This is the author's pre-print manuscript as submitted for refereeing and publication. The penultimate, refereed, publisher-formatted PDF may be available through the journal web site or your college and university library.

(Relatively) Smooth Sailing: How a Large State University Successfully Adopted the PACT Teaching Event

Julie Gainsburg and Bonnie Ericson

Manuscript Citation

The following citation may be used to reference this manuscript:

Gainsburg, J.; Ericson, B. (2015) (Relatively) Smooth Sailing: How a Large State University Successfully Adopted the PACT Teaching Event
Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.csun.edu>

Published Version Information

Citation: Gainsburg, J.; Ericson, B. (2015) (Relatively) Smooth Sailing: How a Large State University Successfully Adopted the PACT Teaching Event, *The New Educator*, 11:1, 24-36.

Copyright: Copyright © Taylor and Francis

Digital Object Identifier (DOI): 10.1080/1547688X.2015.989769

This item was retrieved from CSUN ScholarWorks, the open-access, institutional repository of California State University, Northridge. <http://scholarworks.csun.edu>

RUNNING HEAD: (Relatively) Smooth Sailing

(Relatively) Smooth Sailing: How a Large State University
Successfully Adopted the PACT Teaching Event

Julie Gainsburg, Associate Professor, PACT Coordinator

julie.gainsburg@csun.edu

(818) 677-6155

Bonnie Ericson, Professor

bericson@csun.edu

(818) 677-2576

Fax (818) 677-2582

Department of Secondary Education

Michael D. Eisner College of Education

California State University, Northridge

**(Relatively) Smooth Sailing: How a Large State University
Successfully Adopted the PACT Teaching Event**

ABSTRACT

In this article, the PACT Coordinator and [former](#) Department Chair of the Secondary Education Department at a large state university describe how the PACT Teaching Event was introduced, piloted, and implemented in their department. Despite the size and complexity of this department, PACT implementation went relatively smoothly, with widespread and positive participation by fulltime and part-time faculty. The authors explain the successful implementation, drawing on data from faculty focus groups and campus leaders. The authors give recommendations for large-scale credential programs considering implementing a high-stakes teacher-performance assessment.

INTRODUCTION

California State University, Northridge (CSUN), a campus with 36,000 students from diverse backgrounds, states in its general information materials that “...it is a national leader in preparing K-12 teachers and first generation college students for graduate studies.” Additionally, faculty are expected to join in “a commitment to active learning, to the assessment of learning outcomes, and to multiple pathways that enable students to graduate.” Such statements illustrate the context of the work in a large single-subject teacher-certification program and provide background for the following narrative of the adoption of a high-stakes exit assessment, the PACT Teaching Event, the analysis of why its implementation appears to have been largely successful, and suggestions for other programs considering adopting similar assessments.

How We Came to PACT: A Teacher-Preparation Assessment History

The Department of Secondary Education (SED) faculty at CSUN have a long history of collaborating with one another, with colleagues across campus, and with secondary-school partners, a value reflected even in hiring. The criteria when selecting tenure-line or adjunct faculty include strong secondary teaching and collaboration experience. So, in 2002, when new California legislation (SB 2042) required significant modifications to credential programs, SED faculty worked together and actively sought input from other campus departments and focus groups of area teachers and principals.

SB 2042 established 13 Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) – professional standards for new teachers – and required credential programs to institute a Teacher Performance Assessment to determine that each candidate has met the TPEs (see Chapter 1 of this issue). However, not long after the passing of SB2042 state funding to support a valid and reliable assessment was delayed and thus, so was the implementation of this aspect of the legislation. The

moratorium of SB2042 permitted the SED to develop the Professional Teaching Portfolio (PTP), an exit assessment that required candidates to select from their courses and field experiences artifacts that aligned with TPEs, and augment them with written descriptions, analyses, and reflections. When the hard-copy PTPs were submitted near the end of a semester, SED faculty, including student-teacher/intern supervisors, participated in one of the four or five half-day training and scoring sessions, without compensation. Results were collected and analyzed by the Department Chair and outcomes were then reported to SED faculty and other groups. These reports summarized average scores, as well as percentages of PTPs that passed, needed re-writing, or failed, by subject area and program pathway, as well as overall. Outcomes were used to engage faculty in discussions about the program quality and ways to make improvements to course assignments and field experiences.

At about the same time as the development and implementation of the PTP, CSUN's selection for participation in the Carnegie-funded *Teachers for a New Era* initiative led to the development of an online Data Warehouse that collected PTP, student-teacher evaluation, and various survey outcomes, and a practice of evidence-based decision making began. Thus, by 2007, when notified that SB 2042 would be fully enacted by Fall 2008, faculty were well aware of the shortcomings of the Professional Teaching Portfolio. It served the SED well, and there was certainly trepidation related to the time and cost of a more reliable, unbiased, and valid Teacher Performance Assessment, but the faculty realized this was an opportunity to adopt a more rigorous and meaningful assessment.

With the deadline for a decision fast approaching, faculty from elementary and secondary education were invited by the Associate Dean of the College of Education to a full-day workshop to learn about the two state-endorsed available Teacher Performance Assessment options; the Cal

Teacher Performance Assessment and the PACT, as well as a few online submission systems for collecting and scoring TPAs. Following several department meetings and meetings in the College's Curriculum and Assessment Committee, to discuss each option for the TPA, CSUN decided to pilot the PACT. The decision was made largely because of a consensus that the PACT Teaching Event more closely reflected the university's and faculty's program and teacher-preparation values.

The SED Credential Committee was charged with the task of planning the implementation. This committee, comprising nearly half of the department and representing varied subject areas and credential pathways, created a two-year schedule and system of piloting and rolling out the PACT Teaching Event in the final student-teaching/intern experience, supported by course assignments and a practice version of the Teaching Event in the initial student-teaching assignment. The committee also recommended that the program focus initially on the Teaching Event and postpone the implementation of the Embedded Signature Assignments (see Chapter 1 of this issue). The piloting plan was approved by the entire department and a PACT Coordinator was selected to oversee implementation.

The first candidates to complete the Teaching Event, in Fall 2007, were in the mathematics student-teaching/intern seminar. These candidates were followed gradually over the next year and a half by candidates in English, science, and social sciences seminars, as well as seminars in lower-incidence subjects such as art and music.

To prepare for scoring of the PACT TE one faculty member from each of the major subjects attended a centralized training of trainers to then return and train his or her colleagues in scoring. As new subject-area seminars first implemented the Teaching Event, faculty with earlier experience shared curriculum and advice, and the PACT Coordinator provided support.

Where We Are Today

Beginning in 2009, all candidates in the secondary and elementary credential programs have completed the PACT Teaching Event. The Department of Secondary Education scores between 100 and 200 Teaching Events annually, distributed across about ten content areas, and submitted via a commercial online platform. Candidates accomplish the Teaching Event entirely in their second (and last) semester of student teaching, when they have primary teaching responsibility for three class periods.

To prepare secondary-education candidates for the Teaching Event, a “Preliminary Teaching Event” (PTE), was created to be completed in the first semester of student teaching. The PTE is identical to the Teaching Event but in a condensed version: The candidate plans, teaches, and analyzes a single lesson rather than a week-long unit. The PTE familiarizes the candidate with the writing prompts and expectations of the Teaching Event and is a vehicle for individual feedback, which does not occur with the PACT Teaching Event. The PTE is not scored—the PACT rubrics and benchmarks are invalid for such a brief evidence set—but a PACT-calibrated scorer writes detailed critique and suggestions to help prepare the candidate for the writing of the “real” Teaching Event.

Student teachers concurrently enroll in a subject-specific seminar, for which faculty members or supervisors serve as instructors, and the writing of the Teaching Event and PTE is supported mainly in these accompanying seminars. Adding Teaching Event support to the existing seminars was one of the most challenging parts of adoption: instructors indicated that the PACT and Preliminary Teaching Events “colonized” the seminar agenda and crowded out other critical components of student-teaching support. Our response to this challenge was to increase the final seminar by one unit so that more time was available in these seminar meetings.

Department faculty and staff involvement in PACT is now widespread. Ten out of 14 SED faculty members, three faculty members from arts and sciences departments, and 20 out of 30 part-time instructors and supervisors score Teaching Events and comment on PTEs for the department (some part-time faculty teach in area schools and are unavailable for the two-day scorer training.) Regardless of their position with the university, scorers earn a stipend for scoring each Teaching Event that is commensurate with what other campuses pay and a smaller stipend for commenting on a PTE. The scorers normally score about four Teaching Events per semester, though this ranges widely across subjects. Many of the scorers have also scored at other universities in need of scorers.

Two department faculty members, three members of other departments, and three part-time instructors lead the student-teaching seminars that guide candidates through the writing of the Teaching Event or PTE. All department faculty members have made course modifications in order to better prepare candidates for the Teaching Event. After the first year of implementation, the need for a dedicated PACT Coordinator was recognized. One faculty member was released halftime to serve in this role, which includes guiding seminar instructors through coaching candidates, assigning and monitoring scoring, recordkeeping, assisting instructors and students with the electronic platform, and conducting remediation meetings with candidates who do not pass the Teaching Event.

Adding such a major initiative to the program was not easy, and the course content and methods of PACT support for candidates continues to change and enhance in response to what is learned each year. However, considering the overhaul of program features, course work and candidate support, the journey has been mainly positive, without significant disruption or trauma,

and virtually all faculty and staff feel that the changes we have made in response to PACT have improved the program.

How was this relatively smooth transition accomplished? How did we solicit and maintain such widespread and willing participation? What advice might we give other campuses on the verge of implementing a major performance assessment like the PACT Teaching Event?

To answer these questions, we conducted focus groups of faculty and staff members who serve as seminar instructors and/or scorers. Many of these also teach credential courses that have been revised to support the Teaching Event. The questions were designed to elicit ideas and stories about becoming involved with Teaching Events and PTEs, the support they receive and wish to receive, the impact of these assessments on the program, and their explanation for the positive and widespread participation we enjoy. Because the Dean of the College of Education and the University Provost have been instrumental in the implementation of the PACT Teaching Event, they were also interviewed to determine what they saw as key leadership moves that contributed to the overall success with PACT. In the remainder of this article, the findings from this inquiry are discussed.

EXPLAINING A SMOOTH AND HIGH-PARTICIPATION IMPLEMENTATION

An Institutional Culture of Assessment Scholarship

Instructors and students may not be aware of the impact of the broader campus culture on day-to-day PACT-oriented practices—indeed, this was not raised in the focus groups. Yet it is clear that campus culture has played a major role in the smooth introduction and implementation of the PACT Teaching Event. Due in large part to the leadership of the Provost, the entire campus has been focused on performance-based assessments for the past [ten](#) years. All departments have been required to identify Student Learning Outcomes for every program,

delineate how these outcomes will be measured, and collect evidence of their degree of success in bringing these outcomes about. The Teaching Event is only one of many major assessments used in the College of Education, but the Provost and Dean have recognized it as exemplary. Thus, they have made special efforts to allocate funding for the Teaching Event —funding that has promoted or enabled the involvement of fulltime faculty. One example is the halftime release of a dedicated departmental PACT Coordinator, an SED faculty member with experience teaching credential courses, supervising student teachers, and coaching the Teaching Event and PTE in the student-teaching seminars. Instructors and scorers in the focus groups unanimously attributed much of the success with PACT to having a PACT Coordinator who handles the bulk of the logistics, recordkeeping, and training and serves as the conduit for new information from PACT Central. This frees up department members to concentrate on “PACT content”: building candidates’ teaching and analytic competencies and scoring accurately. Another example is the use of college funds to send faculty to the annual PACT Implementation Conference, which faculty have found highly valuable for broadening their understanding of this performance assessment and learning new ways to prepare candidates for it. And of critical importance, the College’s Instructional Technology Department offers dozens of hours of support each semester, in the form of video-conversion demonstration sessions for candidates, assistance in computer labs, and the purchase of video conversion software. With additional support from the PACT Coordinator regarding the online platform, we have virtually off-loaded the responsibility of having to know and teach the technological aspects of the Teaching Event from seminar instructors.

The Dean and Provost thoroughly familiarized themselves with PACT, so that they could engage in conversation about it with sophistication, especially when lobbying for funding or

giving motivational talks on campus. Knowing that PACT is not just “on the radar” of campus leaders, but seeing that it’s held in high regard and is well supported by them, is a significant morale booster for the faculty and staff. Involving the entire campus in designing and adopting new, more rigorous, performance-based assessments has helped make the transition to the PACT program a smooth one. Rather than feeling that the teaching-credential programs had been targeted as an extra burden, we took comfort in knowing colleagues across campus were all in the same boat.

In their interviews, both the Dean and Provost expressed the recognition and concern that department-wide implementation of high-stakes performance assessments requires a considerable time investment from faculty, especially in the area of calibrating the expectations, formally, for scorers, and informally, to understand performance levels we should aim for in the courses, achieving what the Provost calls “intellectual consistency.” Thus, these leaders have gone beyond fairly compensating faculty and staff for PACT work; they have strategically allocated resources to elevate the status of PACT, signaling and executing the idea that work on performance assessment can constitute serious scholarship, not merely program administration. As the Provost explained:

If the assessment is not viable as scholarship, then why are we doing it?... I think for faculty who are participating in it, as designers, as implementers, as participants, it provides a wonderful set of occasions for scholarly opportunities.... If we’re not prepared to reward it [as scholarship], then we’re not going to get good work, because people won’t do it.... If you don’t do that, it becomes a vehicle of the part-time people and the institution research office. And then it doesn’t become part of the culture of the campus.

The Dean echoed the idea that work on PACT was an intellectual endeavor, when he stressed the importance of “Ensuring that the resources are in place to ‘ramp up’ a shared understanding of PACT, including the ability to provide necessary professional development to faculty.”

The notion of work on performance assessment as scholarship was not new at CSUN. Receiving the five-year, *Teachers for a New Era* grant in 2002 established teacher education as a campus-wide responsibility and priority. Scores of faculty members across multiple colleges at CSUN have worked on dozens of *Teachers for a New Era* projects, many of which took a scholarly approach to assessing various aspects of the learning of teacher candidates. The projects, publications, and presentations deriving from *Teachers for a New Era* work are recognized in the retention, promotion, and tenure process as well as by larger professional communities. The *Teachers for a New Era* grant has technically ended, but it continues to spawn projects and collaborations across departments and colleges and with area schools and teachers. It is clear to the faculty that campus leaders value work on new-teacher assessment as much as ever.

Local examples of the faculty approach to PACT as an intellectual enterprise are commonplace. In the frequent department and committee meetings, for instance, we come to shared interpretations of key concepts, discuss course modifications to increase candidates’ PACT-related competencies, and revise other program assessments to better align with PACT. Yet many members have taken PACT scholarship beyond the department. One member was involved with PACT early on in the development process, and helped create benchmark examples for his subject. For two years, he and another member served on the PACT design team for a national version. Another department member has published a book about PACT: a “primer” on this assessment for an audience of teacher candidates, teacher educators, and

university or secondary-level administrators. Qualitative and quantitative PACT data have been used in scholarly work: With approval from the university's Institutional Research Board, college faculty members in multiple departments have used Teaching Event scores, scorers' evidence comments, and even candidate work samples as outcome measures in studies of various campus teacher-education initiatives. The general attitude seems to be that if we are going to devote significant time and resources on this performance assessment, we should capitalize on all the opportunities it provides. Moreover, extra-departmental PACT scholarship seems to deepen the commitment of faculty to the PACT process.

The Quality of PACT

Another theme, resonating strongly among focus groups and campus leaders, involved the positive attitude towards the PACT Teaching Event, which stems from its quality and the benefits we observe for the students and the program. Many department members remarked that the Teaching Event embodies a vision of good teaching that aligns with the vision we hold—programmatically and personally—and does so to a greater degree than the old portfolio it replaced. Compared to that portfolio, as well as to the other approved option for the state performance assessment, the PACT Teaching Event feels richer, more coherent, and appropriately situated at the end of the program, when candidates would be expected to perform most competently. As one faculty member put it, “The old portfolio was spinal-cord work and the PACT is cerebral-cortex work.” The video component was all-important to some scorers, who felt that even this short clip provided context that helped them interpret the entire Teaching Event. Further, focus groups felt that the process of completing the PACT or Preliminary Teaching Event requires candidates to carry out the sorts of planning and analyses that we presume leads to good instruction. That it resembles the National Board certification process

only adds to the sense that PACT authentically moves candidates towards professional participation. The Provost viewed its quality from a different angle, lauding PACT for being “university owned” (not administratively owned), research based, and qualitative. The Dean saw the value to the college and its programs, commenting, “Good preparation of educational professionals is highly dependent on accurate analysis, modification, and adoption of best practices (this is highly dependent on core dispositions and in-depth content and pedagogical content knowledge)...Thoughtful and meaningful assessment of teacher dispositions, knowledge, and practices is always a good thing when designing preparation programs.”

Several faculty in the focus groups noted the added leverage that the Teaching Event provided when they tried to convince candidates of the importance of certain teaching practices or methods, including preparing detailed lesson plans, reducing their reliance on lecture, and attending to prior knowledge about pupils and context when planning and assessing. Some supervisors even found this leverage useful in persuading the more traditional cooperating teachers to permit their student teachers to try constructivist or student-centered methods. In general, and in light of a recent trend towards evaluating teachers on the basis of their pupils’ standardized test scores, the faculty and supervisors appreciate an evaluation that promotes and rewards important teaching practices and understandings. The faith in the educative power of PACT has been bolstered by anecdotal remarks made by candidates who failed their first attempt at the Teaching Event but passed the second: The remediation process helped them recognize shortcomings in their teaching and analyses, and they confessed that the opportunity to redo the Teaching Event had been a valuable learning experience. [Similarly, SED faculty hear from former credential candidates \(who are now enrolled in our Master’s programs or serving as cooperating teachers\) that the PACT Teaching Event was an authentic and beneficial assessment.](#)

The perceived quality of PACT goes beyond the prompts, materials, and rubrics to include the processes for accurate evaluation. Scorers valued the extensive initial training as well as the “maintenance” training that comes in the form of annual recalibration, comparison with partner scorers on double-scored Teaching Events, and remedial discussions when their scoring is discrepant with others. Scorers acknowledged that these efforts took much time, and not all of it is monetarily compensated. Yet knowing that Teaching Event scores have serious consequences for candidates, the scorers worry about “getting it right,” and these calibrating activities mitigate their stress.

Other benefits directly affect faculty and supervisors, and ultimately they also impact candidates. One faculty member used the task structure of the PACT Teaching Event (Planning, Instruction, Assessment, Reflection) to reorganize his courses. Two members mentioned that attending to the requirements of the Teaching Event inspired them to fill in gaps in their courses that had previously been easier to ignore, for example teaching candidates how to give good feedback and addressing the needs of diverse pupils who may not have official special-education codes or English-Learner designations. One supervisor felt that the Teaching Event gave her language to better express what she tacitly knew as an experienced teacher. Many members felt the attention that PACT forces the entire department to pay to academic language has been long overdue. One faculty member discovered that department work on the Teaching Event has resulted in his knowing far more about courses in the credential program other than his own and thus obtaining a broader view of the candidates’ experience.

A Shared Mission

Leadership and resources have supported the implementation of a culture of assessment, including PACT, at [CSUN](#). The Teaching Event itself is commonly viewed as promoting

excellence and thoughtfulness in teaching. But something more amorphous and difficult to define emerged quite powerfully in both focus group discussions: a genuine belief in being capable of making a difference in the profession by working together with colleagues. Indeed, the focus group sessions themselves were marked by active engagement in the discussion, curiosity about the opinions and experiences of others, and a respect for those opinions and experiences across subject areas and courses taught. One part-time supervisor, a retired public middle-school teacher of many years, explained how she first came to be involved with PACT: “You needed a math scorer. I like all of you and I like working with all of you, so I said yes.”

Noted another, a fulltime instructor from a fine arts department who teaches subject methods and seminar courses: “[PACT] was happening at [CSUN](#), and so we all embraced it.” Thus, we believe it’s fair to say that a shared sense of mission – of caring deeply about the success of teacher candidates in the program and in the years to come and a willingness to collaborate with others to accomplish the mission – is a key additional factor contributing to the smooth implementation of PACT at [CSUN](#). The culture of “we’re all in this together” has allowed for contributions from a majority of stakeholders and genuine consensus, despite the fact that an unfunded state mandate for a high-stakes assessment on a large teacher preparation program was potentially a disaster in the making.

To get to this point, however, required deliberate leadership decisions that were probably invisible to the focus group participants. It was critical for college leaders – the Dean, Associate Dean, and Department Chair – to arrange opportunities for genuine discussion and genuine choice, but within the clear parameters of state mandates. Because the Secondary Education faculty brings knowledge of and experience with middle schools and high schools and their assessments, we began with a high level of assessment familiarity. Once the decision was made

to adopt the PACT Teaching Event, one leadership strategy was to financially support the work that mattered to faculty. Thus, fulltime and part-time faculty teaching single-subject methods courses and the literacy and English-learners methods course were granted stipends to share course-teaching ideas that would promote candidates' success in the Teaching Event and to develop common assignments and assessments across multiple sections of a course. All fulltime and numerous experienced part-time faculty were invited to train as scorers, with stipends for both training and scoring. Participation in scoring was initially optional, as the numbers of incoming Teaching Events were low during the pilot phase. But the department chair made clear that scoring Teaching Events and commenting on PTEs would eventually be part of the expectations for fulltime faculty, because the knowledge they personally gain from such up-close and rich portraits of individual candidate proficiencies would be key to ongoing program and course improvement. Similarly, the department's Credential Committee members received stipends to develop the Preliminary Teaching Event and the piloting process in the early years, and more recently, to plan and implement cooperating teacher workshops that in part address the Teaching Event, as well as to draft modifications to the student/intern teaching evaluations to more closely align with some of the language of the Teaching Events.

A second strategy included continually keeping PACT "front and center" in department meetings and workshops, giving faculty ongoing opportunities for the discussion of issues, concerns, and successes. Updates regarding the Teaching Event were part of every monthly department meeting agenda, and Teaching Event outcomes were frequently considered in department subgroups and discussed by fulltime and part-time faculty at the annual fall and spring semester department retreats. Similarly, university supervisors were engaged in Teaching-Event related activities and updates at the annual half-day supervisor workshops. The high level

of faculty involvement in planning PACT-related workshops and discussions for the broader community has increased the sense of ownership in PACT. Further, putting PACT on virtually every department-meeting agenda has had the effect over time of engaging all faculty members, whether they were directly involved in coaching or scoring Teaching Events at first or at a later time, or whether their direct involvement remains minimal.

One more strategy used the PACT Teaching Event data in scholarship and as evidence for program improvement. There has been a deliberate effort to make outcomes meaningful for students and for faculty, and not simply a program hoop to jump through. An example from a few years ago is illustrative. In examining data from the Data Warehouse, including student-teacher/intern evaluation items and California State University system-wide survey responses from employers and program completers at the end of the first year of teaching, coupled with the PACT Teaching Event data, faculty identified patterns of lower scores in items related to teaching English learners and teaching content literacy, both part of the academic language aspect of the Teaching Event. In response, some course assignments were tweaked and these topics became a focus in university supervisor and cooperating teacher workshop sessions. While there were some improvements, the pattern persisted. Concurrently, an additional concern emerged: support for the Teaching Event was dominating time in the student-teaching seminar, preempting opportunities for discussion and demonstrations related to student-teaching experiences.

After extensive brainstorming and dialogue, the SED faculty directed the Credential Committee to divide the current SED 521 course (Literacy, Language, and Learning in Multiethnic Secondary Schools – 3 units) into two courses: a modified SED 521 course (now called Content Area Literacy and Learning in Multiethnic Secondary Schools – 3 units), focusing

on content-area literacy instruction and assessment, and their applications, and a new SED 529 course (Teaching English Learners in Multiethnic Secondary Schools – 3 units), addressing a substantially richer curriculum related to English Language Development (ELD/ESL) instruction and Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE). (Ironically, SB 2042 had been largely responsible for bringing this subject matter together in a single course, when that legislation motivated a previous upper-level administrator to impose a unit restriction on the program.) A request for a new faculty position in Teaching English Learners was approved and a new faculty member was hired into this position in 2012. With a new faculty member and course, the department is well positioned to address ongoing concerns from the Commission on Teacher Credentialing regarding teacher preparation for English learners, as is evidenced in CTC's recent updates to SB2042 Standard 13.

The department also directed the Credential Committee to explore ways to increase the time available in the student-teaching seminars, so that candidates have more time to consider and share teaching strategies and assessment approaches, as well as instructional scaffolding and differentiation. The committee completed this work over the summer, and the department faculty approved the SED 521 modification, the new SED 529, and an additional unit for the final student-teaching seminar. We then planned and held a series of faculty workshops in an effort to bring additional cohesion among these two “new” courses and the methods course. The department will continue to review and analyze program data into the future, with the PACT Teaching Event outcomes as one key source of information for scholarship and for program change.

RECOMMENDATIONS

From these sentiments, we have gleaned a few recommendations for credential programs that are considering implementing a performance assessment. We recognize that programs will vary in the way their assessment will be structured, overseen, and staffed; thus, these recommendations will apply to personnel in different positions across institutions. With that caveat, we present nine recommendations for faculty to discuss and consider.

- If you have a choice of assessment, choose one that faculty believe assesses the right areas and that will strongly encourage candidates to develop important teaching and analytic practices. Of course, this means that faculty must be deeply involved and empowered in the choice.
- Enlist the support of campus leaders. Help them see, if they do not initially, how the assessment links to existing campus initiatives and culture.
- Approach the assessment as an [ongoing](#) department- or program-wide endeavor. All program faculty should feel responsible for preparing candidates for the assessment in their courses, and scoring should be seen as a way for faculty to learn about candidates and formatively assess the program. Regular meetings of task-alike program members (scorers, seminar instructors, course instructors) allow for collaboration and boost morale. Keep the assessment central to the work and attention of the department and continually link other work to it.
- Engage faculty in designing program structures that will support students and faculty in implementing the assessment.
- Find ways to elevate work on the assessment to the status of scholarship. Help faculty find outlets for scholarly work related to the assessment, reward them for it, and recognize such work in the retention, tenure, and promotion process.

- Encourage faculty to become involved with the assessment in venues beyond the campus, e.g., in developing or refining it at the state (or appropriate) level, attending related conferences, and collaborating across campuses on scoring or benchmarking.
- Find funding for a designated assessment coordinator, who can assume the logistical, recordkeeping, and communication burdens.
- Find funding for technical support for faculty and students (e.g., for video uploading, the online platform, and scanning materials) and to compensate department members for time spent supporting and scoring the assessment.
- Seek and capitalize on other uses of the assessment besides determining whether the credential can be awarded. Use the requirements of the assessment as leverage to promote desired teaching or mentoring practices. Use the assessment data formatively to improve courses or other evaluations. Use the data as an outcome measure for evaluative studies of new program initiatives or changes.

In this time of public accountability, high-stakes assessments are the norm in elementary, middle, and high schools. A number of states already mandate teacher-preparation assessments as well, and given the increasing recognition of the role of teachers in pupil achievement, it seems inevitable that they will be joined by the remaining states. This is a crucial moment in time, when teacher-performance assessments are still in development and universities and states have some degree of freedom to experiment and pilot. We encourage credential programs to be “forward leaning”: to empower and galvanize their faculties to be proactive in selecting and shaping their teacher-performance assessments (rather than waiting for one to be imposed). We also encourage campus leaders to provide teacher-credential faculty with the time, resources, and

authority to collaborate in building programmatic structures that will support the assessment and enhance its value for students, faculty, and the program as a whole.