
education policy analysis archives

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



Arizona State University

Volume 27 Number 122

October 7, 2019

ISSN 1068-2341

State-wide Implementation of edTPA in Preparation for High-Stakes Testing: A Mixed-Methods Study of the Concerns of edTPA Coordinators

Joyce E. Many, Ruchi Bhatnagar, Carla Tanguay, Shaneeka Favors-Welch,

Clarice Thomas, Susan Ophelia Cannon

Georgia State University

Tamra Ogletree

University of West Georgia

Jihye Kim, Shannon Howrey, Sohyun An

Kennesaw State University

Karen Kurz

Berry College

&

Judi Wilson

Augusta University

United States

Citation: Many, J. E., Bhatnagar, R., Tanguay, C., Favors-Welch, S., Thomas, C., Cannon, S., ... Wilson, J. (2019). State-wide implementation of edTPA in preparation for high-stakes testing: A mixed-methods study of the concerns of edTPA coordinators. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 27(122). <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.27.4460>

Journal website: <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/>

Facebook: /EPAAA

Twitter: @epaa_aape

Manuscript received: 1/22/2019

Revisions received: 5/7/2019

Accepted: 5/7/2019

Abstract: This study examined the implementation of high-stakes adoption of edTPA® in one state in the year prior to consequential use of edTPA scores for teacher licensure. Using a mixed methods design, we investigated concerns of coordinators who were responsible for edTPA implementation in their institutions. We utilized the Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM) to understand edTPA coordinators' *Stages of Concern*, the nature of the challenges they faced, and the professional development opportunities that alleviated their concerns. Based on the CBAM survey, the most common *Stage of Concern* for edTPA coordinators was *Management*. Coordinators' interviews revealed the nature of their concerns at different stages and how the size of their institution and supportive resources at particular times may have played a crucial role in shaping the edTPA roll-out in their institutions. The use of the CBAM framework enabled edTPA coordinators (a) to understand their own concerns about the high-stakes policy, (b) to articulate the complexities involved in implementing edTPA initiatives, and (c) to underscore the importance of relating concerns to appropriate professional development opportunities and support for themselves as well as their faculty.

Keywords: edTPA policy; stages of concern; teacher education accountability

Implementación de estatal de edTPA en preparación para pruebas de alto riesgo:

Un estudio de método mixto de las preocupaciones del coordinador de edTPA

Resumen: Este estudio examinó la implementación de la adopción de edTPA® de alto riesgo en un estado previo al uso consecuente de los puntajes de edTPA para la licencia de maestros. Usando un diseño de método mixto, investigamos las preocupaciones de los coordinadores responsables de implementar edTPA en sus instituciones. Utilizamos el Modelo de adopción basado en la preocupación (CBAM) para comprender las etapas de preocupación para los coordinadores de edTPA, la naturaleza de los desafíos que enfrentaron y las oportunidades de desarrollo profesional que alivian sus preocupaciones. Según la investigación de CBAM, la etapa de preocupación más común para los coordinadores de edTPA fue la gestión. Las entrevistas con los coordinadores revelaron la naturaleza de sus preocupaciones en diferentes etapas y cómo el tamaño de su institución y los recursos de apoyo en ciertos momentos pueden haber jugado un papel crucial en la definición de la implementación de edTPA en sus instituciones. El uso del marco CBAM ha permitido a los coordinadores de edTPA (a) comprender sus propias preocupaciones sobre la política de alto riesgo, (b) articular las complejidades involucradas en la implementación de iniciativas de edTPA, y (c) subrayar la importancia de relacionar las preocupaciones con oportunidades apropiadas para el desarrollo profesional y el apoyo para ellos mismos y la facultad.

Palabras clave: política edTPA; etapas de preocupación; rendición de cuentas de la formación docente

Implementação estadual do edTPA em preparação para testes de alto risco: Um estudo de métodos mistos das preocupações dos coordenadores do edTPA

Resumen: Este estudo examinou a implementação da adoção de edTPA® de alto risco em um estado do ano anterior ao uso consequente das pontuações de edTPA para licenciamento de professores. Usando um design de métodos mistos, investigamos as preocupações dos coordenadores responsáveis pela implementação do edTPA em suas instituições. Utilizamos o Modelo de Adoção com Base em Preocupações (CBAM) para entender os Estágios de Preocupação dos coordenadores da edTPA, a natureza dos desafios que enfrentaram e as oportunidades de desenvolvimento profissional que

atenuaram suas preocupações. Com base na pesquisa da CBAM, o estágio de preocupação mais comum para os coordenadores da edTPA foi o gerenciamento. As entrevistas dos coordenadores revelaram a natureza de suas preocupações em diferentes estágios e como o tamanho de sua instituição e os recursos de suporte em determinados momentos podem ter desempenhado um papel crucial na definição da implementação do edTPA em suas instituições. O uso da estrutura CBAM permitiu aos coordenadores da edTPA (a) entender suas próprias preocupações sobre a política de altos riscos, (b) articular as complexidades envolvidas na implementação de iniciativas da edTPA, e (c) sublinhar a importância de relacionar as preocupações às oportunidades apropriadas de desenvolvimento profissional e apoiar a si e ao corpo docente.

Palabras-clave: política edTPA; estágios de preocupação; prestação de contas da formação de professores

State-wide Implementation of edTPA in Preparation for High-Stakes Testing: A Mixed-Methods Study of the Concerns of edTPA Coordinators

Teacher education has long been critiqued for relying on locally-developed assessments that lack reliability and validity (Grossman, Hammerness, McDonald, & Ronfeldt, 2008). As a result, rigorous assessments have been advanced which focus on teacher candidates' application of knowledge of teaching and learning in a classroom setting, one of which is edTPA® (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Tanguay, 2018). A performance-based assessment created by teacher educators, edTPA, has been embraced by education reformers and teacher educators who aim to professionalize teaching (Sloan, 2015; SCALE, 2017). Such assessments have, however, been criticized by those who propose critical pedagogy, who object to the privatization of public educational services (Attick & Boyles, 2018), and who advocate for faculty autonomy in teacher preparation (Donovan & Cannon, 2018; Henning et al., 2018; Sato, 2014).

As of 2019, 21 states require the use of edTPA or a similar teacher performance assessment for program completion, initial teacher licensure, and/or program approval (SCALE, 2019). As states have adopted policies involving high-stakes use of such performance assessments, institutions of higher education have felt compelled to provide intensive faculty development and to consider extensive curricular redesign to ensure candidates' preparation. Pressure to undertake reform as a result of policies requiring performance assessments as part of program or certification requirements has caused intense concerns for faculty (Lit & Lotan, 2013; Meuwissen & Choppin, 2015; Peck, Galluci, & Sloan, 2010). Our study draws from literature on the change process in educational contexts to understand what happens when teacher education programs are required by state policy to utilize a performance assessment. Further, we see potential in the findings to improve support during the implementation of changes that may occur as a result of such mandates.

Research on Implementation of Teacher Performance Assessments and Faculty Concerns

Over the last decade, edTPA has been promoted as an authentic teacher preparation assessment that meets the qualities of rigor desired by policy makers (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Tanguay, 2018). Proponents contend edTPA affords the field of teacher education a common language and tool for assessment to enhance program improvement and curriculum renewal (Pecheone & Whittaker, 2016). edTPA includes differentiation for 27 different content areas with

subject specific handbooks and portfolio requirements for each area. The majority are structured in the form of three subject-specific tasks: 1) planning for instruction and assessment, 2) instructing and engaging students in learning, and 3) assessing students' learning. The assessment requires candidates to plan and conduct a 3-5 day cycle of teaching focused on student learning. The portfolio and reflections demonstrate candidates' abilities to embed academic language components and require teacher candidates to justify their planning decisions, analyze their teaching effectiveness, and use data to inform instruction (SCALE, 2017). The assessment comes with elaborate expectations and guidelines that require intensive training to ensure candidate and faculty understanding (Meuwissen & Choppin, 2015; Sato, 2014; Tanguay, 2018). Creating the edTPA portfolio typically takes 5-6 weeks including preparation time and videotaping the teaching segment. When policies call for external scoring, candidates upload their work on a portal and pay for it to be evaluated by a rater selected by the testing company.

In response to the widespread adoption of teacher performance assessments, teacher educators have voiced numerous concerns regarding how edTPA as a high-stakes assessment can narrow the scope of teacher education curriculum, making it test-centered; can reduce autonomy of teacher educators; and may be influenced by factors outside of teacher candidates' control (Henning, et al, 2018; Lit & Lotan, 2013; Meuwissen & Choppin, 2015). Others have argued that any standardized assessment increases opportunities for privatization of education and discounts the local context, a particular concern for programs which prepare candidates for urban settings (Donovan & Cannon, 2018; Dover & Schultz, 2016; Tuck & Gorlewski, 2016).

From the perspective of the change process, structures within institutions of higher education have been found to be slow to change and may even resist change when faced with mandates such as a high-stakes assessment (Peck et al., 2010; Sloan, 2013). Teacher educators may view policy mandates as threats to their autonomy or program's mission. In response, teacher educators may comply or resist, in either case the mandates can be opportunities for inquiry, curriculum adaptation, and program improvement (Kornfeld, Grady, Marker, & Ruddell, 2007; Lit & Lotan, 2013; Peck et al., 2010; Sloan, 2015). When teacher educators respond to policy changes as learning experiences and explore teacher performance assessments (TPAs) as instructional tools, they can become leaders in the process and develop a culture of inquiry as opposed to adopting a compliance orientation (Ledwell & Oyler, 2016; Sloan, 2015). Faculty who have used inquiry to guide their involvement with edTPA have developed common understandings and used data for curriculum mapping, course revision, and program improvement (Lys, L'Esperance, Dobson, & Bullock, 2014).

While some have espoused the benefits of an inquiry approach, one challenge faced by teacher educators has been preparing candidates for rigorous requirements of edTPA without teaching to the test (Lachuk & Koeller, 2015; Miller, Carroll, Jancic, & Markworth, 2015). Aligning curriculum with a summative assessment can create tensions for faculty who value and wish to retain their long-held perspectives on teaching and learning, including critical pedagogical stances (Lachuk & Koeller, 2015; Lit & Lotan, 2013; Sato, 2014). Many have alluded to the challenge inherent in preparing candidates for edTPA expectations while maintaining program philosophy (Fayne & Qian, 2016; Lachuk & Koeller, 2015; Lit & Lotan, 2013; Miller et al., 2015). Others believe that when TPAs are high-stakes, changes in curriculum may actually take candidates' attention away from learning how to adopt responsive pedagogical practices (Henning et al., 2018; Ledwell & Oyler, 2016).

To cope with such issues, educational leaders have begun to recognize the need for institutional structures that support teacher candidates and faculty as they navigate tensions which emerge from these new mandates, particularly when candidates are required to complete edTPA portfolios (Lys et al., 2014; Tanguay, Many, Ariail, Bhatnagar, & Emerson, 2019). Sloan (2013)

recommends the use of distributed leadership between and across stakeholders (e.g., teacher educators, administrators, mentor teachers, edTPA coordinators) to create a system of collaboration. Fayne and Qian in a longitudinal study (2016), found professional development within communities of practice was effective in addressing faculty members' personal concerns related to edTPA and subsequently faculty shifted to focusing on program issues and candidate supports. They contend a top-down leadership format is ineffective in the face of external mandates; instead, an approach grounded in understanding faculty concerns and the change process is critical to achieving positive results. More information is needed, however, on best ways to support institutions and, in particular, the educational leaders who are instrumental in facilitating reform initiatives within high-stakes contexts.

Theoretical Framework

The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) provides a theoretical lens for examining the change process of educational reforms and how concerns of participants can impact the success or failure of an educational innovation (Hall, 2010; Hall, Newlove, George, Rutherford, & Hord, 1991; Kapustka & Damore, 2009). From Hall and colleagues' (1991) perspective, to be concerned is “. . . to be in a mentally aroused state about something” (p. 3). Concerns about an implementing an innovation, or the affective part of change, is one of the key diagnostic dimensions to be considered in designing educational interventions (Hall, 2010). The CBAM posits that the single-most important factor in any change process is the people responsible; therefore, facilitating change means understanding the existing attitudes and perceptions of those involved (Hall & Hord, 2015). The underlying premise behind the CBAM is “change is a process, not an event” (Hall, 2010, p. 234). The *Change Facilitator's Stages of Concern* (CFSoc) instrument (Hall et al., 1991) focuses on the developmental stages of concern experienced by facilitators responsible for leading a change process.

According to CBAM, the Stages of Concern (SoC) experienced by change facilitators occur across a continuum, peaking in a linear fashion (Hall et al., 1991). Facilitators' reactions across this continuum focus on the following stages: awareness, informational, personal, management, consequence, collaboration, and refocusing. Facilitators may have concerns across these categories at any time; however, their peak—or highest level of concern—generally progress from focusing on personal and role-related aspects to later concentrating more fully on innovation-related aspects. Hall and Hord (2015) emphasize anticipating, recognizing, and addressing personal and task concerns must occur prior to facilitators being able to fully turn their attention to analyzing the impact of the innovation being implemented. This theoretical construct was consistent with findings from Ogletree, Kim, Bhatnagar, Many, and Tanguay's study (2018), which found teacher education faculty who were at the beginning of the SoC continuum in terms of their stages of concern were significantly less likely to focus on analyzing and making informed decisions from edTPA student data. In addition, their research indicated faculty at the management and collaboration stages of concern were more likely to have integrated edTPA-like content into their courses.

In our study, the CBAM model and the CFSoc survey were utilized to understand the experiences and concerns of individuals in Georgia who served as edTPA coordinators at their institutions. In Georgia, a policy directive required implementation of edTPA initiatives in all teacher-education programs in the year directly prior to a new requirement instituting passing cut-off scores on edTPA for initial teacher licensure. Institutions appointed edTPA coordinators who assumed responsibility for leading their institution's efforts to implement edTPA.

Given the national trends in adopting edTPA as a high-stakes assessment (Donovan & Cannon, 2018; Henning et al., 2018; SCALE, 2018), more information is needed to understand edTPA coordinators' concerns in varying institutional contexts. The backdrop of resistance and concerns voiced by the teacher education community about the edTPA could have intensified some edTPA coordinators own concerns about the performance assessment, as they were simultaneously trying to unpack this complex assessment and become pioneers of implementing edTPA in their respective institutions. Although edTPA coordinators are designated as the leaders in charge of initiating change in their institutions, philosophical tensions, high-stakes nature of the assessment for their students and faculty, and time concerns could potentially cause tremendous stress and confusion for edTPA coordinators. In addition, their special role as edTPA experts and leaders within their institution could have an influence on their faculty's perceptions of edTPA oriented initiatives in the institution and ultimately the support offered to the candidates.

Our state-wide study examined the concerns of these coordinators during an edTPA implementation year and explored the extent to which professional development or resources met the needs of these coordinators. We used a mixed-method approach (a) to identify coordinators' developmental Stages of Concern and (b) to understand in further detail the nature of concerns expressed by coordinators in varying contexts. The mixed-methods approach allowed us to develop a more complex understanding of the topic than would be possible through the use of a singular method (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). We chose mixed-methods for our study to increase the validity of findings (Hurmeninta-Peltomaki & Nummela, 2006) and to provide descriptive integration of experiences with the numerical data to provide nuance and more confidence in the results (O'Cathain, Murphy, & Nicholl, 2010). Specifically, we addressed the following questions:

1. What are edTPA coordinators' Stages of Concern during an implementation year prior to the adoption of a high-stakes policy related to edTPA scores?
2. How do edTPA coordinators describe the nature of their concerns about facilitating edTPA implementation?
3. How do contextual factors relate to edTPA coordinators' Stages of Concerns and the nature of those concerns?
4. What types of professional development and resources did coordinators find helpful or did they desire for edTPA implementation in their institutions?

The CBAM theoretical framework indicates new edTPA coordinators, as key facilitators of program change during the edTPA implementation process, are likely to be confronted with intense concerns about their roles and with respect to the performance assessment that will need to be understood and addressed effectively. This study will provide important information on the nature of coordinators' development and the effectiveness of varying professional development and resources in addressing their ability to facilitate changes needed to prepare candidates for passing a high-stakes performance assessment. The research will also extend the literature on supporting institutional response to policy mandates involving teacher performance assessments.

Method

This state-wide study used a two phase, sequential explanatory mixed-method design where the qualitative data were used to supplement the quantitative findings (Creswell, 2003). During Phase I and II of this study, coordinators had been tasked with ensuring their institution's candidates

would be capable of performing effectively on edTPA in preparation for a new state policy that would require candidates (a) to submit portfolios for national scoring by the testing company to complete their program and (b) to achieve a minimum cut-score to obtain certification. In Phase I of the study, we first examined the overall trends in the state by identifying peak Stages of Concern for coordinators using quantitative methods. Based on the results of Phase I, we subsequently conducted follow-up interviews to explore specific tensions and/or opportunities for learning that were offered or desired by the edTPA coordinators to alleviate their concerns (Phase II).

Participants

Participants were individuals responsible for facilitating the implementation of edTPA initiatives at public and private educator preparation institutions in Georgia. A state-wide database provided contact information for a pool of 51 coordinators. Phase I of the study was conducted in early spring of the implementation year prior to the fall deadline when edTPA would become consequential. In Phase I, all of the state's 51 edTPA coordinators were invited to participate in an electronic survey and 34 (67%) coordinators representing 27 of the 41 institutions responded (some institutions utilized multiple coordinators). Though all 34 survey participants served as edTPA coordinators at their institutions, most also had additional roles and responsibilities. Twenty-two (65%) also served as a course instructor, 19 (56%) as a university supervisor, 13 (38%) as a field placement coordinator, 12 (35%) as the assessment coordinator, 11 (32%) as a department/college administrator, and 9 (26%) as a program coordinator. In Phase II, we contacted the 34 survey respondents and 22 (65%) coordinators from 18 institutions agreed to participate in a follow-up interview. Phase II interviews took place in April-June of the implementation year.

Phase I: Survey and Statistical Analysis

The online edTPA coordinator survey included (a) contextual items related to respondents' institutions and roles, and (b) 35 items from the Measuring Change Facilitators' Stages of Concern (CFSoc) questionnaire (Hall et al., 1991). The CFSoc instrument measures concerns along seven stages (Awareness, Informational, Personal, Management, Consequence, Collaboration, and Refocusing) with test re-test and internal consistency reliability measures (alpha-coefficients) established at levels over .65 in all stages (Hall et al., 1991).

The responses to the CFSoc items were analyzed by converting raw scores to percentiles and graphing percentiles to identify the peak-stage for each facilitator (as outlined in Hall et al., 1991). Next, we used three independent samples *t*-tests to compare the difference on the peak of CFSoc by contextual factors including: the size of institution (Title II initial preparation completers, > or < 100), public or private status, and the number of roles played by the edTPA coordinator. Then, we ran a Pearson product-moment correlation to reveal the association between Stage of Concern and the number of edTPA handbooks implemented by the institution.

Phase II: Follow Up Interviews and Qualitative Analyses

Phase II focused on qualitative data collection consisting of phone, video conference, or in-person interviews that lasted 30 to 45 minutes. Participants received their graphed CFSoc survey responses, identifying their peak, along with definitions for each stage. The semi-structured interviews focused on open ended discussion of coordinators' roles and concerns, probed discussion of their personal CFSoc graphed results and the stages, and explanation of circumstances may have led to both their CFSoc and their overall concerns. Finally, input was sought regarding the professional development opportunities that participants felt were supportive at particular Stages of Concern, and other opportunities that could have been helpful. All interviews were transcribed and

participants were provided interview transcripts to review for accuracy. Later participants were also provided analysis of the results with an invitation to provide confirmation, clarification or other feedback on interpretations.

Interviews were analyzed using a constant-comparative method (Creswell, 2003; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). De-identified data units related to concerns were entered into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet and important elements were highlighted in color. In a second column, temporary constructs were entered as descriptions of highlighted areas. Temporary constructs were reviewed to establish the nature of issues expressed as related to specific Stages of Concern. Subsequently, the temporary constructs were compared through a process of data reduction, and subcategories were clustered into broader over-arching themes as necessary.

The process of identifying initial constructs and stages was completed by one member of the research team and described in a code book. The 10 research team members then divided into five groups of two members each. Data for each participant were analyzed independently by at least one group and discussions occurred across the entire team to clarify the coding system and reach consensus. Following the establishment of the final codes, groups re-coded a second set of data. Afterwards the entire data set was reviewed by the lead author to ensure consistency. Finally, a column indicating the size of participants' institutions was added and potential patterns within the nature of concerns were examined in light of this contextual variable. All participants were assigned a pseudonym to preserve anonymity.

Results

Using survey responses from the 34 edTPA coordinators, we calculated the peak CFSoc for each coordinator. Two coordinators had double peaks (stage 3 and 6; and stage 1 and 4) and for quantitative analyses we used the stage which represented the highest point of the continuum for that individual's peak. The percentage of edTPA coordinators peaking at each stage can be seen in Table 1. The largest percentage (41%) were peaking at Management (Stage 3) with concerns focusing time, logistics, resources, and energy in facilitating edTPA implementation.

Table 1
Frequency of Highest Stage of Concerns for edTPA Coordinators

Stages	Description	Frequency	%
Stage 0: Awareness	Concerns are focused elsewhere -- not on change facilitation.	7	20.6
Stage 1: Informational	Focus is on need to know more about an innovation.	1	2.9
Stage 2: Personal	Uncertainty about one's ability or role.	3	8.8
Stage 3: Management	Time, logistics, and difficulties of managing process.	14	41.2
Stage 4: Consequence	Improving facilitation and effectiveness of innovation.	2	5.9
Stage 5: Collaboration	Coordinating with others to increase capacity.	5	14.7
Stage 6: Refocusing	Ideas about alternatives to innovation.	2	5.9
Total		34	100

To explore the degree to which Stages of Concern may be related to context, we ran three independent samples t-tests and a Pearson product-moment correlation. The results of t-tests showed non-significant mean difference in the Stages of Concern for coordinators from public or private institutions ($t(29) = 0.70, p = 0.49, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.84, 1.71]$), with respect to the additional roles the coordinators played in their institution ($t(29) = 0.21, p = 0.21, 95\% \text{ CI } [-1.28, 1.57]$), and for size of institution ($t(24) = -0.05, p = 0.40, 95\% \text{ CI } [-1.48, 1.40]$) at the 0.05 level of significance (Table 2). Correlations were also non-significant for peak Stage of Concern for the number of handbooks implemented at institutions ($r = 0.16, p = .41$). These findings demonstrated the consistency of the developmental model describing Stages of Concern and indicated coordinators' progression across stages was not related to contextual factors during the implementation year.

Table 2
Independent samples of t-test for Facilitator Stages of Concern

	Type of Institution						95% CI for Mean Difference	T	df
	Public			Private					
	M	SD	n	M	SD	n			
	2.68	1.53	19	2.25	1.91	12	-0.84, 1.71	0.70	29
Highest Peak of Change Facilitator Stages of Concern	Roles						95% CI for Mean Difference	T	df
	1 role			2 or more					
	M	SD	n	M	SD	n			
	2.63	2.07	8	2.48	1.56	23	-1.28, 1.57	0.21	29
	Size of Institution						95% CI for Mean Difference	T	df
	Less than 100			Greater than 100					
	M	SD	n	M	SD	n			
	2.6	1.6	15	2.64	1.96	11	-1.48, 1.40	-0.05	24

Note. The size of institution was defined by number of Title II initial preparation completers (> or <100); * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$.

In order to explore the specific tensions coordinators faced and the nuances within stages that might be affected by institutional contexts, we turned to data from Phase II. The 22 coordinators participating in the follow-up interviews represented 10 public and 8 private institutions of varying sizes (7 at institutions producing more than 100 teachers a year, 11 at smaller institutions). In addition to being responsible for edTPA coordination, 18 of those interviewed (82%) were also course instructors, 14 (63%) supervised student teachers, 9 (41%) coordinated programs, 8 (36%) were department or college administrators, 8 (36%) were assessment coordinators, and 7 (32%) were responsible for field placements. The interviews provided descriptive details of the nature of concerns which coordinators had experienced and the types of supports they had received or needed. As shown in Table 3, coordinators' concerns could be framed in relation to the following themes (a) the need to learn about edTPA, (b) concerns about self, (c) concerns regarding facilitating the effectiveness of initiatives, and (d) concerns of how to improve edTPA implementation. In the results which follow, participants are assigned a pseudonym, a number associated with their institution, and a letter (A-D) to differentiate between multiple respondents at the same institution.

Table 3
Change Facilitator Stages of Concern for edTPA Implementation

Developmental Concerns Regarding edTPA Implementation	Change Facilitator Stage of Concern	Description
	Awareness	Facilitation in relation to edTPA is not an area of intense concern. The person's attention is focused elsewhere.
Learning About edTPA	Informational	There is interest in learning more about edTPA. The concern is not self-oriented or necessarily oriented toward facilitation. The focus is on the need/desire to know more about edTPA, its characteristics, its use, and effects.
Concerns About Self	Personal	Uncertainty about one's ability and role in facilitating the use of edTPA is indicated. Doubts about one's adequacy to be an effective facilitator and questions about institutional support and rewards for doing the job are included. Lack of confidence in one's self or in the support to be received from superiors, nonusers, and users are a part of this stage.
Facilitating and Improving edTPA Initiatives	Management Consequence	The time, logistics, available resources, and energy involved in facilitating others in use of edTPA are the focus. Attention is on the 'how to do its' of facilitation, decreasing the difficulty of managing the change process, and the potential of overloading staff. Attention is on improving one's own style of facilitation and increasing positive innovation effects. Increasing the effectiveness of users and analyze the effects on students, faculty and/or the program are the focuses. Expanding his/her facility and style for facilitating change is also the focus.
Maximizing edTPA Implementation	Collaboration Refocusing	Coordinating with other edTPA facilitators and/or administrators to increase one's capacity in facilitating use of edTPA is the focus. Improving coordinator and communication for increased effectiveness of the innovation are the focuses. Issues related to involving other leaders in support of and facilitating the use of edTPA for increase impact are indicated. Ideas about alternatives to edTPA are a focus. Thought and opinions oriented toward increasing benefits to the education community are based on substantive questions about the maximum effectiveness of edTPA. Thought is being given to alternative forms or possible replacement of edTPA.

Concerns Related to Learning about edTPA

According to the CBAM model, the two initial Stages of Concern for change facilitators are Awareness and Informational, both of which involved our participants' concerns in learning about edTPA. Of the 34 edTPA coordinators responding to the CFSoc survey items, eight coordinators (23%) were still at the early stages (Awareness and Informational Stage), which was somewhat surprising given that these individuals had been tasked with facilitating the roll-out of edTPA at their institutions. Interview data revealed that for these coordinators, other responsibilities were taking precedence over edTPA. For instance, one coordinator at a large public research university explained,

At the same time that we are doing this with edTPA, we have had new data systems come into play.... So, those new things that were causing me to recreate all of my data collection strategies, and how we manage data. And that in combination with knowing we are going to be changing with CAEP [Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation]. Those are other things that have been pressing concerns in addition to edTPA. So, I have other things there that are in the back of my head that have taken up a lot of anxiety. (Dr. Johns, 19B)

Across the state, most institutions assigned the edTPA coordinator position to an existing faculty member, and in many cases, this work was simply added to responsibilities individuals were already handling. Consequently, coordinators were "wearing a lot of hats" (Dr. Knight, 38C) and managing ongoing duties while trying to make time to also attend to edTPA coordination. Dr. Knight, who was from a regional institution, went on to note,

Well, I don't have much choice! And I kind of have my fingers in everything. So, yeah, I have a lot of things to do, so I try ... I think the focus would be more--to intentionally give edTPA enough attention.

Coordinators also discussed how they had scrambled to be prepared to introduce edTPA to faculty and to be able to run local evaluation trainings. One stressed the enormity of the task stating, "So for me to do edTPA local evaluation training I had to know everything about edTPA handbooks, how the rubrics were structured, and the thinking behind the rubrics." (Dr. Johns, 19B). The coordinators' job was complicated by the need to be knowledgeable about each of the different handbooks. This task was daunting to many coordinators; as one noted, "as edTPA Coordinator, obviously, I don't know the content of every single handbook--and understanding exactly what it is that our candidates need to do to be ready for their particular edTPA" (Dr. Summers, 7B). She noted that although she eventually learned more about the different handbooks, dealing with content-related questions remained a concern adding, "I think I was able to help candidates understand ... the layout of the handbook; but for specific questions, content-related questions, that was more difficult." Just as this participant spoke to the challenge of addressing the complexity of requirements across disciplines, nine other coordinators who had moved beyond the initial stages of concern also spoke to the volume of information that had to be learned initially.

Because the edTPA coordinators, regardless of the types of institutions, were responsible for facilitating the implementation of edTPA on their campuses, they were typically the ones who introduced faculty to the assessment. Dr. Morjaria (19C) described this task saying,

Well the primary concern has been building capacity ... for something new that came in and to have everybody on-board. We had to have several trainings for supervisors and instructors and also faculty on edTPA, just getting acquainted to edTPA and its

expectations and of what each of the handbooks was talking about--going into detail about rubrics.

This coordinator also stressed the lack of access to portfolio exemplars across the content areas explaining,

Now the biggest concern was that everybody wanted to see a well done portfolio, and this is something that the students would all ask also. "So if I'm going to prepare an edTPA portfolio, show me an example of a really well done one."... We were limited in the resources that we had which we could share with our faculty and students.

Similarly, eight other participants reiterated the challenges of helping faculty learn the nuances of portfolio requirements, unpack the density of the expectations, and understand the rubrics.

Concerns about Self

After change facilitators gain knowledge and understanding of an innovation such as edTPA, they progress to CBAM's next stage which is characterized by concerns regarding one's role as a facilitator of the change process and doubts regarding one's ability to do the task. While only three coordinators were currently peaking at the Personal Stage, many of the edTPA coordinators detailed the personal struggles they had encountered or were still facing as a result of edTPA implementation. Of the concerns discussed in the interviews, 28% (104/377) reflected personal or self-concerns. For edTPA coordinators, this stage was characterized by efforts to cope with resistance against the mandate and with changing roles.

Coping with resistance. Much of the resistance with which coordinators were coping centered on feelings of angst as a result of the state policy to require edTPA as a high-stakes assessment, with 13 of the participants sharing their concerns in this area. Ms. Andrews (36A) noted, "the obvious concern is that the decision to implement edTPA came, you know, from outside of us, was forced upon us, and so there was a lot of controversy about it—there was a lot of resistance." Some coordinators had their own philosophical conflicts with the use of edTPA as a certification requirement and struggled with being the individual who was responsible for facilitating implementation. For instance, Dr. Rogers (10A) elaborated,

The commercial nature of it, in the whole business and, you know, created by the profession for the profession... I have concerns about that and the fact that the students have to pay a company three hundred dollars for something that is a compliance requirement to give a certificate. Basically, we're outsourcing to a corporation, so, no amount of training is going to change my philosophical objection to this assessment tool.

Even while expressing such philosophical tensions, these coordinators recognized the consequences for candidates and shouldered responsibility for engaging faculty in the process. Other coordinators personally recognized value in edTPA as a performance assessment, but they also found that coping with resistance from faculty was particularly stressful. Dr. Holiday (3A) remarked,

I really do believe that edTPA is a good instrument, and it can tell us, as a program, and tell our candidates, a lot about their teaching, and hopefully make our program a better program. There's just a lot of pushback... we're doing this because the state says we have to do it!

Because they were leading the implementation, the coordinators were the ones who typically had to deal with the backlash of negative reactions. Dr. Holiday (3A) went on to explain,

There were a couple faculty members that were really very negative, just like the rotten apple. . . the faculty meetings, they're just not positive. There was no positive support from department chair or the dean.... The emotional support, and the support encouraging faculty to get on board with this, wasn't there.

Other coordinators felt the negative feelings of faculty members limited the extent to which those faculty were willing to support the preparation of candidates on edTPA. One explained,

We had some faculty who were very resistant to doing edTPA....They didn't like [the corporate partner]....I wasn't fully able to do [an edTPA pilot] the last year because we had some resistance among our faculty to edTPA. It took a lot of time explaining to everybody that it wasn't something that we really had a choice in currently since it's state-adopted and the state's going to do it. That we can go fight it if we want to fight it, but in the meantime, we have to get our candidates prepared. (Dr. Summers, 7B)

Dr. Holiday (3A) also addressed the difficulties which emerged when faculty shared negative attitudes with candidates saying, "The negative side of [faculty resistance] is not helping the candidates. The same faculty member says things in front of the students. Then, the students come to me, and so those types of things." Even when resistance was not specifically named, coordinators were concerned about the need for faculty to devote attention in courses to prepare students for edTPA. For instance, Dr. Hamilton (14A) spoke about the need for buy-in saying,

We have a grasp on the process and expectations of edTPA. At this point, it's more about the individual faculty members making a commitment to the actual implementation. I think that we provided the structure, and we've taken a pretty in-depth inquiry approach to learning more about it. But... it's more about getting the faculty to buy-in to the commitment level.

Some coordinators encountered a lack of support when changes were suggested in order to provide teacher candidates with familiarity with edTPA language or format. For instance, Dr. Holiday (3A) explained, "we put together some resources and were trying to help faculty look at every aspect of any course ...where our candidates were teaching, weaving that into the lesson plan. Totally redesigned the lesson plan. Faculty didn't like that!" Another reflected,

I agreed with faculty – we don't want to teach to the test – but at the same time I didn't want them to start backing out and not supporting our students. I felt this pressure...I was this advocate for our students. I was negotiating with [faculty] about how they still had to prepare [candidates] so that students would be successful. (Ms. Cary, 19A)

As shown in these examples, in the face of push-back, coordinators were faced with a situation where they actively acknowledged faculty concerns but at the same time personally struggled with the implications of the not preparing students adequately. Fourteen of the 22 coordinators interviewed spoke about coping with lack of support or resistance and their concerns over being personally responsible for ensuring their students were ready for the assessment.

Coping with changing roles. In addition to coping with feelings of resistance to the high-stakes policy requiring edTPA for certification, 15 coordinators were vocal about the stress related to the role of coordinator and the need for institutional support. Ms. Reed (22A) shared,

I tend to be one of those people who take it upon myself if anything goes wrong, but the support from my department chair has meant a great deal in saying that “We're all in this together, we will figure it out together! You're doing the best you can but we all share responsibility to do that is best for our students, don't take it personally!”

When administrative support was not evident, coping with responsibilities was more difficult. Dr. Hamilton (14A) noted,

We've had just a lot of flux with our top administrators--people have moved about, and I think in that, there's been a lack of across-the-board understanding, and the authority to say, this is what we're doing--everybody, you know, hop on board.

Some felt the absence of administrative support implied a lack of understanding or even empathy for the time required to provide edTPA leadership. One explained,

I volunteered to be edTPA coordinator, but when I went to talk about what could be taken off the plate, because I'm also assistant dean, and I am the assessment coordinator, and I also teach, what could be taken off the plate, nothing was taken off the plate! It was like, well, this is just other assorted duties. It's a lot! “Well, you can do it”, was the message. (Dr. Holiday, 3A)

Some coordinators underscored the importance of drawing on faculty members who could add the necessary expertise in content areas or technology. At smaller institutions which had fewer faculty, however, coordinators found they had no other individuals to whom they could turn, stating, “It's a small department. It's people doing multiple things at one time . . . makes management difficult.” (Dr. Summers, 7B). This coordinator went on to underscore the lack of personnel resources saying,

We have 10 faculty members, and they're not all interested in helping with edTPA. I'm sure that's true [at larger institutions], but you're also able to find staff and other support. Whereas here, just about everything falls on faculty. There was only so much that I could take and actually do because I don't have as much of that support.

While this coordinator expressed appreciation for a stipend she received for edTPA coordination, she still felt she had to step down from the role because she had too many other responsibilities, saying, “It's not that I'm saying that the university isn't supportive because I think they are. It's just we're not big. We don't have the size and we don't have the faculty and staff.” This coordinator reiterated the role the small size of her institution played in the difficulties they were experiencing, something expressed by another coordinator from a small institution as well.

Facilitating and Improving edTPA Initiatives

Tensions focused on facilitating new initiatives related to edTPA and concerns about what might happen if teacher candidates did not perform well on the assessment were evident in comments related to CBAM's next two stages, the Management and Consequence Stages of Concern. Given that this study examined the concerns of coordinators the semester preceding edTPA becoming consequential for licensure, the fact that over 48% of our participants peaked at these two stages is understandable. In the interviews, 34% of the comments (128/377) detailed the issues coordinators faced while managing edTPA implementation and 9% comments (34/377)

focused on consequences. Next, we illustrate the nature of issues with which edTPA coordinators were grappling at these stages.

Managing time and resources. A primary Management Stage issue of 14 edTPA coordinators was assisting faculty in finding the time and resources they needed to be able to focus on edTPA effectively. Coordinators recognized the enormity of the task facing faculty as Dr. Hamilton (14A) stressed, “I think that my main concern has been, and continues to be, the amount of time that faculty have to devote to learning all they can about the edTPA.” Similarly, Dr. Knight (38C) explained her concern as, “managing the change process, avoiding overloading staff or faculty; ironically [there is] an overabundance of available resources and trying to determine which of those have value.” As change facilitators, these coordinators assumed the burden of trying to watch out for their faculty and of finding solutions to improve the situation.

Coordinators also expressed concern about the stress faculty faced because of the mismatch between institutional and edTPA expectations, as one coordinator at a large research university explained,

I have concern for faculty in terms of how they're feeling about how it's impacting their life and their courses...we're a research institution and so our tenure-track faculty are having to write [and] publish, and their planning time, to prepare to teach and to integrate, has really increased since the incorporation of the edTPA.” (Ms. Cary, 19A)

Dr. Hamilton (14A) also underscored,

. . . faculty are doing all they can do to meet the expectations in this environment. You know, promotion and tenure and . . . supporting their students and being out in the field. edTPA is something that requires the time and the space to do that, and so administratively providing the opportunity or safety to do that in a time where it's become consequential and high-stakes [is important].

Through such comments, participants indicated the tensions they were experiencing and the need for their university administrations to be aware of the demands placed on faculty,

Providing faculty training and support. In addition to worrying about how to manage time and resources for faculty, 11 edTPA coordinators also underscored their concerns about providing faculty support and training. Dr. Morjaria (19C) perceived this as daunting saying, So, the biggest implementation challenge was to get everybody acquainted with these expectations and have them become aware of what they should be doing in their courses that will align with preparing the candidates for their edTPA portfolio eventually, to send to [the corporate partner].

As coordinators worked with faculty to integrate attention to edTPA in course assignments and activities, the complexity of working across departments was a pervasive management tension felt more by coordinators at larger institutions, as one explained,

I think my concerns probably are understood within the context of how large we are and how many initial prep programs we have. Because we are spread across two colleges, 7 departments, we have over 35 initial prep programs. We have one version at undergrad and one version at one at MAT . . . in many cases, we have different faculty with the different levels who operate as self-contained programs. (Dr. Johns, 19B)

Some coordinators described establishing new infrastructures and procedures within institutions to address management issues. One supportive approach mentioned was the establishment of edTPA liaison groups which brought together faculty and staff from across programs, departments, and colleges to discuss best practices and concerns related to edTPA implementation. Dr. Johns (19B), an associate dean who worked on edTPA initiatives with an assessment coordinator and two program coordinators, shared their need to establish new communication structures through monthly, unit-wide meetings saying,

I have liaisons for every department, every program...To tell you the truth, that is where I learned the most about the on the ground applications of edTPA and what needs to be done. I learn by listening to their concerns. I learned what types of resources they need, and then I try to figure out how to structure it... and then figure out what we needed to do at the unit level and at the program level. What is going to be the responsibility of who, where, when?...So, being able to figure out how we can coordinate across that and facilitate communication internally has been a concern.

Another coordinator discussed the process of building capacity within her faculty sharing, Georgia's had rather intensive levels of opportunity in providing overviews of edTPA and certainly [we] sent of numbers of people to that. We designated certain folks in the faculty to be leaders and to provide support for students and other faculty. We provided stipends for those who would go through the edTPA scoring process that we would have access to that sort of support and then try it with regard to scoring them. We, I think, have done a quite a good job of availing ourselves of resources. (Dr. Smith, 38A)

In such comments this coordinator illustrates how her institution helped her to address concerns that there would be enough people with the knowledge to provide leadership.

Providing candidate support. In addition to the Management concern of supporting faculty, 11 edTPA coordinators noted they were also in the position of identifying and problem solving potential issues candidates would face. A major concern was candidate support for technical aspects of portfolio preparation and the upload process. Dr. Smith (38A) explained,

... When you're trying to upload several hundred students' edTPA portfolios into the system it turned out to be very problematic...there were technical problems. Even though we worked to ensure that those things didn't happen, there were problems with the 'what is required by the manual' technically not matching the evidence charts in the cases of several specific tests so that people that were working with students in the final hour, were trying to rename video clips in a way that would match because the video clips had to match the evidence sheet, but the evidence sheet didn't match the directions.

In some institutions, coordinators worked to solve problems by writing grants for materials and by creating packets of information to provide guidance. Dr. Holiday (3A) shared,

I think the management side of it, working out with our instructional technology—we purchased more digital video cameras, tripods. I put together—I had to research and put together a packet for that. I had a lot of things like that to get done in the fall.

Technical complications were further described by Dr. Morjaria (19C), from a large institution, You really have to streamline what kind of resources will come in handy; our Technology Center wrote a manual about recommendations on developing your edTPA portfolio and video-taping. We also got a grant to purchase 100 mini iPads, which the students would issue out. Mini iPads were the most effective method of video-taping themselves while teaching because it can automatically compress the video and save a lot of time, basically, makes the file upload-ready. So all of these things, took a lot of time initially.

Another coordinator, Dr. Smith (38A), commented that technical guidance was overlooked in initial trainings offered by the state, explaining “problems with uploading and things like that because none of the state training dealt with the submission problems.”

In addition to technical support, most edTPA coordinators were also responsible for workshops and training seminars to ensure candidates were immersed in edTPA concepts and in reflective experiences throughout their programs. Interaction with candidates taught coordinators the importance of not overwhelming candidates. For example, one coordinator explained, “we have kind of zeroed in on things like academic language . . . there is so much and you don’t want to give it all to the students because it is going to overwhelm them!” (Dr. Knight, 38C). In such ways, coordinator-led seminars provided a feedback loop on what students needed.

Concerns about the consequences of edTPA. Coordinators also worried about potential negative consequences for use of edTPA as a requirement for certification in the upcoming year. While these comments were not as expansive as other those in other categories (only 9% of the overall concerns addressed), concerns over consequences were mentioned by 11 coordinators. As Dr. Hamilton (14A) stated, “Yeah, the consequential nature is now upon us, so again, I wonder what that is going to look like and what the fallout will be as a result of that.” In some cases, coordinators were concerned if the results might reflect negatively on their program saying, “It’s so high stakes and their certification is at stake and that will directly impact us because it will count against us if a large number of our candidates are unable to pass it” (Dr. Morjaria, 19C). Ms. Cary (19A), from the same institution, worried about the potential impact on public perception of teacher preparation saying,

I am concerned for all programs in the state and teacher education in general. I don’t want Teacher Ed to be shut down if this is going to come in the public eye. In the event that maybe our scores are not as high as we would hope they would be, I don’t want the public to get a view of Teacher Ed as not being strong.

Dr. Summers (7B) felt the high-stakes policy had actually limited the usefulness of edTPA as an educative tool,

When [edTPA is] something that is a [high-stakes] measurement, you don’t worry as much about the process. You worry a lot more about the end outcome. I would like for us to go through this and worry a lot more about the process than the outcome. We don’t have that luxury because it all counts, and it’s all consequential for them. We don’t get to walk them through it and teach them; and we don’t get to learn as much about the process as I think, we could, if there wasn’t so much pressure. If it wasn’t high- stakes!

For this coordinator, the anxiety surrounding the assessment limited the value that might otherwise be derived from candidates' reflecting on their instructional processes.

Maximizing edTPA Implementation

For some edTPA coordinators, once their concerns about the technical, infrastructure, and training of faculty and students had begun to be addressed, their attention turned to the importance of collaborating to improve the effectiveness of initiatives or to consider possible alternatives. In the quantitative analysis, five of the coordinators peaked at Collaboration stage (14.7%) and two were at the Refocusing stage (5.9%), indicating concerns related to these stages were currently at the forefront of their attention. In the follow-up interviews, concerns focusing on Collaboration made up 13% (48/377) of the comments, while only 2% (8/377) were indicative of the Refocusing stage. Analysis revealed collaboration with colleagues, both internally within institutions and with others across the state and nationally, was seen as important to the effort to improve edTPA implementation. Dr. Johns (19B) explained:

Our programs were at very different places and very different points of understanding in terms of what [was in] their handbook..., different size of faculties that would have to be involved, of what [edTPA] entails...and knowing that people would have different kinds of needs. [We] needed to figure out how to organize so we could share knowledge across people, who had expertise and did have knowledge.

Such a focus on collaboration was salient to coordinators at small institutions as well, as Dr. Knight (38C) noted,

We do it collaboratively. To me, coming from an R1 institution before, I think one of the pluses of the smaller institutions is that you work more collaboratively and that we are always together making decisions by program not by educational unit, so we'll get together as the middle-grades program and work on making decisions about what resources are important there. Then, where the holes are, we create those resources.

Coordinators noted positive outcomes resulting from such interactions, as one stressed, Overall, I would say initially my concerns were understanding, management, and consequence, but I've moved beyond that now... I continue to be concerned about those other issues, but my main concern is collaborating with all the coordinators and other people in the state in order to increase the effectiveness of the assessment for our students, that it's educative, so that it's successful, so that our faculty don't feel burdened and that they feel like it's an educative experience. (Ms. Cary, 19A)

This coordinator valued connecting with others as part of the ongoing improvement process. Seven other coordinators also emphasized the desire to extend their professional network outside of the institution in order to share/gain knowledge and implementation strategies.

Discussion

Previous research regarding educators' reactions and experiences to the adoption of a teacher performance assessment has focused on case studies of institutions/programs and responses from faculty (Lit & Lotan, 2013; Lys et al., 2014; Peck et al., 2010; Sato, 2014). In contrast, our study provides a state-wide examination of the concerns of the individuals responsible for implementing

the reform at their institutions and illustrates the tensions and concerns expressed by these coordinators when edTPA was adopted for high-stakes purposes. The consequential nature of edTPA impacted all institutions and programs in this state and as designated edTPA coordinators, these educational leaders were compelled to invest time and resources in providing professional development to faculty and candidates and to ensure aspects of edTPA were integrated within programs. The mixed-method approach in this study proved to be particularly valuable in that the qualitative data provided during the interview process demonstrated how coordinators in different contexts may be at similar stages of development and yet the nature of their concerns be experientially unique and consequently they needed differing support structures to alleviate their tension.

Following the introduction of an innovation such as edTPA, all individuals go through the CBAM Stages of Concern, beginning at awareness and progressing through the stages to refocusing (Hall, 2010). In our study, quantitative analyses (i.e., t-tests and correlations) showed that institutional factors did not influence coordinators' progression across the Stages of Concern, as indicated by their peak concerns on the CFSoc survey. At institutions across the state, the added demands for coordinators, faculty, and students to prepare for edTPA was accompanied by a sense of intense pressure. All of the edTPA coordinators had assumed responsibility for trying to alleviate tensions felt within their institutional context in light of the high-stakes policy adoption. Interview data illustrated that within some Stages of Concern, the nature of the tensions played out somewhat differently for coordinators at smaller versus larger institutions. Coordinators from small institutions felt their college's size helped them to be more collaborative but they also emphasized a lack of personnel on whom they could depend when trying to juggle responsibilities. At larger institutions, developing new infrastructures and routines to maximize communication was a pressing concern as coordinators worked to determine what might be best done at the unit level or overseen at the program level. Hall and Hord (2015), note structural conditions such as the size of an institution, proximity of staff, and time to meet and interact must be carefully considered to ensure the success of professional learning communities involved in the change process. Establishing procedures to support collaboration and reduce isolation are also important. Our data indicate that while all coordinators may progress through Stages of Concern in a similar fashion, challenges shaped by institutional size must be considered as coordinators facilitate faculty's engagement with edTPA.

Profiles of the 34 coordinators showed that Management was the most common Stage of Concern during the edTPA implementation year with 14 coordinators (41%) peaking at this stage. An additional 13 coordinators were at stages above Management, which showed that for the most part, the coordinators (68% of the respondents) had gone over the hump of learning about edTPA, overcoming apprehensions about their personal capacities, and were at a point where they were primarily focused on allocating resources, time, and energy to edTPA implementation. The fact that 68% of the coordinators across the state were at or above the Management stage after only a year of working with this performance assessment, suggests the high-stakes nature of the state's policy may have propelled these individuals through the initial Stages of Concern. Coordinators reminisced about having had to make a concerted effort to quickly acquire knowledge and expertise in edTPA, and they expressed the importance of establishing processes in their institutions to prepare for the consequential year. They were busy creating new infrastructures, trying out and evaluating new curricular approaches, and figuring out what would work best in their contexts.

Overall, implementing edTPA was a huge undertaking and coordinating implementation of this reform at the grass-roots level was complex and emotional. The coordinators were not only involved in providing professional development to the faculty on the different edTPA content handbooks, they were also leading discussions on rethinking and recalibrating courses, assignments,

and field experiences to incorporate aspects of edTPA. Coordinators were also worried about promoting a culture of teaching to the test, which, for many of them, went against their personal philosophy (Kornfeld et al., 2007; Lachuk & Koellner, 2015). At the same time, managing faculty concerns, incorporating edTPA components within programs, and running edTPA seminars for students required a great deal of time and energy. In addition, coordinators had to navigate unforeseen challenges such as the ones encountered in the upload process and they had to act swiftly and creatively to generate processes and procedures to deal with emerging problems. Thus, given the complex nature of edTPA, it is not surprising that the largest number of coordinators peaked at the Management stage as they were navigating faculty and student needs and continuously improvising (Lachuk & Koellner, 2015).

As a state initiative, implementing edTPA as a licensure requirement was angst-ridden in Georgia. Several other accountability-related changes in the state were occurring simultaneously, a context which has been found to complicate the implementation landscape for edTPA coordinators (Ledwell & Oyler, 2016). Currently, 782 teacher education programs from 40 states and the District of Columbia are utilizing edTPA (SCALE, 2018), a phenomenon likely to have been encouraged by accrediting bodies' emphasis of the need for valid and consistent measures of performance (AAQEP, 2018; CAEP, 2018). As more states move to adopt policies regarding performance assessments within a reform-rich context, we believe understanding the concerns of those responsible for coordination and supporting those leaders in the change process is crucial. In our study, specific professional development opportunities and resources appeared to stand out in alleviating the concerns of the edTPA coordinators at specific stages. Understanding how to differentiate support opportunities in light of Stages of Concern would provide insights to educator preparation institutions in other states when they are in the process of implementing teacher performance assessments for a high-stakes purpose (Hall, 2010).

Implications

Our findings highlight the need for institutions adopting a teacher performance assessment to carefully consider the selection of a coordinator and to build support structures for coordinators, faculty, and students. While additional roles of edTPA coordinators had no significant correlation with their Stages of Concern in our study, the interview data suggested that juggling and attending to competing demands, responsibilities, and roles caused immense levels of stress. Interestingly, while concerns at the informational, management, and collaboration stages were well supported by state and national opportunities, the issues emerging at the Personal stage related to multiple and competing roles, were most effectively addressed by institutional supports. Beneficial institutional supports identified in our study and reflected in related research ranged from: (a) distributed leadership (Sloan, 2013), (b) provision of faculty stipends or additional personnel for edTPA work, and (c) supporting faculty voice and autonomy in the decision-making process. Support from institutional leadership and colleagues can help alleviate edTPA coordinators' concerns about personal capacity and enable them to develop confidence in their position. Additionally, we believe strong institutional leadership was instrumental in edTPA coordinators' ability to overcome resistance to change, to deal with negative reactions, and to promote a sense of collegiality and collaboration within their institution.

At the Management and Collaboration stages, we noted edTPA coordinators found it beneficial to create effective infrastructures within their institutions and to draw on external networks. As found in previous research, faculty involvement and ownership were key components in institutional support systems (Peck et al, 2010; Sloan, 2013). Our research suggests open forums

where individuals from across the college share their feelings, strategies, and even frustrations can give faculty a sense of involvement in the change process, an approach which may lead to their ownership of the change (Lit & Lotan, 2013). Liaison meetings and training sessions may also provide edTPA coordinators insights into contextual issues which can help them create better resource management strategies. Coordinators in our study also mentioned other beneficial strategies such as: involvement of instructors in local evaluation, creating exemplars of edTPA portfolios across handbooks, group upload sessions, partnerships with instructional technology divisions, and acquisition of equipment for video-recording.

The challenges and concerns faced by the edTPA coordinators in this state are applicable to educators at other institutions transitioning to using teacher performance assessments in response to a high-stakes policy. By considering the concerns of those who have been charged with providing leadership in the change process, policy makers can become better informed about practical issues such as: timeline for policy roll-out, potential state-wide professional development, and opportunities for providing information and networking. At the institutional level, our findings can also provide greater understanding of the complexity of coordinators' roles and the support structures and resources needed for effective implementation of initiatives. In particular, we advocate that institutions faced with the parameters of top-down policies find ways to honor faculty voices and autonomy within curricular revisions or other changes. By acknowledging faculty concerns and thoughtfully considering supports aligned to those concerns, efforts to implement initiatives related to teacher performance assessments do not have to occur at the expense of faculty autonomy or jeopardize program missions and visions.

In closing, the CBAM model used as a framework in this study was beneficial in exploring the concerns of those facilitating the implementation of initiatives related to preparing candidates for success on this high-stakes performance-based assessment. CBAM posits educators' concerns can impact the success or failure of innovation (Hall, 2010; Hall et al., 1991; Kapustka & Damore, 2009). Future research could draw on the CBAM's description of not only the stages of concern but also the concepts of levels of use and specific innovation configurations (Hall & Hord, 2015) to understand the relationships of faculty and supervisors' concerns with the extent to which they integrate particular curricular reforms. Additional mixed-methods studies could allow for understanding the patterns of attitudes and behaviors of faculty as identified in surveys and also the detailed nuances of curriculum mapping and support structures as gathered through interviews. Research might examine the relationship of concerns, level of integration of initiatives, and specific types of reform efforts in juxtaposition with candidate effectiveness in clinical experiences and on the high stakes TPA. Information from such inquiries could prove to be crucial for faculty working to thoughtfully prepare teacher candidates in today's complex educator preparation context which is shaped simultaneously by educational reform initiatives, accreditation requirements, and institutional missions.

Acknowledgements

As members of Georgia's Teacher Education Research Consortium, the authors recognize and appreciate the role the consortium played in providing a network for teacher educators across public and private universities to collaboratively plan and implement research which informs and supports their work.

References

- Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation. (2018). *AAQEP expectations framework*. Retrieved May 9, 2018, from <https://www.aaqep.org/>
- Attick, D., & Boyles, D. (2016). Pearson Learning and the ongoing corporatization of public education. *Journal of Thought*, 50(1-2), 5-19.
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2018). *Standard 5: Provider quality, continuous improvement, and capacity*. Retrieved May 9, 2018, from <http://www.ncate.org/standards/standard-5>
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *Evaluating teacher effectiveness: How teacher performance assessments can measure and improve teaching*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.
- Donovan, M. K., & Cannon, S. O. (2018). The university supervisor, edTPA, and the new making of the teacher. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 26(28), 1-30. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.2849>
- Dover, A. G., & Schultz, B. D. (2016). Troubling the edTPA: Illusions of objectivity and rigor. *The Educational Forum*, 80, 95-106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2015.1102368>
- Fayne, H., & Qian, G. (2016). What does it mean to be student centered? An institutional case study of edTPA implementation. *The New Educator*, 12 (4), 311-321. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1547688X2016.1196407>
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00006199-196807000-00014>
- Grossman, P., Hammerness, K. M., McDonald, M., & Ronfeldt, M. (2008). Constructing coherence: Structural predictors of perceptions of coherence in NYC teacher education programs. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59, 273–287. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487108322127>
- Hall, G. E. (2010). Technology's Achilles heel: Achieving high-quality implementation. *Journal of Research in Technology Education*, 42(3), 231–253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2010.10782550>
- Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (2015). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Hall, G. E., Newlove, B. W., George, A. A., Rutherford, W. L., & Hord, S. M. (1991). *Measuring change facilitator stages of concern: A manual for use of the CFSoc questionnaire*. Greeley, CO: Center for Research on Teaching and Learning. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t43947-000>
- Henning, N., Dover, A. G., Dotson, E., Agarwal-Rangath, R., Clayton, C. D., Donovan, M. K., ...Dunn, A. H. (2018). Navigating the contested terrain of teacher education policy and practice: Authors respond to SCALE. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 26(31), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.3745>
- Humerinta-Peltomaki, L., & Nummela, N. (2006). Mixed methods in international business research: A value-added perspective. *Management International Review*, 46, 439-459. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11575-006-0100-z>
- Kapustka, K. M., & Damore, S. J. (2009). Processes of change in professional development schools as viewed through the lens of the concerns-based adoption model. *School-University Partnerships*, 3(2), 116–131.

- Kornfeld, J., Grady, K., Marker, P. M., & Ruddell, M. R. (2007). Caught in the current: A self-study of state-mandated compliance in a teacher education program. *Teachers College Record*, 109(8), 1902–1930.
- Lachuk, A. J., & Koellner, K. (2015). Performance-based assessment for certification: Insights from edTPA implementation. *Language Arts*, 93(2), 84–95.
- Ledwell, K., & Oyler, C. (2016). Unstandardized responses to a “standardized” test: The edTPA as a gatekeeper and curriculum change agent. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 67, 120–134. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487115624739>
- Lit, I. W., & Lotan, R. (2013). A balancing act: Dilemmas of implementing a high-stakes performance assessment. *The New Educator*, 9(1), 54–76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1547688X.2013.751314>
- Lys, D. B., L’Esperance, M. L., Dobson, E., & Bullock, A. (2014). Large-scale implementation of the edTPA: Reflections upon institutional change in action. *Current Issues in Education*, 17(3), 1–15.
- Meuwissen, K. W., & Choppin, J. M. (2015). Preservice teachers’ adaptations to tensions associated with the edTPA during its early implementation in New York and Washington states. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 23(103), 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v23.2078>
- Miller, M., Carroll, D., Jancic, M., & Markworth, K. (2015). Developing a culture of learning around the edTPA: One university’s journey. *The New Educator*, 11, 37-59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1547688X.2014.966401>
- O’Cathain, A., Murphy, E., & Nicholl, J. (2007). Why, and how, mixed methods research is undertaken in health services research in England: A mixed methods study. *BMC Health Services Research*, 7, 85. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-7-85>
- Ogletree, T. W., Kim, J., Bhatnagar, R., Many, J., & Tanguay, C. (2018). Push-pull relationships between concerns and personal engagement: Exploring the adoption of edTPA as an innovation. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 6(7), 902-908. <https://doi.org/10.12691/education-6-7-3>
- Peck, C. A., Galluci, C., & Sloan, T. (2010). Negotiating implementation of high-stakes performance assessment policies in teacher education: From compliance to inquiry. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61, 451–463. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109354520>
- Pecheone, R. L., Whittaker, A., & Klesch, H. (2016). *Educative assessment and meaningful support: 2015 edTPA Administrative Report*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford Center for Learning, Assessment, and Equity.
- Sato, M. (2014). What is the underlying conception of teaching of the edTPA? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 65, 421–434. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114542518>
- Sloan, T. (2013). Distributed leadership and organizational change: Implementation of a teaching performance measure. *The New Educator*, 9(1), 29–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1547688X.2013.751313>
- Sloan, T. F. (2015). Data and learning that affords program improvement: A response to the U.S. accountability movement in teacher education. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 14(3), 259–271. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-015-9179-y>
- Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (2017). *edTPA*. Amherst, MA: Pearson Education, Inc. Retrieved from <https://scale.stanford.edu/teaching/edtpa>
- Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (2019). *edTPA participation map*. Retrieved May 2, 2019, from <http://edtpa.aacte.org/state-policy>

- Tanguay, C. (2018). The evolution of teacher performance assessments as a measure of accountability. In J. Many & R. Bhatnagar (Eds.), *Implementing and analyzing Performance Assessments in Teacher Education* (pp. 1-37). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Tanguay, C., Many, J. E., Ariail, M., Bhatnagar, R., & Emerson, J. (2019). An organic model for edTPA exploration and implementation. In K. K. Winter, H. H. Pinter, & M. K. Watson, (Eds.) *Performance-based Assessment in 21st Century Teacher Education* (pp. 42-80). Hershey, PA: IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-8353-0>
- Tuck, E., & Gorlewski, J. (2016). Racist ordering, settler colonialism, and edTPA: A participatory policy analysis. *Educational Policy*, 30, 197–217. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904815616483>

About the Authors

Joyce E. Many

Georgia State University

jmany@gsu.edu

Joyce Many is a Professor and Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies and Educator Preparation in the College of Education and Human Development at Georgia State University. Her research explores teacher education program effectiveness including factors impacting faculty and candidate perceptions and concerns and candidates' performance and retention in the classroom. Dr. Many is the Series Editor of *Contemporary Issues in Accreditation, Assessment and Program Evaluation* with Information Age Publishing.

Ruchi Bhatnagar

Georgia State University

rbhatnagar@gsu.edu

Ruchi Bhatnagar is a Clinical Assistant Professor and the assessment coordinator for the College of Education and Human Development at Georgia State University. Her research interests are: teacher education assessment, accountability, and educational policy.

Carla Tanguay

Georgia State University

ctanguay@gsu.edu

Carla Tanguay, Ph.D. is a clinical assistant professor in the Department of Early Childhood and Elementary Education at Georgia State University and the Associate to the Dean for Clinical Practice, supporting initial teacher preparation programs in the areas of teacher performance assessment and clinical practice. She serves on the Georgia edTPA Policy & Implementation Advisory Committee and is the Chair of the Assessment and Accreditation Committee in the College of Education and Human Development. Her scholarly interests include teacher development, teacher induction and retention, assessment, program evaluation, and educational policy.

Shaneeka Favors-Welch

Georgia State University

sfavors1@student.gsu.edu

Shaneeeka Favors-Welch is a doctoral student at Georgia State University in Teaching and Learning with a concentration in Teaching and Teacher Education. In 2008 she founded a non-profit, G.R.O.W.E (Giving Resources and Opportunities to Women through Education), dedicated to advancing women in STEM fields. Her particular areas of interests are cultural asset pedagogies, decolonization theories, and critical quantitative methods.

Clarice Thomas

Georgia State University
cthomas97@gsu.edu

Dr. Clarice Thomas received her Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning with a focus on Teaching and Teacher Education from Georgia State University. Her research interests include narrative research of experiences with the school to prison nexus, equitable education for African American students, preservice teacher preparation in urban education, and qualitative research methodology.

Susan Ophelia Cannon

Georgia State University
scannon5@student.gsu.edu

Susan Ophelia Cannon, a doctoral graduate from Georgia State University, will be an assistant professor of Early Childhood/Middle Grades Education at Mercer University beginning in fall 2019. She works and thinks across the boundaries of mathematics and statistics education, qualitative inquiry, and teacher education.

Tamra Ogletree

University of West Georgia
togletre@westga.edu

Dr. Tamra W. Ogletree is an Associate Professor and Program Coordinator of the Language and Literacy program in the Literacy and Special Education Department at the University of West Georgia. She is the founder and former Director of UWG's Cherokee Rose Writing Project, which is an affiliate of the National Writing Project. She holds a PhD in Language and Literacy and a Certificate in Interdisciplinary Qualitative Research from the University of Georgia. Her research focus includes literacy education, teacher preparation, and qualitative methodology.

Jihye Kim

Kennesaw State University
jkim59@gmail.com

Jihye Kim, Ph.D. is an assistant professor of educational research at Kennesaw State University. Her current research lies in evaluating survey instruments' validity and reliability in order to provide accurate identification of emotional and behavioral risk in middle and high school students.

Shannon Howrey

Kennesaw State University
showrey@kennesaw.edu

Shannon Howrey is an Associate Professor of Reading and Literacy Education at Kennesaw State University. She teaches courses in literacy, curriculum, and instruction as well as coordinating the Ed.S. in Curriculum and Instruction program. Her research interests include the use of literature in developing pre-service teachers' dispositions.

Sohyun An

Kennesaw State University
san2@kennesaw.edu

Sohyun An is an Associate Professor of Social Studies Education at Kennesaw State University in Kennesaw, Georgia, with research and teaching interests in issues related to racism, citizenship, immigration, and social justice within the context of social studies education.

Karen Kurz

Berry College
kkurz@berry.edu

Dr. Kurz has been a faculty member at Berry College Charter School of Education and Human Sciences since fall 1995 and served Assistant Dean for Graduate Studies in Education from 2001 to 2017. Her professional service has included Board of Examiner Georgia Professional Standards Commission, adjudicator for National Association for Sport and Physical Education, mentor National Board of Professional Teaching Standards portfolio development, Georgia Association of Colleges of Teacher Education President and Georgia Association of Independent Colleges of Teacher Education President.

Judi Wilson

Augusta State University
JWILSO24@augusta.edu

Dr. Judi Wilson has served as a Department Chair, Associate Dean, and now serves as the Interim Dean of the College of Education at Augusta University. She taught elementary school and served as a primary, middle school, and district level administrator in Georgia. Judi Wilson received a B.A. in Education from Furman University, M.Ed. and Ed.S. degrees from The University of Georgia, and an Ed.D in Educational Administration from Georgia Southern University.

education policy analysis archives

Volume 27 Number 122

October 7, 2019

ISSN 1068-2341



Readers are free to copy, display, distribute, and adapt this article, as long as the work is attributed to the author(s) and **Education Policy Analysis Archives**, the changes are identified, and the same license applies to the derivative work. More details of this Creative Commons license are available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. **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: **Melanie Bertrand, David Carlson, Lauren Harris, Eugene Judson, Mirka Koro-Ljungberg, Daniel Liou, Scott Marley, Molly Ott, Iveta Silova** (Arizona State University)

Cristina Alfaro
San Diego State University

Gary Anderson
New York University

Michael W. Apple
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Jeff Bale
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

David E. DeMatthews
University of Texas at Austin

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

Yariv Feniger Ben-Gurion
University of the Negev

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

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 University of
Massachusetts Lowell

Noah Sobe Loyola University

Nelly P. Stromquist
University of Maryland

Benjamin Superfine
University of Illinois, Chicago

Adai Tefera
Virginia Commonwealth University

A. Chris Torres
Michigan State 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

Miri Yemini
Tel Aviv University, Israel

archivos analíticos de políticas educativas consejo editorial

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

Editores Asociados: **Felicitas Acosta** (Universidad Nacional de General Sarmiento, Argentina), **Armando Alcántara Santuario** (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México), **Ignacio Barrenechea**, **Jason Beech** (Universidad de San Andrés), **Angelica Buendia**, (Metropolitan Autonomous University), **Alejandra Falabella** (Universidad Alberto Hurtado, Chile), **Veronica Gottau** (Universidad Torcuato Di Tella), **Antonio Luzon**, (Universidad de Granada), **José Luis Ramírez**, (Universidad de Sonora), **Paula Razquin**, **Axel Rivas** (Universidad de San Andrés), **Maria Alejandra Tejada-Gómez** (Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Colombia)

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

Pedro Flores Crespo

Universidad Iberoamericana, México

Ana María García de Fanelli

Centro de Estudios de Estado y Sociedad (CEDES) CONICET, Argentina

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)

José Ignacio Rivas Flores

Universidad de Málaga, España

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

Catalina Wainerman

Universidad de San Andrés, Argentina

Juan Carlos Yáñez Velazco

Universidad de Colima, México

arquivos analíticos de políticas educativas
conselho editorial

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

Editoras Associadas: **Kaizo Iwakami Beltrao**, (Brazilian School of Public and Private Management - EBAPE/FGV, Brazil), **Geovana Mendonça Lunardi Mendes** (Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina), **Gilberto José Miranda**, (Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Brazil), **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