

SPECIAL ISSUE
Redesigning Assessment and Accountability

education policy analysis
archives

A peer-reviewed, independent,
open access, multilingual journal



Arizona State University

Volume 26 Number 14

January 29, 2018

ISSN 1068-2341

**Integrating Performance Assessments Across a PK-20
Continuum: A Locally Developed Collaboration**

Kathryn McCurdy

Emilie Mitescu Reagan

University of New Hampshire

Audrey Rogers

Southern New Hampshire University

&

Thomas Schram

University of New Hampshire

United States

Citation: McCurdy, K., Reagan, E. M., Schram, T., & Rogers, A. (2018). Integrating performance assessments across a PK-20 continuum: A locally developed collaboration. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 26(14). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.3437> This article is part of the special issue, *Redesigning Systems of Assessment and Accountability for Meaningful Student Learning*, guest edited by Soung Bae, Jon Snyder, and Elizabeth Leisy Stosich.

Abstract: A response to Stosich et al.'s (2018) article reviewing ways in which states have taken up performance assessments, this commentary seeks to extend the focus and use of performance assessments to preservice teacher education. As such, the authors describe

Journal website: <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/>
Facebook: /EPAAA
Twitter: @epaa_aape

Manuscript received: 9/30/2017
Revisions received: 12/29/2017
Accepted: 1/12/2018

statewide initiatives in New Hampshire that are working to integrate performance assessments along a PK – 20 continuum by articulating how Stosich et al.'s key points of educator capacity, context, and assessments for and of learning are developing in one state. This commentary highlights key contextual factors for the lasting implementation of the performance assessments as well as raises critical new challenges and opportunities for understanding this tool as an assessment for and of learning.

Keywords: teacher performance assessments; preservice teacher education; school-university partnership

Integración de evaluaciones de rendimiento en un continuo PK-20: Una colaboración desarrollada localmente

Resumen: Como una respuesta al artículo de Stosich et al. (2018) sobre las evaluaciones del desempeño del estado, este comentario amplía el enfoque y el uso de las evaluaciones del desempeño a la formación docente pre-servicio. Los autores describen iniciativas estatales en New Hampshire que están trabajando para integrar evaluaciones de desempeño a lo largo de un continuo PK-20 y articulan cómo se desarrollan los puntos clave de Stosich de capacidad educativa, contexto y evaluaciones para y de aprendizaje en un estado. Este comentario destaca los factores contextuales clave para la implementación duradera de las evaluaciones de desempeño, así como plantea nuevos desafíos y oportunidades para entender esta herramienta como una evaluación para el aprendizaje.

Palabras clave: evaluaciones de desempeño docente; educación de profesor de pregrado; asociación escuela-universidad

Integração das avaliações de desempenho em um PK-20 contínuo: Uma colaboração desenvolvida localmente

Resumo: Como resposta ao artigo Stosich et al. (2018) em avaliações de desempenho do estado, este comentário se estende a abordagem eo uso de avaliações de desempenho de pré-formação contínua de professores. Os autores descrevem iniciativas estaduais em New Hampshire que estão trabalhando para integrar as avaliações de desempenho ao longo de um PK-20 contínua e articular pontos como principais Stosich de educacional capacidade, contexto e avaliações para a aprendizagem e desenvolver um estado. Este comentário destaca a chave para a implementação de avaliações de desempenho fatores contextuais, bem como novos desafios e oportunidades duradouras para entender isso como uma ferramenta de avaliação para a aprendizagem.

Palavras-chave: avaliações de desempenho do professor; formação de professores de graduação; associação escola-universidade

Integrating Performance Assessments Across a PK-20 Continuum: A Locally Developed Collaboration

In the article, “How Do States Integrate Performance Assessment in Their Systems of Assessment,” Stosich, Snyder, and Wilczak (2018) contribute an important review of PK-12 state-level policies and practices at a time when performance assessments are entering a new stage of maturity within the national discourse on systems of educational accountability. Their focus on the actions of key stakeholders across multiple states to implement and/or support performance assessments in PK-12 schools, regardless of the catalysts that prompted such actions, reveal four “common but distinct” (p. 7) strategies for incorporating those assessments into systems of accountability ranging from classroom-specific purposes to federal testing requirements. We

highlight three broadly applicable points that extend across this analysis of these four approaches, and then extend our commentary to invite consideration of how their analytical framework might be expanded.

The first point, and of particular significance within a context of contested policies around use of performance assessments in the service of classroom purposes as well as for broader consequential aims (e.g., as part of statewide assessment systems), stems from Stosich et al.'s repeated finding pertaining to the need to *build the capacity of educators* to use performance assessments in practice. Second, amidst ongoing efforts to highlight potential educative benefits associated with using performance assessments, the authors direct attention to the challenging aim of designing tools that act as assessments *of learning* as well as assessments *for learning*. Third, reflecting the fundamental premise that *context matters*, Stosich and colleagues clearly describe how performance assessments can take shape in different ways and in response to varied prompts or pressures. This sets the stage for their articulation of a “multilayered system of assessment practices” that is “influenced by actors at all levels of the educational system” (2018, p. 19), including decision-makers at the school, district or network, state, and federal level.

As we consider the compelling need identified by Stosich and colleagues (2018) to build educator capacity, we believe the findings underscore the need to promote a higher education voice within this ecosystem, operating with these other decision-makers through a lens of shared responsibility that incorporates a continuum of PK-20, and not simply a PK-12, perspectives. The inclusion of higher education teacher educators in the complex, multi-layered assessment system has the potential to promote mutual responsibility (Cochran-Smith, 2016; Sahlberg, 2010), characterized by collaboration across multiple policy-making levels, in which multiple stakeholders operate with a shared and co-created vision. A performance assessment at the PK-12 level, therefore, is enhanced when there are performance assessments as part of teacher preparation and vice versa. Creating a broad system of performance assessments across a PK-20 continuum can serve to raise questions, increase comfortability, and deepen respect around the nature and use of these assessments. Such an environment of mutual responsibility is also characterized by open dialogue that enhances trust across all stake holders and supports continuity in the development and implementation of performance assessments. Educator capacity to take up and ultimately realize the full, “beneficial use of performance assessments” (Stosich et al., 2018, p. 19) that such a system has to offer for student learning is attended to, augmented through, and embedded in a culture and context of inquiry.

As an example, there have been multiple parallel efforts in New Hampshire to support the development and implementation of performance assessments along a PK-20 continuum. In their article, Stosich et al. (2018) highlight New Hampshire's Performance Assessment of Competency Education (PACE) as a performance assessment that is locally developed by educators and used as part of federal accountability reporting requirements. Here we highlight other efforts across the state to build educator capacity including the adoption of a teacher candidate performance assessment in higher education, and joint efforts between PK-12 educators, university faculty, and state policy makers to support a PK-20 continuum.

In 2013, a consortium of teacher educators across all institutions of higher education in New Hampshire adopted the New Hampshire Teacher Candidate Assessment of Performance (NH TCAP) as a performance assessment to support teacher candidate learning and assess readiness to teach. Both PACE and the NH TCAP are locally developed performance assessments, reflecting the culture of a state that values such local influence, and allows, as Stosich and colleagues discuss, the historical, political, and educational factors that are important to the New Hampshire contexts to be considered. The development of the NH TCAP was influenced by a shift in the national discourse of teacher preparation to include performance assessments. Members of the consortium adapted an

existing teacher candidate performance assessment (i.e., Performance Assessment for California Teachers, Pecheone & Chung, 2006) for the state context and came to agreement around key implementation issues such as facilitation of the Teacher Performance Assessment with teacher candidates; scorer training; instructor involvement and assistance; and the consequential nature of the assessment. Specifically, in this process, the consortium explicitly addressed key components of each of the institutions, the policy context of the state, and ways in which their joint efforts can cultivate the space for conversations around preservice teacher learning, assessment, and accountability.

Drawing on and inspired by examples of other initiatives around teacher performance assessments taking place across the country, the NH TCAP aspires to strike a balance between assessment of and assessment for learning. As with assessments that Stosich et al. highlight exist at the PK-12 level, the NH TCAP seeks to provide opportunities for deep and meaningful learning within higher education. In contrast to other teacher candidate performance assessments across the country (Reagan, Schram, McCurdy, Chang & Evans, 2016), the NH TCAP is housed at the institutional level and is one of multiple measures that determine readiness to teach as determined by the institutions. As such, it has the capacity to continue evolving as teacher educators collect and analyze data about the efficacies and challenges faced by teacher candidates, cooperating teachers, and university faculty. In this way, it serves as a tool for learning at multiple levels. As Stosich et al. comment on similar efforts at the PK-12 level, this approach enabled teacher educators to develop a system of assessment that incorporates locally-developed assessments to “encourage more meaningful learning opportunities for [teacher candidates] by creating cohesion across curriculum, instruction, and assessment” (2018, p. 18). The NH TCAP serves as the vehicle by which teacher educators can engage in rich conversations around effective practice within and across institutions. Furthermore, as a performance assessment, the NH TCAP serves as a practical example for preservice teacher candidates to explore the potential of performance assessments through the process of responding to prompts and unpacking and understanding rubrics, as well as experiencing the process themselves.

The NH TCAP represents one of multiple initiatives across the state to design and implement performance assessments and promote coherence across levels and layers of education in the state. Other state-level initiatives include strengthening of PK-20 partnerships through annual summits of state-level policy makers, district- and school-based practitioners, and teacher education faculty. These initiatives also fundamentally share the belief that “creating a multilayered system of assessment practices can provide more coherent or fragmented support for performance assessments” (Stosich et al., 2018, p. 19). A context of innovation is necessarily supported by the buy-in from all stakeholders. While there is work to be done, these initiatives are one step towards tighter integration of the implementation of performance assessments. Such a network of PK-20 partnerships and associated supporters could intimately contribute to a context that gives rise to reflection about the relationships among curriculum, instruction, and assessment across the full spectrum of student learning. These parallel initiatives of the NH TCAP and PK-20 partnerships are also creating a safe space for embracing a more critical look at not only the benefits but the factors (ie. educator capacity, financial resources) potentially limiting the full realization of performance assessments

Over the past decade, New Hampshire policy makers, teacher educators, and school partners have worked deliberately and thoughtfully to conceptualize a learning and assessment system that developed from and encourages the shared values of this community: strong local control where the voices from multiple engaged stakeholders are encouraged and considered. The process for the development of such performance assessments was slow at times because it was recognized by all

that careful attention needed to be paid to the needs and identities of all members in the ecosystem. These conversations included deep attention to respective histories, shared and different values, as well as shared and divergent trajectories. Ultimately the critical component and binding thread for the New Hampshire context was the recognition of and commitment to the belief that the learning of New Hampshire's PK-12 students is deeply tied to the preparation of its teachers. New Hampshire's example extends Stosich and colleagues' review of emerging PK-12 practices around performance assessment to teacher preparation demonstrating a cohesive and sustaining statewide effort in order to realize fully learning opportunities of these assessments for students and teachers.

References

- Cochran-Smith, M., Stern, R., Sanchez, J., Miller, A., Keefe, E., Fernandez, M., . . . Baker, M. (2016). *Holding Teacher Preparation Accountable: A Review of Claims and Evidence*. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. <http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/holding-teacher-preparation-accountable-a-review-of-claims-and-evidence>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487105284045>
- Reagan, E., Schram, T., McCurdy, K., Chang, T., & Evans, C. (2016). Politics of policy: Assessing the implementation, impact, and evolution of the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) and edTPA. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.24.2176>
- Sahlberg, P. (2010). Rethinking accountability in a knowledge society. *Journal of Educational Change*, 11, 45 – 61. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-008-9098-2>
- Stosich, E. L., Snyder, J. & Wilczak, K. (2018). How do states integrate performance assessments in their systems of assessment? *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 26(13). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.2906>

About the Authors

Kathryn McCurdy

University of New Hampshire

kathryn.mccurdy@unh.edu

Dr. Kathryn McCurdy is an Assistant Clinical Professor at the University of New Hampshire where she also serves as the Director of Field Placement for its Manchester campus. Prior to her doctoral work, Kathryn taught middle school mathematics in Boston where she also worked for years supporting and mentoring preservice and beginning teachers. Her research interests are novice teacher learning, mentoring and induction support structures and activities, teacher performance assessments, and continuing professional learning of veteran teachers. Kathryn holds a bachelor's degree in Philosophy from the University of Kansas, a master's degree from University of Michigan in Curriculum Development, and a Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction from the University of New Hampshire.

Emilie Mitescu Reagan

University of New Hampshire

emilie.reagan@unh.edu

Emilie Mitescu Reagan is an Assistant Professor of Assessment and Policy in the University of New Hampshire Department of Education. Emilie began her career in education as a fifth grade teacher in Philadelphia, PA. Her current research focuses on assessment of and accountability in teacher education using quantitative and mixed methods research. She has co-authored publications in the *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *Education Policy and Analysis Archives*, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *International Journal of Educational Research*, and *Teacher Education and Practice*. Emilie is currently the Principal Investigator on a Spencer Foundation Grant and Co-Principal Investigator on the U.S. Department of Education funded *Teacher Residency for Rural Education*. Emilie holds a bachelor's degree in Foreign Service from Georgetown University, a master's degree in Elementary Education from St. Joseph's University, and a Ph.D. in Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation from Boston College.

Audrey Rogers

Southern New Hampshire University

a.rogers@snhu.edu

Audrey Rogers is an Associate Professor in the School of Education at Southern New Hampshire University in Manchester, NH. She teaches courses in educational technology, literacy, secondary methods, and history. She is a local and national presenter and has authored several Jackdaw Primary Source Kits, Cooperative Learning Basics, and numerous articles. Certified in social studies and as a technology integrator, she taught social studies at Nashua High School from 1989-2001. She was a founding member of NH READS - Reading Excellence across Disciplines and lead Scholar for the development of a web-based curriculum at the Fort at No. 4/Living History Museum. She directed a grant from the Education Commission of States on increasing civic engagement in New Hampshire. She received her B.A in History from Tufts University. She holds a Master's in History from the University of NH/Durham and a Master's in Education from the University of Massachusetts/Lowell. She holds an Ed.D. in Leadership and Learning from Rivier University. Her current research focuses on technology and cultural competence in educators.

Thomas Schram

University of New Hampshire

tom.schram@unh.edu

Tom Schram is Associate Professor and Director of the Division of Educator Preparation at the University of New Hampshire, where he coordinates master's-level credentialing programs in teacher education, special education, early childhood education, and counseling. He is a founding member and Vice President of the New Hampshire IHE Network, a nonprofit consortium comprised of all the higher education educator preparation programs in the state. He has authored books on qualitative research design, served as a research consultant for the Teachers for a New Era (TNE) evidence team at Boston College, and was the lead qualitative researcher of a nationwide study on reform in mathematics education and the NCTM Standards.

About the Guest Editors

Elizabeth Leisy Stosich

Fordham University

estosich@fordham.edu

Elizabeth Leisy Stosich is an Assistant Professor in Educational Leadership, Administration, and Policy at Fordham University. Previously, she was a Research and Policy Fellow at the Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education. Her research interests include education policy, assessment and accountability, school and district leadership, school improvement, and teachers' professional learning.

Soung Bae

Stanford University

soungb@stanford.edu

Soung Bae is a Senior Learning Specialist and UDL Innovation Studio Manager at the Schwab Learning Center at Stanford University. Formerly, she was a Senior Research and Policy Analyst at the Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education. Her research interests focus on school accountability, student engagement, and designing learning environments that appreciate and support learner variability.

Jon Snyder

Stanford University

jdsnyder@stanford.edu

Jon Snyder is the Executive Director of the Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education (SCOPE). His research interests include teacher learning, conditions that support teacher learning, and the relationships between teacher and student learning.

SPECIAL ISSUE
Redesigning Assessment and Accountability

education policy analysis archives

Volume 26 Number 14

January 29, 2018

ISSN 1068-2341



Readers are free to copy, display, and distribute this article, as long as the work is attributed to the author(s) and **Education Policy Analysis Archives**, it is distributed for non-commercial purposes only, and no alteration or transformation is made in the work. More details of this Creative Commons license are available at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>. All other uses must be approved by the author(s) or **EPAA**. **EPAA** is published by the Mary Lou Fulton Institute and Graduate School of Education at Arizona State University. Articles are indexed in CIRC (Clasificación Integrada de Revistas Científicas, Spain), DIALNET (Spain), [Directory of Open Access Journals](#), EBSCO Education Research Complete, ERIC, Education Full Text (H.W. Wilson), QUALIS A1 (Brazil), SCImago Journal Rank; SCOPUS, SOCOLAR (China).

Please send errata notes to Audrey Amrein-Beardsley at Audrey.beardsley@asu.edu

Join **EPAA's Facebook community** at <https://www.facebook.com/EPAAAPE> and **Twitter feed** @epaa_aape.

education policy analysis archives
editorial board

Lead Editor: **Audrey Amrein-Beardsley** (Arizona State University)

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Associate Editors: **David Carlson, Lauren Harris, Eugene Judson, Mirka Koro-Ljungberg, Scott Marley, Iveta Silova, Maria Teresa Tatto** (Arizona State University)

Cristina Alfaro San Diego State University

Gary Anderson New York University

Michael W. Apple University of Wisconsin, Madison

Jeff Bale OISE, University of Toronto, Canada

Aaron Bevanot SUNY Albany

David C. Berliner Arizona State University

Henry Braun Boston College

Casey Cobb University of Connecticut

Arnold Danzig San Jose State University

Linda Darling-Hammond Stanford University

Elizabeth H. DeBray University of Georgia

Chad d'Entremont Rennie Center for Education Research & Policy

John Diamond University of Wisconsin, Madison

Matthew Di Carlo Albert Shanker Institute

Sherman Dorn Arizona State University

Michael J. Dumas University of California, Berkeley

Kathy Escamilla University of Colorado, Boulder

Melissa Lynn Freeman Adams State College

Rachael Gabriel University of Connecticut

Amy Garrett Dikkers University of North Carolina, Wilmington

Gene V Glass Arizona State University

Ronald Glass University of California, Santa Cruz

Jacob P. K. Gross University of Louisville

Eric M. Haas WestEd

Julian Vasquez Heilig California State University, Sacramento

Kimberly Kappler Hewitt University of North Carolina Greensboro

Aimee Howley Ohio University

Steve Klees University of Maryland

Jaekyung Lee SUNY Buffalo

Jessica Nina Lester Indiana University

Amanda E. Lewis University of Illinois, Chicago

Chad R. Lochmiller Indiana University

Christopher Lubienski Indiana University

Sarah Lubienski Indiana University

William J. Mathis University of Colorado, Boulder

Michele S. Moses University of Colorado, Boulder

Julianne Moss Deakin University, Australia

Sharon Nichols University of Texas, San Antonio

Eric Parsons University of Missouri-Columbia

Amanda U. Potterton University of Kentucky

Susan L. Robertson Bristol University, UK

Gloria M. Rodriguez University of California, Davis

R. Anthony Rolle University of Houston

A. G. Rud Washington State University

Patricia Sánchez University of University of Texas, San Antonio

Janelle Scott University of California, Berkeley

Jack Schneider College of the Holy Cross

Noah Sobe Loyola University

Nelly P. Stromquist University of Maryland

Benjamin Superfine University of Illinois, Chicago

Adai Tefera Virginia Commonwealth University

Tina Trujillo University of California, Berkeley

Federico R. Waitoller University of Illinois, Chicago

Larisa Warhol University of Connecticut

John Weathers University of Colorado, Colorado Springs

Kevin Welner University of Colorado, Boulder

Terrence G. Wiley Center for Applied Linguistics

John Willinsky Stanford University

Jennifer R. Wolgemuth University of South Florida

Kyo Yamashiro Claremont Graduate University

archivos analíticos de políticas educativas
consejo editorial

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Editores Asociados: **Armando Alcántara Santuario** (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México), **Jason Beech** (Universidad de San Andrés), **Ezequiel Gomez Caride** (Pontificia Universidad Católica Argentina), **Antonio Luzon** (Universidad de Granada), **Angelica Buendia** (Metropolitan Autonomous University), **José Luis Ramírez** (Universidad de Sonora)

Claudio Almonacid

Universidad Metropolitana de
Ciencias de la Educación, Chile

Miguel Ángel Arias Ortega

Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad
de México

Xavier Besalú Costa

Universitat de Girona, España

Xavier Bonal Sarro Universidad
Autónoma de Barcelona, España

Antonio Bolívar Boitia Universidad
de Granada, España

José Joaquín Brunner Universidad
Diego Portales, Chile

Damián Canales Sánchez Instituto
Nacional para la Evaluación de la
Educación, México

Gabriela de la Cruz Flores
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de
México

Marco Antonio Delgado Fuentes
Universidad Iberoamericana, México

Inés Dussel, DIE-CINVESTAV,
México

Juan Carlos González Faraco

Universidad de Huelva, España

María Clemente Linuesa

Universidad de Salamanca, España

Jaume Martínez Bonafé

Universitat de València, España

Alejandro Márquez Jiménez

Instituto de Investigaciones sobre
la Universidad y la Educación,
UNAM, México

María Guadalupe Olivier Tellez,
Universidad Pedagógica Nacional,
México

Miguel Pereyra Universidad de
Granada, España

Mónica Pini Universidad Nacional
de San Martín, Argentina

Omar Orlando Pulido Chaves
Instituto para la Investigación
Educativa y el Desarrollo
Pedagógico (IDEP)

Paula Razquin Universidad de
San Andrés, Argentina

Miriam Rodríguez Vargas

Universidad Autónoma de
Tamaulipas, México

José Gregorio Rodríguez

Universidad Nacional de Colombia,
Colombia

Mario Rueda Beltrán Instituto de
Investigaciones sobre la
Universidad y la Educación,
UNAM, México

José Luis San Fabián Maroto

Universidad de Oviedo,
España

Jurjo Torres Santomé,

Universidad de la Coruña, España

Yengny Marisol Silva Laya

Universidad Iberoamericana,
México

Ernesto Treviño Ronzón

Universidad Veracruzana, México

Ernesto Treviño Villarreal

Universidad Diego Portales
Santiago, Chile

Antoni Verger Planells

Universidad Autónoma de
Barcelona, España

arquivos analíticos de políticas educativas
conselho editorial

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Editores Associados: **Geovana Mendonça Lunardi Mendes** (Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina),
Marcia Pletsch, Sandra Regina Sales (Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro)

Almerindo Afonso

Universidade do Minho
Portugal

Alexandre Fernandez Vaz

Universidade Federal de Santa
Catarina, Brasil

José Augusto Pacheco

Universidade do Minho, Portugal

Rosanna Maria Barros Sá

Universidade do Algarve
Portugal

Regina Célia Linhares Hostins

Universidade do Vale do Itajaí,
Brasil

Jane Paiva

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Maria Helena Bonilla

Universidade Federal da Bahia
Brasil

Alfredo Macedo Gomes

Universidade Federal de Pernambuco
Brasil

Paulo Alberto Santos Vieira

Universidade do Estado de Mato
Grosso, Brasil

Rosa Maria Bueno Fischer

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Sul, Brasil

Jefferson Mainardes

Universidade Estadual de Ponta
Grossa, Brasil

Fabiany de Cássia Tavares Silva

Universidade Federal do Mato
Grosso do Sul, Brasil

Alice Casimiro Lopes

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Jader Janer Moreira Lopes

Universidade Federal Fluminense e
Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora,
Brasil

António Teodoro

Universidade Lusófona
Portugal

Suzana Feldens Schwertner

Centro Universitário Univates
Brasil

Debora Nunes

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Norte, Brasil

Lílian do Valle

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Flávia Miller Naethe Motta

Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Alda Junqueira Marin

Pontifícia Universidade Católica de
São Paulo, Brasil

Alfredo Veiga-Neto

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Sul, Brasil

Dalila Andrade Oliveira

Universidade Federal de Minas
Gerais, Brasil