

THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN
FIRST LANGUAGE STATUS AND SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHER
EDTPA PERFORMANCE, PERCEPTIONS, AND PREPARATION

by

Cornelia Van Staalduinen Okraski

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Curriculum and Instruction

Charlotte

2022

Approved by:

Dr. Scott Kissau

Dr. Kristin Davin

Dr. Paul Fitchett

Dr. Adriana Medina

ABSTRACT

CORNELIA V. OKRASKI. The Association between First Language Status and Second Language Teacher edTPA Performance, Perceptions, and Preparation
(Under the direction of Dr. SCOTT P. KISSAU)

Due to the shortage of World Language and English as a Second Language teachers, recruiting, retaining, and supporting aspiring second language teachers in the completion of their teacher licensure program is crucial. One barrier to the profession for these teachers is edTPA. Research has suggested that non-native English speakers (NNES) who populate second language teacher preparation programs may struggle to complete this assessment more so than their native-English speaking (NES) peers. To shed light on this topic, the researcher used a mixed methodology to examine the performance, perceptions, and preparation of NNES and NES teacher candidates on the World Language and English as an Additional Language edTPA. Data sources included edTPA scores, survey responses and faculty interviews.

The study's results suggest that the performance of NNES candidates may vary by their teaching assignment and corresponding edTPA portfolio to complete. The results indicated that both NNES and NES groups struggle with time and understanding edTPA rubric language and that both groups would benefit from a mentor teacher who is familiar with edTPA. Both candidates and faculty mentioned the benefits of practice edTPA tasks infused in coursework and content-specific seminars offered during the internship. Specific to NNES candidates, the results also revealed that their perceptions centered on their struggles with the writing requirements for edTPA and their lack of awareness of the assessment's expectations and its connections to coursework. The use of customized language support such as peer editing and the use of other writing resources was reported by candidates and faculty to be especially beneficial for NNES

candidates. The study's findings serve to inform teacher preparation programs as they strive to improve the edTPA preparation of all candidates, including those whose first language is not English.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my dissertation chair, Dr. Scott Kissau, for his continuous support, feedback, encouragement, and (especially) patience during my dissertation journey. I would also like to thank my dissertation committee members for their expert feedback on my qualitative data analysis (Dr. Kristin Davin) and quantitative data analysis (Dr. Paul Fitchett) as well as Dr. Adriana Medina who provided feedback at the time of the proposal defense and dissertation defense.

My completion of this project could not have been accomplished without the Office of Assessment and Accreditation (OAA), Office of School and Community Partnerships (OSCP) in the College of Education at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. I would also like to thank my friend Nicki Kincaid for sharing this doctoral journey with me and being a great classmate for 3+ years.

Many thanks to my family! To my husband Andy, thank you for making it possible for me to be a full-time doctoral student. I know you suffered through many of my half-finished utterances when I was, once again, totally absorbed in writing or reading. To my daughters Trish and Francine, I am sorry for serving you so many crockpot dinners when I had to leave once again for an evening class before dinner time. I promise to never serve smothered pork chops again! I am proud of both of you for your successes in high school and college while I struggled to finish my doctoral studies.

Finally, many thanks to my parents Daniel and Henny van Staaldin, who brought me to the United States in my teens and later provided me with the opportunity to attend college in this country. When your parents take classes in their 30s and 40s, you learn to see the value of every step of your own education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	6
Purpose of the Study	7
Research Questions	7
Methodology	8
Definition of Terms	8
Significance of the Study	11
Organization of the Study	13
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	16
Historical Overview of Teacher Accreditation	16
Evolution of Performance-Based Assessments	18
edTPA	20
Predictive Validity of edTPA	22
Proliferation of edTPA	23
Teacher Candidate Performance on edTPA	24
World Language Teacher Candidate Performance	26
English as a Second Language Teacher Candidate Performance	29
Non-native English-speaking (NNES) Teacher Candidate Performance	31
Perceptions of edTPA	34
Researchers and Teacher Educators	34

Teacher Candidates	38
Non-Native English-Speaking Candidates	39
Teacher Preparation Strategies to Support Non-Native English-Speaking Candidates	40
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	44
Introduction	44
Research Questions	44
Research Design and Rationale	45
Setting and Participants	47
Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Analysis	54
Instrumentation	56
edTPA	56
Surveys	56
Teacher Candidate edTPA Survey	56
World Language and TESL Candidate edTPA Survey	57
Teacher Candidate Interviews	58
Faculty Interviews	59
Data Analysis	59
Researcher Positionality	62
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS	64
Introduction	64
Data and Statistical Results	65
Research Question 1	65
Total Mean edTPA Scores	67

Task Sum Scores	69
Relationship between edTPA Total Scores and Language Status	71
Relationships between Summed Task 1 Scores and Language Status	73
Relationships between Summed Task 2 Scores and Language Status	74
Relationships between Summed Task 3 Scores and Language Status	75
Summary	76
Research Question 2	77
Quantitative Results	77
Qualitative Results	85
Theme One: edTPA Support and Tools	86
Theme Two: Challenges	95
Research Question 3	108
Theme One: Writing Support in Coursework	109
Theme Two: Impact of School Experience	110
Theme Three: Faculty Experience with edTPA	111
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	114
Candidate edTPA Performance	114
Perceptions of Preparation: Challenges	117
Support Strategies	121
Implications and Applications	123
Limitations and Direction for Future Research	129
Conclusion	132
REFERENCES	133

APPENDIX A: General Exit Survey	145
APPENDIX B: Content-Specific Survey for World Language and ESL Teacher Candidates	152
APPENDIX C: Proposed Interview Questions for Teacher Candidates	153
APPENDIX D: Proposed Interview Questions for Program Faculty	154
APPENDIX E: IRB Application	155

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: World Language and English as an Additional Language edTPA Rubrics	2
TABLE 2: Average Candidate Performance on edTPA (for all 15-rubric Content Areas)	24
TABLE 3: Average Candidate Performance on World Language edTPA	26
TABLE 4: Average Candidate Performance on English as an Additional Language edTPA	29
TABLE 5: World Language and TESL Graduate Certificate Program Coursework	48
TABLE 6: Teacher Candidate Demographics	50
TABLE 7: Content-Specific Survey Completers	51
TABLE 8: Student Interview Participants Demographics	52
TABLE 9: Faculty Interview Participants	53
TABLE 10: Student Participant Demographics (Spring 2015 - Spring 2021)	65
TABLE 11: Included and Excluded Cases for Research Question 1	67
TABLE 12: Means and Standard Deviations for WL and EAL edTPA Scores	68
TABLE 13: Mean and Standard Deviation for Task Sum Scores of WL edTPA	70
TABLE 14: Mean and Standard Deviation for Task Sum Scores of EAL edTPA	71
TABLE 15: Predictors of Total edTPA Scores	72
TABLE 16: Predictors of WL and EAL edTPA Scores on Task 1	73
TABLE 17: Predictors of WL and EAL edTPA Scores on Task 2	75
TABLE 18: Predictors of WL and EAL edTPA Scores on Task 3	76
TABLE 19: WL Candidate Perceptions of the Most Challenging Aspect of edTPA	78
TABLE 20: EAL Candidate Perceptions of the Most Challenging Aspect of edTPA	79
TABLE 21: Survey Responses for Task 1 of Content-Specific Survey	81

TABLE 22: Survey Responses for Task 2 of Content-Specific Survey	82
TABLE 23: Survey Responses for Task 3 of Content-Specific Survey	84
TABLE 24: Resulting Themes with Sub-Themes	85
TABLE 25: Sub-Theme: edTPA Preparation in Coursework	86
TABLE 26: Sub-Theme: Resources	89
TABLE 27: Sub-Theme: Peer Editing and/or Support from Program Completers	91
TABLE 28: Sub-Theme: Content-Specific Seminar and Meetings with Instructor	93
TABLE 29: Sub-Theme: Time Constraints/Timing	95
TABLE 30: Sub-Theme: Understanding edTPA Rubric Prompts/Handbook	98
TABLE 31: Sub-Theme: Clinical Educator Cooperation and Approval	101
TABLE 32: Sub-Theme: Need for Specific Support	104

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The edTPA is a performance-based assessment for teacher candidates seeking initial certification in a variety of content areas. It was developed by the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity (SCALE) and has been available nationally since the start of the 2013-2014 academic year. As of 2021, 955 educator preparation programs in 41 states and the District of Columbia are implementing edTPA (American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education [AACTE], 2020). The edTPA is subject-specific and currently available for 27 content areas (SCALE, 2018). For teacher candidates in all middle and high school teacher education programs, as well as K-12 world language and English as a second language (ESL) teacher candidates, the assessment consists of three tasks with accompanying rubrics intended to measure a teacher candidate's ability to plan (Task 1), instruct (Task 2), and assess (Task 3) student learning. (NB: English as an Additional Language is the assigned name of the edTPA portfolio for ESL teacher candidates.)

All three tasks are evaluated through a digital portfolio that includes lesson plans, student assessments, teaching materials, detailed written reflective commentaries, and video recorded teaching segments. Trained scorers employed by edTPA's Administrator Evaluation System (a group of Pearson), assess a teacher candidate's performance in each of the three tasks using a number of five-point rubrics.

edTPA tasks are scored through the use of rubrics that have some similarities across content areas. For 25 of the 27 edTPA content areas, candidates' edTPA portfolios are scored through the use of 15 separate rubrics spread across three tasks. For example, the English as an Additional Language edTPA, a focal area in this study, has 15 rubrics. A fourth task with three additional rubrics has been added to the Elementary Education edTPA to reflect literacy and

mathematics instruction by candidates in elementary school classrooms for a total of 18 rubrics. The edTPA portfolios for Classical Languages and World Language are scored through the use of 13 rubrics, reflecting the incorporation of academic language within the content area “because language development is the focus” (SCALE, 2019, p. 14). In this study, the focus is on the World Language (WL) edTPA with 13 rubrics and the English as an Additional Language (EAL) edTPA with 15 rubrics.

Table 1

World Language and English as a Additional Language edTPA Rubrics

World Language edTPA	English as an Additional Language edTPA
TASK 1 Planning for Instruction and Assessment	
Rubric 1: Planning for Communicative Proficiency in the Target Language (How do the candidate’s plans develop students’ communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful context(s)?)	Rubric 1: Planning for English Language Development within Content-Based Instruction (How do the candidate’s plans build on each other and make connections between language competencies and content to support students’ English language development in two or more of the four modalities [speaking, listening, reading, writing]?)
Rubric 2: Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs (How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to target support for students’ development of communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful cultural context(s)?)	Rubric 2: Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs (How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to target support for students’ development of English language in meaningful content-based instruction?)
Rubric 3: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning (How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to justify instructional plans?)	Rubric 4: Identifying and Supporting Language Demands (How does the candidate identify and support language demands associated with a key content learning activity?)

Rubric 4: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Students' Development of Communicative Proficiency in the Target Language
(How are the informal and formal assessments selected or designed to monitor students' development of communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful cultural contexts?)

Rubric 5: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Students' Development of English Language
(How are the informal and formal assessments selected or designed to monitor students' development of English language in content-based instruction?)

TASK 2 Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning

Rubric 5: Learning Environment
(How does the candidate demonstrate a positive learning environment that supports students' engagement in learning?)

Rubric 6: Learning Environment for English Language Development within Content-Based Instruction
(How does the candidate demonstrate a positive learning environment that supports students' English language development within content-based instruction?)

Rubric 6: Engaging Students' Target Language Communication
(How does the candidate actively engage students in developing communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful cultural context(s)?)

Rubric 7: Engaging Students' English Language Development within Content-Based Instruction
(How does the candidate actively engage students in developing English language proficiency with content-based instruction?)

Rubric 7: Deepening Student Communicative Proficiency in the Target Language
(How does the candidate elicit student responses to promote their communicative proficiency in the target language in meaningful cultural context(s)?)

Rubric 8: Deepening Student English Language Development within Content-Based Instruction
(How does the candidate elicit student responses to promote students' English language proficiency within content-based instruction?)

Rubric 8: Subject-Specific Pedagogy
(How does the candidate promote comparisons and connections between students' prior experiences and knowledge and the new cultural practices, products, and perspectives of the target language?)

Rubric 9: Subject-Specific Pedagogy
(How does the candidate promote comparisons and connections between the content being taught and the students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds, experiences, and prior academic knowledge?)

Rubric 9 (WL)/Rubric 10 (EAL): Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness
(How does the candidate use evidence to evaluate and change teaching practice to meet students' varied learning needs?)

 TASK 3 Assessing Student Learning

Rubric 10: Analysis of Student Communicative Proficiency in the Target Language
(How does the candidate analyze evidence of student development of communicative proficiency?)

Rubric 11: Analysis of Students' Development of English Language Proficiency through Content-Based Instruction
(How does the candidate analyze evidence of student learning of English language proficiency through content-based instruction?)

Rubric 11: Providing Feedback to Guide Student Development of Communicative Proficiency in the Target Language
(What type of feedback does the candidate provide to focus students?)

Rubric 12: Providing Feedback to Guide Student Development of English Language Proficiency within Content-Based Instruction
(What type of feedback does the candidate provide to focus students on their strengths and areas for improvement?)

Rubric 12: Student Understanding and Use of Feedback
(How does the candidate support focus students to understand and use the feedback to guide the development of communicative proficiency in the target language?)

Rubric 13: Student Understanding and Use of Feedback
(How does the candidate support focus students to understand and use the feedback to guide their development of English language proficiency in content-based instruction?)

Rubric 14: Analyzing Students' Language Use and Content Understanding
(How does the candidate analyze students' use of language to develop content understanding?)

Rubric 13: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction/Rubric 15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction of English Language with Content
(How does the candidate use the analysis of what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction?)

Each institution or state may set its minimum or “cut” scores for edTPA. During the implementation, piloting or phasing in stage, each state may determine its own pass/fail score. States may require the completion of edTPA, but scores may be non-consequential during a piloting stage. A candidate’s edTPA portfolio assessment is evaluated by trained Pearson scorers using a five point rating scale (1-5), with five being the highest score. At the time of the current

study, established passing scores for the WL edTPA portfolio ranged from 29 to 35 (13 rubrics) in participating states; for the EAL edTPA, cut scores ranged from 35 to 40 (15 rubrics) in participating states (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education [AACTE], 2020).

Early adopter teacher education programs have used initial edTPA scores for program improvement or alignment purposes (Sato, 2014). Goldhaber et al. (2017) reported that “[w]hile the edTPA is designed to assess individual teacher candidates, it is also thought to inform improvements in [a teacher education program]” (p. 379) through the use of candidate scores in a program’s accreditation process. Likewise, Lys et al. (2014) provided examples of data-directed program improvement as a result of edTPA implementation, including disaggregation at multiple levels. Supporting this statement, on the FAQ page of its website, AACTE (n.d.) advises teacher education programs to utilize candidates’ edTPA scores for program improvement. AACTE also predicts that as some teacher education programs experience challenges during edTPA adoption, that candidate portfolio scores will “provide valid research-based performance data for ongoing program revision. Candidate score profiles, artifacts, and commentaries provide a rich data source for programs to examine how they are preparing quality teachers to respond effectively to varied student learning needs” (AACTE, n.d.)

Existing research on the performance of teacher candidates in early-adopting programs suggests that many teacher candidates struggle to meet all expectations of the assessment (Billington, 2012; Denton, 2013; Hildebrandt & Swanson, 2016; Ledwell & Oyler, 2016). Candidates who fail to meet minimum or “cut” scores may be prevented from gaining licensure. Gate-keeper assessments, like edTPA, that prevent entry into the teaching profession are particularly troublesome in high-need fields, such as World Language and ESL instruction, henceforward referred to collectively as second language instruction, where a critical shortage of

licensed teachers exists (Aragon, 2016; Cowan et al., 2016; Cross, 2016; Kissau et al., 2019; Sutchter et al., 2019; Papay et al., 2018; Swanson & Mason, 2018). At a time of critical teacher shortage, teacher education programs need to support second language teacher candidates in the successful completion of edTPA so they can enter the profession and help fill teacher vacancies.

Statement of the Problem

While multiple studies have lamented the struggles of teacher candidates when completing edTPA, more recent work has problematized the performance of a specific subgroup, NNES candidates (Jourdain, 2018; Kissau & Algozzine, 2017; Micek, 2017; Russell & Davidson Devall, 2016; Russell & Davidson, 2018). Within these aforementioned studies, researchers have primarily identified the types of challenges that candidates experience during the completion of edTPA, with a few exceptions that have suggested specific types of support throughout the preparation for and completion of edTPA (Cole, 2018; Hébert, 2017; Lachance & Kissau, 2018; Okraski & Kissau, 2018; Russell & Davidson Devall, 2016; Troyan & Kaplan, 2015; Wesely et al., 2018).

In an era of critical shortage of WL and ESL teachers, recruiting, retaining, and supporting second language teacher candidates in the successful completion of their second language licensure program is crucial. At the researcher's institution, at any time, 50% of teacher candidates in these content areas may be non-native English speakers (NNES). In this study, the researcher examined the performance of second language teacher candidates whose first language is not English (NNES) on the WL and EAL edTPA portfolio assessment. More specifically, in addition to examining their performance, the researcher investigated the perceptions of second language teacher candidates as they complete edTPA, as well as faculty support or practice to query how it is impacted by teacher candidates' first language status.

Purpose of the Study

The study utilized a mixed methodology to address three goals. First, using both quantitative and qualitative data gathered concurrently, the researcher investigated the association between first language status of second language teacher candidates and their WL and EAL edTPA scores. Second, the perceptions of both NNES and NES candidates were investigated. Thirdly, to get a more complete and well-rounded understanding of the association between first language status and edTPA, the researcher investigated how the educator preparation program's (EPP) faculty members modified instructional support for non-native English-speaking candidates. To get a more complete picture of the association between first language status and edTPA, this mixed-methods study included the perceptions of one EPP's faculty members on how they modified instructional support for NNES teacher candidates.

The findings from both quantitative and qualitative data will help develop an in-depth understanding of the struggles that NNES teacher candidates experience as they complete their edTPA portfolio with the goal to advise teacher preparation programs of the specific needs of NNES candidates. This researcher's experiences in supporting candidates throughout coursework, clinical placement, and internship seminars with embedded edTPA preparation underscored the need to explore the struggles of NNES candidates and identify effective scaffolding practices.

Research Questions

1. What is the association between first language status of second language teacher candidates and edTPA performance?
2. What is the association between first language status and teacher candidate perceptions of preparation to complete edTPA?

3. How have faculty in one EPP modified instructional support for non-native English-speaking candidates?

Methodology

The researcher used a mixed methodology to address the above-mentioned research questions. To address the influence of first language status on edTPA performance, edTPA scores were collected from both NNES and NES teacher candidates in World Language and ESL teacher preparation programs. To answer the second research question, the researcher interviewed both NNES and NES candidates and asked them to respond to surveys to better understand their perceptions of the performance-based assessment and the extent they felt prepared by their teacher preparation program to complete it. To answer the third research question, the researcher interviewed program faculty in the World Language and ESL teacher preparation programs to better understand how they have modified their support to meet the needs of non-native speakers of English.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are used throughout the study:

Academic English: the specialized, often decontextualized language that enables students to participate in school curriculum; it is different from conversational, everyday language (Bailey, 2007).

Artifacts: lesson plans, video clips, and student work samples that are uploaded as part of a candidate's edTPA portfolio.

Candidate: a student in a teacher preparation program.

Capstone Project: a summative assessment at the end of a course that determines a student's ability to perform a certain skill; in teacher preparation programs, this assessment often resembles edTPA.

Certification: a license issued by a state department of education which allows an individual to teach in that state based on meeting state requirements for teaching.

Classical Languages: Greek and Latin

Clinical Placement: an internship or field experience during which student teachers spend time in an actual classroom learning how to teach.

Commentary: reflective writing piece that responds to prompts as part of the edTPA portfolio assessment, requires a reflective style of writing, and must be written in English.

Cooperating Teacher: or clinical educator is a teacher who mentors a student teacher in his/her classroom during an internship.

Cut Score: the minimum score that a candidate must receive on the edTPA in order to be considered for licensure.

Differentiation: the process of adapting teaching techniques and lessons in order to meet the needs of diverse learners.

Digital Portfolio: a portfolio consisting of uploaded electronic documents which must be submitted to an electronic platform.

edTPA: a subject-specific performance-based assessment for teacher candidates seeking initial certification.

English as an Additional Language (EAL): also known as ESL; English instruction for students whose native language is not English; edTPA uses the term EAL instead of the more widely known term ESL.

English as a Second Language (ESL): English instruction for students whose native language is not English.

Heritage Language Learner: a student who grows up in a household where a language other than English is used.

Methodology Coursework: required university courses about the “how” of teaching.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS): optional subject-specific, performance-based portfolio assessment for in-service teachers that may provide extra pay for in-service teachers who successfully complete it; edTPA is built on the foundation of NBPTS.

Non-native English-speaking (NNES) candidates: teacher candidates whose native language is not English.

Pearson: the for-profit publishing and education company that provides the infrastructure for the distribution, collection, and managing of edTPA.

Performance-Based Assessment: an assessment that requires demonstration of a specific task.

Portfolio Assessment: a collection of academic work that is used to evaluate a candidate’s mastery of content.

Reflective writing: a writing style that utilizes describing and analyzing of teaching practices with the purpose to explore and develop one’s identity as a teacher.

Rubric: a grading table that lists the criteria used to score an assessment; the edTPA portfolio consists of 13 and 15 specific rubrics for World Language and ESL teacher candidates, respectively.

SCALE: Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity; the developer of edTPA.

Scorer: an anonymous evaluator of a candidate’s edTPA portfolio.

Seminar: a university course that provides support to teacher candidates during their internship or clinical placement; may include a focus on edTPA.

Task: one of three parts in the edTPA portfolio assessment (Planning, Instruction, Assessment); each task of edTPA is numbered (ie., Task 1; Task 2; Task 3).

World Languages: languages other than English that are taught as a foreign or second language in schools, such as Chinese, French, German, Japanese, Spanish, etc.

Significance of the Study

Findings from this study provided meaningful information regarding the performance, perceptions, and preparation of NNES teaching candidates when completing the WL and EAL edTPA portfolio assessment for teacher certification. By gaining insight into candidates' performance and perceptions, research findings have the potential to inform teacher preparation programs how to better prepare candidates for edTPA, especially since research has shown that NNES candidates underperform on the edTPA in comparison with their NES peers (Jourdain, 2018; Kissau & Algozzine, 2017; Russell & Davidson, 2018). Since the implementation of edTPA is widespread, this study has potential for far-reaching impact.

Teacher shortages in certain subject areas occur in nearly every state, but widespread teacher shortages also exist at the national level. Schools report having difficulties in filling vacancies with fully qualified teachers that meet state requirements (U.S. Department of Education Office of Postsecondary Education, 2017). This study may help teacher education programs to attract and prepare more future teachers as well as better understand and support candidates in their trajectory to become fully qualified teachers.

At a time of critical teacher shortage (Sutcher et al., 2019), edTPA is a gatekeeper or barrier that could negatively affect the diversification of the teacher workforce as it seeks to

match the racial, linguistic, and cultural diversity of the K-12 student population. Currently, the teacher workforce is almost 80% White (NCES, 2020) in comparison to 46% of the K-12 public school student population (NCES, 2020). A more diverse teacher workforce has the power to positively impact the growing number of English learners in K-12 settings who may benefit from having a NNES classroom teacher (Redding, 2019). The content areas of WL and EAL have the potential to attract more teacher candidates who are racially, linguistically, and culturally more diverse than the existing White teacher workforce because the content areas focus on languages other than English. This study may impact the current recruitment and success of historically underrepresented teacher candidates who are disproportionately absent from the profession (Kissau et al., 2019).

The field of WL teaching attracts NNES aspiring teachers whose native language is the language of the content area or instruction (for example, native Spanish speakers who teach Spanish as a foreign language to monolingual students in the United States). WL teachers are expected to use the target language during 90% of instruction, as recommended by professional associations (such as the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages [ACTFL]) and existing research (Bex, 2014; Ceo-DiFrancesco, 2014; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002). In order to meet this target language percentage, advanced content knowledge is required of World Language teacher candidates. For this reason, the field of WL teaching attracts NNES candidates whose native language is the language of the content area or instruction. However, “it is of great concern that native/heritage speakers of Spanish are experiencing difficulties in obtaining Spanish certification [when completing requirements for Spanish teacher licensure] and at rates disproportional to non-native speakers [i.e., native speakers of English]” (Jourdain, 2018). When teacher candidates are native speakers of the target language and NNES, their struggles with

edTPA may prevent them from becoming teachers since edTPA requirements, such as writing ten-page commentaries in English, may place them at a disadvantage compared to native English-speaking peers (Ratner & Kolman, 2016; Russell & Davidson Devall, 2016). The study sought to contribute insights regarding the experiences of NNES teacher candidates with the goal to better prepare diverse candidates for the edTPA assessment, operationalize support as they complete edTPA requirements, and help address the shortage of second language teachers and teachers representing minoritized groups.

Having a diverse and robust WL and ESL teacher workforce also contributes to district internationalization efforts, as promoted by the State Board of Education in North Carolina, the state in which the participating institution is located. The Board's vision encourages K-12 students to "become lifelong learners who will engage in a globally-collaborative society" because "[g]lobal education is the means to ensuring that our North Carolina public school graduates are globally engaged and productive citizens" (North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, n.d.). A Task Force on Global Education was formed in 2011 to provide a process and incentives for K-12 second language opportunities for all students and to increase the supply of competent K-12 WL teachers, among other commitments as reported in a 2019 final report (Task Force on Global Education, 2019). The study aimed to encourage second language learning and teaching, a commitment that is shared by the task force's internationalization efforts.

Organization of the Study

The introductory chapter of this dissertation provides an introduction to edTPA and further develop this topic by including the background, problem, purpose, methods, and significance of the study, along with its limitations. Through this information, the need for a

mixed-methods study on the association between first language status of second language teacher candidates and edTPA performance and perceptions of preparation to complete edTPA is established, as well as the association between teacher candidates' first language status and faculty support or practice. Key terms and definitions are provided as a reference for use throughout the study.

In Chapter II, a comprehensive review of the literature is provided, with particular attention to the evolution of teacher candidate evaluation and edTPA. The chapter starts with a historical overview of performance-based assessments in teacher education and leads to the development and implementation of edTPA. Next, the researcher reviews existing literature related to the performance of candidates on the World Language and English as an Additional Language edTPA.

A description of the methodology used in this study is the focus of Chapter III. The rationale for the mixed-methods study and the related data sources is also discussed in the chapter. The researcher also describes the study's context, participants, and data collection procedures. More precisely, the researcher describes the quantitative data analysis of the edTPA scores and surveys as well as the qualitative data analysis of the open responses on the surveys and in the interviews with participants.

Chapter IV details how the data was analyzed. The quantitative data, in the form of edTPA scores and Likert-scale survey responses, was analyzed using SPSS and the qualitative data (open-ended survey and interview responses) was analyzed using a grounded theory approach. The researcher provides both a written and graphic summary of the results in chapter IV.

In Chapter V, the researcher interprets and discusses the results, as it relates to the existing body of research related to edTPA and NNES teacher candidates. Chapter V also includes sections on implications, limitations, and directions for future research. The chapter ends with a conclusion that summarize the study.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

To create context for the research study, a historical overview of performance-based assessments in teacher education is provided, followed by a discussion of the evolution of performance-based assessments that ultimately led to the development and implementation of edTPA. Next, speaking specifically to the first research question, the researcher reviewed the existing literature describing performance of teacher candidates on the WL and EAL edTPA, including that of NNES teacher candidates. Relating to the second research question, existing literature concerning stakeholders' perceptions of edTPA is described, including those of NES second language teacher candidates, and perceptions from NNES candidates as they complete the WL and EAL edTPA. Finally, and pertaining to the third research question, a summary of teacher preparation strategies, reported in the literature, that support NNES teacher candidates to complete edTPA is provided, including those offered by teacher education faculty.

Historical Overview of Teacher Accreditation

More than thirty years ago, the publication of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) criticized public education in the United States. Failing schools and a declining educational system compared with those in other countries were the target of this criticism. The report blamed poor teacher education programs for unqualified teachers and high turnover rates among teachers. During the last two decades of the 20th century, several reports casting a negative spotlight on teachers in the United States were published, such as *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future* by the National Council on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF, 1996). This report found that many teacher preparation programs were not accredited since no such requirement existed and, as a result, strongly recommended mandatory accreditation of teacher preparation programs. According to the NCTAF report

(1996), “competent teaching depends on educators who deeply understand subject matter and how to teach in ways that motivate children and help them learn” (p. 8). Additionally, the NCTAF report recognized the importance of standards for teaching, especially those related to knowledge of subject matter and teaching knowledge, as developed (and revised) in 1995 by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the former organization that oversees the accreditation of teacher preparation programs in the United States.

The NCTAF report (1996) prompted multiple research studies investigating the quality of teacher training in the United States (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986). In 2000, Goldhaber and Brewer concluded that “most states that require teachers to pass competency exams [had set] relatively modest hurdles” that “[did] little to screen out poor candidates” (p. 131). For example, 90% of teacher candidates in Pennsylvania passed a teacher certification exam on the first try (p. 130). In other words, standard certification did not necessarily guarantee a highly competent teacher. When entry standards are extremely low, teacher certification exams are not meaningful. The researchers argued that their results regarding teacher competency exams “should, at the very least, cast doubt on the claims of the educational establishment that standard certification should be required of all teachers” (p. 141) because little evidence was found to support this position.

Teacher competency exams reflect candidates’ content knowledge and teaching knowledge but, in at least one state, these exams did not prevent unqualified teachers from entering the profession. Darling-Hammond et al. (2001) concurred with the NCTAF report (1996) that “teacher expertise is one of the most important school factors influencing student achievement” (Darling-Hammond et al., 2001, p. 10), and that without content knowledge, teachers are ill-prepared to make an impact on student academic growth (NCTAF, 1996).

Despite the importance of content knowledge, in a study of California's teachers, Darling-Hammond (1997) found that, in some content areas, fewer than half of teachers had a major and full certification in their field in 1994. In California, teacher education programs were historically disconnected from content-area studies, which made it difficult to link arts and sciences coursework with theory and pedagogical courses within teacher preparation. Darling-Hammond called for professionalization of the teaching profession, as a response to California's overreliance on emergency hiring of underprepared, inexperienced, and short-term teachers. She urged California to invest in teacher education programs that provided "more coherent and comprehensive training" (p. 37) and outlined strategies for high quality teacher education in California (Darling-Hammond et al., 2001). According to the researchers, this "comprehensive training" should include content area studies as well as educational theory and pedagogical courses to better prepare teacher candidates.

Evolution of Performance-Based Assessments

As a way to identify experienced and effective teachers, voluntary national performance-based portfolio assessments were introduced to recognize content-specific and pedagogical teacher expertise. "While subject matter knowledge is important, research consistently indicates that knowledge of how to teach is an equally powerful factor in teacher effectiveness and in some cases bears an even stronger relationship to teacher performance and student learning" (Darling-Hammond et al., 2001, p. 12). According to Shulman (1986), pedagogical content knowledge includes making content comprehensible to others, and "an understanding of what makes the learning of specific topics easy or difficult" (p. 9). A national certification for experienced teachers was established in 1987, as an effort to recognize effective teaching or "what teachers should know and be able to do" as part of an "accomplished practice" (National

Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2016, p. 2). The professionalization of the teaching profession through the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) was recommended in a report by the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986). This optional national certification process exists in addition to the mandatory state process that involves candidates meeting minimum requirements. The NBPTS proposed a subject-specific, performance-based portfolio assessment for in-service teachers as well as a subject test in 30 content areas. Experienced teachers could choose to participate, and could earn NBPTS certification, a credential “above and beyond state certification” and would be “acknowledged as the best U.S. teachers” (Parker, 1993, p. 3). In their study of teachers pursuing NBPTS, Sato et al. (2008) identified six dimensions of formative assessment and aligned each with indicators that were rated on a rubric with a five-point scale. The findings of their study suggested that “professional development strategies like those provided by National Board Certification may help to change teachers’ formative assessment practices, and, [...], their instruction more generally” (p. 695). National Board Certification continues to exist as an optional or voluntary recognition of teacher qualifications that teachers may choose to obtain after teaching for more than three years (Sato et al., 2008).

Fifteen years after implementation of the NBPTS, in 2002, California introduced a generic, standardized performance-based assessment for use by the state’s teacher education programs. A consortium of more than 20 California colleges and universities responded with the creation of the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) to propose an “integrated, authentic, and subject-specific assessment” (Pecheone & Chung, 2006, p. 22). The PACT was intended to measure a candidate’s subject-specific pedagogical knowledge, and its assessments or teaching events (TE) used multiple sources of data, such as lesson plans, video

clips of teaching, and student work samples. Additionally, reflection and commentaries were an essential part of PACT's four categories of teaching (planning, instruction, assessment, and reflection). Pecheone and Chung (2006) differentiated the PACT from National Board Certification by describing the TE tasks of PACT as "more integrated (capturing a unified learning segment), [designed] to measure teacher performance at the preservice level, and [without] assessment center components" (p. 23). The PACT included two assessment strategies: "signature" assessments that took place during teacher preparation as well as a summative assessment during a candidate's field placement. The TE portfolio portion of the PACT was scored via a centralized scoring model using guiding questions and corresponding rubrics with a 4-point scale (1 = does not meet standard; 2 = meets standard; 3 = represents advanced level of standard; 4 = represents superior level of standard).

edTPA

With the PACT as its model, the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) developed a performance assessment for beginning teachers that could be used as a national standard. This performance assessment, known as edTPA, was field tested in 2013 and is currently being used in more than 900 teacher education programs in 41 states and the District of Columbia (AACTE, 2022).

Similar to the national board portfolio assessment available through the aforementioned NBPTS, the edTPA is subject-specific and available for 27 content areas (AACTE, 2022). The edTPA assessment consists of three tasks with accompanying rubrics intended to measure a teacher candidate's ability to plan (Task 1), instruct (Task 2), and assess student learning (Task 3) which are evaluated through a digital portfolio that includes lesson plans, detailed written reflective commentaries, and video recorded teaching segments. For Task 1, candidates are asked

to plan for instruction and assessment by writing three to five consecutive lesson plans for approximately three to five hours of connected instruction. Candidates must also write a multi-page commentary (often as many as nine single-spaced pages) with attention to the central focus, content standards, learning objectives, instructional supports, planned supports, and the ways in which lesson plans build on each other throughout the learning segment selected for edTPA, among other topics. With respect to Task 2 (Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning), candidates are expected to submit one or two video clips of their teaching (depending on their content area requirements) in which they identify evidences of a positive learning environment that demonstrates student engagement, building upon student responses (through follow-up questions), and connections to students' prior academic knowledge while teaching content, among other topics. In the accompanying commentary, candidates must write a multi-page commentary (often as many as six single-spaced pages) describing how they demonstrated respect and/or rapport to students, and how their instruction engaged students in specific scenes in the video clip(s). Additionally, in the commentary for Task 2, candidates must analyze their teaching by referring to examples from the video clip(s) and reflecting on the changes they would implement in order to improve their teaching in future lessons. In the Task 2 commentary, these proposed changes must be explained and also supported by principles from relevant theory and/or research applicable to the content area. Finally, for Task 3 (Assessing Student Learning), candidates must select three student work samples from one assessment that is included in the lesson plans and define the evaluation criteria (such as a rubric) in order to analyze student learning. Candidates must analyze this student work to identify quantitative and qualitative patterns of learning within the whole class. For Task 3, candidates are tasked with writing a commentary (often ten single-spaced pages) in which they must summarize student performance

in a graphic or a narrative for the purpose of analysis. In response to subsequent commentary prompts, candidates must provide evidence of feedback given on assessments for three focus students and explain how this feedback matched students' individual strengths and needs as well as supported future learning. Ultimately, as a reflective component, the commentary must include an explanation of next steps for instruction supported by research-based theory, such as Second Language Acquisition.

Trained scorers employed by edTPA's Administrator Evaluation System (a group of Pearson) assess a teacher candidate's performance in each of the three tasks using a number of five-point rubrics. In 25 of the 27 edTPA content areas, 15 rubrics are used to score candidates' edTPA portfolios. Scorers evaluate the edTPA portfolios for Classical Languages and World Language through the use of 13 rubrics, reflecting the incorporation of academic language within the content area "because language development is the focus" (SCALE, 2018, p. 14). Minimum or "cut" scores for edTPA are set by an institution or state. Each state may determine its own pass/fail score as it implements, pilots, or phases in edTPA. During a piloting stage, states may require the completion of edTPA, but scores may be non-consequential. In the state where this study took place, the cut scores were 32 for the World Language edTPA and 38 for the EAL edTPA.

Predictive Validity of edTPA

Whereas the edTPA was implemented as a tool to improve teacher workforce quality, existing studies on its predictive validity of teacher effectiveness have concluded in mixed results. In a study of teacher candidates who completed edTPA, Goldhaber et al. (2017) used longitudinal data to predict the potential "validity of the edTPA as both a screen and a signal of future teacher effectiveness" (p. 378). Their study, using edTPA results of more than 2,300

teacher candidates in Washington state, found that passing edTPA scores are “significantly predictive of teacher effectiveness” in some content areas (p. 378). In their discussion, the researchers emphasized the potential of edTPA as a screening mechanism for teachers but added the concern that “teachers who perform poorly on the edTPA, but still obtain teaching positions likely have other skills that are valued in the workplace, but are not observed in our data” (p. 387). The researchers warn of using edTPA “as a one-time, high-stakes test for employment eligibility [because doing so] comes at a cost of screening out some candidates who would become effective teachers” (p. 389). In response to edTPA criticism, the developers at SCALE stated that there is “evidence that edTPA is predictive of future teaching effectiveness” based on preliminary data obtained by others (Whittaker et al., 2018, p. 8).

In a similar study, Bastian and Lys (2016) assessed the relationship between edTPA scores and two teacher performance indicators: teacher value-added data and teacher evaluation ratings. The researchers found that teacher effectiveness improved as a result of teacher candidates completing edTPA. Specifically, edTPA rubrics in Task 2 (Instruction) predicted significantly higher evaluation ratings for first year teachers.

Proliferation of edTPA

Since the launch of edTPA in 2013 (AACTE, 2018), implementation of the performance-based assessment has spread across the United States. As of 2020, more than 900 institutions across 41 states have adopted edTPA as a requirement for licensure or are considering edTPA as a requirement for licensure (AACTE, 2020). The Department of Public Instruction in the state of North Carolina, where the study took place, required edTPA for licensure in 2019 but many institutions, including the one at which the study took place, began piloting the assessment much earlier (Bastian & Lys, 2016).

Teacher Candidate Performance on edTPA

To provide context for this study, the extant literature on teacher candidate edTPA performance is summarized below. Literature looking broadly at edTPA performance across content areas is first summarized, followed by a more detailed analysis of the performance of second language teacher candidates, with specific reference made to the performance of NNES candidates.

The following table shows average candidate performance on edTPA overall, and for each task and rubric, for all 15-rubric content areas. To help interpret these findings, a rubric score of 3 indicates that a candidate is ready to teach. This table includes data from 49,123 edTPA portfolios submitted by candidates in 2019 and is adapted from the 2019 edTPA Administrative Report.

Table 2

Average Candidate Performance on edTPA (for all 15-rubric content areas)

Rubric	Mean score
Task 1: Planning	
P01: Planning for Content Understandings	3.0
P02: Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs	3.0
P03: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning	3.1
P04: Identifying and Supporting Language Demands	2.9
P05: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning	2.9
Task 1	14.9
Task 2: Instruction	
I06: Learning Environment	3.1
I07: Engaging Students in Learning	3.0

I08: Deepening Student Learning	2.9
I09: Subject-Specific Pedagogy	2.9
I10: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness	2.7
Task 2	14.5
Task 3: Assessment	
A11: Analysis of Student Learning	2.9
A12: Providing Feedback to Guide Learning	3.2
A13: Student Understanding and Use of Feedback	2.7
A14: Analyzing Students' Language Use and Content Learning	2.9
A15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction	2.9
Task 3	14.7
Overall	44.2

Adapted from Task and Rubric Scores (2019 edTPA Annual Administrative Report, 2021, p. 14)

Looking holistically across all content areas, as reported by SCALE's 2019 Administrative Report, candidates in all 15-rubric content areas earned the highest scores (mean = 14.9) out of 25 maximum points on Task 1 (Planning), lower scores (mean = 14.7) out of 25 maximum points on Task 3 (Assessment), and the lowest scores (mean = 14.5) out of 25 maximum points on Task 2 (Instruction). Looking specifically at rubrics, candidates scored lowest on Rubric 10 (Task 2: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness) and Rubric 13 (Task 3: Student Understanding and Use of Feedback). Candidates performed best on Rubric 12 (Task 3: Providing Feedback to Guide Learning). In a study by Williams et al. (2019) involving 952 candidates in multiple content areas, candidates performed best on Task 1, with mean scores ranging from 2.84 to 2.96 (disaggregated by candidates' race). On the other hand, candidates obtained the lowest average score on Task 3 (2.54 to 2.85).

World Language Teacher Candidate Performance

Table 3

Average Candidate Performance on the World Language edTPA

Rubric	Mean score
Task 1: Planning	
P01: Planning for Communicative Proficiency in the Target Language	3.1
P02: Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs	3.0
P03: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning	3.0
P04: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Students' Development of Communicative Proficiency in the Target Language	3.0
Task 1 Mean Score	12.1
Task 2: Instruction	
I05: Learning Environment	3.1
I06: Engaging Students' Target Language Communication	2.7
I07: Deepening Student Communicative Proficiency in the Target Language	2.5
I08: Subject-Specific Pedagogy	2.0
I09: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness	2.5
Task 2 Mean Score	12.8
Task 3: Assessment	
A10: Analysis of Student Communicative Proficiency in the Target Language	2.9
A11: Providing Feedback to Guide Student Development of Communicative Proficiency in the Target Language	3.2
A12: Student Understanding and Use of Feedback	2.7
A13: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction	2.9
Task 3 Mean Score	10.9

Total Mean Score	35.75
------------------	-------

Adapted from Task and Rubric Scores (2019 edTPA Annual Administrative Report, 2021, p. 29)

As illustrated in Table 3, data from the 2019 edTPA Annual Administrative Report shows that candidates in World Language scored highest on Task 1 (Planning) and lowest on Task 2 (Instruction) in their edTPA portfolios. Candidates scored highest on Rubric 1 (Planning for Communicative Proficiency in the Target Language) and Rubric 5 (Learning Environment) but lowest on Rubric 8 (Subject-Specific Pedagogy).

Multiple studies have investigated second language teacher candidates' performance on the World Language edTPA, especially those in early adopter programs (Hildebrandt & Swanson, 2014; Kissau & Algozzine, 2017; Okraski & Kissau, 2018; Russell & Davidson Devall, 2016; Troyan & Kaplan, 2015). In a study of 21 World Language teacher candidates, Hildebrandt and Swanson (2014) found that candidates were most successful (mean 3.64) in the planning tasks (Task 1) and least successful (mean 3.04) in the assessment tasks (Task 3). Similar to Hildebrandt and Swanson, Kissau and Algozzine (2017) investigated the performance of 21 World Language teacher candidates and found that candidates obtained the highest scores (mean 3.36) on the planning tasks (Task 1). However, unlike Hildebrandt and Swanson, students in their study obtained the lowest scores (2.87) on the instruction tasks (Task 2). Similarly, Russell and Davidson Devall's (2016) study included seven World Language teacher candidates who scored highest (mean: 3.29) in the planning tasks (Task 1) and lowest (mean: 2.46) on the instruction tasks (Task 2). As part of a larger study with 63 candidates in two content areas, Okraski and Kissau (2018) reported that 29 World Language teacher candidates scored highest (mean 4.36) on the planning tasks (Task 1) and lowest (mean 4.10) on the assessment tasks (Task 3). Based on findings from these four studies, all found the highest scores for planning tasks

(Task 1), two found lowest scores on assessment tasks (Task 3), and two found lowest scores on the instruction tasks (Task 2).

Moving beyond simple reporting of mean scores, studies have sought to explain candidate performance. Hildebrandt and Swanson (2014) proposed that higher scores on the planning task (Task 1) may be explained by the emphasis on and practice of lesson planning in education coursework, specifically content-specific methods courses. The authors added that teacher candidates “may have the most experience planning for lessons during their education coursework and their content-specific classes” (p. 585) and possibly planned for or taught similar lessons to students during field experiences. Attempting to explain lower Task 2 scores, Russell and Davidson Devall (2016) suggested that lower scores on the instruction task (Task 2) may be related to the early timing and related lack of preparation for the videorecording and delivering of instruction in the target language. When the videorecording takes place in week two or three of a semester-long clinical placement, teacher candidates have little prior experience teaching in a K-12 classroom and are, thus, minimally prepared.

With respect to Task 3, Hildebrandt and Swanson (2014) related the poor performance on Task 3 to the amount of time that teacher preparation programs devote to assessment and how it relates to future instruction. In their study, the researchers found that many of the candidates experienced difficulties providing ways to improve student performance (Rubric 12: Student Understanding and Use of Feedback) and using results from the assessment to inform future instruction (Rubric 13), attributing these struggles to a lack of related experience or practice. Similarly, in a study of high and low scoring portfolios, WL teacher candidates struggled the most with Rubric 13 in Task 3, the last rubric of the assessment, which requires an analysis of what students know in order to plan future instruction (Swanson & Goulette, 2018). Adkins

(2016) hypothesized that, when candidates practice with assessments relatively late in the curriculum, “candidates have far fewer opportunities to practice and receive feedback on one of the most technically complex aspects of teaching” (p. 56). While noting that teacher training programs have responded to these data by placing increased attention to assessment, Swanson and Hildebrandt (2017) cautioned programs about diverting too much attention and effort to improve Task 3 performance. In a study involving two WL teacher education programs’ edTPA outcomes, the researchers found that WL teacher candidates’ edTPA scores on Task 1 and 2 decreased after making curricular changes to address initial low scores for Task 3.

English as Second Language Teacher Candidate Performance

Table 4

Average Candidate Performance on the English as an Additional Language edTPA

Rubric	Mean score
Task 1: Planning	
P01: Planning for English Language Development within Content-Based Instruction	3.4
P02: Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs	3.2
P03: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning	3.4
P04: Identifying and Supporting Language Demands	3.3
P05: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Students’ Development of English Language	3.3
Task 1 Mean Score	16.6
Task 2: Instruction	
I06: Learning Environment for English Language Development within Content-Based Instruction	3.3
I07: Engaging Students’ English Language Development within Content-Based Instruction	3.2

I08: Deepening Student English Language Development within Content-Based Instruction	3.1
I09: Subject-Specific Pedagogy	2.9
I10: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness	3.0
Task 2 Mean Score	15.5
Task 3: Assessment	
A11: Analysis of Students' Development of English Language Proficiency through Content-Based Instruction	3.2
A12: Providing Feedback to Guide Student Development of English Language Proficiency within Content-Based Instruction	3.3
A13: Student Understanding and Use of Feedback	2.9
A14: Analyzing Students' Language Use and Content Understanding	3.1
A15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction of English Language with Content	3.2
Task 3 Total	15.7
Overall Total	47.85

Adapted from Task and Rubric Scores (2019 edTPA Annual Administrative Report, 2021, p. 29)

As illustrated in Table 4, the 2019 edTPA Annual Administrative Report showed ESL candidates scored highest on Task 1 (Planning) and lowest on Task 2 (Instruction). Looking at performance at the rubric level, candidates received highest scores on Rubric 1 (Planning for English Language Development within Content-Based Instruction) and Rubric 3 (Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning) but lowest scores on Rubric 9 (Subject-Specific Pedagogy) and Rubric 13 (Student Understanding and Use of Feedback).

In comparison to WL, the performance of ESL teacher candidates has not been researched as often. Baecher et al. (2017) conducted a self-study of teacher education practice that focused on key tasks with the EAL edTPA. Their data sources included interviews with 96 ESL teacher candidates about the benefits of edTPA and how edTPA affected their teaching. The

researchers found that, in order to meet edTPA requirements, “candidates must have high language awareness” and be capable of designing linguistic supports as well as identifying the language demands for K-12 content areas (p. 117). Specifically, attention to English language teaching in the content area instead of solely providing support (such as scaffolding) for the content area led to a reflection and articulation of the teaching practice that better aligned with edTPA requirements. In the researchers’ master’s degree program in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESOL), 83% of teacher candidates passed edTPA. However, scores were not disaggregated by task or rubric (Baecher et al., 2017). Micek (2017) analyzed the edTPA portfolios of four ESL teacher candidates as part of a mixed method study, and found that candidates’ lowest averaged scores were for Task 2, but this may have been due to one candidate who was unsuccessful in uploading her Task 2 video. More recently, and involving more participants, Lachance and Kissau (2018) investigated the impact of strategies designed to support ESL teacher candidates with the edTPA tasks. Similar to the results of WL teachers, they found that while the ESL candidates ($n = 34$) at their institution scored higher than national averages on all three edTPA tasks, their mean scores for Task 3 were the lowest of all three tasks. In a study of ESL teacher candidates ($n = 18$) in a graduate program, Tigert et al. (2018) reported that candidates performed strongest on Task 1 ($M = 2.62$) and lowest on Task 2 ($M = 2.34$), identifying a lack of higher-order questioning and thinking, among other weaknesses, in the video recordings.

Non-native English-speaking (NNES) Teacher Candidate Performances

More recent research (Behizadeh & Neely, 2019; Okraski & Kissau, 2018; Williams et al., 2019) has begun to focus on the struggles of specific subgroups of teacher candidates, more specifically those of NNES or candidates who were born in the United States, but grew up in

households where a language other than English was spoken (heritage language speakers). In previous studies, researchers found that the overall and individual edTPA rubric scores for these NNES were lower than scores of NES teacher candidates (Jourdain, 2018; Kissau & Algozzine, 2017; Russell & Davidson, 2018). More specifically, in a study involving 33 World Language teacher candidates, Jourdain (2018) compared edTPA scores of 24 NES candidates with those of nine NNES candidates. Out of these nine NNES candidates, four Hispanic candidates received failing scores, four did not submit, and only one received a passing edTPA score. In a similar study, Kissau and Algozzine (2017) compared edTPA scores of 21 World Language teacher candidates of which ten were NNES candidates. The researchers found that the edTPA scores of NNES candidates ($M = 2.77$) were lower than those of NES candidates ($M = 3.36$). Similarly, Russell and Davidson (2018) examined the performance of NES and NNES candidates ($n = 7$) on the WL edTPA. Compared to NES candidates, the NNES teacher candidates performed lower on all tasks, but scores of NNES teacher candidates were the lowest ($M = 7.5$) on Task 3 compared to scores of native English-speaking candidates ($M = 10.8$) out of a possible maximum score of 20 for all four rubrics within Task 3.

In these few studies, the researchers have attempted to explain the underperformance of NNES candidates (Jourdain, 2018; Kissau & Algozzine, 2017; Lachance & Kissau, 2019; Okraski & Kissau, 2018; Russell & Davidson Devall, 2016, 2018). The consensus across research studies is that the commentary prompts are lengthy and use complex academic language. These studies also show that NNES candidates struggle with the reflective writing style that is expected in the commentaries of the edTPA. In his study of teacher candidates from a variety of content areas, Denton (2013) found that candidates must understand rubric language and subject-specific terminology, especially related to academic language. Miller et al. (2015)

concurrent, describing how teacher candidates from a variety of content areas struggled with “translating the general language from the edTPA task prompts” (p. 51) in order to write reflective commentaries. In the case of second language teacher candidates, Okraski and Kissau (2018) found that NNES candidates needed extra support to comprehend the language of the rubrics before they were able to address each aspect of the prompts. Likewise, in a study by Tigert et al. (2018), ESL teacher candidates reported being confused by the language of the directions in the EAL edTPA handbook and had “difficulty unpacking the language in the assessment prompts, rubrics, and resources” (p. 31). The researchers recommended examining conflicting interpretations, resulting in a better understanding of the directions, rubrics, and specialized terminology in the EAL edTPA handbook.

In addition to struggling with long and complicated rubric language, studies have suggested that the lengthy written commentaries required in edTPA also put NNES candidates at a disadvantage. In their study involving WL candidates, Russell and Davidson (2016) found that NNES candidates were “at a disadvantage compared to their peers who were native speakers of English” (p. 496) as they completed edTPA commentaries in English. The researchers interviewed candidates and supervisors who expressed concern that the edTPA was “significantly more challenging” (p. 493) for NNES candidates because advanced writing skills in English were needed to reflect and respond to edTPA prompts, as well as edTPA-specific language. Russell and Davidson (2016) suggested that multilingual candidates should be allowed to use their preferred or strongest language for the extensive commentary writing. The researchers concurred with Troyan and Kaplan (2015), recognizing the need for practice, explicit training or remediation for the reflective academic writing that is needed for the edTPA commentaries. Kissau and Algozzine (2017) also found that NNES candidates struggled with the

written commentaries of the edTPA and recommended that future studies investigate “what level of English proficiency [...] is required to be successful on the edTPA” (p. 131). In a study by Okraski and Kissau (2018), instructors commented that NNES candidates needed extra support to comprehend the language of the edTPA rubrics in order to address each aspect of the commentary prompts.

Offering yet another explanation for the underperformance of NNES candidates, Kissau and Algozzine (2017) added that NNES candidates experience difficulties when using knowledge of students to tailor instruction due to their unfamiliarity with American culture, especially as related to American schools, which may result in the struggle to meet the requirements/expectations of edTPA. Participants in the study mentioned that they “were still learning how to differentiate their instruction to incorporate students’ interests and needs” (p. 125) and felt they “would have benefited from taking a course on differentiation” (p. 125) that would have been tailored to their needs as NNES new to American schools. Making connections with students, learning from colleagues, and fulfilling the cultural expectations of teaching in the United States were also found in the study by Kissau and Algozzine (2017) to be a stumbling block for NNES candidates who were born and educated outside of the United States.

Perceptions of edTPA

Although not specific to WL or ESL instruction, multiple studies on edTPA have presented the perceptions of researchers and teacher educators, teacher candidates, and even the perceptions of NNES candidates since edTPA became widely adopted.

Researchers and Teacher Educators

The positive perceptions of the edTPA, as documented in the research, focus on the professionalization of the teaching profession through videotaping and reflective commentary

writing in a portfolio assessment (Sato, 2014). According to Sato (2014), teaching is a professional activity, with skills and techniques that are research-based. Sato (2014) claims that, with regards to professionalism, edTPA defines “the skilled performance of a teacher candidate as a beginning practitioner” (p. 429). Another positive perception is that of edTPA results leading to the implementation of curricular changes as part of program improvement in order to provide candidates with greater edTPA practice and support (Lachance & Kissau, 2018; Kissau et al., 2017; Miller et al., 2015; Troyan & Kaplan, 2015). In support of this perception, Lachance and Kissau (2018) made a number of recommendations for how programs can enhance their preparation based on edTPA results. For example, the researchers recommended capstone projects with structured peer review, an expanded programmatic lesson plan template, specialized internship seminars, and writing support. Troyan and Kaplan (2015) recommended that teacher education programs include explicit training, practice, and coaching of writing skills for candidates with less formal training in writing. Based on their significant findings, Kissau et al. (2019) suggested teacher preparation programs provide professional development related to edTPA to mentoring teachers during the student teaching internship to familiarize them with the assessment and enable them to provide more support to their teacher candidates. Holistically, researchers have argued that the collection, analysis, and interpretation of edTPA results have led to improved instruction in teacher education programs (Cash et al., 2019; Cuthrell et al., 2016).

Countering these positive perceptions are a number of related criticisms. One common criticism relates to the cost involved with completing the assessment (Hildebrandt & Swanson, 2014; Kissau et al., 2019). Chiu (2014), a student who wrote about her experiences with edTPA, criticized the \$300 fee to score the edTPA portfolio charged by Pearson. Further, in a study that investigated motivational draws, deterrents, and perceptions of pursuing a career as a World

Language teacher, participants reported feeling intimidated by costs related to licensure assessment tests such as edTPA (Kissau et al., 2019).

On a related note, Picower and Marshall (2017) criticized the involvement of a for-profit company in the administration of edTPA, especially the “corporate encroachment [...] that directly impacts what [occurs] in the classroom” (p. 194) and the corporate invasion that goes along with outsourcing. Teacher education faculty have expressed concern about the lack of local control when a national for-profit company is in charge of designing and scoring the edTPA portfolio. Both Au (2013) and Carter and Lochte (2017) cautioned teacher education faculty about allowing “corporate testing giant Pearson” (Au, 2013, p. 22) to be in charge of the administration of edTPA and expressed concern about the involvement of a for-profit company with “significant influence on America’s classrooms” (p. 20). Several researchers addressed the outsourcing of edTPA scoring. Dover and Schultz (2016), for example, criticized edTPA by describing candidates’ learning to teach as a “dynamic, situated, and complex endeavor” (p. 103) that could not be adequately evaluated by an outsourced scorer hired by a privatized assessment system. The researchers blamed outsourcing on “an unregulated and opportunistic marketplace” of scorers who performed an “artificially decontextualized, standardized, and anonymous evaluation of candidates” (p. 102). According to Dover and Schultz (2016), scorers have no way of determining whether candidates’ portfolios are authentic representations of candidates’ daily practice” (p. 102). Supporting this claim, Chiu (2014) believed edTPA depersonalized her student teaching experience since a “distant, anonymous scorer” ignored the “expertise of the teacher educators who [were] best positioned to judge [her] current abilities and potential to further develop as a teacher” (p. 29). Au (2013) described how his students believed edTPA caused a “teaching-to-the-test” situation at their university.

Additional concerns center on the lack of transparency about the edTPA scorer training and the demographic profile of scorers. Potter (2020) criticized Pearson's lack of specific requirements for scorers, as no minimum years of teaching experience or mentoring experience are required (Pearson, 2020). Potter (2020) questioned who exactly was doing the scoring since "very little data is provided about the evaluators" (p. 7). Similarly, Dover and Schulz (2016) criticized the lack of data on the demographic profile of scorers, assuming that "the scoring pool reflects the overwhelming Whiteness of teaching and teacher education" (p. 98). The researchers were troubled by the significant differences of candidates' scores "according to the racial and socioeconomic context of their student teaching placement" (Dover & Schulz, 2016, p. 98).

Yet another concern expressed in the literature pertains to teacher candidates working with culturally and linguistically diverse students. In 2013, the National Association of Multicultural Education (NAME) published a position statement on the edTPA in which it spoke out against edTPA since it privileges "dominant cultural norms that reproduce inequities" (p. 2) and "severely limits faculty ability to enact their commitment to preparing teachers to promote critical multicultural education, social justice, and democratic citizenship" (p. 2). Sato (2014) discussed the importance of non-biased scoring of edTPA based on where a candidate is placed (i.e., the teaching context), especially when the school context is affected by poverty and low student performance (p. 430). Sato (2014) warned that the performance of a teacher candidate placed in a "difficult" or "more challenging" school could be assessed differently compared to the performance of other candidates placed in schools that are perceived as "easier" and "less challenging" (p. 430).

Other concerns relate to edTPA being a gatekeeper assessment that may keep diverse teacher candidates from entering the profession (Au, 2013; Carter & Lochte, 2017; Cronenberg

et al., 2016; Dover & Schultz, 2016; Ledwell & Oyler, 2016; Olson & Rao, 2017; Petchauer et al., 2018; Picower & Marshall, 2017). A gatekeeper assessment controls access to the profession by way of exams or hindrances of a financial nature. In a survey of teacher educators, Picower and Marshall (2017) found that the edTPA may reduce the ability of teachers of color to enter the teaching profession because of the heavy emphasis placed on reflective writing as an assessment strategy and on traditional teaching practices. Additional concerns were related to the cost of the edTPA and the lack of access to support such as writing coaches. Petchauer et al. (2018) called attention to the institutional and labor resources necessary for successful implementation of edTPA, favoring teacher education programs at well-resourced institutions compared to those at smaller, underfunded Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) and Minority Serving Institutions (MSI).

Teacher Candidates

Teacher candidates in several content areas have also shared their perceptions of edTPA in a variety of publications. After completing edTPA, Chiu (2014) and Kuranishi and Oyler (2017) expressed their concerns that the edTPA was not a true indicator of teaching competence. Chiu (2014) wrote of edTPA completion as an artificial process of “test preparation culture” (p. 28) that did not take into consideration the “real-life demands of teaching in a public school classroom” (p. 29). Together with his professor, Kuranishi co-wrote an article about his failure to meet the cut score requirement of the edTPA in New York state and explored explanations for the candidate’s low-scoring edTPA portfolio. Prior to his edTPA completion, Kuranishi was a successful graduate student and received extremely positive reviews on his 12 clinical teaching observations. In the article, Kuranishi and Oyler described their concerns about edTPA and juxtaposed the student’s obvious readiness to teach with the low score rated by one edTPA

scorer. The authors concluded that the inclusive practices in the candidate's classroom were not the special accommodations that the scorer expected to see. Supporting Sato's previously mentioned concerns (2014), the authors questioned edTPA's construction of literacy, relating Freire's (1998) findings that literacy priorities "whitewash the curriculum" (Kuranishi & Oyler, 2017, p. 309).

While not criticizing the scoring per se, Chiu (2014) described the semester during which she completed her edTPA as "artificial" since it required "backtracking and making up or misrepresenting details in order to produce a narrative that would be judged well according to edTPA standards" (p. 28). Furthermore, Chiu criticized the intensity of the edTPA by labeling its tasks "unrealistic" because "the task demands do not take into consideration the real-life demands of teaching in a public school classroom" (p. 29). Faculty and candidates alike have expressed concern over the exorbitant amount of time spent preparing for the assessment, at the expense of lesson planning, and other teaching-related tasks (Whitaker et al., 2018). Some candidates told of working more than 25 hours on the portfolio during the student teaching semester in which they would have preferred to spend more time preparing for actual classroom teaching (Olsen & Barske, 2018).

Non-Native English-Speaking Candidates

Few studies have focused on the perceptions of edTPA of NNES teacher candidates. In some instances, the perceptions of one or a few NNES candidates were included because these candidates happened to belong to a group of teacher candidates studied by researchers (e.g., Kissau & Algozzine, 2017; Russell & Davidson Devall, 2016), but they were not the focus per se. In a study by Kissau and Algozzine (2017), for example, NNES teacher candidates (10 NNES out of 21 participants) explained that practice and preparation during methodology coursework

and clinical placements helped them improve performance on the edTPA. Specifically, these NNES candidates recognized the value of understanding students' backgrounds, their interests, and prior learning as they completed edTPA. In a study by Russell and Davidson Devall (2016), NNES teacher candidates expressed that they experienced difficulties with the requirement to use academic English in the commentaries of the edTPA. One of these candidates explained that "the need to use written scholarly English extensively when completing the portfolio limited her ability to explain and justify her teaching practices, even though no problems existed with her oral language skills" (p. 490).

Teacher Preparation Strategies to Support Non-Native English-Speaking Candidates

Due to the high-stakes nature of edTPA and candidate struggles to successfully complete the assessment, many teacher training programs have made adjustments to better support their candidates. For example, many programs now include edTPA practice tasks in coursework for pre-service candidates (Kleyn et al., 2015; Lachance & Kissau, 2018; Okraski & Kissau, 2018). As a response to challenges related to edTPA-driven instruction, Kleyn et al. (2015) made changes to their teacher education program to include practice tasks in coursework leading up to the clinical placement. Lachance and Kissau (2018) threaded aspects of practice tasks throughout coursework beyond methods classes. In their study, two capstone projects related to Task 2 and Task 3 were shifted into one assessment course in order to provide specialized support within one semester and during one particular clinical placement.

In addition to providing edTPA practice tasks, Okraski and Kissau (2018) suggested embedding opportunities for practice with edTPA rubric language and reflective writing throughout coursework in preparation of the edTPA assessment. As previously mentioned, several studies showed that candidates lacked the reflective writing skills necessary for edTPA

commentaries (Denton, 2013; Lachuk & Koellner, 2015; Ledwell & Oyler, 2016; Troyan & Kaplan, 2015), indicating a need for reflective and evidence-based writing practice and instruction in teacher education coursework. In response to these findings, some teacher education programs have incorporated reflective commentary writing supports into earlier coursework through backward-design (Miller et al., 2015). Bjork and Epstein (2016) reported that their institution redesigned student teaching seminars to resemble edTPA prep courses. These seminars are typically offered during the internship semester and provide tailored support for candidates in a “boot camp” style (i.e., Whittaker et al., 2018). Other forms of support (such as writing tutors) were also recommended to support candidates in their completion of edTPA (Jourdain, 2018; Pasternak & Bailey, 2004).

As yet another means of supporting NNES, Okraski and Kissau (2018) investigated the impact of content-specific seminars on the preparation and performance of second language teacher candidates. The authors compared outcomes of second language teacher candidates in content specific seminars with outcomes of candidates in other content areas (e.g., math, science, English language arts, and social studies) who were all combined in the same, non-content specific seminars. This study provided evidence that the tailored support of content-specific seminars may address the language-related challenges experienced by NNES candidates. This tailored support included customized instruction by faculty who were familiar with second language K-12 classrooms, their specific standards for instruction, and the various teacher roles in these settings. Furthermore, interview data demonstrated that a focus on contextual understanding of the rubrics was beneficial to second language teacher candidates, especially those who were NNES.

Additional research has looked into providing support to address language demands and cultural differences. In the study by Lachance and Kissau (2018), the researchers investigated the impact of a variety of different support strategies on the performance of 63 second language teacher candidates, such as programmatic and instructional strategies, strategic clinical experiences, cooperating teacher orientation sessions, specialized internship seminars, and graduate assistant support. Specifically pertaining to mentor teacher preparation, the researchers' institution offered orientation sessions with general information as well as breakout sessions focused on specific content areas to familiarize mentor teachers with the assessment. These mentor teachers were informed about the constructs of edTPA and also the aspects of edTPA where the institutions' teacher candidates were excelling or underperforming. In the breakout session for WL and ESL mentor teachers, more attention was given to edTPA's distinct language demands and possible language differences between NNES candidates and cooperating teachers. A second strategy mentioned by Lachance and Kissau (2018) included edTPA scorer training for faculty with the goal to provide "more targeted perspectives on the language demands of the edTPA rubrics and commentaries from external scorers" (p. 170). This strategy aimed to better prepare candidates for external scoring and provide scaffolding to other faculty when incorporating practice tasks in coursework. The researchers also incorporated the use of graduate students to further support second language teacher candidates. More specifically, graduate students offered a review of the candidates' draft edTPA commentaries as well as allowable feedback and suggestions. Adhering to edTPA guidelines, these graduate writing assistants "reviewed candidate draft edTPA commentaries and provided peer-directed feedback and support related to the quality of student written communication" (p. 176). While the researchers did not look at the impact of individual support strategies, when considered holistically, they

appeared to make a difference. The edTPA scores in this study demonstrated that candidates completing the WL and EAL edTPA outperformed teacher candidates in 10 content areas at the institution.

As the literature review revealed, no studies to date have focused specifically on the performance, perceptions, or preparation of non-native English-speaking teacher candidates on the WL or EAL edTPA portfolio.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

While several studies have described the struggles of teacher candidates when completing edTPA, more recent work has focused on the performance of specific subgroups, including NNES (Jourdain, 2018; Kissau & Algozzine, 2017; Micek, 2017; Russell & Davidson Devall, 2016; Russell & Davidson, 2018). Within these prior studies, researchers have predominantly focused on the types of challenges that candidates experience as they complete edTPA, with a few exceptions that have identified and suggested specific types of support as part of the preparation for and completion of edTPA (Cole, 2018; Hébert, 2017; Lachance & Kissau, 2018; Okraski & Kissau, 2018; Russell & Davidson Devall, 2016; Troyan & Kaplan, 2015; Wesely et al., 2018). The current study builds upon this earlier work by not only analyzing the performance of non-native speakers of English, but also by exploring possible reasons for their performance and potential recommendations to provide further support.

Research Questions

This mixed methods study sought to better understand the association between first language status of second language candidates and their performance, perceptions, and preparation as they complete edTPA through the following three research questions:

1. What is the association between first language status of second language teacher candidates and edTPA performance?
2. What is the association between first language status and teacher candidate perceptions of preparation to complete edTPA?

3. How have faculty in one EPP modified instructional support for non-native English-speaking candidates?

Research Design and Rationale

In the study, the researcher employed Creswell and Plano Clark's (2007) concurrent mixed methods design to collect both quantitative and qualitative data concerning the association between first language status of second language teacher candidates and their edTPA performance, perceptions, and preparation. According to Creswell and Plano Clark, a mixed methods design "integrates two forms of data and their results" (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018, p. 5). A mixed-methods study is appropriate when both qualitative and quantitative methods are used because one sole method would not suffice. Together, qualitative and quantitative methods have the ability to complement each other and allow for a more complete analysis (Greene et al., 1989). According to Creswell and Plano Clark (2018), "mixed methods research provides more evidence for studying a research problem than either quantitative or qualitative research alone" (p. 13) because it "provides a way to harness strengths that offset the weaknesses of both quantitative and qualitative research" (p. 12). When researchers are free to use all methods possible to address a research problem, the results offer new insights that go beyond separate quantitative and qualitative results. When illustrating the value of multiple data sources, Creswell and Plano Clark explained that research questions in mixed methods studies require both an exploration and explanation that draw from different data sources, gaining greater understanding from the combination. Likewise, Greene (2006) described the mixed methods design as more than one way of knowing primarily because it "incorporat[es] a diversity of perspectives, voices, values and stances" in the way it "honor[s] complexity alongside diversity and difference, and thereby resists simplification of inherently contextual and complex human phenomena" (p. 97).

On the other hand, while collecting quantitative and qualitative data as part of a mixed methods study may lead to a greater understanding of the research phenomena, Almeida (2018) warns that concurrent data collection could “speed up the development process” but also may lead to “greater difficulties in the integration of both studies” (p. 137).

In the study, the research questions guided the selection of a mixed methods research design, as described in Creswell and Plano Clark (2018). For example, with respect to the first research question (What is the association between first language status of second language teacher candidates and edTPA performance?), a quantitative approach allowed the researcher to analyze the performance of a large number of participants on the multiple tasks and rubrics associated with edTPA. Additionally, the quantitative approach allowed for the analysis of trends in the edTPA scores. With respect to the second research question (What is the association between first language status and teacher candidate perceptions of preparation to complete edTPA?), both quantitative and qualitative data were collected from survey responses and semi-structured interviews. Through the use of a Likert scale, quantitative survey data allowed for quantifying the level of preparedness as perceived by candidates in regard to the multiple components of the edTPA portfolio, and again for analysis of trends in candidate responses. On the other hand, open-ended survey and interview data offered the ability to elicit candidate perceptions to help better understand the numerical scores. Finally, the analysis of qualitative data gathered during semi-structured interviews with second language program faculty helped the researcher to address the third research question (How have faculty in one EPP modified instructional support for non-native English-speaking candidates?). Qualitative data collected through open-ended questions in interviews was intended to validate, elaborate upon, and help to possibly explain the findings of the quantitative analysis of the survey and edTPA data.

Setting and Participants

The study involved a teacher education department in a college of education at an institution of higher education in the southeastern United States that produces the second largest number of new teachers in its state. While the department prepares middle and high school teacher candidates in a variety of content areas including math, science, social studies, English language arts, and visual and performing arts, the focus of the study will be on graduate teacher candidates in its K-12 WL and Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) initial licensure second language teacher preparation programs. The participating institution first piloted edTPA in 2014, at a time when the performance-based assessment was not required in the state. That said, as of fall 2019, teachers in the state must complete edTPA or its equivalent (PPAT) within their first three years of employment as a teacher and must obtain a minimum threshold score. The PPAT is a similar teacher performance assessment that requires teacher candidates to submit artifacts as well as written commentaries (ETS, n.d.). Teacher preparation programs in the state may choose to require the use of edTPA or PPAT as the portfolio assessment for teacher candidates (NCForum, 2021). The institution involved in this study chose to use edTPA as a means of demonstrating its candidates' readiness to teach.

While the graduate programs for both WL and ESL in the department have many commonalities, each has its own set of required courses that are specific to the needs of each of its respective teacher candidates. For example, both programs share a required course on planning for K-12 instruction. Accompanying this course is a required one credit hour lab where candidates have the opportunity to practice some of the skills taught in the online course in a face-to-face setting, and receive feedback from their instructor. Both programs also have required content-specific methodology and assessment courses. In addition, the WL program has

a co-requisite one credit hour lab accompanying the methodology course that provides candidates with the opportunity to practice more content-specific teaching strategies in a face-to-face environment. The TESL program also provides opportunities for content-specific rehearsals and instructor feedback, but this “lab” opportunity is infused in the three-credit hour assessment course. The TESL program requires a course on second language acquisition, whereas a course on adolescent pedagogy is a requirement in the World Languages program. Both programs offer a course focused on diversity, equity, and multiculturalism, but the course is specific to the types of learners for each content area. In other words, the TESL course focuses more on children of immigration, second language learners, and multiculturalism. Both programs conclude with a culminating full-time internship in a K-12 WL or ESL classroom. During the full-time student teaching internship in the final semester of the program, candidates participate in a weekly support seminar for WL and TESL candidates.

In fall 2019, these programs were re-designed to compete with alternative licensure programs and to respond to programmatic data. Some of the changes were intended to enhance edTPA support. For example, the new program included a content-specific course focusing on assessment in response to data indicating candidates struggled with the use of student learning outcome data to inform instruction. The new program also offered opportunities for candidates to practice strategies and receive instructor feedback in labs and in video submissions. More details about each program are provided in Table 5.

Table 5

World Language and TESL Graduate Certificate Program Coursework

Graduate Certificate in K-12 Foreign Language Education	Graduate Certificate in Teaching English as a Second Language
Planning for K-12 Instruction (2 credit hours)	Planning for K-12 Instruction (2 credit hours)

Lab in Instructional Design (1 credit hour)	Lab in Instructional Design (1 credit hour)
Course on Diverse Populations (2 credit hours)	Course on Multiculturalism or Serving Diverse Populations Diverse Learners (3 credit hours)
Methods in K-12 Foreign Language Teaching (3 credit hours)	Methods in Teaching English as a Second Language (3 credit hours)
Lab in Content Pedagogy (1 credit hour)	N/A
Assessment in K-12 Foreign Language Teaching (2 credit hours)	Authentic Assessment with embedded lab (3 credit hours)
Adolescent Pedagogy (2 credit hours)	Second Language Acquisition (3 credit hours)
Graduate Student Teaching Internship (3 credit hours)	Graduate Student Teaching Internship (3 credit hours)
Total: 16 credit hours	Total: 18 credit hours

With respect to specific research questions that involve the collection and analysis of quantitative data (e.g., the first research question), due to the relatively small number of program completers each semester in the WL and TESL programs, archived data collected from recent program completers (Fall 2015 - Spring 2021) in both the WL and TESL programs were used to augment the participant numbers and allow for more meaningful comparisons. More specifically, to draw comparisons on edTPA performance (first research question) between NNES and NES, edTPA performance data were collected and analyzed from former program completers (Fall 2015 - Spring 2021). Exit survey data speaking to candidate perceptions of preparation (second research question), were also collected and analyzed from this large group of program completers between Fall 2015 and Spring 2021. The program was re-designed in Fall 2019 when completion of edTPA became consequential, but the study did not examine the extent that this change may have had on candidate performance or perceived preparation.

Due to the nature of second language teacher education programs, many of the above-mentioned program completers are NNES (Jourdain, 2018; Kissau & Algozzine, 2017; Russell & Davidson Devall, 2016; Russell & Davidson, 2018). As indicated in Table 6, at the participating university, 120 teacher candidates were enrolled in the WL program (51 or 42.5%) and the TESL program (69 or 57.5%) during twelve semesters from 2015 to 2021. Of these 120 teacher candidates, 69 (57.5%) were NES. Of the remaining candidates, 51 (42.5%) were NNES whose first languages were Chinese, French, German, Japanese, Portuguese, and Spanish (among others). As Table 6 illustrates, 100 candidates from World Language and TESL programs were female (83.3%) versus 20 male candidates (16.7%).

Table 6

Teacher Candidate Demographics

Program	Native speaker of English (NES) or Non-native speaker of English (NNES)	Gender	
WL	NES 18	Male 5	Female 13
	NNES 33	Male 3	Female 30
TESL	NES 51	Male 8	Female 43
	NNES 18	Male 4	Female 14

While describing participants, it should also be mentioned that the two programs each serve two distinct groups: residency teachers and traditional teacher candidates. To address the shortage of teachers in the state, residency programs provide an alternative pathway for prospective teachers who hold a bachelor's degree in a field other than education. In the current study, many candidates are employed as "residency" teachers and complete the internship in their own classrooms. Residency teachers are allowed up to three years to complete their licensure requirements. On the other hand, traditional teacher candidates are not currently

employed as teachers and complete their internship under the supervision of a mentor teacher (cooperating teacher).

To gain more detailed information specific to perceived preparation to complete specific edTPA tasks (Research Question #2), from this large group of program completers (Fall 2015-Spring 2021), a smaller subset (Fall 2019-Fall 2021) was invited to complete an online survey (Appendix B). As illustrated in Table 7, the online survey included the responses of 26 participants, of which 22 were enrolled in the last semester of the program at the time of the survey. Of the 26 participants, 21 were female and 5 were male. The participants were enrolled in the TESL program (12) and in the WL program (14). The first language was English for 14 participants, whereas English was not the first language for the remaining 12 participants. Most of the survey completers were residency teachers (20) but just under one-fourth (6) were traditional student teachers who were placed with a clinical educator or cooperating teacher.

Table 7

Content-Specific Survey Completers

Candidate	Gender	WL or TESL	NES or NNES	Residency Teacher (Res) or Student Teacher (ST)
#1	F	TESL	NES	Res
#2	F	WL	NNES	Res
#3	F	TESL	NES	Res
#4	M	TESL	NNES	Res
#5	M	WL	NNES	ST
#6	F	WL	NES	Res
#7	F	WL	NNES	ST
#8	F	WL	NES	Res
#9	F	TESL	NNES	Res
#10	F	TESL	NNES	ST
#11	F	WL	NES	Res
#12	F	WL	NES	Res
#13	F	TESL	NNES	Res
#14	M	TESL	NES	Res
#15	F	WL	NNES	Res
#16	M	WL	NNES	Res

#17	M	WL	NES	Res
#18	F	WL	NES	Res
#19	F	WL	NNES	ST
#20	F	TESL	NES	Res
#21	F	TESL	NES	Res
#22	F	WL	NNES	Res
#23	F	TESL	NES	ST
#24	F	TESL	NES	ST
#25	F	TESL	NES	Res
#26	F	WL	NNES	Res

From the participants who completed edTPA and the above-mentioned surveys, an even smaller subset of program completers was invited to participate in semi-structured interviews. (See Appendix C for interview questions.) Not all of these participants accepted the invitation for an interview. More TESL than WL candidates agreed to be interviewed which led to an uneven split of eight TESL candidates and four WL candidates as interview participants. As illustrated in Table 8, these interview participants represented a diverse pool of aspiring teachers. Out of the twelve interview participants, half were NES whereas the other half were NNES candidates, with first languages as Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Spanish. Of the twelve teacher candidates, two participants were male and ten were female. In the group of the twelve participants, eight were aspiring ESL teachers and four were planning to teach a world language.

Table 8

Student Interview Participants Demographics

Participant Name	Gender	Program	Student Teacher (ST) or Residency Teacher (Res)	First Language
Ayesha	F	WL	Res	English
Claire	F	TESL	Res	English
Diana	F	TESL	ST	English
Brianna	F	TESL	Res	English
Ellen	F	TESL	Res	English

Felicia	F	TESL	Res	English
Rayna	F	WL	Res	Arabic
Yin	F	WL	Res	Chinese
Zacarias	M	WL	ST	Spanish
Satsuki	F	TESL	Res	Japanese
Uzma	F	TESL	ST	Arabic
Xavier	M	TESL	Res	Spanish

Note. All participant names are pseudonyms

Program faculty were also interviewed to gain their perspectives on the impact of teacher candidates' first language on faculty support or practice (Research Question #3). As illustrated in Table 9, program faculty participants represented both teacher education programs. The three faculty members had 20 to 31 years of experience; one was a WL faculty member and the other two were TESL faculty members. Dr. Kramer was a former Spanish teacher and is the current methodology instructor for all WL teacher candidates. Dr. Landas, a trained edTPA scorer, teaches TESL coursework, and provides edTPA support workshops to both WL and TESL candidates. Dr. Morris, also a trained edTPA scorer, teaches TESL methodology and assessment coursework to all TESL candidates.

Table 9

Faculty Interview Participants

Program Faculty	Affiliated program	Title	Years of Experience
Kramer	WL	Associate Professor	20
Landas	TESL	Professor	31
Morris	TESL	Associate Professor	32

Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Analysis

To understand the association between edTPA performance and first language status of second language teacher candidates (Research Question #1), permission was requested from the institution's research compliance board to access archival edTPA data speaking to candidate edTPA performance from Spring 2015 to Spring 2021. Archived edTPA data are housed in the college of education's Office of Assessment and Accreditation and used for annual performance reports. To gather sufficient data to facilitate meaningful comparisons, the researcher sought edTPA data from candidates who completed the TESL or WL programs between 2015 and 2021. After receiving the initial edTPA data on program completers, the researcher identified the first language status of candidates before requesting that all identifiers be removed to protect candidate anonymity. Then, the researcher used the de-identified data for the study.

To address the second research question, archival data was once again used. More specifically, the institution requires all program completers (regardless of content area) to complete an exit survey seeking their input into the extent they felt that their program prepared them to complete edTPA. At the end of each semester, the institution's Office of Assessment and Accreditation emails all program completers requesting they complete this online survey and uses the data collected to guide program improvement. From these data, the researcher requested a small subset specifically collected from completers (Fall 2015-Spring 2022) of the WL and TESL programs.

Complementing the exit survey data, the researcher also sought additional survey data using a valid and reliable survey that was used in a similar study investigating the influence of content-specific seminars on candidate edTPA preparation and performance (Okraski & Kissau, 2018). This second survey measured candidates' perceived confidence in their preparation to

complete specific edTPA tasks. To ensure sufficient data to make meaningful comparisons between NNES and NES candidates, the researcher reached out to a smaller subset of the above-mentioned participants who have more recently completed the WL or TESL program (Fall 2019-Fall 2021). This subset of 26 participants consisted of 14 (54%) NES and 12 (46%) NNES candidates who completed the program in the five previous semesters (Fall 2019-Fall 2021). Of the 26 participants, 14 (54%) completed the WL edTPA and 12 (46%) completed the EAL edTPA. In the application to the Institutional Review Board (IRB), the researcher requested personal email addresses from recent program completers in order to conduct this survey.

To further address the second research question, from all candidates who provided consent and completed the online survey, the researcher selected 12 teacher candidates (both NNES and NES) who very recently completed their respective program (Spring 2021-Fall 2021) to participate in a semi-structured, audio-recorded interview. Purposeful random sampling (Coyne, 1997) was used when selecting interview participants to ensure the participation of an equal number of WL and TESL candidates, as well as a variety of different backgrounds and perspectives (e.g., first language status, gender, language of instruction, residency/traditional teacher candidate).

To address the third and final research question, the researcher reached out to the WL and TESL program faculty and requested their participation in a brief semi-structured interview after obtaining their consent to participate. In these 25-50 minute long, audio recorded interviews, faculty were asked about the type of support that they provided candidates whose first language was a language other than English in their completion of edTPA.

Instrumentation

This study considered both quantitative and qualitative data gathered from the following sources:

edTPA

The edTPA scores for all candidates at the participating institution are stored in the Office of Assessment and Accreditation. As stated in the IRB application, the researcher requested archived edTPA scores from all program completers from the Office of Assessment and Accreditation at the participating university.

Surveys

Two separate surveys were used to collect data with the purpose to answer the second research question (What is the association between first language status and teacher candidate perceptions of preparation to complete edTPA?). The survey data for the first survey were archived by the institution. The second survey was administered as part of the study.

Teacher Candidate edTPA Survey. The first survey is an exit survey that is sent out to teacher candidates in all content areas upon program completion. The survey consists of Likert-style items as well as open-ended questions. This survey asks graduates of all teacher education programs at the participating institution to respond to survey items in each of its three sections: perception, (edTPA completion) process, and preparation. Participants are asked to rate their experience in completing each of the three edTPA tasks, ranging from very challenging to very easy on a four-point Likert-style scale (i.e., Rate your experience in completing each Task; 1 = very challenging; 4 = very easy). Additional questions in the perception section ask participants to select the three most challenging aspects of edTPA, perception of time needed and adherence to deadlines to complete edTPA, and their perceived level of preparation to successfully

complete edTPA. In the preparation section, participants are asked about their experience with edTPA and their attendance at edTPA support sessions. At the end of the preparation section, open-ended questions ask participants to provide advice related to edTPA to future candidates. Slight modifications were made to the teacher candidate edTPA survey to make it more relevant to the proposed study. More specifically, the researcher removed questions related to candidates in Elementary Education since the responses from these candidates did not pertain to the proposed study. The survey results are archived in the institution's data management system. The survey was evaluated in the 2019-2020 academic year, using Cronbach's alpha for reliability (Cronbach's alpha for section on Perception = .834; Cronbach's alpha for section on the edTPA completion process = .788; Cronbach's alpha for section on preparation = .842). For more detailed information about the Exit Survey see Appendix A.

World Language and TESL Candidate edTPA Survey. To further address the second research question, the researcher utilized a valid and reliable survey used in a similar study by Okraski and Kissau (2018) that investigated the impact of content-specific seminars on WL and TESL candidates' preparation to complete edTPA. The survey gauges the extent candidates feel prepared by their program to complete requirements associated with all three edTPA tasks, using a five-point Likert scale (1= strongly disagree; 5=strongly agree). Five survey items were aligned with each edTPA task (Task 1: Planning; Task 2: Instruction; Task 3: Assessment). In addition, open-ended questions asked teacher candidates to elaborate on their perceptions of preparation for edTPA. (See Appendix B.) These open-ended questions are intended to measure the extent candidates perceived they were prepared to complete edTPA by their teacher education program (second research question). Designed for a previous study, the survey is aligned with edTPA

tasks and rubrics and was approved by the researcher's Institutional Review Board. For more detailed information about the WL and TESL candidate edTPA survey see Appendix B.

Teacher Candidate Interviews

After collecting the survey responses, the researcher invited a select group of 12 second language teacher candidates enrolled in the graduate student teacher internship course during the Fall 2021 semester to participate in semi-structured interviews (See Appendix C). Interview questions specifically addressed candidates' perceptions of their preparation for edTPA with the goal to answer Research Question 2 ("What is the association between first language status and teacher candidate perceptions of preparation to complete edTPA?). More specifically, the researcher asked the candidates to describe their experience completing edTPA, what they found most challenging, how their teacher preparation program prepared them to successfully complete the assessment, what they found to be most beneficial in this preparation, in which areas they felt least prepared, and any recommendations they might have to enhance preparation for future aspiring WL or TESL teachers.

Interviews were conducted by phone, lasted 15-55 minutes, and were audio-recorded and transcribed. The interviews took place after the completion of the Fall 2021 semester and after final grades were posted in order to ensure students felt safe to express themselves openly and honestly without fear of reprisal. Consistent with semi-structured interview methodology, the researcher encouraged the participants to speak candidly, openly, and freely. It was the researcher's intention not to interrupt them and to hold questions until it appeared that they had finished their thoughts. When clarification seemed necessary, the researcher asked follow-up questions to seek clarification about crucial elements related to the research questions (i.e., about their perceptions of the edTPA preparation or completion experience). Similarly, the researcher

used prior institutional knowledge to ask follow-up interview questions that have a pertinent connection, as allowed by the semi-structured format.

Faculty Interviews

To investigate how faculty in one EPP modified support for NNES candidates (Research Question #3), the researcher invited faculty in the WL and TESL teacher preparation programs to participate in interviews to gain their perspective. During these semi-structured interviews the researcher asked faculty to describe their perceptions of the challenges NNES candidates experienced while completing or preparing to complete edTPA, how they modified instruction to meet their needs, which support strategies were most successful, areas where additional support was still needed, and recommendations for instructors who may be working with NNES candidates (See Appendix D.) Interviews were conducted by phone, lasted 25-50 minutes, and were audio-recorded and transcribed.

Data Analysis

The researcher selected a mixed method design in which she intended to “collect and analyze data, integrate the findings, and draw inferences using both qualitative and quantitative approaches or methods in a single study or program of inquiring” (Tashakkori & Creswell, 2007, p. 4). In this study, the researcher brought together the results of quantitative and qualitative data analysis in a convergent design with the goal to better understand the association between first language status of second language teacher candidates and edTPA performance, perceptions, and preparation.

To investigate the association between first language status of second language teacher candidates and edTPA performance (i.e., first research question), the researcher used official edTPA scores of program completers in both content areas. These program completers submitted

edTPA portfolios to trained (external) Pearson scorers at a cost of \$100 per task (for a total of \$300) after which their edTPA scores were reported to the institution. To address this research question, the researcher used a descriptive statistical analysis to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between edTPA scores (overall, in tasks and in rubrics) for NNES and NES candidates.

To address the second research question (What is the association between of first language status and teacher candidate perceptions of preparation to complete edTPA?), the researcher used a descriptive statistical analysis (i.e., M , SD , and effect size values) and linear regression analysis for the responses in two separate surveys. In the first survey (“General Exit Survey”), all program completers responded to questions about their perception of preparation to complete edTPA, but only responses from second language teacher candidates were considered for this study. In the second survey (“Content-Specific Survey”), solely second language teacher candidates responded to questions about their perception of preparation to complete specific tasks for the Word Language and English as an Additional Language edTPA, respectively. For both surveys, statistical analyses were used to determine if first language status indicated a statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) in perception of preparation for teacher candidates.

Additionally, in order to further answer the second research question, the researcher analyzed the open-ended responses of both surveys, using a grounded theory approach (Glaser 1992). The researcher compared open-ended survey responses from NNES and NES candidates by looking for emerging themes that could corroborate and/or possibly explain the quantitative results. The two groups (NNES and NES) were set up as two separate cases. Interview responses obtained during interviews with a subset of second language teacher candidates were also included as qualitative data to answer the second research question. As a first step in data

analysis, upon completion of each interview, audio recordings were transcribed and, subsequently, read and reviewed for accuracy. This process helped familiarize the researcher with the data as coding, in grounded theory, is not a linear process but must include a process that cycles through data multiple times (Saldaña, 2016).

The second phase of data analysis consisted of re-reading the interview transcripts as well as conducting line by line coding and identification of themes to identify emergent codes (Glaser, 1992), which were then be applied to interview transcripts. Each review of transcripts also included analytical memo writing that highlighted key phrases, key ideas, and key questions raised by each particular interview. These memos served as a source of data where the recording of thoughts, issues, and discoveries was made as part of the coding process.

During the next phase of data analysis, code mapping was used to organize the codes identified in the previous cycle into a list of categories (Saldaña, 2016). During this process, the researcher reviewed the data in context as it was being placed into a category of recurring or significant codes from the previous cycle (Saldaña, 2016, p. 234). In this phase of the data analysis, the researcher transitioned from writing memos “to develop a sense of categorical, thematic, conceptual, and/or theoretical organization from [the] array of first cycle codes” (Saldaña, 2016, p. 234). As explained by Charmaz (2014), “focused coding is the second major phase in coding” because “these codes appear more frequently among your initial codes or have more significance than other codes” (p. 138). After initial coding, Charmaz advises to use focused coding in the synthesis and analysis of larger segments of data.

The last phase of data analysis helped the researcher to establish themes and patterns among the groups of participants. The researcher analyzed the codes based on the differences (in first language, program, and teacher status: residency or traditional) among teacher candidates.

The researcher analyzed the similarities and differences among the codes for these various groups. As a last step, the researcher interpreted the data to explain the perceptions of the teacher candidates in this study.

To address the third research question, the researcher interviewed program faculty to better understand how they modified their instructional support for NNES. Similar to the qualitative data analysis of candidate interviews, these semi-structured faculty interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed. Following the guidelines established by Charmaz (2014) and Saldaña (2016), the researcher started with line-by-line initial coding in alignment with the interview questions (i.e., questions about candidate support) before identifying categories and themes in the second cycle. In their book about mixed methods research design, Creswell and Plano Clark (2018) suggested that after coding an entire text, the researcher should re-read the entire text with the goal to reduce the number of codes in order to generate approximately five to seven themes or categories.

Researcher Positionality

The researcher came to this study with certain presuppositions related to the findings because of her past and current role in the teacher education program at this institution as well as her experience as a K-12 WL and ESL teacher. The researcher served as instructor for the graduate student teaching internship seminar in previous semesters for both WL and ESL teacher candidates as well as the (Fall 2021) semester when the study took place. In recent semesters, the researcher also served as writing consultant for this seminar. More specifically, the researcher provided feedback on candidates' written commentaries. Prior to this study, the researcher regularly served as the instructor for WL methods courses at the participating institution. In this same time period, the researcher supervised 50+ teacher candidates in nearby K-12 schools in a

role as Student Teacher Supervisor. During the study, the researcher served as Student Teacher Supervisor for some of the interview participants. Furthermore, with the goal to gain experience with edTPA portfolio scoring, the researcher completed edTPA scorer training through Pearson in spring 2016 (but chose not to work as an edTPA scorer). The researcher aimed to reduce her bias by transcribing the interviews and employing a systematic coding process. The researcher recognized that her past and current roles could influence some of the candidates' candid responses and willingness to participate. For this reason, the researcher conducted candidate interviews once final grades had been posted. The researcher acknowledged her bias and reduced the influence of bias and improved trustworthiness by presenting all interviewees with the opportunity to read the final interview transcription for member checking purposes. Furthermore, the professional experiences of the researcher might have set her apart from the lived experiences of the teacher candidates who were invited to participate in this study. However, as an immigrant and NNES, the researcher shared linguistic experiences with the participants in this study. Through the seminar course and interview process, the researcher emphasized these shared experiences before asking participants to share their own challenges. Finally, the researcher kept detailed notes through the use of memos and asked interviewees for feedback to ensure that all were represented accurately and fairly (Ezzy, 2002). By using a systematic coding process, the researcher sought to reduce the possibility of bias when identifying common, but unanticipated, themes in the open-coding process.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this mixed-methods study was to analyze the edTPA performance and perceptions of NNES candidates seeking a K-12 license to teach a world language or ESL, and to explore how faculty at one institution of higher education supported these candidates in the completion of this high-stakes assessment. The ultimate goal of the study is to better understand their performance and perceptions and to offer the field potential recommendations for enhanced support. This chapter first presents the analysis of quantitative data gathered from candidate edTPA scores and surveys, followed by analysis of qualitative data collected from open-ended survey responses as well as candidate and faculty interviews. In each subsection, the research questions guided the presentation of the results.

This chapter presents a description of the results for each of the following three research questions:

1. What is the association between first language status of second language teacher candidates and edTPA performance?
2. What is the association between first language status and teacher candidate perceptions of preparation to complete edTPA?
3. How have faculty in one EPP modified instructional support for non-native English-speaking candidates?

Data and Statistical Results

Research Question 1

To investigate the association between first language status of second language teacher candidates and edTPA performance, the researcher collected archived edTPA scores for all 120 candidates who completed the WL (51 candidates) and EAL (69 candidates) edTPA during twelve semesters from Fall 2015 through Spring 2021. Table 10 below summarizes the demographics of this group of 120 aspiring teachers. Of the 51 WL candidates, 33 (65%) were NNES. In the group of 69 candidates who completed the EAL edTPA, 18 (26%) were NNES. Overall, of the 120 program completers in the two programs during Fall 2015-Spring 2021, 51 (42.5%) were NNES. Of the 120 total participants, 100 (83%) were female, and only 20 (17%) were male.

Table 10

Student Participant Demographics (Spring 2015-Spring 2021)

Teacher Education Program	Female Native English Speakers	Male Native English Speakers	Female Non-native English Speakers	Male Non-native English Speakers	Total Number of Participants
World Language	13 (10.83%)	5 (4.17%)	30 (25%)	3 (2.5%)	51 (42.5%)
TESL or English as an Additional Language	43 (35.83%)	8 (6.67%)	14 (11.67%)	4 (3.33%)	69 (57.5%)
	46 (38.33%)	13 (10.83%)	54 (45%)	7 (5.83%)	120

The number of scores and percentage of scores for the WL and EAL edTPA that were used in this study are reported in Table 11 below. As shown in Table 11, of the total 120 candidates who completed an edTPA portfolio, some of their edTPA scores were excluded from the data analysis. Out of 51 candidates who submitted the WL edTPA, only 49 submitted (at least partially) scorable portfolios. Of these 49 portfolios, four were marked as “missing” because one or more portions (rubrics or tasks) were unscorable. From the group of 69 TESL candidates, 68 submitted EAL edTPA portfolios, but one was deemed unscorable and excluded from the data analysis. Candidates who submitted unscorable portfolios were given the opportunity to resubmit, but their second attempts were not included in this study because candidates whose first attempt was not successful received intensive support prior to resubmission. In the four semesters between Fall 2019, when the edTPA became consequential for licensure, and Spring 2021, three (5.88%) NNES candidates submitted unscorable WL edTPA portfolios. During this same time period, all NES WL candidates submitted scorable portfolios and passed on their first attempt. Prior to Fall 2019, five (9.80%) NES candidates and one (1.96%) NNES candidate submitted unscorable WL edTPA portfolios but these candidates were not required to resubmit since the edTPA was not yet consequential for licensure. Concerning the EAL edTPA, in the four semesters between Fall 2019 and Spring 2021, one (1.45%) TESL NNES candidate and two (2.90%) TESL NES candidates submitted unscorable portfolios. Prior to Fall 2019, one NNES TESL candidate submitted an unscorable EAL edTPA portfolio; all NES TESL candidates who submitted the EAL edTPA passed on their first attempt.

Table 11*Included and Excluded Cases for Research Question 1*

	Included		Excluded		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
WL edTPA scores	45	91.8%	4	8.2%	49	100.0%
EAL edTPA scores	68	98.6%	1	1.4%	69	100.0%

Archived edTPA scores of the candidates listed in Table 11 were analyzed using SPSS. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the frequencies of edTPA scores for all WL and EAL program completers during 2015-2021. Data for the WL edTPA were reported separately from the data for the EAL edTPA due to the difference in number of rubrics for each of the edTPA portfolios. The WL edTPA consists of 13 rubrics whereas the EAL edTPA contains 15 rubrics, as explained in more detail in chapter 1. The edTPA scores for NNES and NES were reported separately for both licensure areas (WL and EAL). In order to answer the first research question, the sections listed below first describe the total mean edTPA scores, followed by the summed scores for each of the three tasks for NES and NNES candidates who completed the WL or EAL edTPA. A description of linear regression analysis follows. These analyses were performed to predict the relationships between edTPA scores (total and summed tasks) and first language status (NES and NNES), and summed task scores for both NES and NNES candidates.

Total Mean edTPA Scores. To investigate the association between first language status of second language teacher candidates and edTPA performance, descriptive statistics were used

within SPSS to describe the total edTPA mean score of candidates, the total number of candidates, and the standard deviation of both NES and NNES candidates (see Table 12). Each task consists of four or five rubrics, with a maximum score of five for each rubric. The maximum summed task scores vary according to the number of rubrics per task.

Table 12

Means and Standard Deviations for WL and EAL edTPA scores

		WL edTPA Scores	EAL edTPA Scores
NES	<i>M</i>	37.50	49.6
	<i>SD</i>	5.02	7.59
	<i>N</i>	14	50
NNES	<i>M</i>	40.68	47.39
	<i>SD</i>	5.82	7.30
	<i>N</i>	31	18
Total	<i>M</i>	39.69	49.02
	<i>SD</i>	5.72	7.53
	<i>N</i>	45	68

Note. The WL edTPA consists of 13 rubrics with a maximum score of 65; the passing score in the state where the study was conducted is currently 32. The EAL edTPA consists of 15 rubrics with a maximum possible score of 75 and with a current passing score in the state of 38.

As illustrated above in Table 12, of the 45 scorable WL edTPA portfolios submitted during Fall 2015-Spring 2021, 14 (31%) were submitted by NES candidates, whereas 31 (69%) were submitted by NNES. Table 12 shows that the mean of the WL edTPA total scores for the 31 NNES WL teacher candidates was higher (40.68) than that of NES candidates (37.50). The

standard deviation for NNES candidates' scores on the WL edTPA was larger (5.82) than that of NES candidates' WL edTPA scores (5.02).

For the EAL edTPA, of the total 68 scorable portfolios submitted during Fall 2015-Spring 2021, 50 (74%) were submitted by NES candidates and 18 (27%) by NNES candidates. Table 12 shows that in contrast with the WL edTPA results, the mean of the EAL edTPA scores for NES teacher candidates was higher (49.60) than that of the NNES candidates (47.39). The standard deviation for NES candidates' scores on the EAL edTPA was larger (7.59) than that of NNES candidates' EAL edTPA scores (7.30). In other words, the amount of variation among EAL edTPA scores for NES candidates was greater than that of NNES candidates.

Task Sum Scores. In addition to reporting the total mean scores and standard deviations, the task sum scores for both the WL edTPA and EAL edTPA were analyzed. Task sum score is used to indicate the total 'summed' scores of the four or five rubrics that comprise each of the three tasks. The maximum sum score for each task changes according to the number of rubrics for each task. The EAL edTPA consists of three tasks, with each task consisting of five rubrics, for a total of 15 rubrics. However, the WL edTPA consists of three tasks with four or five rubrics each, leading to a total of 13 rubrics. Table 13 shows the mean and standard deviation of the sums of Task 1, Task 2, and Task 3 scores for NES and NNES candidates who submitted the WL edTPA.

Table 13*Mean and Standard Deviation for Task Sum Scores of WL edTPA*

		WL edTPA		
		Task 1 Sum	Task 2 Sum	Task 3 Sum
Maximum Task Sum Score		20	25	20
NES	<i>M</i>	12.78	12.89	8.47
	<i>SD</i>	1.91	3.39	4.64
	<i>N</i>	18	18	18
NNES	<i>M</i>	13.48	15.29	11.98
	<i>SD</i>	1.90	2.76	2.22
	<i>N</i>	31	31	31
Total	<i>M</i>	13.23	14.41	10.69
	<i>SD</i>	1.91	3.19	3.69
	<i>N</i>	49	49	49

As shown in Table 13, the mean task sum scores of NNES WL candidates were higher (13.48, 15.29, 11.98) than the mean task sum scores of NES WL candidates (12.78, 12.89, 8.47) on the WL edTPA. However, the standard deviation was greater for NES candidates' scores on all three task sums. On average, the task scores for NNES candidates were closer to the mean, whereas the task scores for NES candidates were more spread out on the WL edTPA.

Table 14 shows descriptive statistics of the task sum scores for the EAL edTPA. The task sum scores for NES candidates were higher (17.49, 16.12, 16.31) than those of NNES candidates (16.81, 15.47, 15.11) on the EAL edTPA. The standard deviations varied across the three task sums of the EAL edTPA.

Table 14*Mean and Standard Deviation for Task Sum Scores of EAL edTPA*

		EAL edTPA		
		Task 1 Sum	Task 2 Sum	Task 3 Sum
Maximum Task Sum Score		25	25	25
NES	<i>M</i>	17.49	16.12	16.31
	<i>SD</i>	2.30	3.31	2.87
	<i>N</i>	51	51	51
NNES	<i>M</i>	16.81	15.47	15.11
	<i>SD</i>	2.30	2.27	3.48
	<i>N</i>	18	18	18
Total	<i>M</i>	17.31	15.95	16.00
	<i>SD</i>	2.30	3.07	3.06
	<i>N</i>	69	69	69

Relationships between edTPA Total Scores and Language Status. To dig a little deeper into the edTPA performance of NES and NNES candidates, a regression analysis was conducted to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between WL and EAL edTPA scores for NES and NNES teacher candidates. Linear regression analyses are intended to predict one variable through the use of another (given) variable, using a regression line. The regression analysis in this study was performed in order to predict the WL and EAL edTPA scores for candidates who complete edTPA while estimating the effect of their first language status on their performance. The regression analysis was applied to the overall edTPA scores as well as the summed scores for each of the three tasks in the WL and EAL edTPA. Additionally,

the regression analysis was conducted to determine if there were statistically significant differences between WL and EAL edTPA scores of all candidates who submitted before or after 2019 when the edTPA became consequential. It could be hypothesized that once edTPA became a high-stakes state licensure requirement in Fall 2019 that candidates would put forth more effort than they had prior to the assessment becoming consequential. Using these criteria, a regression analysis was conducted and is shown in Table 15.

The regression analysis was used to investigate relationships between total WL or EAL edTPA scores, candidate first language status (NNES), and the timing of the edTPA submission (after edTPA became consequential for state licensure in 2019). A positive score for NNES candidates indicates NNES candidates scoring higher than NES candidates whereas a negative score for NNES candidates can be interpreted as NNES candidates scoring lower than NES candidates.

Table 15

Predictors of Total edTPA Scores

	Total WL edTPA Score		Total EAL edTPA Score	
	B	SE	B	SE
(Constant)	38.11	(1.56)	50.95	(1.343)
NNES	3.81*	(1.86)	-1.77	(2.06)
Consequential edTPA (starting Fall 2019)	-2.13	(1.72)	-2.94	(1.82)

Note. * $p < .05$

As shown in Table 15, within the WL edTPA sample, higher edTPA scores were associated with being a non-native speaker of English (NNES) ($B = 3.81$, $t(2.05)$, $p = .05$). In other words, NNES candidates tended to score higher on the WL edTPA than their NES

counterparts. However, starting with Fall 2019, when the edTPA became consequential, there was no statistically significant difference between the WL edTPA scores of NNES and NES candidates ($B = -2.13$, $t(-1.24)$, $p = .22$) even when controlling for consequentiality.

Distinct from the WL sample, being a non-native speaker of English (NNES) was not associated with a higher edTPA score ($B = -1.77$, $t(-.858)$, $p = .39$) among the EAL teacher candidates. After the edTPA became consequential in 2019, lower EAL edTPA scores associated with all candidates were not statistically significant ($B = -2.94$, $t(-1.617)$, $p = .11$).

Relationships between Summed Task 1 Scores and Language Status. After analyzing the predictors for the edTPA total scores in Table 15, the summed task scores for each of the three tasks of the WL and EAL edTPA were analyzed separately using the following independent variables: first language status of candidates and the timing of the edTPA submission starting with Fall 2109 (when edTPA became consequential). Table 16 shows how some of these characteristics were associated with higher summed scores for Task 1 of the WL and EAL edTPA, whereas others were not.

Table 16

Predictors of WL and EAL edTPA Scores on Task 1

	WL edTPA Task 1 Sum (Maximum Score of 20)		EAL edTPA Task 1 Sum (Maximum Score of 25)	
	B	SE	B	SE
(Constant)	12.88	(.47)	17.91	(.41)
NNES	.87	(.61)	-.56	(.63)
Consequential edTPA (starting Fall 2019)	-.45	(.59)	-.89	(.55)

As shown in Table 16, higher scores on Task 1 of the WL edTPA for NNES candidates ($B = .87, t(1.441), p = .16$) compared to NES candidates were not statistically significant. In simple terms, the positive association (.87) between first language status of NNES candidates and performance on Task 1 of the WL edTPA was not statistically significant. After the edTPA became consequential for state licensure, lower scores that were associated with performance on Task 1 of the WL edTPA ($B = -.45, t(-.775), p = .44$) for both NES and NNES candidates were not statistically significant.

For the EAL edTPA, lower scores on Task 1 for NNES candidates ($B = -.56, t(-.891), p = .38$) were not statistically significant but mirrored lower total EAL edTPA scores as seen in Table 15. Likewise, after edTPA became consequential for licensure, the association between lower scores and performance on Task 1 of the EAL edTPA ($B = -.89, t(-1.615), p = .11$) for both NES and NNES candidates was not statistically significant.

Relationships between Summed Task 2 Scores and Language Status. Table 17 below shows the associations with the summed scores of Task 2 for NNES candidates and the timing of the edTPA completion (before or after edTPA became consequential for state licensure in 2019). As illustrated in Table 17, first language (NNES vs. NES), was associated with the summed scores of Task 2.

Table 17*Predictors of WL and EAL edTPA Scores on Task 2*

	WL edTPA Task 2 Sum (Maximum Score of 25)		EAL edTPA Task 2 Sum (Maximum Score of 25)	
	B	SE	B	SE
(Constant)	13.13	(.733)	16.96	(.535)
NNES	2.80**	(.944)	-.39	(.82)
Consequential edTPA (starting Fall 2019)	-1.11	(.915)	-1.80*	(.72)

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Table 17 shows a positive association between NNES candidates and their higher summed scores for Task 2 of the WL edTPA ($B = 2.80$, $t(2.965)$, $p = .005$) that is statistically significant. NNES candidates were associated with higher summed scores for Task 2 of the WL edTPA compared to NES candidates. After the edTPA became consequential for state licensure in 2019, the association of lower scores for Task 2 of the WL edTPA ($B = -1.11$, $t(-1.208)$, $p = .23$) was not statistically significant. Similarly, with respect to the EAL edTPA, the association of NNES candidates' lower summed Task 2 scores ($B = -.39$, $t(-.480)$, $p = .63$) compared to NES candidates was not statistically significant. However, after the edTPA became consequential for state licensure in 2019, completion of Task 2 was associated with lower scores for the EAL ($B = -1.80$, $t(-2.499)$, $p = .02$) edTPA; this association is statistically significant.

Relationships between Summed Task 3 Scores and Language Status. Table 18 below shows the associations with summed scores for Task 3 of the edTPA for NNES candidates (vs. NES candidates) and the timing of the edTPA completion (before or after edTPA became

consequential for state licensure in 2019). As illustrated in Table 18, first language status (indicated by NNES vs. NES), was associated with the summed scores of Task 3.

Table 18

Predictors of WL and EAL edTPA Scores on Task 3

	WL edTPA Task 3 Sum (Maximum Score of 20)		EAL edTPA Task 3 Sum (Maximum Score of 25)	
	B	SE	B	SE
(Constant)	8.29	(.82)	17.00	(.54)
NNES	3.21**	(1.05)	-1.00	(.82)
Consequential edTPA (starting Fall 2019)	.84	(1.02)	-1.46*	(.72)

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

As shown in Table 18 above, higher scores on Task 3 of the WL edTPA were associated with NNES candidates ($B = 3.21$, $t(3.065)$, $p = .004$); this was a statistically significant association. However, after the edTPA became consequential for state licensure in 2019, there was no statistically significant association with higher summed scores on Task 3 of the WL edTPA ($B = .84$, $t(-.822)$, $p = .42$). For the EAL edTPA, there was no statistically significant association with higher scores on Task 3 for NNES candidates ($B = -1.00$, $t(-1.216)$, $p = .23$). However, edTPA consequentiality was associated with lower scores for the summed Task 3 of the EAL edTPA ($B = -1.46$, $t(-2.021)$, $p = .05$) for both NES and NNES candidates; this was statistically significant.

Summary. For the WL edTPA, higher scores were associated with NNES candidates for both total scores and task scores, with the most significant difference in Task 3, when compared with NES candidates. For the EAL edTPA, lower scores were associated with NNES candidates

for both total scores and task scores, with the most significant difference in Task 3, when compared with NES candidates. Furthermore, for both NES and NNES candidates, the consequential nature of the edTPA had a negative impact on total scores and task scores of the WL and EAL edTPA.

Research Question 2

To investigate the association between first language status and teacher candidate perceptions of preparation to complete edTPA (RQ2), both quantitative and qualitative data were gathered. More specifically, quantitative data were gathered from the General Exit Survey (see Appendix A) and the Content-Specific Survey (see Appendix B). Qualitative data were also collected from open-ended questions in both surveys as well as from interviews with teacher candidates. Quantitative and qualitative data speaking to RQ2 are reported separately below.

Quantitative Results. Quantitative data speaking to RQ2 were collected from the General Exit Survey and the Content-Specific Survey. Related to perceptions of preparation, in the General Exit Survey, participants were asked to identify what they perceived to be the most challenging aspect of the (WL or EAL) edTPA from a list of 13 possible choices. As can be seen in Table 19 below, 43 (84.31%) participants who submitted the WL edTPA completed the exit survey. Of the 43 participants, 14 (32.56%) were NES candidates and 29 (67.44%) were NNES candidates. Table 19 lists the responses from candidates who completed the WL edTPA. Due to the optional nature of the General Exit Survey, some participants did not complete the survey and their responses are listed as missing.

Table 19*WL Candidate Perceptions of the Most Challenging Aspect of edTPA*

	WL edTPA (<i>n</i> = 43)			
	NES Candidates (<i>n</i> = 14)	Percent	NNES Candidates (<i>n</i> = 29)	Percent
Identifying student assets	1	7.14%	6	20.69%
Language functions	5	35.71%	3	10.35%
Vocabulary	0		0	
Discourse	1	7.14%	4	13.79%
Syntax	1	7.14%	1	3.45%
Identifying environment	0		0	
Engaged learning	1	7.14%	4	13.79%
Deeper thinking of students	3	21.43%	7	24.14%
Making connections between practice and research/theory	1	7.14%	2	6.90%
Giving feedback	1	7.14%	2	6.90%
Assessing whole group	0		2	6.90%
Assessing three students	0		0	
Giving reflections	0		0	
Keeping record of data other than assessments	0		0	
Total	14		29	
Missing	4		4	

As illustrated in Table 19, “language function” was reported by five (35.71%) NES WL edTPA candidates as the most challenging aspect. Language function in the WL edTPA refers to

the use of the world language in a meaningful or real-world context, such as expressing likes and dislikes as well as making requests. On the other hand, seven (24.14%) NNES candidates identified “deeper thinking of students” as the most challenging aspect. These seven participants perceived extending student learning in meaningful and deeper ways as a challenging aspect of the WL edTPA. In other words, the NNES WL candidates found it most challenging to feature the deeper thinking of students in their edTPA portfolio, a practice that refers to extending student learning in meaningful and deeper ways.

Of the 69 candidates who submitted the EAL edTPA, 64 (92.75%) completed the survey. Out of the 64 survey completers, 49 (76.56%) were NES candidates and 15 (23.44%) identified as NNES candidates. Table 20 shows the responses from both NES and NNES candidates who submitted the EAL edTPA and completed the survey question about their perceived most challenging aspect of edTPA.

Table 20

EAL Candidate Perceptions of the Most Challenging Aspect of edTPA

	EAL edTPA (<i>n</i> = 64)			
	NES Candidates (<i>n</i> = 49)	Percent	NNES Candidates (<i>n</i> = 15)	Percent
Identifying student assets	7	14.29%	1	6.67%
Language functions	11	22.45%	7	46.67%
Vocabulary	1	2.04%	1	6.67%
Discourse	6	12.25%	1	6.67%
Syntax	2	4.08%	2	13.33%
Identifying environment	1	2.04%	2	13.33%
Engaged learning	5	10.20%	0	

Deeper thinking of students	10	20.14%	1	6.67%
Making connections between practice and research/theory	1	2.04%	0	
Giving feedback	3	6.13%	0	
Assessing whole group	0		0	
Assessing three students	1	2.04%	0	
Giving reflections	0		0	
Keeping record of data other than assessments	1	2.04%	0	
Total	49		15	
Missing	2		3	

As shown in Table 20 above, 11 (22.45%) NES candidates and seven (46.67%) NNES candidates who completed the EAL edTPA reported “language function” as the most challenging aspect. Both NES and NNES candidates found it most difficult to feature language function during their edTPA as it refers to the use or purpose of language in meaningful contexts, such as comparing, summarizing, and expressing opinions. Language functions must be listed in lesson plans for the EAL edTPA and must align with the learning outcome standards.

Quantitative data collected from 26 participants (14 NES and 12 NNES) who completed the Content-specific Survey did not indicate statistically significant differences outside of one or two outliers as demonstrated in the tables below. As shown in Table 21 below, NES and NNES candidates reported similar perceptions about the extent they felt prepared to complete Task 1 of the WL or EAL edTPA. While the two groups of candidates (NES and NNES) shared similar perceptions about their preparation, a few differences were noted. Out of the five survey items in Task 1 pertaining to planning for instruction, NNES candidates were more likely to agree that

their program prepared them to successfully complete the tasks related to planning for instruction than their NES counterparts. NNES candidates did not indicate their disagreement with any of the five statements (i.e, Lesson planning for understanding in my content area). However, in each of the questions at least one (7%-14%) of the surveyed NES candidates indicated a neutral perception and or disagreed with the statement related to their preparation for Task 1.

Table 21

Survey Responses for Task 1 of Content-Specific Survey

With respect to Planning for Instruction (Task 1), my seminars prepared me for	Strongly Agree & Agree		Neutral		Disagree & Strongly Disagree	
	NES	NNES	NES	NNES	NES	NNES
Number of responses	14	12	14	12	14	12
a. Lesson planning for understanding in my content area	13 (92.86%)	11 (91.67%)	1 (7.14%)	1 (8.33%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
b. Planning to support varied student learning needs	11 (78.57%)	12 (100%)	2 (14.29%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.14%)	0 (0.00%)
c. Using knowledge of students to inform teaching and learning in my content area	13 (92.86%)	12 (100%)	1 (7.14%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.00%)
d. Identifying and supporting language demands	11 (78.57%)	10 (83.33%)	2 (14.29%)	2 (16.67%)	1 (7.14%)	0 (0.00%)

e. Planning assessments to monitor and support student learning in my content area	11 (78.57%)	12 (100%)	2 (14.29%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.14%)	0 (0.00%)
--	----------------	--------------	---------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

Candidates' perceptions about the extent they felt prepared to complete Task 2 of the WL or EAL edTPA are shown below in Table 22. As shown in the table, NES and NNES candidates reported similar perceptions about the extent they felt prepared to complete Task 2 of the WL or EAL edTPA. That said, some slight differences were noted. For example, out of the six survey items pertaining to Task 2, NNES candidates were more likely to agree that their program prepared them to engage students in learning than their NES counterparts. Notably, NNES candidates did not indicate their disagreement with any of the six statements. However, at least one of the surveyed NES candidates (7%-14%) indicated a neutral perception or disagreed with five of the statements related to their preparation for Task 2. Three NES candidates reported to be either unsure (neutral) or disagreed that their program prepared them to use evidence from content-specific pedagogy to support students.

Table 22

Survey Responses for Task 2 of Content-Specific Survey

With respect to Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning (Task 2), my seminars prepared me for	Strongly Agree & Agree		Neutral		Disagree & Strongly Disagree	
	NES	NNES	NES	NNES	NES	NNES
Number of responses	14	12	14	12	14	12

a. Demonstrating a positive learning environment	13 (92.86%)	11 (91.67%)	1 (7.14%)	1 (8.33%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
b. Engaging students in learning in my content area *	13 (92.86%)	11 (91.67%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (8.33%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
c. Deepening student learning in my content area	13 (92.86)	12 (100%)	1 (7.14%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
d. Using evidence from content-specific pedagogy to support students	11 (78.57%)	10 (83.33%)	2 (14.29%)	2 (16.67%)	1 (7.14%)	0 (0.00%)
e. Analyzing teacher effectiveness	12 (85.71%)	12 (100%)	1 (7.14%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.14%)	0 (0.00%)
f. Analyzing student learning my content area*	12 (85.71%)	11 (91.67%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (14.29%)	0 (0.00%)

Note. Asterisk indicates that one participant did not answer this question

As shown in Table 23 below, NES and NNES candidates also reported similar perceptions about the extent they felt prepared to complete Task 3 of the WL or EAL edTPA, with some slight differences observed. For example, out of the five survey items specific to assessment (i.e., providing feedback to support further learning), NNES candidates were more likely to agree that their program prepared them to assess student learning than their NES peers. NNES candidates did not indicate their disagreement with any of the five statements. However, NES candidates were less positive (unsure or disagreed) that their program prepared them to assess student learning. Two NES candidates disagreed that their program prepared them to

collect and analyze student assessment data in their content area (#3a). Four NES candidates (29%) recorded a neutral or negative perception for “providing feedback (to students) to guide learning in my content area” (#3b). Three NES candidates reported to be either unsure (neutral) or disagreed that their program prepared them to support focus students to understand and using feedback to guide further learning (#3c).

Table 23

Survey Responses for Task 3 of Content-Specific Survey

With respect to Assessing Student Learning (Task 3), my seminars prepared me for	Strongly Agree & Agree		Neutral		Disagree & Strongly Disagree	
	NES	NNES	NES	NNES	NES	NNES
Number of responses	14	12	14	12	14	12
a. Collecting and analyzing student assessment data in my content area	12 (85.71%)	11 (91.67%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (8.33%)	2 (14.29%)	0 (0.00%)
b. Providing feedback (to students) to guide learning in my content area	10 (71.43%)	12 (100%)	3 (21.43%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.14%)	0 (0.00%)
c. Supporting focus students to understand and using feedback to guide further learning	11 (78.57%)	12 (100%)	1 (7.14%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (14.29%)	0 (0.00%)
d. Analyzing	11	10	1	2	1	0

students' content-specific language use and content-specific learning*	(84.62%)	(83.33%)	(7.69%)	(16.67%)	(7.69%)	(0.00%)
e. Using assessment to inform instruction in my content area	12 (85.71%)	11 (91.67%)	1 (7.14%)	1 (7.69%)	1 (7.14%)	0 (0.00%)

Note. Asterisk indicates that one participant did not answer this question

Qualitative Results. Qualitative data speaking to candidate perceptions of preparation to complete edTPA (RQ2) were gathered from open-ended questions in the General Exit Survey, the Content-Specific Survey, and from the interviews with NES and NNES teacher candidates. During analysis of the qualitative data gathered from these three sources, a variety of themes and sub-themes emerged that are presented below in Table 24.

Table 24

Resulting Themes with Sub-Themes

Themes	Sub-Themes
Support and Tools	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. edTPA preparation in coursework 2. Resources (schedule, notes, outline, edTPA handbook, etc.) 3. Peer editing and/or support from program completers 4. Content-specific seminar and meetings with instructor
Challenges	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Time constraints/timing 2. Understanding the edTPA Rubric prompts/handbook 3. Clinical educator cooperation & approval 4. Need for specific support

Theme One: edTPA Support and Tools. When providing advice to future candidates (question #2 in the General Exit Survey), offering general comments about their experience (question #3 in the General Exit Survey), commenting on their perceptions of edTPA preparation (questions #7, #8, #9 in the Content-Specific Survey), and suggesting improvements (#8 in the Content-Specific Survey), all candidates (both NES and NNES) frequently made reference to various forms of support and tools. Among the various forms of support mentioned, sub-themes in the data emerged. For example, candidates often made reference to the fact that they were introduced to edTPA in coursework and completed assignments that aligned with edTPA expectations (practice tasks) and received feedback from instructors. Candidates also reported on the usefulness of learning about relevant language acquisition or teaching research and theory during prior coursework. Table 25 below shows sample responses from NES and NNES candidates relating to the theme of edTPA preparation in coursework.

Table 25

Sub-Theme: edTPA Preparation in Coursework

	NES Participants	NNES Participants
General Exit Survey Data	“I would say that the practice edTPA assignment that is done prior to the full time internship is good practice for the real thing. It’s helpful to have already taken time to think through the questions in the commentaries.” (TESL NES candidate)	“My [...] semester when I took the edTPA class to submit my practice edTPA was the one most helpful.” (TESL NNES candidate)
Content-Specific Survey Data	“I think we all felt that we could have used more specific feedback for edTPA [...]. During our practice course I think we could have had more specific feedback.” (TESL NES candidate)	“Share with candidates right from the beginning different examples of complete tasks, contrast low and high scores.” (FLED NNES candidate)

Interviews	<p>“I tell people to keep their notes and their textbooks, Yes, I have mine color-coded here. I went back to my notes so many times and they were so helpful.” (Ellen interview)</p> <p>“I’ve got all the books on my shelf[...] but I’ve also read, I ordered some books that we didn’t actually use in some of the classes just that to have as reference material [and] books that had things kind of organized in an easier way to, that were presented in an easier way then I could kind of leverage that.” (Diana interview)</p> <p>“Because we did that practice run, like I felt more confident in like the things I had to change and like how to like make the writing better and how to make it longer and just having that like reflection process throughout the whole thing, I think it was really helpful.” (Brianna interview)</p> <p>“I think being able to practice all of the tasks and the videos was really helpful because I kind of already knew what I needed to show.” (Felicia interview)</p>	<p>“If I knew I had to deal with this [edTPA], I’d probably kept all my textbook [from previous courses] and then probably organized some of that, these research like theories, at least print them out or because we had to do so much reading, some of the theories I kind of skimmed through. [I] didn’t, never really looked back and I’m like, I wish I had those, you know somewhere that I can go back to, or at least dog-eared [or] I can come back and look through.” (Satsuki interview)</p> <p>“A good recommendation is do your best when you are practicing [your edTPA during previous courses], like it’s a real one. And that helped me a lot because I had like the bones of what I, I just needed to expand. Maybe honestly, some questions where I realized after going through the seminars that I did not understand the question, I didn’t answer properly the first time but the real edTPA was my second time [and that] helped me to really understand what they were asking me to [do] [and] if you take it seriously, you, I will say you have like 40% of your edTPA towards a success, towards 38 points or above.” (Xavier interview)</p>
------------	--	---

As illustrated in Table 25, both NES and NNES candidates perceived edTPA preparation during previous coursework as “helpful” according to their survey responses. In the General Exit Survey, one TESL NES candidate reported that “it’s helpful to have already taken time to think through the questions in the commentaries” and a TESL NNES candidate echoed this response indicating that it was “most helpful.” Both NES and NNES candidates perceived edTPA

preparation in coursework as a valuable experience, especially in hindsight. In his interview, a NNES TESL candidate (Xavier) explained that “the real edTPA was my second time [and that] helped me to really understand what they were asking me to [do].”

There were also differences between the two groups related to the edTPA preparation in coursework. Data suggested that the NES candidates were more aware of the connections and relevance of prior coursework to edTPA and thus when it came time to complete the assignment were better prepared. In the interviews, NES candidates stressed the importance of notes and material from previous coursework as support during edTPA preparation, whereas NNES candidates did not mention these tools or solely recognized, after the fact, that notes or textbooks from previous courses would have been helpful. One TESL NNES candidate (Satsuki) commented in her interview that she would have “kept all my textbook [sic] and then probably organized some of that” if she had known beforehand what edTPA preparation entailed. In other words, NES candidates were better able to anticipate the demands of edTPA whereas NNES candidates needed more guidance to realize these demands throughout the practice and actual edTPA.

The second sub-theme in the Support and Tools theme focused on the various resources that were available to candidates as they prepared for edTPA completion. During the interviews and open-ended survey responses, candidates spoke of publications such as edTPA handbooks and Understanding Rubric Level Progressions that accompanied each of the WL and EAL edTPA assessment portfolios. Similarly, candidates mentioned tools prepared by instructors such as graphic organizer tools, notes, outlines, checklists, and schedules. These resources were part of the previous coursework as well as the seminar that took place during the (final) internship

semester. Candidates' quotes from the surveys and interviews that related to the use of these resources are listed in Table 26 below.

Table 26

Sub-Theme: Resources

	NES Participants	NNES Participants
General Exit Survey Data	“Split project up into manageable bits throughout semester - make small goals weekly. This was a life-saver for me” (TESL NES candidate in GE survey)	
Content-Specific Survey Data	“Having templates, examples” (FLED NES candidate in CS survey)	“Checklist, [...], rubric explanations, examples.” (TESL NNES candidate in CS survey)
Interview Data	<p>“I used your timeline [be]cause if not, then I wouldn't have done anything at the time that I needed to do it.” (Claire interview)</p> <p>“During the bootcamp [the instructor] was just like, you know, if you do these things, we rarely have students who have to, you know, resubmit [...] and I feel like now that I'm at the end and I got my score back, I was like, okay, they were right. If we, if we follow these, you know, these suggestions and aim higher, you know, we'll, we'll do well enough to pass.” (Felicia interview)</p> <p>“So what I did was, [...] because of my experience as a writer, I really tried to break things, you know, I found so many of the examples that were just these blocks of text, so hard to read, so I really tried to break things up. I used a lot of bullet points [and] I had a chart</p>	<p>“You help us do the time management [with the timeline/schedule] very well as well [to] keep my project on track, that's pretty helpful as well. [because there were] many things I need to, you know, do about it, and need to finish it by the due date. The calendar was a very, very difficult time for me.” (Yin interview)</p> <p>“[The] rubrics are the best” (Rayna interview)</p>

[and] then I had the summary afterwards.” (Diana interview; more detail for task 3 in brackets)

As illustrated in the table above, NES and NNES candidates made similar comments about the general support that was offered as part of the seminars. Both NES and NNES candidates appreciated the suggested schedule (or timeline) for edTPA completion. Positive comments indicated that it “[kept] the project on track, as reported by a WL NNES candidate (Yin) and that it kept candidates accountable, as stated by a TESL NES candidate (Claire).

A third sub-theme in the Support and Tools theme focused on the support that candidates received from peers and (recent) program completers. During interviews, candidates explained that they were paired up during the (final) internship semester to peer review or peer edit each other’s lesson plans for Task 1 of the edTPA. Candidates explained that peer editing involved reading a classmate’s work and providing constructive feedback. Some candidates reported continuing to collaborate with (support or peer) groups that were formed during previous courses. Other candidates mentioned seeking support from recent program graduates who had successfully completed edTPA in a previous semester. Some candidates indicated that they sought support from program completers because they were colleagues, had been classmates, or shared a first language. In some cases, candidates mentioned that these program graduates offered valuable advice or moral support. Table 27 below shows survey and interview data related to peer editing and support from program completers.

Table 27*Sub-Theme: Peer Editing and/or Support from Program Completers*

	NES Participants	NNES Participants
General Exit Survey Data	<p>“Let a peer review all of your work prior to submission.” (FLED NES candidate)</p> <p>“Have a support group (friends, family, co-workers, classmates, etc.) of individuals to help you who can review or proofread your edTPA project.” (TESL NES candidate)</p>	<p>“Rely on your classmates and have a lot of opening [sic] communication with them.” (FLED NNES candidate)</p> <p>“Seek advice from those who have completed edTPA.” (FLED NNES candidate in GE survey)</p>
Content-Specific Survey Data	<p>“I think we all felt that we could have used more specific feedback for edTPA - not just from our peers.” (TESL NES candidate)</p> <p>“Having other students read [edTPA Task] and give me feedback was very helpful.” (TESL NES candidate)</p> <p>“I had a peer support group in which we shared a lot of information we found ourselves about edTPA, language demand, and language competencies...I think this helped us a lot.” (TESL NES candidate)</p>	<p>“Feedbacks from peers.” (FLED NNES candidate)</p> <p>“Partner assistance.” (FLED NNES candidate)</p>
Interview Data	<p>“I did not work with other students [classmates] just because I felt like everybody was stressed and I’m not good with other people stressing.” (Felicia interview)</p>	<p>“Create a little PLC with your classmates. That was really amazing. Those dark days that you are so tired, you don’t understand something and you just text and in ten seconds [classmates] said, oh, I did it. And it’s here and you’re like wow, wow, thank you lord for these people that really, I think, saved me some of my white hair.” (Xavier interview)</p>

The perceived benefit of peer editing was more evident in interviews with NNES. While only one of the NES candidates mentioned seeking (minimal) peer support to complete edTPA, all six NNES candidates interviewed commented on the benefits of peer support. One TESL NNES candidate explained how when he didn't "understand something [in the rubrics]," he would reach out to classmates via text message and receive responses almost immediately. Another TESL NNES candidate recommended "[c]reating a little PLC with your classmates" because of the "amazing" support he received, especially when he was able to text classmates with quick questions that "saved [him] some of [his] white hair." Comments from NNES candidates also suggested the perceived benefits of reaching out to a broader group of peers, not just classmates. For example, one WL NNES candidate recommended reaching out to former students who already completed edTPA. Differing from their NNES peers, comments from NES candidates also suggested potential drawbacks of seeking peer support. One TESL NES candidate, for example, stated that she preferred to work alone since she was "not good with other people stressing" (Felicia). In the Content-Specific Survey, one TESL NES candidate mentioned wanting more feedback from instructors instead of peers, a practice that is highly regulated and restricted through a Pearson document specifying allowable support.

For the fourth sub-theme in the Support/Tools theme, Table 28 below shows sample responses from NES and NNES candidates related to the content-specific seminars and meetings they attended throughout the semester, either during scheduled seminar sessions, office hours or at other times as requested. Soon after adopting and piloting edTPA, the aforementioned university at which the study took place started offering content-specific seminars in order to better support candidates in their specific content areas. Candidates spoke favorably about the content-specific seminars, where all WL and EAL candidates were clustered together, since the

content areas of WL and TESL are both focused on teaching language, and very different from other content areas (e.g., math or social studies).

Table 28

Sub-Theme: Content-Specific Seminar and Meetings with Instructor

	NES Participants	NNES Participants
General Exit Survey Data	“Attend support sessions.” (TESL NES candidate)	<p>“Participate in any and all support sessions.” (FLED NNES candidate)</p> <p>“Ask all the questions that you have.” (TESL NNES candidate)</p> <p>“Ask all the questions you have to your professor, [t]hey will help you.” (FLED NNES candidate)</p> <p>“Don’t hesitate to reach out for help from your teachers. They are very helpful in giving you advice.” (FLED NNES candidate)</p>
Content-Specific Survey Data	<p>“I really liked the section on lowest scoring rubrics.” (FLED NES candidate)</p> <p>“The recorded sessions to go back to review at our own pace.” (FLED NES candidate)</p> <p>“Going through the rubrics one by one. Having the slides available to review.” (TESL NES candidate)</p> <p>“The question and answer sessions were very helpful and direct.” (TESL NES candidate)</p>	<p>“Getting advice on what to focus on.” (TESL NNES candidate)</p> <p>“All the tips and tricks to improve edTPA results.” (TESL NNES candidate)</p> <p>“The most helpful aspect of the edTPA was support and help of the professor.” (FLED NNES candidate)</p> <p>“Having extra meeting time with the instructor during the weekends. It was a more personalized time for us and we were more confident in asking questions.” (FLED NNES candidate)</p>
Interview Data	“Having your drop-in hours were helpful [because] I was overwhelmed by the amount of information that I didn’t really	“You give us a lot of time to meet you when, I don’t know if there is any teacher would do that on Sunday, [...] but what helps literally [is] a Saturday

know.” (Ayesha interview)

and Sunday [because] those days were great.” (Rayna interview)

“Being able to like join the Saturday sessions because it’s not after work and you’re not just like let me make it through these hours. It’s, you know, you’re more awake and focused.” (Felicia interview)

As illustrated in Table 28, both NES and NNES candidates commented on the importance of attending the support seminars. In the Content-Specific Survey, NES candidates identified helpful aspects of the seminars such as “going through rubrics one by one” (TESL) and “the section on lowest scoring rubrics” (WL) as well as participating in “question and answer sessions” (TESL) as part of the seminars. NNES candidates also commented on hearing about the “tips and tricks” (TESL) and “advice on what to focus on” (TESL) in the edTPA portfolio assessment. Both NES and NNES candidates were able to identify specific parts of the seminars that they found most helpful.

Due to their busy schedules during the week, many candidates wrote favorably about the availability of the instructor during the weekend. In the interviews, a WL NES candidate (Ayesha) called these “drop in” hours “helpful” because she felt overwhelmed and another TESL NES candidate (Felicia) stated she joined these weekend office hours because she felt “more awake and focused” compared to evening hours for scheduled seminar sessions. NNES candidates made similarly positive comments about the weekend hours because “[i]t was a more personalized time for us and we were more confident in asking questions,” (WL NNES candidate).

Theme two: Challenges. When asked in the General Exit Survey (see Appendix A), the Content-Specific Survey (see Appendix B), and the interviews (see Appendix C) about their experiences, several candidates commented on the challenges they experienced during edTPA preparation and completion. Four sub-themes were identified in the Challenges theme: (1) time constraints/timing, (2) understanding the edTPA rubric prompts/handbook, (3) cooperating teacher or clinical educator cooperation and approval, and (4) need for specific support. Table 29 below lists sample quotes for the first sub-theme related to time constraints and timing.

Table 29

Sub-Theme: Time Constraints/Timing

	NES Participants	NNES Participants
General Exit Survey Data	<p>“Make sure you plan out time to work on edTPA throughout the semester – this is not something that can be done in a night or two.” (TESL NES candidate)</p> <p>“Have ideas about what you want to teach and film even before starting the project so that way you can maximize your time writing the commentaries.” (TESL NES candidate)</p> <p>“Start filming early! Give yourself a deadline of three weeks after you pick up your class so by the time you are full-time you have the film picked out already. After that you can begin the commentary for everything else and have enough time to work on everything.” (FLED NES candidate)</p>	<p>“Start as early as you can, and do the video early in case you need to redo it.” (FLED NNES candidate)</p> <p>“Time is very crucial for edTPA, especially most of candidates are working full-time in school. Full-time teaching in school is very tough with extra tasks, not to mention those [sic] COVID-19 situation. I have to say I was almost gave up and cried at home.” (FLED NNES candidate)</p> <p>“Start early so that if a lesson plan, a video or anything is not working good for you, just try another lesson, take other videos. And this can be done multiple times.” (FLED NNES candidate)</p>
Content-Specific Survey Data	<p>“Give more time to complete the edTPA. At the time we had to turn it in very quickly from when</p>	<p>“Explain and talk about edTPA earlier in the [academic] year too [to] give students a chance to start preparing for</p>

	we started our student teaching. Especially in the fall it takes a while to figure out the classes and getting to [know] the students well enough to really plan an effective lesson suitable for edTPA requirements.” (TESL NES candidate)	it time ahead.” (TESL NES candidate)
	“Help [the university] understand that TESL is different from content specific teaching. For example, we spend the first few weeks testing students and schedule arrangements with both content, EC, and MTSS. Therefore, we may not get our schedules set up until sometime in September. Consequently, our timeline does not correlate to content specific teachers and timing for our requirements should be adjusted accordingly.” (TESL NES candidate)	“Start early. Don’t procrastinate. Ask your principal to attend your observations for [your university supervisor] so you can complete both task [sic] at the same time.” (TESL NES candidate)
Interview Data	“I would spend like the whole weekend doing [edTPA] like ten hours each day, well six to ten hours [...] and then that wasn’t enough for me. [In total it was] over 100 hours.” (Ellen interview) (TESL)	“I did not have enough time because, because of my bad planning.” (Uzma interview) (TESL)
	“Don’t do it [edTPA] all in one weekend. If you don’t have to, pace it out, take your time, so that way you don’t have to do it twice.” (Ayesha interview) (FLED)	“As a procrastinator, you learn to do things, really like you compress your time. You know, I spent, if you asked me how many times you spent [working on edTPA], how many hours you spent worrying about it? I could tell you the whole semester.” (Uzma interview) (TESL)
	“I underestimated the amount of time it would take to make sure you have all of your materials in place.” (Felicia interview) (TESL)	“I expect that about one month I can finish that [edTPA] but actually it’s not, I think I need more time to prepare for [edTPA].” (Yin interview) (FLED)
		“I did not sleep for three days.” (Rayna interview) (FLED)

“I felt like I didn’t have enough time
to learn how to be a teacher.”
(Diana interview) (TESL)

Preparing for and submitting the edTPA requires time, with many candidates reporting upwards of 100 hours necessary to complete the process. Data from both NES and NNES candidates speaking to the amount of time needed to complete edTPA were pervasive. For example, out of 149 total comments submitted by candidates in the General Exit Survey, 55 comments were related to time constraints or timing of the portfolio assessment. The open-ended questions in the Content-Specific Survey did not specifically ask candidates about possible time-related challenges while completing edTPA which may explain the small number of comments related to time in candidates’ responses.

When looking back at the onset of the semester, both NES and NNES candidates reported feeling unsure of the amount of time it would take to complete the edTPA. One TESL NES candidate stated that she “underestimated the amount of time it would take to make sure you have all of your materials in place” while describing the process to gather multiple uploadable items that must be included in the portfolio. Similarly, a WL NNES candidate who underestimated the required time to complete edTPA explained that “I expect that about one month I can finish that [edTPA] but actually it’s not, I think I need more time to prepare for [edTPA]” (Yin interview). In summary, both NES and NNES candidates commented on time constraints related to edTPA completion. When asked how much time was needed to prepare for and complete edTPA, TESL candidates were more likely to mention 100 hours or more but some NNES WL candidates were unable to quantify the number of hours spent on edTPA preparation beyond listing their frustration. In describing her struggles with time when preparing for edTPA,

a WL NNES candidate commented that she “did not sleep for three days” during her final 72 hours of preparation for the WL edTPA. While both groups commented frequently about time, the data suggested that time was a greater concern among NNES candidates. TESL NES candidates who completed the EAL edTPA were least likely (33%) to make comments related to time in their responses whereas FLED NNES candidates who completed the WL edTPA were most likely (61%) to comment on time in their responses in the General Exit Survey.

A second sub-theme related to challenges was understanding the edTPA rubric prompts and edTPA handbook. In preparation for edTPA completion, candidates mentioned consulting the edTPA handbook for their content area and other related materials available on the Pearson/SCALE website. Several candidates reported experiencing difficulties with comprehension when reading the rubric prompts in the edTPA handbook for their content area during previous coursework as well as the support seminar. Table 30 lists sample responses from NES and NNES candidates related to the ways in which they attempted to understand the language used in edTPA handbooks and rubric prompts.

Table 30

Sub-Theme: Understanding edTPA Rubric Prompts/Handbook

	NES Participants	NNES Participants
General Exit Survey Data	<p>“Take it rubric by rubric, don’t freak out.” (TESL NES candidate)</p> <p>“It was a struggle to really understand what edTPA was.” (FLED NES candidate)</p> <p>“I think the rubrics are extremely vague and subjective.” (TESL NES candidate)</p>	<p>“Read the rubrics like it’s your bible. You will need to use the jargon that is found on them and write them into your commentaries.” (TESL NNES candidate)</p>
Content-	<p>“Going through the rubrics and</p>	<p>“I also found it very helpful [during</p>

Specific Survey Data (“What was helpful aspect of seminar?”)	providing examples of how to accomplish them.” (TESL NES candidate)	seminars] to understand the rubric and what exactly edTPA is looking for.” (FLED NNES candidate)
	“Highlighting the prompts where candidates are most likely to stumble.” (TESL NES candidate)	
	“Going through the rubrics one by one.” (TESL NES candidate)	
Interview Data	“The language of the commentaries is a bit difficult and it’s a bit difficult to know exactly what they were looking for [...] the rubrics kind of sound very vague.” (Claire interview)	“If I was trying to read this [edTPA handbook] all by myself, it never made sense to me. So, taking a class and looking at each, each of [the tasks and rubrics] really helped me to fully understand, you know. Like what’s Task 1 and what they need and all that [but] I mean taking a class alone really helped me to understand the handbook, but me reading it by myself?” (Satsuki interview)
	“I didn’t spend that much time going through every single rubric and, you know, lining it up with my, with my task. I, I feel like the questions were clear enough and [then] I put the words in, the words in the question in [the] response.” (Felicia interview)	“Some of the wording was very confusing [and there was one time] I was completely misunderstood.” (Satsuki interview)
		“[My advice is] take more time understanding and being familiar with the handbook [and] dig deeper with the handbook to really understand because the glossary, wow. The day that I found the glossary, wow, we have a glossary, this is amazing! And I was looking on the internet things that were not because it was not for edTPA and we need to think about those words based on edTPA. [My advice is] you don’t need to go to Google, you need to look at your glossary.” (Xavier interview)
		“I wasn’t able to understand very well the concept of the vocabulary words [in the glossary]. For example, as non-

native English speaker, I am saying I thought “personal assets” was about something about a very big picture. But it was my fault. Fortunately, it was something small [but] I was very confused. I was having some misconceptions [and] that is the reason why it was extra challenging for me.” (Zacarias interview)

“In the beginning, I [be]came a confusing, you know, confused with, what they are asking for and why they asked, ask me the same thing all the time. I feel that I can say the same thing but they just use a different way to ask me.” (Yin interview)

“I had to find definitions, for example, language demands, you know, I had to literally Google it, examples of language demands, you know.” (Uzma interview)

Data presented from multiple sources suggested that while both groups found the rubrics challenging to understand, the NNES candidates were much more specific with respect to the challenges they experienced. For example, whereas TESL NES candidates used vague descriptors for the rubric language in the handbook, such as “vague and subjective,” “a bit difficult,” “difficult to know what exactly what they were looking for,” NNES candidates identified specialized vocabulary used in the edTPA handbooks as particularly challenging, leading them to misunderstand rubric prompts. In her interview, Satsuki (TESL NNES candidate) explained that the rubric language “never made sense to me” and that she would not have been able to understand the rubric language without the instructor’s support. Another WL NNES candidate (Zacarias) explained that his “misconceptions” were related to

misunderstanding the meaning of words in the glossary section of the handbook. Yin, a WL NNES candidate, did not understand why the rubric language in the prompt seemed to ask her the same questions throughout the portfolio, but later figured out that “I feel that I can say the same thing but they just use a different way to ask me.”

The third sub-theme related to Challenges focused on the role of Clinical Educators (CEs), also called Clinical Teachers or Cooperating Teachers, who mentor student teachers during the internship. Candidates placed with a CE consistently reported on the important role of CEs during the internship semester. Since edTPA has only been required for state licensure since 2019, more experienced CEs would not have completed the portfolio assessment themselves when completing their licensure requirements. As a result, several candidates reported that many CEs were unfamiliar with edTPA and rely on the student teacher to educate them (see Table 31).

Table 31

Sub-Theme: Clinical Educator Cooperation and Approval

	NES Participants	NNES Participants
General Exit Survey Data	<p>“Talk to your CE about the next units, so you can plan learning segments that align with the school’s curriculum.” (FLED NES candidate)</p> <p>“Meet with your CE early during the internship to discuss each student and their backgrounds, home life, English language proficiency, academic needs, and any behavioral concerns. This will aid in constructing the learning segments for edTPA.” (TESL NES candidate)</p> <p>“Ask your cooperating teacher if</p>	<p>“Start working on lesson plans as soon as you meet your clinical teacher. Discuss the topic and grade level you are going to teach.” (FLED NNES candidate)</p>

	he/she is requiring you to focus on any particular content or standards. Hopefully you will have the freedom to choose the content area and standards for this project.” (TESL NES candidate)	
Content-Specific Survey Data	“It would be helpful to have more training for CE’s and principals about the edTPA process and how to support candidates.” (TESL NES candidate)	
Interview Data	“I think I would’ve tried to have planned [edTPA] from the very, very beginning of the semester with my CE and I mean, but you know, it was so hard to try to fit in all of these requirements simultaneously and also be on track, keep on track with the curriculum, but I think that’s what I would have done differently is I would have tried to have integrated something a little bit sooner.” (Diana interview)	<p>“Make sure to ask your CE if she is familiar with edTPA, for example, like I did, does she have other student teachers that have been doing [best practices in foreign language teaching] or something like that. And, and, if you know your CE is not really familiarized with this [best practices example], you talk to your professor [especially] before the deadline is nearby.” (Zacarias interview)</p> <p>“It will be very helpful for everybody that you ask the professors [to] make some kind of interviews to the CEs first and then ask them if they are really familiarized with edTPA [or]something like that. Like, what are the expectations that the edTPA will ask to your teachers to do on your class?” (Zacarias interview)</p> <p>“[My CE] helped me with the timeline, you know, because I, at the same time had observations with [supervisor] and I was like, I’m horrible at time management. So she was like, you know what, you have three weeks, this week you’re going to do, you can do this this week you can, even though she had no experience with edTPA, I was her first, I was her first student teacher.” (Uzma interview)</p>

NES and NNES candidates alike commented on the need for (early) communication with CEs regarding lesson planning, curriculum, and standards as well as learning about students. One TESL NES candidate reported that more training was needed for CEs and principals “about the edTPA process and how to support candidates.” A WL NNES candidate who completed the WL edTPA advised to “start working on lesson plans as soon as you meet your clinical teacher. Discuss the topic and grade level you are going to teach” because CEs may not be familiar with edTPA requirements and submission dates. These two candidates referred to their respective CEs’ lack of knowledge about edTPA and its requirements as a disadvantage when preparing for edTPA.

The importance of CE training was underscored by NNES candidates who explained in much more detail how a CE’s knowledge of best practices and edTPA was of utmost importance. TESL NNES candidate Uzma remarked that her CE was only able to help her with time management regarding edTPA because “she had no experience with edTPA.” WL NNES candidate Zacarias wanted to remind others to “[m]ake sure to ask your CE if she is familiar with edTPA” and, when asked to clarify, Zacarias recommended that only CEs who “are really familiarized with edTPA” be selected as CEs.

The final sub-theme related to challenges addressed the need for more customized support, as explained by candidates in their survey and interview responses. After completing edTPA, candidates were asked what type of support would have been helpful, but was not offered or tailored to specific situations or candidates. Table 32 below lists sample responses about the need for specific support as perceived by candidates as they completed edTPA.

Table 32*Sub-Theme: Need for Specific Support*

	NES Participants	NNES Participants
General Exit Survey Data	“Create a checklist for all requirements of Task 2 video clips [...] I was incorrect in my understanding of these guidelines and received an F code for my Task 2.” (TESL NES candidate) (submitted video clip of virtual learning environment during pandemic)	“I think more preparation is needed in guiding the non-English [speakers]” (FLED NNES candidate)
Content-Specific Survey Data	<p>“More video examples at different age levels - I’ve had access to plenty of MS and HS examples, very few FLES.” (FLED NES candidate) NB: candidate was Spanish teacher in elementary school</p> <p>“More example videos of excellent performances.” (FLED NES candidate)</p>	<p>“Explaining the world [language] glossary terms for non-native English speakers” (FLED NNES candidate)</p> <p>“I struggled with theories. I think having one session on different instructional theories would have helped us refresh on the content. It would have made it less difficult” (FLED NNES candidate)</p> <p>“Read the rubrics like it’s your bible. You will need to use the jargon that is found on them and write them into your commentaries” (TESL NNES candidate)</p>
Interview Data	<p>“I didn’t know how much outside input we could, we could get ‘cause I really felt like it was like, you have to do this on your own.” (Ellen interview)</p> <p>“I have never had to write like this or like writing about what you’re teaching about. So I was unsure about it.” (Felicia interview)</p>	<p>“I need to admit that [classmate], she proofread some of my documents and my wife proofread them. I mean, I will not lie to you. And I am a smart man. I could not pass edTPA without an English native speaker giving some sense to my sentences and correcting the grammar. Because again, I’m not here to show my students how good I write. I’m here to teach my kids skills to be able to have a successful life.” (Xavier interview)</p>

“My husband, we met in college, he’s known me since I spoke very little English, and so he proofread a lot of my writing. [...] The writing [of edTPA commentaries] was hard [...] I’m still learning English [...] Providing [future candidates] somebody who can proofread for them, like, you know, my husband did. [...] Even just sending emails [in English], it’s difficult for me.” “When somebody asks you a question, you answer it as if you’re writing the question. So that’s what I started, started the, to answer the question, that was my sentence starter for me. And that was, that was really helpful because sometimes I was like, I don’t know what to write or where to start” (Satsuki)

“I was needing more support for the professional English part [...] because it’s due, the ESL actually [...] for my high school, [...] they didn’t help me a lot with the English. I’ve been here for around, like almost ten years. [...] I don’t have also my family to speak a lot of English. [...] My sister also speak English but she’s not like in the professional level English.” (Zacarias interview)

“My [teenage] daughter helped me to check out my grammar. [...] I ask her to read it before I turn in, you know, but she was busy because she’s in golf team.” (Yin)

“English is my third language, so I was scared that they’re gonna care about language [...] My English is not that great [...] and I have a lot of mistake in grammar and nobody checked. [...] I didn’t find any help.” “The] rubrics are

the best. So, I just take whatever wording in the rubrics and I go word for word, rewrite it in a prompt and also find way to support whatever they're looking for. So, for the evaluator will be easy for him to find like my sentences" (Rayna)

While both groups wanted more customized support, differences emerged in what that support involved. The data suggested, for example, that NES candidates wanted more specific examples. In the Content-Specific Survey, one WL NES teacher candidate placed in an elementary school requested more examples of successful teaching at “different age levels” since most examples came from middle and high school classrooms that did not reflect her elementary school setting. Another WL NES candidate preferred “[m]ore example videos of excellent performances” as models for edTPA.

The NNES candidates also reported their own specific needs. For example, the data suggested that NNES candidates needed more structure prior to starting the writing commentaries. WL NNES candidates (such as Rayna) needed guidelines for writing, specifically targeting the use of jargon from the rubrics in their commentary writing. Rayna advised to “rewrite [rubric language] in a prompt and also find [a] way to support whatever [scorers are] looking for.” Another TESL NNES candidate (Satsuki) felt unprepared for the writing task because she didn’t “know what to write or where to start.” A third TESL NNES candidate remarked in the survey that candidates should “[r]ead the rubrics like it’s your bible. You will need to use the jargon that is found on them and write them into your commentaries.” NNES candidates acknowledged that language from the prompt should be used in the answer whereas

no NES candidates mentioned that particular detail. Related to using rubric language, NNES candidates commented that “I just take whatever wording in the rubrics and I go word for word, rewrite it in a prompt” (WL; Rayna) and “[w]hen somebody asks you a question, you answer it as if you’re writing the question. So that’s what I started, started the, to answer the question, that was my sentence starter for me” (TESL; Satsuki). In other words, data suggested that an important factor for NNES candidates was a need for direct instruction when answering edTPA rubric prompts. Additionally, data provided compelling evidence that candidates needed to be reminded on how to approach responding to the prompts and that this process needed to be taught explicitly. NES candidates did not need this advice; these candidates knew how to navigate the rubric prompts without being told how to do so.

Overall, NNES candidates wanted more customized language support. A WL NNES candidate argued that “more preparation is needed in guiding the non-English [speakers]” as they try to make sense of edTPA. A second WL NNES candidate specified needing support such as “explaining the world [language] glossary terms for non-native English speakers,” honing in on the language difficulties these NNES candidates experience as part of their edTPA completion. Five NNES candidates provided compelling evidence that writing support was of utmost importance as they detailed their need for proofreading. Xavier (TESL) explained that he asked his wife as well as a classmate to proofread his work because he “could not pass edTPA without an English native speaker giving some sense to [his] sentences and correcting the grammar.” Likewise, Satsuki (TESL) reported that her husband proofread her writing, and urged future candidates to find or be provided with “somebody who can proofread for them, like, you know, my husband did.” Undergraduate WL NNES candidate Zacarias, who did not have a family member to help him with proofreading, explained that “I was needing more support for the

professional English part” but could not rely on writing support from his family. Yin, a WL NNES teacher of Chinese, asked her teenage daughter “to check out my grammar [and asked] her to read it before I turn in, you know, but she was busy because she’s in golf team.” Native Arabic speaker Rayna (WL), who taught French, admitted that “English is my third language, so I was scared that they’re gonna care about language [...] My English is not that great [...] and I have a lot of mistake[s] in grammar and nobody checked. [...] I didn’t find any help.” Rayna did not have access to native speakers of English who could assist with writing or proofreading. All five NNES candidates whose quotes are listed above had to seek writing or proofreading support outside of the university; they asked family members such as spouses and teenage children and, when they did not have family members who were native or proficient English speakers to help them, they suffered and clearly felt they were at a disadvantage.

Research Question 3

To investigate how faculty in one EPP modified instructional support for non-native English-speaking candidates (RQ3), the researcher invited three faculty in the World Language and English as a Second Language teacher preparation programs to participate in interviews to gain their perspectives. During these semi-structured interviews the researcher asked faculty to describe their perceptions of the challenges non-native speakers of English experienced while completing or preparing to complete edTPA, how they modified instruction to meet their needs, which support strategies were most successful, areas where additional support is still needed, and recommendations for instructors who may be working with non-native speakers of English (See Appendix D.) Three themes emerged during interviews with faculty: (1) writing support in coursework prior to internship, (2) impact of candidates’ school experiences and, (3) faculty experience with edTPA.

Theme One: Writing Support in Coursework. All three faculty spoke of writing strategies intended to help all students, but that were particularly beneficial to NNES candidates. Dr. Kramer (pseudonym), explained how she used a backward design model in the Methods course, developing ten modules with “thinking organizers” that support writing in each of the three edTPA tasks. According to Dr. Kramer, these resources “break down and scaffold the different prompts of the edTPA commentaries [with] graphic organizers [and] tables [that] make them more comprehensible.” Dr. Kramer added how she provided students with “formative feedback on the thinking organizers throughout the entire semester so that when they turn in their summative assessment at the end of the semester, they’ve gotten feedback on everything.” The supports in place scaffold every aspect of edTPA, for both NES and NNES candidates. Dr. Kramer recognized that, prior to adding the thinking organizers and other edTPA resources, NNES candidates struggled more with the language in the edTPA prompts. She remarked that modifications are continuously occurring as she sees new struggles in her candidates, leading her to make changes and add more support.

To further scaffold the writing process, Dr. Morris (pseudonym) mentioned that candidates complete a practice edTPA assignment during coursework, along with collective writing sessions where candidates “do a think aloud and write aloud process where we’re going through the sections of the commentaries [to align] with the rubric.” These collective writing sessions provided support to NNES candidates who struggled with the format or style of commentary writing. Dr. Morris spoke of candidates who participated in these sessions, “especially those that speak a language other than English, [who] have really benefited from doing that, like significantly, because it’s a way for us to actually do this writing and thinking aloud in terms of the narrative format of the commentaries.” Both Drs. Kramer and Morris took

steps to address the writing needs of NNES candidates with a variety of support strategies, ranging from scaffolded thinking organizers to collective writing sessions, whereas Dr. Landas remarked on the “thorough and impressive” alignment of edTPA in coursework leading up to the completion of the portfolio during the internship semester.

Theme Two: Impact of School Experience. The second theme focused on the impact of the school experiences of NNES candidates in American K-12 schools. All three faculty members who were interviewed recognized the difference in candidates’ experiences in American K-12 schools and how this experience impacted their understanding of teaching in American K-12 schools. Dr. Landas made a comparison between NES and NNES candidates when he noted that “immigrant teachers might potentially struggle [when completing edTPA as] the paradigm for good teaching is so different” from their own culture. When NNES candidates come from “more traditional backgrounds [in cultures] where the teacher would do most of the talking” that would be “a stumbling block for adult immigrant candidates” as they complete edTPA in an American K-12 school. Dr. Morris agreed when she described “international candidates [who] come from academic backgrounds that are very teacher centered [...] where the teacher teaches and the students take notes,” leading her to point out to NNES candidates a “focus on describing what the students are doing [instead of] describing what they have taught.”

Likewise, Dr. Kramer explained that “a lot of [teacher candidates in her program] did not go to school here in the US so they might not have the same conceptualization of understanding of cultural norms and routines” compared to NES candidates. Unfamiliarity with American schools may lead to misunderstandings when interacting with K-12 students, their parents, and staff at K-12 schools. When candidates prepare for the WL edTPA, those NNES candidates who are teaching their first language may “have trouble anticipating what students’ errors and

misconceptions might be with that language” since the candidates learned it as a first language. Dr. Morris explained that many candidates currently complete their internship as Residency teachers, without the benefit of a Clinical Educator, which may lead to challenges for those candidates with a home language other than English. However, Dr. Morris noted that it clearly would not be fair to require these candidates who have never been in US schools to take additional coursework preparing them for US schools “unless we could find a way to pay them a teacher’s salary for that year.” She recommended that EPPs “rely on the expertise of the [EPP’s] professors in each respective field to identify and recommend the clinical educators with whom our candidates should be placed for their internship” especially when candidates are unfamiliar with US schools. She cautioned against the practice of relying on a small number of partnership schools who may, or may not, have high-quality role models in the areas of WL and ESL because when relying on models with “partnership” schools, these schools may not have cooperating teachers or clinical educators appropriate for content areas such as WL or ESL.

Theme Three: Faculty Experience with edTPA. The data gathered during interviews with faculty suggested that the support they offer as part of their coursework has been influenced by their experience as trained edTPA scorers. Two of the three faculty interviewed were trained edTPA scorers who used their scoring experience to guide teacher candidates during edTPA preparation. One faculty member, Dr. Landas, who stated he had scored almost “a thousand portfolios,” developed face-to-face workshops as well as tutorials specifically geared toward teacher candidates preparing to complete the WL and EAL edTPA. He explained how he had scored so many portfolios that he could easily recognize where candidates typically struggle. He spoke of a workshop activity that points out how key edTPA terminology appears throughout the portfolio’s rubric language and prompts: “So I think by doing the [specific] activity and looking

very closely for repetition of key words, [this will] help [candidates] understand to see the bigger picture.” He described how he advised candidates to use the rubric language when answering the prompts and to use the rubric as a way to gain a passing score. He stated, “in the assessment task feedback, what I think is rubric 11, if I give grows, glows, and resources, if I add resources, I’m going to get a [score of] four [or] if I had established patterns in rubric 10 of the group and now individuals [then I can] push it up to [a score of] three or four.” This example showed how careful reading of the prompts and rubrics can lead to an improved score. Another faculty member, Dr. Morris, spoke specifically about her experience with preparing NNES candidates when she explained that “because I have been working with edTPA since 2013, I feel like I have paid attention to where those [NNES] candidates have needed support and amended the practices to sort of meet them where they are.” These faculty members aligned their support based on their experiences with edTPA and their knowledge of candidates, modifying assignments and practice tasks with the end result in mind.

Further informed by their experience scoring edTPA portfolios, faculty in the WL and ESL programs at the participating institution developed separate seminars with tailored, subject-specific support that are geared towards second language teachers and taught by instructors with edTPA scorer training. Support seminars addressed candidates’ understanding of the edTPA rubrics, coordinated peer-editing opportunities for commentary writing, and provided support with respect to common challenges candidates experienced during their placement. While these seminars were designed for all candidates, they specifically addressed the needs of NNES candidates by offering peer-editing, support from writing consultants, as well as contextual understanding of the rubric language.

Faculty support of candidates in the WL and EAL programs was also informed by their multiple research projects as part of their own research agenda. For example, in a study by Lachance and Kissau (2018), the researchers described ten programmatic-level and instructional strategies to enhance the support available to teacher candidates. The researchers recommended strategic programmatic-level support, including targeted sessions for NNES by Pearson-trained faculty that aligned language choices, organizational features and explicit understandings of commentary prompts, among other topics. The researchers also recommended strategic clinical placements with “earlier and more recursive exposure to student-centered schooling” (p. 171) which especially benefited NNES candidates. The use of graduate assistants as writing consultants, as described by the researchers, benefitted all students but especially those with home languages other than English.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this mixed-methods study was to analyze the edTPA performance and perceptions of non-native speakers of English seeking a K-12 license to teach a world language or English as a Second Language, and to explore how faculty at one institution of higher education supported these candidates in the completion of this high-stakes assessment. The ultimate goal of the study is to better understand their performance and perceptions and to offer the field potential recommendations for enhanced support. In this final chapter, the researcher discusses the study's contribution to the extant literature, offers recommendations to the field, and suggests directions for future research.

Candidate edTPA Performance

This study builds on the limited research investigating the performance of WL and ESL teacher candidates on the edTPA portfolio assessment. Consistent with the findings of Hildebrandt and Swanson (2014) and Williams et al. (2019), this study reported that WL candidates performed best on Task 1 but obtained the lowest average score on assessment tasks (Task 3). Other prior studies (Kissau & Algozzine, 2017; Okraski & Kissau, 2018) found highest scores on planning tasks (Task 1) but lowest scores on the instruction tasks (Task 2). The findings in the current study did not support the findings reported in the 2019 edTPA Annual Administrative report that showed WL candidates scored lowest on Task 2 of the WL edTPA. In support of previous studies (Micek, 2017; Tigert et al., 2018), candidates in the current study scored the lowest on Task 2 of the EAL edTPA.

This study extends the limited existing research investigating the performance of NNES second language teacher candidates on edTPA (Hildebrandt & Swanson, 2014; Kissau & Algozzine, 2017; Okraski & Kissau, 2018; Russell & Davidson Devall, 2016; Troyan & Kaplan,

2015). In contrast with prior research studies reporting lower overall and lower task edTPA rubric scores for NNES candidates compared to NES candidates (Jourdain, 2018; Kissau & Algozzine, 2017; Lachance & Kissau, 2019; Okraski & Kissau, 2018; Russell & Davidson Devall, 2016; 2018), the results of the current study showed that NNES candidates actually outperformed NES candidates on the WL edTPA. In regard to edTPA overall scores, NNES WL candidates performed better on edTPA than NES WL candidates, but there was greater variation among their WL edTPA scores, suggesting while some do quite well, others do poorly. Possible reasons for the superior performance of NNES candidates may include the higher level of education of NNES candidates compared to NES candidates upon entering the teacher education program. Another possible reason could be that NNES candidates, as native speakers of the language they teach, are more likely to demonstrate the type of interactions valued by edTPA scorers.

With respect to EAL teacher candidates, the opposite, however, was true. With regards to edTPA overall scores, NES EAL candidates performed better on the edTPA than NNES candidates. When analyzing the summed task scores of the EAL edTPA, NES candidates outperformed NNES candidates on every task. Consistent with findings reported in the 2019 edTPA Annual Administrative Report and other related studies (Micek 2017; Tigert et al., 2018), in this study, all candidates performed best on the instruction tasks (Task 1) of the EAL edTPA, but higher scores on the EAL edTPA were earned by NES candidates. In the current study, NES candidates scored lowest on the instruction tasks (Task 2) consistent with the 2019 edTPA Annual Administrative Report and other studies (Micek, 2017; Tigert et al., 2018). In the current study, NNES candidates scored lowest on the assessment tasks (Task 3) which was also consistent with other studies (Lachance & Kissau, 2018).

While the study's results pertaining to EAL candidates support earlier research (Hildebrandt & Swanson, 2014; Kissau & Algozzine, 2017; Okraski & Kissau, 2018; Russell & Davidson Devall, 2016; Troyan & Kaplan, 2015) that NNES candidates may struggle more than their NES peers when completing components of the assessment, a major contribution of the study is that the data suggests that the performance of NNES candidates may vary by their teaching assignment and related edTPA portfolio to complete. NNES candidates outperformed NES candidates on the WL edTPA but the opposite was true for the EAL edTPA. As for the EAL edTPA, NES candidates scored higher than NNES candidates. These findings support previous research (Russell & Davidson Devall, 2016) suggesting the advantage NNES WL candidates may have when able to deliver instruction in their native language. In this study, the NNES candidates who were able to communicate in their native language while completing the WL edTPA performed better on all three tasks.

Also, building upon previous research, the study investigated the relationship of the consequential nature of edTPA with the performance of NES and NNES candidates. While one might hypothesize that the consequential nature of edTPA may lead to higher scores as candidates might be inclined to take the assessment more seriously, the results indicated that candidates in both content areas performed more poorly once the assessment became mandatory. After edTPA became consequential, higher scores were solely associated with task 3 of the WL edTPA; this was the only task where candidates performed better. It is interesting to note that, during the program redesign (see Table 5 on page 58), an assessment course was added to the program to better prepare WL candidates for Task 3. This assessment course was implemented in Fall 2019 when edTPA became consequential. A similar course was already part of the TESL curriculum. The implementation of the course when edTPA became consequential may help to

explain why WL candidates did better on Task 3 once the assessment became consequential. For the three tasks of the EAL edTPA, all candidates performed worse after edTPA became consequential in 2019.

Perceptions of Preparation: Challenges

The study's results also confirmed previous research indicating the challenges that both NES and NNES candidates experience while completing edTPA (Hildebrandt & Swanson 2014; Kissau & Algozzine, 2017; Okraski & Kissau, 2018; Russell & Davidson Devall, 2016; Troyan & Kaplan, 2015). This study's results identified common challenges shared by both NNES and NES candidates, and shed light on some challenges that may be unique or amplified in the context of NNES candidates.

Findings related to time and time constraints in this study were consistent with the results of prior research studies. Russell and Davidson Devall (2016), for example, suggested that the early timing of the edTPA assessment may have led to lower scores on the instruction task (Task 2) in their study. When the videorecording occurs in week two or three of a semester-long clinical placement, teacher candidates have little prior teaching experience in a K-12 classroom and are, thus, minimally prepared. Further related to time, all participants in the present study commented on the exorbitant amount of time required to complete the edTPA portfolio, with many candidates reporting upwards of 100 hours.

While all candidates (both NES and NNES) commented on the amount of time needed to complete edTPA, the results suggested that this challenge is even more problematic among NNES. When asked about challenges during preparation for edTPA, NNES candidates were more likely to make comments related to time in their survey responses. In the General Exit Survey (see Appendix A), 61% of the NNES candidates who completed the WL edTPA mention

the issue of time when completing the edTPA, compared to only 33% of the NES candidates who completed the EAL edTPA.

The study's findings also lend support to previous research studies expressing concerns regarding the challenges candidates experience when understanding rubric language in lengthy prompts (Denton, 2013; Miller et al., 2015). Okraski and Kissau (2018), for example, found that NNES candidates needed extra support to comprehend the language of the rubric in order to address each aspect of the prompts. While both the NES and NNES participants in this study found the rubrics challenging to understand, NNES candidates were more specific in their comments. For example, in his interview, a NNES candidate (Zacarias) explained that his "misconceptions" were related to misunderstanding the meaning of words in the glossary section of the handbook. Yin, a NNES candidate, did not understand why the rubric language in the prompt seemed to ask her the same questions throughout the portfolio.

Further supporting previous research, the study's findings emphasized the importance of the cooperating teacher or clinical educator in supporting candidate completion of edTPA (Kissau et al., 2017). The results confirmed the work of Kissau et al. (2017) that CEs are important to the success of all candidates while completing edTPA. Candidates placed with a cooperating teacher consistently reported the importance of cooperating teachers while completing edTPA. Since edTPA has only been required for state licensure since 2019, several candidates lamented that cooperating teachers lacked knowledge of the portfolio assessment and relied on their student teachers to inform them about all things edTPA.

Extending the abovementioned research, the study's results provided compelling evidence that having a CE with edTPA training and experience is even more critical for NNES candidates. A NNES candidate commented on the disadvantage he experienced as his CE was

unfamiliar with edTPA and its requirements. Another NES candidate explained in her survey response that “it would be helpful to have more training for CEs and principals about the edTPA process and how to support candidates.” Supporting this claim, a faculty member charged with supporting both NES and NNES second language teacher candidates emphasized that CEs for NNES student teachers should be high-quality role models who are familiar with edTPA and its expectations.

In addition to the emphasis on the role of CEs in supporting candidates during edTPA preparation, the study’s findings also lent support to the notion that CEs can serve to bridge cultural gaps between NNES candidates and American classrooms. Kissau et al. (2011) reported that unfamiliarity with American K-12 schools and student-centered teaching styles contributed to the struggles that many NNES teachers experience in U.S classrooms. A faculty member in the current study explained that teacher candidates who did not attend American K-12 schools “might not have the same conceptualization of understanding of cultural norms and routines” compared to NES candidates, leading to misunderstandings when interacting with K-12 students. Results from the General Exit Survey lend some support to this claim. For example, more than one fifth of the NNES reported in the General Exit Survey that identifying student assets was the most challenging aspect of edTPA, compared with only 7% of NES candidates.

Furthering supporting previous research (Jourdain, 2018; Kissau & Algozzine, 2017; Russell & Davidson, 2018), the study provided ample evidence that NNES candidates struggle with the writing requirements of edTPA. Xavier, a NNES candidate, explained that he asked his wife as well as a classmate to proofread his work because he “could not pass edTPA without an English native speaker giving some sense to [his] sentences and correcting the grammar.” The NNES candidates reported specific needs, such as seeking more structure prior to starting the

writing commentaries. Further, the findings provided insights regarding NNES candidates' need for direct instruction when answering edTPA rubric prompts. NES candidates, on the other hand, did not need this advice. The data suggested that they already knew how to navigate the rubric prompts without being told how to do so.

An interesting contribution of the study to existing research is that its findings suggest that NNES may be less aware of edTPA expectations and its connections to coursework, and may need more explicit instruction from their instructors as to what is relevant to the performance-based assessment. One NNES candidate (Satsuki) commented in her interview that she would have “kept all my textbook [sic] and then probably organized some of that” if she had known beforehand what edTPA preparation entailed. While many of the programmatic resources and components were perceived to be beneficial to their performance, the NNES candidates may not have been aware at the time of their relevance and potential benefit. In other words, NES candidates were better able to anticipate the demands of edTPA, whereas NNES candidates needed more guidance to realize these demands throughout the practice and actual edTPA.

While data indicated that in some areas NNES had different perspectives about edTPA, it also suggested that both NNES and NES candidates perceived themselves to be equally prepared. For example, when asked in the Content-Specific Survey about their preparation for edTPA lesson planning, 92% of NNES candidates and 93% of NES agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Similarly, in the same survey, 92% of NNES candidates and 93% of NES candidates agreed or strongly agreed that they felt prepared for demonstrating a positive learning environment in their video recordings for Task 2 of the edTPA. Both NNES and NES candidates also reported similar perceptions about the extent they felt prepared to complete Task 3 of the WL or EAL edTPA. When analyzing students' content-specific learning, 83% of NNES

candidates and 85% of NES candidates agreed or strongly agreed that their program prepared them to do so.

Support Strategies

Expanding upon the related literature, the study shed light on strategies perceived to be beneficial to all candidates, regardless of their first language status. Supports such as handbooks, outlines, and schedules (suggested timeline) for edTPA completion were considered beneficial by all candidates. Positive comments indicated that these supports “[kept] the project on track, as reported by a NNES candidate (Yin) and kept candidates accountable, as stated by an NES candidate (Claire).

An equally important contribution is that the study suggested strategies that were beneficial to one group, but not for the other. Peer editing was perceived most beneficial by NNES candidates, but NES candidates found it less beneficial. The perceived benefit of peer editing was more evident in interviews with NNES candidates. While only one of the NES candidates mentioned seeking peer support to complete edTPA, all six NNES candidates interviewed commented on the benefits of peer support. Comments from NNES candidates also suggested the perceived benefits of reaching out to a broader group of peers, not just classmates. For example, one NNES candidate recommended reaching out to former students who already completed edTPA.

Supporting previous research (Kleyn et al., 2015; Lachance & Kissau, 2018; Okraski & Kissau, 2018; Troyan & Kaplan, 2015), data from multiple sources emphasized the importance of preparing NNES candidates via edTPA practice tasks infused into coursework leading up to the internship. NNES candidates made reference to the fact that they were introduced to edTPA in coursework and completed assignments that aligned with edTPA expectations (practice tasks)

and received feedback from instructors. The benefits of providing edTPA practice tasks in coursework were further supported by faculty. Confirming prior research by Lachance and Kissau (2018) on support strategies for practice tasks within coursework, program faculty also reported on the writing support they offered to candidates prior to the internship, primarily as part of edTPA practice tasks during coursework leading up to the internship. Supporting previous research that recommended the use of practice tasks (Kleyn et al., 2015; Lachance & Kissau, 2018; Okraski & Kissau, 2018; Troyan & Kaplan, 2015), the NNES participants in the study perceived these practice tasks as beneficial to their performance.

Overall, NNES candidates wanted more customized language support. Five NNES candidates provided compelling evidence that writing support was of utmost importance as they detailed their need for proofreading. The NNES candidates sought writing or proofreading support outside of the university; they asked family members such as spouses and teenage children and, when they did not have family members who were native or proficient English speakers to help them, they suffered and clearly felt they were at a disadvantage.

Supporting the recommendations reported in the research of Lachance and Kissau (2018) and Okraski and Kissau (2018), the study's results also suggested that both NES and NNES candidates benefit when they are able to receive more focused support for language teachers in content-specific seminars. In these specialized internship seminars where WL and EAL candidates were clustered together, both NES and NNES candidates were supported while completing edTPA. Both groups found the sessions helpful but NNES candidates seemed most appreciative of these content-specific seminars. One NNES candidate, for example, pointed to office hours as part of these seminars as a time when they felt more confident to ask questions that were more specific to their teaching assignment.

Lastly, the study's results confirmed prior research suggesting the importance of faculty having a deep understanding of edTPA and its requirements (Lachance & Kissau, 2018; Okraski & Kissau, 2018). During interviews, edTPA-trained faculty described how many of their support strategies (i.e., seminars and peer-editing opportunities) had been informed by their experience as a trained edTPA scorer and scoring edTPA portfolios.

Implications and Applications

The study's findings offer a series of recommendations to support the preparation of both NES and NNES candidates, as well as support strategies that the data suggest are more specific to and beneficial for NNES candidates. With respect to the preparation of both groups, the data collected provided compelling evidence that both groups of candidates need extensive support completing edTPA that could not possibly be covered entirely in methodology coursework. With this in mind, teacher preparation programs might consider infusing support beyond methods courses and student teaching seminars. By starting edTPA preparation in initial coursework, it may take the load and responsibility off the shoulders of methods instructors who typically teach courses later in teacher education programs and often assume sole responsibility for preparing candidates to successfully complete the assessment.

As an additional means of support for all candidates (both NES and NNES), EPPs should consider tailored support during their internship semester via their content-specific seminars. In the study, candidates from WL and TESL content areas were appreciative of the content-specific support they received in their seminars, where they were clustered together with other WL and TESL teacher candidates. Recognizing that the needs of second language teachers are unique from teachers of other content areas, EPPs may want to consider grouping teacher candidates from WL and TESL content areas in content-clustered seminars where instructors are

experienced second language educators and knowledgeable about the WL and EAL edTPA requirements.

In acknowledgement of the importance of seminar instructors in supporting candidates in the successful completion of edTPA, EPPs are also advised to encourage their faculty to complete edTPA scorer training and to conduct related research to guide and inform their instruction. In this study, program faculty with expertise in second language teaching were active in the field of edTPA research, had several years of experience preparing candidates for edTPA, or were Pearson-trained scorers of edTPA portfolio assessments. These instructors frequently mentioned the impact completing edTPA scorer training and serving as an edTPA scorer had on their instruction, as well as the impact of what they learned via their own related research. The results of their experience led to several program modifications to better support candidates as they completed edTPA and may help to explain both NNES and NES candidates reported being equally prepared by their program in the Content-Specific Survey.

Resources and tools that supported candidates in their edTPA completion were also perceived as beneficial to all candidates, regardless of first language status. Candidates commented on resources such as handbooks, thinking organizers (outlines), and suggested schedules for completion as useful during coursework as well as the internship semester during which edTPA was completed. EPPs are advised to compile resources such as supplementary materials explaining content-specific jargon and requirements, graphic organizers (thinking organizers), and schedules to support candidates who are preparing for and completing edTPA.

The significant amount of time necessary to complete edTPA also impacts both NES and NNES candidates and should be taken into account by EPPs when considering how they might best support their candidates. All candidates in the study identified the amount of time needed to

complete edTPA as a challenge. The timing of an institution's edTPA submission date may be a challenge for candidates, especially when this date occurs just a few weeks after starting an internship. Since Pearson provides several edTPA submission dates each semester, selecting a later date would allow more time for candidates to familiarize themselves with teaching before video recording or writing commentaries for edTPA. First-year residency candidates who are new to teaching may need additional time to get accustomed to a new school environment before starting preparation for edTPA. EPPs may want to consider offering multiple edTPA submission dates as options to candidates. Another recommendation is to reduce additional workload requirements during the portion of the internship that overlaps with edTPA preparation. Teacher preparation programs are encouraged to look critically at all course assignments and requirements to determine if they are necessary, or if they could possibly be removed or streamlined to reduce workload. To provide candidates with more time to complete the assessment, EPPs may also want to consider building in edTPA writing days, where candidates who are placed with CEs are permitted to take the day off from their internship experience and participate in structured writing time on campus. Candidates who complete edTPA in their own classrooms, and do not have an assigned CE, could also be invited to participate in weekend or evening writing groups, either on campus or via a web-based platform, such as Zoom.

The study also emphasized the importance of cooperating teachers or clinical educators who are familiar with edTPA, for both NES and NNEC candidates. Many cooperating teachers were reported to be unfamiliar with the edTPA jargon used in the edTPA rubrics, prompts, and handbooks. This was especially true for cooperating teachers who did not complete edTPA themselves. In the state where the study took place, edTPA became consequential in 2019. In most cases, cooperating teachers completed their teaching training before edTPA came into

existence or became consequential. As a result, candidates are often placed with cooperating teachers who lack knowledge of edTPA and its requirements. In the study, candidates consistently perceived their cooperating teacher's lack of knowledge of edTPA as a disadvantage, especially when cooperating teachers relied on their student teachers to inform them about edTPA requirements. EPPs may want to select cooperating teachers who completed edTPA or, alternatively, provide cooperating teachers with edTPA training before placing student teachers in their classrooms. Training for cooperating teachers may consist of virtual sessions in the evening or on campus orientations in the summer. Cooperating teachers may be better equipped to support student teachers when they are role models who have edTPA training and experience.

Perhaps the most beneficial support strategy, as perceived by all candidates, was the inclusion of edTPA practice tasks during coursework leading up to the internship. Instructors aligned assignments with edTPA expectations and introduced appropriate scaffolding before providing feedback on the practice tasks. In contrast with the actual edTPA, where instructor feedback is not acceptable, during these practice tasks, candidates may receive feedback from instructors on their performance. EPPs should strategically divide edTPA practice tasks among coursework with the expectation of instructor feedback as a support strategy.

The study's findings also offer multiple recommendations that may be of particular benefit to NNES candidates. For example, while all candidates in the study expressed struggles to understand edTPA rubric language, NNES candidates, in particular, reported misconceptions and misunderstandings related to language used in the edTPA rubrics, prompts, and glossary. To address this concern, EPPs should provide scaffolded materials such as thinking organizers for each of the three tasks, with the goal to explain "edTPA speak" in plain language. NNES

candidates may also benefit from the explicit teaching of terminology specific to edTPA during methods courses, seminars, or dedicated support sessions for NNES candidates.

Further speaking to the importance of quality CEs, the study also provided evidence that NNES candidates, in particular, may benefit from an experienced CE who provides an excellent role model. The study's findings supported the idea that NNES candidates who are unfamiliar with American K-12 schools, related cultural norms, and student-centered teaching styles struggled with edTPA requirements. With this in mind, CEs may serve to bridge cultural gaps between NNES candidates and American classrooms. As recommended by a faculty member, EPPs may want to consider "rely[ing] on the expertise of the [EPP's] professors in each respective field to identify and recommend the CEs with whom candidates should be placed for their internship" especially in cases when candidates are unfamiliar with U.S. schools. The study indicates that NNES candidates have a lack of knowledge of American K-12 students which may negatively impact their edTPA scores. In response to this shortcoming, EPPs may want to place NNES candidates with CEs who not only display best practices in teaching but are also able guide these candidates to gain knowledge of American schools. EPPs might also want to consider increasing the number of suggested clinical hours spent in American schools to gain greater familiarity with American students.

In addition to challenges related to a lack of familiarity with American schools and students, the study provided ample evidence that NNES candidates struggled with the writing requirements of edTPA. It is recommended that EPPs provide direct instruction to support NNES candidates as they navigate the commentary writing process. More specific writing support could be offered by writing consultants or tutors such as graduate students who have already

successfully passed edTPA. A campus writing center could also provide support as long as its tutors are familiar with the reflective writing requirements of the edTPA commentaries.

Peer support was also perceived as a strategy that was especially beneficial to NNES candidates. In this study, when instructor feedback on the actual edTPA portfolio assessment was not allowed, NNES candidates sought writing or proofreading support outside the institution. EPPs should consider employing writing consultants, such as graduate students who have already completed edTPA, are familiar with the reflective commentary writing as required by edTPA, and have experience working with candidates whose first language is a language other than English. The NNES candidates in the study who passed edTPA on their first attempt were proactive in their search for writing and proofreading support and sought the help of family members (often spouses or teenage children) or colleagues before tackling edTPA. Teacher training programs should consider implementing peer writing support. That said, the study's results suggested that peer support was perceived as more beneficial by NNES than NES candidates. In response, EPPs may want to offer support that is customized to each group's needs, such as optional peer writing support groups. NNES candidates recommended reaching out to former students who already completed edTPA, especially if those former students shared a language or culture with a current candidate. With this in mind, EPPs should consider keeping records of former students and note their linguistic and cultural backgrounds in order to make connections with or meet the needs of current students.

In addition to learning from practice edTPA tasks during coursework, NNES candidates may need more explicit and direct instruction about edTPA from their instructors. The study's results showed that, during coursework, NNES candidates may not have been aware of the relevance and potential benefit of instructional resources compared to NES candidates who were

better able to anticipate their purpose. One NNES candidate commented in her interview that she would have “kept all my textbook [sic] and then probably organized some of that” if she had known beforehand what edTPA preparation entailed. Instructors at EPPs should emphasize the direct connection of these resources and tools to the practice and actual edTPA instead of expecting candidates to do so without being directly instructed.

Limitations and Direction for Future Research

This study’s results provided an insight into an important association between first language status and second language teacher edTPA performance, perceptions, and preparation. While the findings are worthy of consideration, there are limitations to consider, and further research is needed. The study's limitations and some direction for additional research are described below.

The study involved teacher candidates in two content areas (WL and TESL) in one teacher education program at one university. While efforts were made to gather data from a large number of participants (120), future efforts should be made to gather data from a broader group of participants and from a wider geographic area. Related research might, for example, gather edTPA scores and perceptions on edTPA preparation from NES and NNES participants in additional content areas and at several universities. A related limitation would be the small number of program faculty who were interviewed for this study. Future studies may want to include the perspectives of university supervisors who supervise candidates during their placement. Data in the current study were not collected from university supervisors who also play a role in preparation of candidates and could offer a unique perspective on candidate preparation and support. In the study, university supervisor perspectives were not included because the researcher served as the university supervisor. In future related research it might be

useful to survey and interview program faculty at universities from a wider geographic area. Future related research might also include the perceptions of mentor teachers (also known as cooperating teachers or clinical educators). Interviewing participants' mentor teachers might have shed additional light on the disadvantages that several teacher candidates mentioned. Additionally, only 26 participants completed the Content-Specific Survey (see Appendix B) and candidates that struggled the most may not have completed it. Future studies may want to increase the sample size of survey participants.

The study investigated the relationship between first language status and edTPA performance. Another limitation to consider is that while language status may influence a candidate's performance, it must be acknowledged that not all NNES candidates are alike in all aspects, and there may be a variety of other influencing factors. NNES candidates in the study, for example, did not all have similar linguistic or cultural backgrounds. Additionally, prior to enrolling in a teacher licensure program, some candidates may have been better educated, spent more time living and working in the United States, or been more proactive about seeking out needed support while completing edTPA. Future studies may want to investigate edTPA performance, perceptions, and preparation of NNES candidates from similar linguistic, cultural, and educational backgrounds.

Another limitation specifically relates to the placement of teacher candidates during the internship. In the study, some participants had the added benefit of receiving the support of a cooperating teacher, whereas others completed the internship in their own classroom as residency teachers, and thus did not have this extra layer of support while completing edTPA. It could be hypothesized, for example, that whether or not a candidate was placed with a cooperating teacher may have greater influence on edTPA performance than first language

status. That said, the impact of the CE may be mitigated by the fact that CEs did not have edTPA experience and were therefore not able to provide edTPA support. Future research might take into account the influence of the mentoring teacher in the performance of NNES candidates.

The study looked at the association between edTPA performance and the consequential nature of the assessment. Results indicated that edTPA scores decreased after the assessment became consequential for state licensure but the study did not investigate the root cause of this finding. A decrease in scores might be related to more stringent scoring or less qualified candidates. Future research should investigate scoring over time as well as this decline in scores in some content areas. It should be noted that, after the WL assessment course was added during a program redesign in 2019, WL candidates performed better on Task 3 of the WL edTPA.

Finally, the unique nature of the participating EPP and its faculty need to be considered when interpreting the results. This study was conducted after the EPP had recently revised its teacher education program. The needs of NNES candidates were taken into account when making these revisions. In the General Exit Survey, NNES candidates reported feeling prepared for the edTPA assessment, possibly as a result of the program redesign. However, in the same survey, more than one fifth of NNES WL candidates identified identifying student assets as the most challenging aspect of edTPA, speaking to a possible cultural gap related to an unfamiliarity or misunderstanding when engaging with K-12 students in American schools. Further, the faculty involved in the participating WL and TESL programs had multiple years of experience preparing WL and TESL candidates to complete edTPA, including many NNES candidates. To guide and inform their instruction, these faculty members had also engaged in prior related research. Since not all EPPs may have the same degree of experience preparing WL and TESL

candidates to complete edTPA, nor may their faculty have the related research experience, the study's results cannot be generalized to all EPPs.

Conclusion

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to concurrently gather quantitative and qualitative data to investigate the association between first language status and second language teacher edTPA performance, perceptions, and preparation. The study's results suggest that the performance of NNES candidates may vary by their teaching assignment and related edTPA portfolio to complete. NNES candidates outperformed NES candidates on the WL edTPA, but there was greater variation among their edTPA scores. With respect to EAL candidates, the opposite was true; NES candidates scored higher than NNES candidates on the EAL edTPA. Related to candidates' perceptions of edTPA preparation, all candidates expressed concerns about the timing of the assessment and its time-consuming nature, challenges related to understanding rubric language, and the importance of CEs. NNES candidates' perceptions centered on their struggles with the writing requirements for edTPA and their lack of awareness of the assessment's expectations and its connections to coursework. Both candidates and faculty mentioned the benefits of practice edTPA tasks infused into coursework and content-specific seminars offered during the internship. The use of customized language support such as peer editing and the use of other writing resources (for example, outlines and thinking organizers) was reported by both groups to be especially beneficial for NNES candidates. The study's findings serve to inform teacher preparation programs as they strive to improve the edTPA preparation of all candidates, including those whose first language is not English.

References

- Adkins, A. (2016). The benefits of edTPA. *Educational Leadership*, 73, 55–58.
- Ahmed, K. (2019). Against the script with edTPA: Preservice teachers utilize performance assessment to teach outside scripted curriculum. *Urban Education*, 1-31.
- Almeida, F. (2018). Strategies to perform a mixed methods study. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 5(1), 137-150.
- American Association of College for Teacher Education (AACTE). (n.d.) *FAQ*. Retrieved from <http://edtpa.aacte.org/faq>
- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). (2022). *State edTPA policy overview*. Retrieved from https://edtpa.org/resource_item/StatePolicyOverview
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2020). *Use of target language in language teaching*. Retrieved from <https://www.actfl.org/resources/guiding-principles-language-learning/use-target-language-language-learning>
- Aragon, S. (2016). Teacher shortages: What we know. Teacher shortage series. *Education Commission of the States*. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED565893.pdf>
- Au, W. (2013). What's a nice test like you doing in a place like this. *Rethinking Schools*, 27(4), 22-27.
- Baecher, L., Artigliere, M., & Bruno, T. (2017). Leveraging the demands of edTPA to foster language instruction for English learners in content classrooms. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 7(1), 9.
- Bailey, A. L. (Ed.). (2007). *The language demands of school: Putting academic English to the test*. Yale University Press.

- Bastian, K., & Lys, D. (2016). *Initial findings from edTPA implementation in North Carolina*. Education Policy Initiative at Carolina. Retrieved from <https://publicpolicy.unc.edu/files/2016/10/Initial-Findings-from-edTPA-Implementation.pdf>
- Behizadeh, N., & Neely, A. (2018). Testing injustice: Examining the consequential validity of edTPA. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 51(3-4), 242-264.
- Behney, J. (2016). Perceived influence of cooperating teachers on edTPA performance. *Foreign Language Annals*, 49, 271–286.
- Bex, M. (2014, October/November). Make it comprehensible: Tools to transform your target language use. *The Language Educator*, 9(5), 48-49.
- Billington, B. (2012). *Analysis of TPA Task 2: What evidence does the teacher performance assessment reveal about science education teacher candidates' understanding of inquiry-based instruction?* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, Minneapolis.
- Bjork, C., & Epstein, I. (2016, July 31). The unintended consequences of edTPA. *Phi Delta Kappan Online*. Retrieved from <http://www.kappanonline.org/the-unintended-consequences-of-edtpa/>
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.
- Carter, J., & Lochte, H. (2017). *Teacher performance assessment and accountability reforms: The impacts of edTPA on teaching and schools*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan US.
- Cash, A., Putman, S. M., Polly, D., & Byker, E. J. (2019). Candidate and program characteristics associated with edTPA performance. *Action in Teacher Education*, 41(3), 229-248.

- Ceo-DiFrancesco, D. (2014, October/November). Keeping it in the target language: Lessons learned. *The Language Educator*, 9(5), 40-41.
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Chiu, S. (2014). edTPA: An assessment that reduces the quality of teacher education. *Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, 14(1), 28-30.
- Clayton, C. (2018). Policy meets practice in New York state: Understanding early edTPA implementation through preservice candidates' eyes. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 45(3), 97-125.
- Cole, L. (2018). *Differences in performance on a commercially available competency-based exam between traditionally and alternatively prepared teacher candidates: A causal comparative study*. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/2130928209/>
- Cowan, J., Goldhaber, D., Hayes, K., & Theobald, R. (2016). Missing elements in the discussion of teacher shortages. *Educational Researcher*, 45(8), 460-462.
- Coyne, I. T. (1997). Sampling in qualitative research. Purposeful and theoretical sampling; merging or clear boundaries?. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 26(3), 623-630.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cronenberg, S., Harrison, D., Korson, S., Jones, A., Murray-Everett, N. C., Parrish, M., & Johnston-Parsons, M. (2016). Trouble with the edTPA: Lessons learned from a narrative self-study. *Journal of Inquiry and Action in Education*, 8(1), 109-134.

- Cross, F. (2016). Teacher shortage areas nationwide listing: 1990-1991 through 2016-2017. *United States Department of Education*. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oep/pol/tsa.pdf>
- Cuthrell, K., Lys, D., Fogarty, E., & Dobson, E. (2016). Using edTPA data to improve programs. In D. Polly (Ed.), *Evaluating teacher education programs through performance-based assessments* (pp.67-79). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.
- Darling-Hammond, L., LaFors, J., & Snyder, J. (2001). Educating teachers for California's future. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 28(1), 9–55.
- Denton, D. W. (2013). Responding to edTPA: Transforming practice or applying shortcuts? *AILACTE Journal*, 10,19-36.
- Dover, A., & Schultz, B. (2016). Troubling the edTPA: Illusions of objectivity and rigor. *The Educational Forum*, 80(1), 95–106.
- ETS. (n.d.). *About the PPAT (for test takers)*. Retrieved from <https://www.ets.org/ppa/test-takers/teachers/about>
- Ezzy, D. (2002). *Qualitative analysis: Practice and innovation*. London: Routledge.
- Ferguson, R. (1998). Teachers' perceptions and expectations and the Black-White test score gap. In C. Jencks and M. Phillips (Eds.), *The Black-White test score gap* (pp. 273-317). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Glaser, B. G. (1992). *Basics of grounded theory: Emergence vs. forcing*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

- Goldhaber, D. & Brewer, D. J. (2000). Does teacher certification matter? High school teacher certification status and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 22(2), 129-145.
- Goldhaber, D., Cowan, J., & Theobald, R. (2017). Evaluating prospective teachers: Testing the predictive validity of the edTPA. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 68, 377–393.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487117702582>
- Greenblatt, D., & O’Hara, K. E. (2015). Buyer beware: Lessons learned from edTPA implementation in New York State. *The NEA Higher Education Journal*, 42, 57-67.
- Greene, J. (2006). Toward a methodology of mixed methods social inquiry. *Research in the Schools*, 13(1), 93-98.
- Greene, J., Caracelli, V., & Graham, W. (1989). Toward a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation designs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11(3), 255-274.
- Hébert, C. (2017). What do we really know about the edTPA? Research, PACT, and packaging a local teacher performance assessment for national use. *Educational Forum*, 81(1), 68–82.
- Hildebrandt, S. A., & Swanson, P. (2014). World language teacher candidate performance on edTPA: An exploratory study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 47(4), 576-591.
- Hildebrandt, S. A., & Swanson, P. (2016). *Understanding the World Language edTPA*.
Charlotte: IAP.
- Hildebrandt, S. A., & Swanson, P. (2019). The control, content, and consequences of edTPA: World language teacher educators’ perceptions. *Foreign Language Annals*, 52(3), 670-686.
- Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow’s teachers: A report of the Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

- Jordan, A., & Hawley, T. (2016). By the elite, for the vulnerable: The edTPA, academic oppression, and the battle to definite good teaching. *Teachers College Record*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/296699333_By_the_Elite_For_the_Vulnerable_The_edTPA_Academic_Oppression_and_the_Battle_to_Define_Good_Teaching
- Jourdain, S. (2018). Native/heritage Spanish speakers and edTPA. In P. Swanson & S. A. Hildebrandt (Eds.), *Researching edTPA promises and problems: Perspectives from English as an Additional Language, English Language Arts, and World Language Teacher Education* (pp. 67-86). Charlotte: IAP.
- Kissau, S., & Algozzine, B. (2017). Effective foreign language teaching: Broadening the concept of content knowledge. *Foreign Language Annals*, 50(1), 114–134.
- Kissau, S., Davin, K., & Wang, C. (2019). Aspiring world language teachers: Their influences, perceptions, and commitment to teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 78, 174–182.
- Kleyn, T., López, D., & Makar, C. (2015) What about bilingualism? A critical reflection on the edTPA with teachers of emergent bilinguals. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 38(1), 88-106
- Kuranishi, A., & Oyler, C. (2017). I failed the edTPA. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 40(4), 299-313.
- Lachance, J., & Kissau, S. (2018). Language teaching and language learning: Supporting candidates' readiness for edTPA. In P. Swanson & S. A. Hildebrandt (Eds.), *Researching edTPA promises and problems: Perspectives from English as an Additional Language, English Language Arts, and World Language Teacher Education* (pp. 163-163). Charlotte: IAP.

- Lachuk, A., & Koellner, K. (2015). Performance-based assessment for certification: Insights from edTPA implementation. *Language Arts, 93*, 84-95.
- Ledwell, K., & Oyler, C. (2016). Unstandardized responses to a “standardized” test: The edTPA as gatekeeper and curriculum change agent. *Journal of Teacher Education, 67*, 120-134.
- Lys, D., L’Esperance, M., Dobson, E., & Bullock, A. (2014). Large-scale implementation of the edTPA: Reflections upon institutional change in action. *Current Issues in Education, 17*(3), 1-12.
- Micek, T. A. (2017). Completing edTPA: TESOL candidate performance and reflection. *Issues in Teacher Education, 26*(1), 85.
- 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*(1), 37-59.
- National Association for Multicultural Education. (2014). Position statement on the edTPA. Retrieved from www.nameorg.org
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2016). *Redesigning National Board Certification: The advancement of accomplished teaching*. National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2020). *Back to School Statistics*. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=372>
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. A report to the nation and the Secretary of Education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York: Author.

- NCForum. (2021). *Demystifying the pathways to full teacher licensure: How do I become a teacher in North Carolina?* Public School Forum of North Carolina. Retrieved from <https://www.ncforum.org/demystifying-the-pathways-to-full-teacher-licensure-how-do-i-become-a-teacher-in-north-carolina/>
- North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (n.d.). *Global Education website*. Retrieved from <https://www.dpi.nc.gov/districts-schools/classroom-resources/k-12-standards-curriculum-and-instruction/programs-and-initiatives/global-education>
- Okraski, C., & Kissau, S. (2018). Impact of content-specific seminars on candidate edTPA preparation and performance. *Foreign Language Annals, 51*, 685-705.
- Olsen, M. K., & Barske, T. (2018). Specific challenges faced by world language student teachers, cooperating teachers, and program coordinators in development of edTPA portfolios. In P. Swanson & S. A. Hildebrandt (Eds.), *Researching edTPA promises and problems: Perspectives from English as an additional language, English language arts, and world language teacher education* (pp. 273-293). Charlotte, NC: IAP.
- Olson, J. D., & Rao, A. B. (2017). Adopting the edTPA as a high-stakes assessment: Resistance, advocacy, and reflection in Illinois. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 29*(4), 377-402.
- Papay, J., Bacher-Hicks, A., Page, L., & Marinell, W. (2018, January 9). America's teacher shortage can't be solved by hiring more unqualified teachers. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/posteverything/wp/2018/01/09/americas-teacher-shortage-cant-be-solved-by-hiring-more-unqualified-teachers/?utm_term=.55285fb833b6

- Parker, F. (1993). *Reforming U.S. teacher education in the 1990s*. (ERIC Report No. ED 358 084). Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED358084.pdf>
- Pasternak, M., & Bailey, K. M. (2004). Preparing nonnative and native English-speaking teachers: Issues of professionalism and proficiency. In L. Kahmi-Stein (Ed.) *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English-speaking professionals*, 155-175. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Pearson Education. (2020). *edTPA scorer experience qualifications*. Retrieved from <https://survey.vovici.com/se.ashx>
- Pecheone, R., & Chung, R. (2006). Evidence in teacher education: The Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57(1), 22–36.
- Petchauer, E., Bowe, A., & Wilson, J. (2018). Winter is coming: Forecasting the impact of edTPA on Black teachers and teachers of color. *The Urban Review*, 50(2), 323–343.
- Picower, B., & Marshall, A. (2017). “Run like hell” to “look before you leap”: Teacher educators’ responses to preparing teachers for diversity and social justice in the wake of edTPA. In J. H. Carter & H. A. Lochte (Eds.), *Teacher performance assessment and accountability reforms* (pp.189-212). New York: Palgrave MacMillian.
- Potter, D. (2020). (In)visible power: A critical policy analysis of edTPA. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 122(2), 101-114.
- Redding, C. (2019). A teacher like me: A review of the effect of student–teacher racial/ethnic matching on teacher perceptions of students and student academic and behavioral outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 89(4), 499-535.

- Russell, V., & Davidson Devall, K. (2016). An examination of the edTPA portfolio assessment and other measures of teacher preparation and readiness. *Foreign Language Annals, 49*(3), 479-501.
- Russell, V., & Davidson, K. (2018). Native and non-native English speaker perceptions of the World Language edTPA. In P. Swanson & S. A. Hildebrandt (Eds.), *Researching edTPA Promises and Problems: Perspectives from English as an Additional Language, English Language Arts, and World Language Teacher Education* (pp. 23-48). Charlotte, NC: IAP.
- Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Sato, M. (2014). What is the underlying conception of teaching of the edTPA? *Journal of Teacher Education, 65*, 421-434.
- Sato, M., Wei, R., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2008). Improving teachers' assessment practices through professional development: The case of National Board Certification. *American Educational Research Journal, 45*(3), 669–700.
- Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity. (2021). *Educative assessment & meaningful support: 2019 edTPA administrative report*. Retrieved from https://edtpa.org/resource_item/2019AR
- Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE). (2019). *Making good choices: Candidate support resource*. Retrieved from <https://www.edtpa.com/Content/Docs/edTPAMGC.pdf>
- Strauss, R. P., & Sawyer, E. A. (1986). Some new evidence on teacher and student competencies. *Economics of Education Review, 5*(1), 41-48.

- Sutcher, L., Darling-Hammond, L., & Carver-Thomas, D. (2019). Understanding teacher shortages: An analysis of teacher supply and demand in the United States. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 27(35), 1-35.
- Swanson, P., & Goulette, E. (2018). The criticality of the integrated performance assessment in the World Language edTPA. In P. Swanson & S. Hildebrandt (Eds.), *Researching edTPA promises and problems. Perspectives from English as an Additional Language, English Language Arts, and World Language teacher education* (pp. 201-220). Charlotte: IAP.
- Swanson, P. & Hildebrandt, S. (2017). Communicative learning outcomes and World Language edTPA: Characteristics of high-scoring portfolios. *Hispania*, 100(3), 331–347.
- Swanson, P., & Mason, S. (2018). The world language teacher shortage: Taking a new direction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 51(1), 251-262.
- Tashakkori, A., & Creswell, J. (2007). Editorial: The new era of mixed methods. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1, 3-7.
- Task Force on Global Education. (2019). *Preparing students for the world: Final report of the State Board of Education's Task Force on Global Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.dpi.nc.gov/media/10/open>
- Tigert, J. M., Kidwell, T., Budde, C. M., Guzman, N. L., Lawyer, M., & Peercy, M. M. (2018). “It took my knowledge to the limits”: The edTPA teacher performance assessment and its implications for TESOL. *Teacher Learning and Professional Development*, 3(1), 19-38.
- Troyan, F. J., & Kaplan, C. S. (2015). The functions of reflection in high-stakes assessment of world language teacher candidates. *Foreign Language Annals*, 48(3), 372-393.
- Turnbull, M., & Arnett, K. (2002). Teachers' uses of the target and first languages in second and foreign language classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 204-218.

- United States Department of Education. (2016). *Prevalence of teachers without full state certification and variation across schools and states*. Policy and Program Studies Service Report. Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/teaching/teachers-without-certification/report.pdf>
- United States Department of Education Office of Postsecondary Education. (2017). *Teacher shortage areas nationwide listings 1990-1991 through 2017-2018*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Wesely, P., Rissler, S., & DeVault, A. (2018). Revising and creating formative assessments of teacher candidates in preparation for the World Language edTPA. In P. Swanson & S. A. Hildebrandt (Eds.), *Researching edTPA promises and problems: Perspectives from English as an Additional Language, English Language Arts, and World Language Teacher Education* (pp. 119-142). Charlotte: IAP.
- Whittaker, A., Pecheone, R., & Stansbury, K. (2018). Fulfilling our educative mission: A response to edTPA critique. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 26(30), 1-15.
- Williams III, J. A., Hart, L. C., & Algozzine, B. (2019). Perception vs. reality: edTPA perceptions and performance for teacher candidates of color and White candidates. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 83, 120-133.

APPENDIX A: GENERAL EXIT SURVEY

I. Demographics:

1. Please select your gender: Male Female

2. Please select your ethnicity:

African American	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Asian	Hispanic
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races	Prefer not to respond

3. Please select your age range:

17-22	23-28	29-34	35-40	41-46	47-52	53 or greater
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	---------------

4. Please select your primary content area program for licensure.

Art Education (K-12)	Biology Education (9-12)	Birth Kindergarten (B-K)	Chemistry Education (9-12)	Comprehensive Science (9-12)
Dance Education (K-12)	Earth Science Education (9-12)	Elementary Education (K-6)	Elementary Education (K-6) + Special Education (K-12) (Dual)	English Education (9-12)
French Education (K-12)	German Education (K-12)	Mathematics Education (9-12)	Middle Grade English Language Arts (6-9)	Middle Grades Mathematics (6-9)
Middle Grades	Middle Grades	Music	Physics	Spanish

Science (6-9)	Social Studies (6-9)	Education (K-12)	Education (9-12)	Education (K-12)
Special Education: Adapted Curriculum (K-12)	Special Education: General Curriculum (K-12)	Social Studies Education (9-12)	Theatre Education (K-12)	Teaching English as a Second Language (K-12)

5. What level of candidate are you? Undergraduate Graduate
6. Which edTPA Product did you complete this semester?

Early Childhood (B-K)	Elementary Education - Literacy Only (Tasks 1-3)	Elementary Education Combination (Tasks 1-4)	English as an Additional Language
K-12 Performing Arts	Middle Childhood (Middle Grades) Language Arts	Middle Childhood (Middle Grades) Mathematics	Middle Childhood (Middle Grades) Science
Middle Childhood (Middle Grades) Social Studies	Secondary English Language Arts	Secondary Mathematics	Secondary Science
Secondary Social Studies	Special Education	Visual Art	World Language

7. Select your track of study:

Residency Teacher (Not Teach for America)	Teach for America Residency Teacher	Graduate Certificate Student Teacher
Graduate Certificate who is a currently employed Teacher Assistant	Undergraduate - Yearlong Intern	Undergraduate - single semester student teacher only

8. Lateral entry teacher please enter your years of experience: (If you are not lateral entry, please skip this question)

What grade level?	Overall number of years
-------------------	-------------------------

II. Perception

1. *For each of the tasks, rate your experience in completing the Task.

Response Legend: 1 = Very Challenging; 2 = Challenging; 3 = Easy; 4 = Very Easy

	1	2	3	4
Task 1 (Planning)				
Task 2 (Implementation of Instruction)				
Task 3 (Assessment and Feedback)				

[Removed question for Elementary Candidates]

2. Pick the THREE most challenging aspects of the edTPA project for you to complete.

Identifying student assets	Language Function	Vocabulary	Discourse	Syntax
Identifying Environment	Engaged Learning	Deeper Thinking of Students	Making Connections between practice and research/theory	Giving feedback
Assessing whole group	Assessing three students	Giving reflections		

3. Rate your agreement with each of the following:

Response Legend: 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree

	1	2	3	4
Completing edTPA will improve my performance as a classroom teacher.				
The content of edTPA reflects effective teaching practices.				
The content of edTPA reflects what I observed in at least one of my cooperating teacher/mentor teacher classrooms.				

III. Process

1. Rate your agreement with each of the following:

Response Legend: 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree

	1	2	3	4
The time needed to complete the final edTPA project during my student teaching semester was reasonable.				

2. Select the time period that most accurately reflects when you completed edTPA

I followed the recommended target deadlines staggered throughout the semester.
One month prior to submission date
Two weeks prior to submission date
Less than one week prior to submission date

3. I received feedback on my final edTPA project prior to submission from the following:

(check all that apply)

I received no feedback prior to submission	Peer(s)	Writing Center	Cooperating Teacher
University Supervisor	UNC Charlotte Faculty during support workshops	Other UNC Charlotte Faculty (not during support workshops)	

IV. Preparation

4. Rate your agreement with each of the following:

Response Legend: 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree

	1	2	3	4
My university coursework prepared me to successfully complete Task 1 of edTPA.				
My university coursework prepared me to successfully complete Task 2 of edTPA.				
My university coursework prepared me to successfully complete Task 3 of edTPA.				

5. To what extent did you have opportunities to practice edTPA tasks, knowledge, and skills prior to student teaching? Check all that apply.

I have uploaded a practice task for all edTPA tasks in my handbook.	I have uploaded at least one practice task.	I have practiced edTPA skills in at least one assignment.	I have included edTPA knowledge (e.g., academic language demands)
---	---	---	---

			in at least one assignment.
I have practiced digitally recording myself teaching.	I have reviewed video clips of myself teaching.	I have practiced Strategically selecting video clips of myself that match rubric requirements.	I have completed written analyses of my teaching.
I have practiced analyzing whole class assessment data.	I have practiced analyzing individual student assessment data.	I have practiced giving individual student feedback.	I have planned a learning segment focused on my content area.

6. How many edTPA support sessions did you attend?

0	1	2	3	4
5	6	7	All that were provided	None that were provided

7. Which of the following have you utilized to complete edTPA? (check all that apply)

edTPA COED Resource Canvas Page	www.edTPA.com	Video cameras/ equipment from the library	IT help	The Writing Center
--	---------------	---	---------	-----------------------

8. In terms of your internship placement, did any requirements by your district, school or clinical teacher influence your completion of the edTPA (in either a positive or negative way)? Explain.

9. If you could provide advice to the next group who will be completing edTPA, what advice would you give?

10. Feel free to provide any additional comments about your experiences with edTPA or suggestions on how better to prepare student teachers for the experience.

APPENDIX B: CONTENT-SPECIFIC SURVEY

Survey for World Language and ESL Teacher Candidates

Please answer the following questions using a 1-5 scale, as related to the edTPA seminars:

1=strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=neutral 4=agree 5=strongly agree

With respect to Planning for Instruction (Task 1), my seminars prepared me for:

1. lesson planning for understanding in my content area
2. planning to support varied student learning needs
3. using knowledge of students to inform teaching and learning in my content area
4. identifying and supporting language demands
5. planning assessments to monitor and support student learning in my content area

With respect to Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning (Task 2), my seminars prepared me for:

6. demonstrating a positive learning environment
7. engaging students in learning in my content area
8. deepening student learning in my content area
9. using evidence from content-specific pedagogy to support students
10. analyzing teacher effectiveness
11. analyzing student learning in my content area

With respect to Assessing Student Learning (Task 3), my seminars prepared me for:

12. collecting and analyzing student assessment data in my content area
13. providing feedback (to students) to guide learning in my content area
14. supporting focus students to understand and using feedback to guide their further learning
15. analyzing students' content-specific language use and content-specific learning
16. using assessment to inform instruction in my content area

Please answer the following questions:

17. What were the most helpful aspects of the edTPA seminars?
18. What are your suggestions for improving edTPA seminars?
19. What else could the College of Education do to better support teacher candidates in the future?

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR TEACHER CANDIDATES

1. Describe your experience with edTPA practice tasks during coursework prior to FLED/TESL 6470?
2. What did you find most challenging about edTPA?
3. What could your professors do to increase your success on edTPA?
4. Please describe the steps that you took to get started on the edTPA during this semester.
5. Describe the strategies or steps you used to help you to understand the edTPA rubric language and meaning.
6. How did you go about answering the prompt for each rubric in the commentary? How did you start the work on the commentary?
7. What types of support did you use when completing edTPA? Which types of support were the most helpful? Which types of support were the least helpful?
8. If you were given the opportunity to re-do edTPA, what would you do differently the next time?
9. What advice would you give to others who are planning to complete edTPA?
10. (for non-native English speakers only) To what extent do you feel that being a non-native speaker of English impacted your performance on edTPA?

APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR PROGRAM FACULTY

1. What do you do to support students with edTPA completion?
2. Describe the struggles that your non-native speaking English candidates experienced when completing or preparing to complete edTPA. Were those struggles also experienced by native speakers? Explain.
3. What steps did you take to provide support to teacher candidates whose first language was a language other than English?
4. Which support strategies were most successful as you supported teacher candidates whose first language was a language other than English?
5. How did you modify instruction to meet the needs of candidates whose first language was a language other than English?
6. In which areas is there still a need for further or additional support?
7. What recommendations might you have for other faculty who are tasked with supporting non-native speakers of English in the completion of edTPA?

APPENDIX E: IRB APPROVAL



To: Cornelia Okraski
 Middle Grades, Secondary & K-12

From: Office of Research Protections and Integrity

Approval Date: 18-Nov-2021

RE: Notice of Approval of Exemption

Exemption Category: 2~4

Study #: IRB-22-0411

Study Title: The association between first language status and second language teacher edTPA performance, perceptions, and preparation.

This submission has been reviewed by the Office of Research Protections and Integrity (ORPI) and was determined to meet the Exempt category cited above under 45 CFR 46.104(d). This determination has no expiration or end date and is not subject to an annual continuing review. However, you are required to obtain IRB approval for all changes to any aspect of this study before they can be implemented.

Important Information:

1. The University requires face coverings (masks) in all indoor spaces on campus, regardless of vaccination status.
2. The updates to safety mandates apply to North Carolina only. Researchers conducting HSR activities in locations outside of North Carolina must continue to adhere to local and state requirements where the research is being conducted.
3. Face coverings (masks) are still required in healthcare settings, public transportation, and daycares as well as many North Carolina schools. Researchers conducting HSR activities in these settings must continue to adhere to face coving requirements.
4. In addition, some North Carolina counties have additional requirements that researchers must follow.
5. Organizations, institutions, agencies, businesses, etc. may have further site-specific requirements such as continuing to have a mask requirement, or limiting access, and/or physical distancing. Researchers must adhere to all requirements mandated by the study site.

Your approved consent forms (if applicable) and other documents are available online at [Submission Page](#).

Investigator's Responsibilities: