the edTPA may also be used in accreditation reports for institutions of higher education and for comparison among teacher preparation programs.

Many leaders in the field share a conviction that the use of performance assessments in teaching is a critical strategy for improving the quality of teacher preparation (Chung & Whittaker, 2007; Darling-Hammond & Hyler, 2013; Peck, Gallucci, & Sloan, 2010; Peck, Singer-Gabella, Sloan, & Lin, 2014) as these performance assessments are based on authentic assessment rather than the typical multiple-choice standardized tests about pedagogy. Proponents value the edTPA as a resource built in the tradition of National Board certification portfolios which included videotapes, student work samples and teacher analyses scored by trained raters (Sato, Wei, & Darling-Hammond, 2008). Supporters point to the validity of using work samples from the student teaching or internship classroom as an authentic context for generating this evidence. They are enthusiastic about the potential for the edTPA to contribute to the development of a common set of metrics for evaluating the core teaching practices found to impact student learning (Haynes, 2013; Lynn, 2014, Sato, 2014).

On the other hand, critics of the edTPA argue that teacher performance assessment may undermine "teacher preparation by marginal-

izing the local experts best situated to evaluate candidates' performance, transforming student teaching from an educative experience to a prematurely evaluative one" (Dover, Schultz, Smith, & Duggan, 2015, p. 2). It is possible for a cooperating teacher or college supervisor to determine, after months spent together in a personal coaching relationship, that a candidate is ready to teach. In states with high-stakes use of the edTPA, this decision can be overridden by the scorer of the edTPA who views 15-20 minutes of instruction. Other critics have noted that the edTPA may shift the focus of student teaching into being a test preparation experience (Chiu, 2014; Greenblatt & O'Hara, 2015). This can be anathema to cooperating teachers already dismayed by a sense of teaching to the tests administered to their P-12 students. Scoring processes can seem obfuscatory and critics wonder if the edTPA scoring processes are "more reflective of fidelity to the nuances of the task than to the quality of candidates' instruction and assessment" and that passing the edTPA may be more about "knowing what they want" rather than a true measure of quality teaching (Dover et al, 2015, p. 5). In addition, opponents note that candidates understand more about the specific focus of scoring and ways to assure a passing score when assisted by knowledgeable faculty and staff at the college. These critics contend that equity in teacher preparation may be undermined when teacher candidates who attend well-funded institutions benefit from support services focused on the edTPA and others are left to figure out the nuances of the assessment on their own (Dover et al, 2015).

The structure of the student teaching semester is another issue that has been brought to the forefront with the edTPA. Traditionally, student teacher programs have culminated with one semester of two distinct placements of about seven weeks each. Teacher educators have explored other options such as one integrated student teaching placement lasting the entire semester, which can provide excellent depth of learning but may lose breadth in not allowing candidates extended practice in more than one grade level or setting. Another way to extend field experiences is to maintain two distinct student teaching placements but to scaffold at least one placement that is preceded by a previous field experience with the same teacher in the same school (looping). Extended field experiences have been found to assist in building relationships and understanding school culture (Ewart & Straw, 2005; Hughes & McCartney, 2015), two factors that have been shown to be important in the development of teachers (Kosnik & Beck, 2003; Parker, Fazio, Volante, & Cherubini, 2008; Torrez & Krebs, 2012).These field experiences work best in partnership schools where cooperating teachers, college faculty and student teachers form a team approach to the student-teaching ex-

perience. This is further supported by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). Teacher preparation programs who seek accreditation from this organization must comply with Standard 2 entitled "Clinical Partnerships and Practice" which emphasizes the importance of partnerships between K-12 educators and colleges in the preparation of teachers (CAEP, n.d.).

Cooperating teachers have much to contribute to the debate on these issues. Researchers have found that many cooperating teachers reported that they felt the need to be active supporters of work on the edTPA but were conflicted about the relevance of the edTPA and the support they were permitted to provide to their candidates (Burns, Henry, & Lindauer, 2015). In order for this conversation to move forward, researchers need to determine if cooperating teachers feel that they have a stake in the edTPA and have an important connection with it or if they are simply trying to assist their student teachers in jumping through a hollow hoop.

Method

This mixed-methods study described and analyzed the cooperating teacher's role in the implementation of the edTPA. In this study, the authors explored the following research questions:

1. What are the perspectives of cooperating teachers about the edTPA and the student teaching experience?

2. What do cooperating teachers find helpful in support services provided from the college with teacher candidates and the edTPA?

3. What are cooperating teachers' views on looping and other possible ways to structure the student teaching experience given the edTPA?

Participants

In the spring 2015 semester, the student teaching cohort at our college consisted of 57 teacher candidates. In the program, teacher candidates complete the edTPA as a requirement of program completion/graduation. In order to pass student teaching, each candidate needed to complete the edTPA and submit this for review on campus. In addition, they were strongly urged (but not required) to submit their edTPA during the student teaching semester for formal evaluation by scorers trained by Pearson, as this is a requirement for teacher certification in New York State. Candidates completed the edTPA in one of the following content areas: Early Childhood Education ($n = 3$), Elementary Education ($n =$

29), Special Education (n = 9), Physical Education (n = 5) or Adolescent Education (n = 11) (in the content areas of English, Mathematics, Modern Languages, Science or Social Studies).

At the end of the semester, paper and pencil surveys were administered to the cooperating teachers from the placement where the candidates completed their edTPA. Thirty-two surveys were completed and returned (56% response rate). These completed surveys were from cooperating teachers in the areas of Early Childhood/Elementary Education (n = 19), Special Education (n = 2); Physical Education (n = 3) and Adolescent Education (English (n = 2), Mathematics (n = 2); Modern Language (n = 1) and Social Studies (n = 3))

All cooperating teachers (n = 57) were then asked to participate in a virtual focus group to further discuss some of the findings from the survey. A total of 13 of the 57 cooperating teachers (23%) participated in the virtual focus group. Eight of these 13 teachers had also completed the paper and pencil surveys. The participants included Early Childhood/Elementary (n = 8), Special Education (n = 1), Physical Education (n = 1) and Adolescent Education (Mathematics (n = 1), Science (n = 1), and Social Studies (n = 1)). Throughout the course of the study, survey completers and virtual focus group participants were representative of the student teaching cohort and multiple content areas.

Materials

The materials used in this study included a survey which was designed based on outcomes from survey materials used in two previous studies involving implementation of the edTPA (Lindauer, Burns, & Henry, 2013; Burns, Henry, &Lindauer, 2015) and virtual focus group protocols.

Procedure

At the end of the student teaching semester in spring 2015, paper and pencil surveys and return envelopes were mailed to cooperating teachers from the student teaching placement where the candidates completed the edTPA. If a response was not received in a two week time period, a second copy of the survey was sent with another note asking the cooperating teacher to complete and return the survey. The survey was comprised of ten Likert scale questions with room for comments after each question. These questions were designed to help the researchers understand the effects of the edTPA from the cooperating teachers' point of view. A final question on the survey asked cooperating teachers if they would be interested in participating in a focus group designed to help the researchers further understand a cooperating teacher's role in the edTPA.

A virtual focus group was utilized to allow for this study to accom-

modate K-12 professionals' schedules. Previous researchers have found that virtual focus groups can be helpful for soliciting substantive input while overcoming schedule conflicts and providing convenience and flexibility for respondents (Sweet, 2001).

E-mail communication was used to contact the 57 cooperating teachers who had student teachers in the spring semester. They were invited to join the virtual focus group and respond to five prompts using an interactive virtual discussion/blog website. Participants were asked to make initial posts and to check later for comments and feedback during the two week period that the blog was kept active. An opportunity to win a $50 gift card was offered as an incentive to cooperating teachers who made a substantial initial post to the prompts. In addition, for every subsequent substantial post used to continue the discussion thread, a chance for two more gift cards was provided.

Data Analysis

Results from the survey were recorded, response frequencies were tabulated and comments from each item were used to further address each question. Qualitative responses were analyzed using inductive analysis to create categories (Johnson, 2014). These categories were utilized to generated prompts for the virtual focus group site.

The virtual focus group was monitored by the researchers to assure that comments were on task and that prompts were being interpreted correctly by the participants. To avoid bias, the researchers refrained from providing comments or feedback. Responses were collected and illustrative quotes were selected to further articulate the perspectives of cooperating teachers in relation to the research questions.

Findings

Perspectives of Cooperating Teachers about the edTPA and the Student Teaching Experience

On the paper and pencil surveys, most cooperating teachers reported agreement or strong agreement that the edTPA was relevant to the student teachers' professional development (63%), and that the amount of time the student teacher spent on the edTPA during student teaching was appropriate (63%). Most cooperating teachers conveyed that there was sufficient time for the student teachers to successfully complete the edTPA (63%) and that the edTPA work did not interfere with other student teaching responsibilities (54%). Several cooperating teachers in the virtual focus group commended the student teachers for their ability to manage the work:

• "The edTPA is overwhelming at first, and yes it does put extra stress on the student teacher. However, the last two student teachers we have had have been extremely prepared for all the steps they have to perform in the edTPA. They have been very self-sufficient which allows the cooperating teacher to focus on their teaching, classroom management and interactions with students."

• "I have had two student teachers since the edTPA was put into effect. Both were extremely well versed and were prepared to handle the many requirements."

• "My last two candidates were so well organized and prepared; I had the privilege of solely mentoring."

There were also cooperating teachers who emphasized the connection with the new requirements for in-service teachers:

• "Having mentored two student teachers since the edTPA requirement took effect, I have seen that it is very demanding and rigorous, not unlike the newer performance review expectations in the profession."

• "I explain to them that this exercise prepares them for the educational demands of New York State."

One cooperating teacher wrote about how the training provided by the college helped her to assist her student teacher in seeing the relevance of the edTPA: "I am grateful that I was able to take the in-service this year to better assist my pre student teacher. I can assist and explain the correlation to Student Learning Outcomes, Local Measures of Achievement and Annual Professional Performance Reviews. The correlation helps to make the experience more meaningful and not just another project."

While cooperating teachers were able to see the relevance of the edTPA, only 32% agreed or strongly agreed that the edTPA enhanced the student teaching experience for the student teacher, and only 22% agreed or strongly agreed that the edTPA enhanced the student teaching experience for them as the cooperating teachers. Many cooperating teachers reported agreement or strong agreement (47%) that their student teachers seemed overwhelmed by the edTPA. Many of the comments in the discussion group referred to the stress accompanying the edTPA process. Teachers wrote:

• "It is stressful for both the cooperating teacher who is trying to

help but also the student teacher who is making sure the three lessons meet the vague criteria."

• "Even the pre student teachers are stressed with the practice round of edTPA. I agree that it takes away from the time with the students, time they can use for building rapport…I think it makes them miss out on some of the fun of teaching."

• "Prior to the edTPA, I felt that I had more time to spend talking to my student teachers about the art of teaching. Instead we are focusing on the logistics of meeting the edTPA checklist. It seems like the experience has switched from focusing on learning how to teach to learning how to navigate the edTPA."

Perspectives on Supports for Cooperating Teachers

Of the cooperating teachers surveyed, (66%) agreed or strongly agreed that the cooperating teacher should be an active supporter of the student's edTPA work, but only 57% reported that they received enough information about the edTPA to be able to provide this support. It is important to note that all cooperating teachers in this study received a handbook for the edTPA, but one wrote, "I have been working with edTPA for two years. I feel like I don't fully understand what the main expectation of the edTPA is. I think more than just a handbook is needed."

The cooperating teachers at partnership schools that host many student teachers attended one-hour training sessions hosted by the college at their schools and had an identified faculty member who was regularly in the building. Teachers appreciated this training, writing:

• "I feel confident about the information that has been given to me by Dr. X."

• "Dr. Y actually trained me how to prepare for the process. I believe that this professional development would be critical to another cooperating teacher."

• "After attending the in-service provided by X, I am more confident that I can successfully help pre student teachers and student teachers with the edTPA process."

One cooperating teacher who participated in the study was National Board Certified. She wrote, "In my experience, the requirements for National Teacher Certification mimic much of the edTPA process. So that gave me a foundation of understanding of what was expected of the student teachers. Without that background, I would have found the edTPA both overwhelming and vague."

Teachers had suggestions for additional supports that would be useful. Two teachers provided similar recommendations asking for some sort of summary, overview or checklist so they could target the key elements of what is required by the edTPA. At the same time, there were cooperating teachers interested in learning more about the benchmarking and evaluation of edTPA. One cooperating teacher asked, "Is it possible to view sample edTPA videos in order to have a better understanding of the expectations?" Another asked, "Do we know if the state offers example plans, videos, and scored samples?" Other teachers wrote:

> • "I think it would be helpful to revisit the criteria necessary for success now that the process has been in place for some time. Open discussion about the problems and possible solutions in a group setting may help to clarify what exactly needs to be done to ensure success."

> • "It would be nice to see how the state responds to the submitted edTPA so we can better adjust how we can help future student teachers approach the edTPA and for them to be successful."

> • "An update on results would provide insight—identifying both strengths and weaknesses."

These suggestions align with the protocols for local evaluation distributed by SCALE and demonstrate that some cooperating teachers appear be interested in participating in a local evaluation exercise.

Recommendations from Cooperating Teachers
for Structuring the Student Teaching Experience
to Support Student Teachers with the edTPA

In the focus group, most cooperating teachers were in favor of the current student teaching system, where teacher candidates complete pre-student teaching (usually in the fall) and then loop to complete their first student teaching placement (usually in the spring) in that same classroom for seven weeks (10 weeks for physical education teachers) before moving to a second placement in a new school for seven weeks (five for physical education). Twenty-five of the cooperating teachers responding to the survey had student teachers who had completed pre student teaching with them prior to student teaching. These teachers overwhelmingly agreed (92%) that the consistency was beneficial to the student teachers' completion of the edTPA work. This was the strongest level of reported agreement in our survey with 56% of teachers *strongly* agreeing that the looping was beneficial. In the focus group, teachers wrote:

• "With the edTPA in mind, I think the current situation is perfect. Bringing the candidates in as pre-student teachers and then as full time student teachers gives them a level of comfort that I think is beneficial to completing the edTPA successfully...The submission of the edTPA in the spring is perfect. The student teachers are comfortable and it shows in their planning and in their presence commanding the class."

• "I feel that the way you have student teaching placements scheduled and the time that they spend with us is fine. Student teachers are excellent, well prepared, enthusiastic, and often come into school early to work closely with their cooperating teacher. I feel the best time to complete edTPA would be several weeks before they wrap up their placement with us. A practice run should be done so that the cooperating teacher can assist with suggestions."

• "I think the student teaching placement is scheduled great. It is a great opportunity for them to begin in a pre-student teaching placement and then ease into student teaching. It helps them adjust to the class, the expectations and really see how to develop the lessons that will help with the edTPA and complete it successfully."

• "At [another] college, some student teachers combine both student teaching placements to accommodate edTPA. I think it's still important to student teach in two building and with two different classes."

When asked specifically about the looping, cooperating teachers were extremely positive in their remarks including the following:

• "I have had the advantage of looping with my student teacher and I think it makes all the difference! The teachers are comfortable with the students, there is an obviously established relationship, and expectations are clear. I would highly recommend this situation for all placements in regard to success with the edTPA. With the stress of the paperwork, video, and other elements of the process, one thing they don't have to worry about is the actual classroom itself! By spring we are settled and successful. Ownership of the classroom has transferred and the students can see that. The quality of the experience for everyone, especially when they return full time in the spring, is amazing! We all benefit from this situation."

• "I have had the pleasure of "looping" with my student teachers. It is a great experience. Everyone has a chance to adjust, learn the classroom dynamics and expectations. It also creates a stronger relationship between the student teacher and cooperating teacher as well as with the students. Once these are set in place, when they return to do student teaching, they are able to focus more on lessons and how to differentiate for the student needs and behavior management techniques, and I think this helps with the success all around for the student teaching experience."

• "I have had both looped and "un-looped" scenarios and definitely prefer the looped for the reasons already mentioned above by (other members of the virtual focus group). I think it definitely lowers the stress level for the candidates but also enhances the learning for my students!"

One teacher wrote about possible pitfalls in the looping arrangement, noting "In a few rare cases pre-student teaching and student teaching in the same classroom could be difficult for all involved. If there is a personality conflict, it is a long time to share a room. If either the cooperating teacher or student teacher takes the other person for granted, the experience would be strenuous. Of course this is a fact in every work place, so there are even hidden benefits in the conflict."

Other cooperating teachers requested that the current system for pre-student teaching be expanded to more than the current five-six hours a week that the pre-student teachers are in the classroom. One wrote, "Ideally I would like to see them two full days a week during pre-student teaching, give them some more hands- on time with the students, and giving them more time to enjoy the classroom and the students, without having to worry about planning and teaching the required lessons each time they are in." Three other cooperating teachers wrote comments supporting this recommendation emphasizing the need for candidates to focus on building rapport with students, and working on their general planning and management strategies before jumping into the practice edTPA lessons.

Cooperating teachers did not offer any more specific recommendations for changing the current system, although one cooperating teacher recommended that the edTPA should be completed during the second student teaching placement rather than the first placement.

Limitations

As is the case with any study, there are limitations in this analysis

that must be considered. Due to relationships established with the participants at our partnership schools, the halo effect may have impacted the teachers' responses, reflecting a tendency to give their college colleagues (the researchers) the benefit of the doubt (Coombs & Holladay, 2006). While the looping system was reported as an obvious strength in the consistency of the student teaching placement, a looping placement from fall to spring may provide better continuity with the same grade level/classroom of K-12 students than a looping placement that is interrupted by a summer vacation and a change in grade level/classroom of K-12 students from spring to fall. Many of the benefits of the looping placement may be lost and underreported with those participating in a spring to fall cycle. Similarly, other teacher education programs may not be positioned to implement a looping placement which therefore excludes many of these findings for those institutions.

At the same time, the generalizability of the results may be a factor in this study. It is customary to aim for a 50% response rate when conducting survey research (Baruch & Holtom, 2008) and although thirty-two of the fifty-seven cooperating teachers (57%) responded to the original paper and pencil survey, only thirteen of the of the fifty-seven (23%) participated in the virtual focus group. Finally, while the virtual focus group was helpful in many ways, the benefits of face-to-face interaction of a traditional focus group may have been lost in this study. Body language, facial expressions, and voice intonation are not as easily detectable in an online environment (Moloney, Dietrich, Strickland, & Myerburg, 2003).

Discussion and Conclusions

The purpose of this investigation was to examine the perspectives of cooperating teachers regarding the edTPA and to determine if cooperating teachers report having a stake in this certification requirement. Results confirmed that overall, cooperating teachers believed that the edTPA was a relevant task that can be managed by candidates during the student teaching experience. In addition, some professionals reported a similarity between the edTPA and current performance reviews for practicing teachers being conducted in their local school districts. While the findings suggested that teachers found that the edTPA may be appropriate for student teaching, cooperating teachers were not convinced that this certification requirement enhanced the clinical experience for future professionals.

At the same time, there are trends in the findings that mirror many of the concerns raised by those who are critical of the edTPA (Chiu, 2014; Greenblatt & O'Hara, 2015). Cooperating teachers reported that often

student teachers are often overwhelmed by the edTPA, and that many of the nuances and authentic lessons to be learned during the student teaching experience have been replaced by this requirement. This supports the contention that the edTPA has engendered what many have argued as "teaching to the test" and a debate about who best can make decisions about teacher candidate readiness (e.g., teachers, higher education faculty, etc.) (Metzler, 2014; Seymour & Garrison, 2015)).

Cooperating teachers indicated the need to be involved in supporting candidates through the completion of the edTPA, which can be viewed as having a stake in teacher candidate's fulfillment of the edTPA requirement. Exemplars and more training on the edTPA rubrics were conventions that cooperating teachers also recommended to assist in this endeavor. In addition, a support system that could partner all constituents including higher education faculty, the cooperating teacher, and the candidate was a reported recommendation in this study. This support system was found to be greatly enhanced through the looping of pre-student teaching and student teaching placements. Overall, these findings suggest that cooperating teachers reported ownership in the process of the edTPA and supports the stakeholder perspective proposed for examination in this investigation.

Cooperating teachers see many strengths of the edTPA, but have reservations about its use and how it is adopted. If given the choice, cooperating teachers recommend a partnership that can support and nurture the candidate through this requirement, but not at the expense of other critical components of the student teaching process. The findings also suggested that many of the reported issues with the edTPA may be resolved by careful and thoughtful planning that includes all constituents. This positions future study towards programmatic amendments that can support the edTPA much like the looping placement proposed and investigated in this analysis. However, future research will also need to evaluate teacher education program resources and whether such changes are feasible and equitable across all institutions.

In conclusion, it is apparent that these cooperating teachers valued being involved in the edTPA process. They indeed were stakeholders in this certification requirement, with a commitment and connection to the edTPA efforts. This affirms what many experts and accreditors suggest is an integral part of teacher education specifically with partnerships and collaborations with K-12 institutions (CAEP, n.d.). It was also reassuring to note that cooperating teachers utilized in this study saw merit to the edTPA and did not report a need to *pull up stakes and leave*. The key will be if cooperating teachers in the future will have a stake in the edTPA or simply be left holding it.

References

AACTE. (n.d.). *edTPA*. Retrieved August 14, 2016 from http://edtpa.aacte. org/faq#58.

Baruch, Y., & Holtom, B. C. (2008). Survey response rate levels and trends in organizational research. *Human Relations, 61*(8), 1139-1160.

Burns, B. A., Henry, J. J., & Lindauer, J. R. (2015). Working together to foster teacher candidate success on the edTPA. *Journal of Inquiry and Action in Education, 6*(2), 2.

Chiu, S. (2014). edTPA: An assessment that reduces the quality of teacher educa-tion. *Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics, 14*(1), 28-30.

Chung, R. R., & Whittaker, A. (2007, April). *Preservice candidates' readiness for portfolio assessment: The influence of formative features of implementation*. Paper presented at the 2007 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago, IL.

Coombs, T. W., & Holladay, S. J. (2006). Unpacking the halo effect: Reputation and crisis management. *Journal of Communication Management, 10*(2), 123-137.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (n.d.) *Standard 2: Clini-cal partnerships and practice*. Retrieved March 2, 2016, from http://caepnet. org/standards/standard-2.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Hyler, M. E. (2013). The role of performance assessment in developing teaching as a profession. *Rethinking Schools, 27*(4), 10-15.

Dover, A. G., Schultz, B., Smith, K., & Duggan, T. J. (2015). Who's preparing our candidates? edTPA, localized knowledge and the outsourcing of teacher evalu-ation. *Teachers College Record*. www.tcrecord.org. ID number: 17914.

Ewart, G. & Straw, S. B. (2005). A seven-month practicum: Collaborating teach-ers' response. Canadian Journal of Education, 24(1&2), 185-202.

Greenblatt, D., & O'Hara, K. E. (2015). Buyer beware: Lessons learned from edTPA implementation in New York State. *Thought and Action: The NEA Higher Education Journal*.

Haynes, M. (2013, October 21). *Ensuring readiness to teach: edTPA support and assessment*. Alliance for Excellent Education. Retreieved from http://all4ed. org/ensuring-readiness-to-teach-edtpa-support-and-assessment/

Hughes, M., & McCartney, H. (2015). Building relationships within extended field placements in elementary education. *Teacher Educators' Journal*, 51-65.

Johnson, A. (2014). *A short guide to action research*. New York, NY: Pearson Education.

Kosnik, C., & Beck, C. (2003). The internships component of a teacher education program: Opportunities for learning. *The Teacher Educator, 39*(1), 18-33.

Lindauer, J., Burns, B., & Henry J. (2013). Effective scaffolding for edTPA: Perspec-tives from teacher candidates, cooperting teachers, and college supervisors. *Excelsior: Leadership in Teaching and Learning, 8*(1).

Lynn, M. (2014, March 19). Making culturally relevant pedagogy relevant to aspiring teachers. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*. Retrieved from di-verseeducation.com/article/61280.

Metzler, M. W. (2014). Teacher effectiveness research in physical education: the future isn't what it used to be. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 85*(1), 14-19.

Moloney, M. F., Dietrich, A. S., Strickland, O., & Myerburg, S. (2003). Using Internet discussion boards as virtual focus groups. *Advances in Nursing Science, 26*(4), 274-286.

New York State Education Department, Office of Higher Education. (2013). *Commissioner King announces scores needed to pass new edTPA exam*. Retrieved from http://www.highered.nysed.gov/pdf/edtpa-statement.pdf

Parker, D. C., Fazio, X., Volante, L. & Cherubini, L. (2008). Relationship matters: Negotiating and maintaining partnerships in a unique teacher education program. *Action in Teacher Education, 30*, 39-53.

Peck, C. A., Gallucci, C., & Sloan, T. (2010). Negotiating implementation of high-stakes performance assessment policies in teacher education: From compliance to inquiry. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(5), 451-463.

Peck, C. A., Singer-Gabella, M., Sloan, T., & Lin, S. (2014). Driving blind: Why we need standardized performance assessment in teacher education. *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction, 8*(1), 8-30.

Sato, M. (2014). What is the underlying conception of teaching of the edTPA? *Journal of Teacher Education, 65*(5), 421-434.

Sato, M., Wei, R.C., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2008). Improving teachers' assessment practices through professional development: The case of National Board Certification. *American Educational Research Journal, 45*(3), 669-700.

Seymour, C., & Garrison, M. (2015). Is the physical being taken out of physical education? On the possible effects of high-stakes testing on an embattled profession's curriculum goals. *Quest, 67*(4), 400-408.

Stake. (n.d.). In *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. Retrieved March 9, 2016, from http://www.ldoceonline.com/

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity (SCALE). (2014). *edTPA*. Retrieved March 9, 2016 from https://scale.stanford.edu/teaching/edtpa. Palo Alto, CA: Author

Sweet, C., (2001). Designing and conducting virtual focus groups. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal, 4*(3), 130-135. http://doi.org/10.1108/13522750110393035

Torrez, C. A., & Krebs, M. M. (2012). Expert voices: What cooperating teachers and teacher candidates say about quality student teaching placements and experiences. *Action in Teacher Education, 38*, 485-499.