

Teaching performance assessment services: Principles of operation

Teaching performance assessment services: Principles of operation


Introduction

This document sets out the principles of operation for teaching performance assessment (TPA) services ('the services') provided by AITSL to support the development and implementation of teaching performance assessments (TPAs) in Australia.

Service One: AITSL offers free and optional access to advice to ITE providers seeking support on the design and development of their TPAs from a pool of TPA formative advisors

Service Two: AITSL manages the national teaching performance assessment Expert Advisory Group (EAG). The EAG is required, following agreement at Education Council in 2018, to provide their advice to teacher regulatory authorities on all TPAs being implemented in ITE programs against the requirements of Program Standard 1.2 of the *Accreditation of initial teacher education programs in Australia: Standards and Procedures* (Standards and Procedures).

AITSL's teaching performance assessment (TPA) services



Expertise

For both the services, experts have been appointed by AITSL through a request for tender process based their professional expertise and capabilities. They have been appointed under one or more of the following skills and knowledge categories:

- Expert knowledge of the design and delivery of all aspects of initial teacher education (ITE), including in the context of accreditation.
- Technical expertise in statistical data analysis including expertise on standard setting methodology and the development of scoring strategies.
- Assessment expertise and an understanding of how to establish reliability and validity in assessment design.

- Expert knowledge in the implementation and monitoring of assessments to ensure ongoing fidelity.

Expert advisory group operations – advice to teacher regulatory authorities

Role of the expert advisory group

The expert advisory group (EAG) has been established to provide advice to teacher regulatory authorities (Authorities) on TPAs in relation to meeting all the requirements of Program Standard 1.2. Members have been appointed to review all TPAs being implemented for use in Australian ITE programs. The EAG is comprised of six members and a quorum for this group is four.

Authority

1. The EAG members act in an advisory capacity on behalf of AITSL for the Authorities.
2. The EAG members will have access to confidential information relating to the development and implementation of TPAs. Members cannot report on any information, or engage in communications with external stakeholders or other parties on TPA information provided in submissions for review by the EAG or any materials proposed for submission to the EAG.
3. The names of the members of the EAG will be provided publicly via the AITSL website, and may be provided through additional external communications with the public.

Function and scope

AITSL will provide secretariat for the EAG and manage all costs associated with the meetings and members' payments.

Nature of advice to Authorities

The assessment advice provided by the EAG does not constitute an accreditation decision nor guarantee an accreditation outcome. The Authorities remain responsible for the final accreditation decisions in terms of all advice provided by the EAG.

Advice to Authorities may include, but is not limited to:

- advice on whether the evidence presented meets the requirements of Program Standard 1.2
- if the evidence does not meet the requirements, suggestions regarding additional evidence needed to further assist that the Standard is met
- considerations in relation to the implementation of a TPA – based on the design of a TPA and how it might need to be implemented within a program, e.g. adherence to any principles/conditions of use
- suggested evidence that might need to be demonstrated before the next accreditation stage e.g. further evidence that demonstrates and confirms assessment validity and reliability.

Review of a TPA application

EAG members will use their professional judgement in assessing the requirements of Program Standard 1.2. This is based on the evidence requirements for the elements requiring verification and those requiring professional judgement as stipulated in the *Guidelines for the accreditation of initial teacher education programs in Australia*. These evidence requirements are articulated in the EAG assessment criteria (**Appendix 1**). Members are expected to discuss a TPA application on an EAG panel until consensus on a decision is reached.

All decisions are made collectively by members present at the meeting. All members share equal accountability for those decisions.

AITSL may engage an independent note taker to observe and record all meetings convened to review the TPAs. AITSL will prepare an assessment report for endorsement by all EAG members.

For further details on how the EAG reviews a TPA application and terms for which all EAG members are required to fulfil their roles, please see the EAG Terms of Reference at **Appendix 2**.

Requesting and receiving advice from the EAG

The following steps apply for requesting and receiving advice from the EAG:

1. An ITE provider submits their TPA and supporting evidence to the Authority.
2. The Authority submits a request to the EAG for advice via email to AITSL (ite@aitsl.edu.au).
 - An initial determination of whether sufficient information is provided in a TPA application will be made by AITSL and the EAG.
 - In cases where information is deemed not sufficient to enable the EAG to make professional judgements against the evidence requirements, AITSL/EAG may advise the Authority that the ITE provider **could seek** advice from a formative adviser to support with their evidence requirements.
3. Within 15 business days of receiving the request, AITSL convenes a meeting of EAG members to sit and provide advice to the Authority. Where this timeframe is not achievable, AITSL will communicate with the Authority.
4. Within 15 business days of the meeting, AITSL will provide a report to the Authority. Where this timeframe is not achievable, AITSL will communicate with the Authority.

Where the Authority resubmits a TPA to the EAG, the above timeframes will again apply. These timeframes may be extended in consultation with the relevant Authority.

Depending on the maturity of a TPA, the EAG may request for a tool to be resubmitted for an additional review within the accreditation cycle i.e. within a 12-month time period.

Where a TPA is being used across more than one ITE provider, a lead provider must be identified to coordinate the submission. It is recommended that the TPA be submitted by the Authority in the jurisdiction under whose legislation the lead provider is formally established or governed. Authorities with providers in their jurisdiction implementing the TPA will be copied into the EAG assessment report which pertains to the overall design and development of a TPA. It is acknowledged that each ITE provider and or program's approach to implementing a TPA would need to be considered as part of the accreditation of the program. Following the endorsement of a TPA by the EAG, AITSL will circulate a summary report to all Authorities for use by accreditation panels.

AITSL will not engage directly with the ITE provider regarding EAG advice. Upon request, an EAG member will be available to clarify the assessment made by the EAG in its report.

Appeals

AITSL TPA services

AITSL does not provide an appeals process for this service.

Accreditation decisions

As articulated in the [*Accreditation of initial teacher education programs in Australia: Standards and Procedures*](#), a provider may appeal an accreditation decision in accordance with the legislative, policy and administrative requirements of the relevant Authority.

TPA formative advisors operations – advice to initial teacher education providers

Role of TPA formative advisors

TPA formative advisors have been engaged by AITSL to advise individual ITE providers and/or TPA developers on the development and implementation of TPAs.

Authority

1. Formative advisors act in an advisory capacity on behalf of AITSL to ITE providers.
2. Members will have access to confidential information relating to the development and implementation of TPAs. Members cannot report on any information, or engage in communications with external stakeholders or other parties on TPA information.
3. The names of the formative advisors will be provided publicly via the AITSL website and may be provided through additional external communications with the public.

Scope and Function

- Advice to an ITE provider will focus on the specific information sought by the provider in relation to Program Standard 1.2. The advice provided by a formative advisor is in the form of guidance, and neither AITSL nor the individual advisor is responsible for ensuring appropriate consideration and implementation of that advice. Advice provided will be in accordance with the elements requiring verification and those requiring professional judgement and associated assessment criteria.

Requesting and receiving advice from a TPA formative advisor

The following steps apply for requesting and receiving advice from:

1. An ITE provider submits request for advice from TPA formative advisors via AITSL using the online form on the AITSL website (<https://www.aitsl.edu.au/deliver-ite-programs/teaching-performance-assessment/teaching-performance-assessment-expert-advisory-group>)
2. Within 15 business days of receiving the request, AITSL organises a teleconference between the ITE provider and TPA formative advisor. Timeframes may be extended in consultation with the requesting ITE provider.

AITSL will facilitate communication between the ITE provider and TPA formative advisor.

ITE providers accessing advice on developing, implementing and maintaining a TPA have access to two free advice sessions paid for by AITSL.

AITSL will endeavour to ensure that the same expert is accessed where two advice sessions are requested, unless otherwise specified.

The advice of Formative Advisors is intended to assist ITE providers to align their TPA to the requirements of Program Standard 1.2, to better understand the demands of the EAG assessment criteria and to improve an understanding of the necessary evidence to be gathered and submitted to the EAG. However, the **final advice** as to whether a TPA aligns to the requirements of Program Standard 1.2 rests with the EAG.

AITSL will take steps to support the consistency over time of the assessment and professional judgement of Formative Advisors with that of the EAG. For further details on how formative advisors will review TPAs in order to provide expert advice and terms for which all formative advisors are required to fulfil their roles, please see the TPA formative advisor Terms of Reference at **Appendix 3**.

General service operations

Code of conduct

In accordance with generally accepted ethical standards, each EAG member and formative advisor is expected to:

- act honestly, and in good faith
- act with due care and diligence in fulfilling their function
- properly disclose and manage any conflict of interest
- not make improper use of information acquired in the role
- not take improper advantage of the role
- not engage in conduct likely to bring discredit to AITSL, the EAG or formative advisor function
- participate in any evaluation of performance
- comply, at all times, with the duties and obligations inherent in the role.

Confidentiality

Confidentiality arrangements are in place for all EAG members and formative advisors through contract agreements. Any evidence supplied in relation to a TPA will not at any time be used for any purpose other than the assessment or advice against Program Standard 1.2.

Breaches of confidentiality by experts can lead to termination of contract agreements, and criminal prosecution.

Conflict of interest

AITSL will endeavour to manage real and perceived conflicts of interest in the organisation and operation of the EAG or advice provided by formative advisors. The following process will be followed:

- General conflict of interest forms will be completed by all advisory group members as part of the contract execution, which are to be updated yearly.
- members will be asked to complete additional conflict of interest forms prior to reviewing a TPA
- A Register of Ongoing Conflicts of Interest will be maintained by AITSL. Notice of declared conflicts is to be recorded in the Register.
- Before each meeting starts, any new conflicts of interest should be disclosed.
- When an EAG member who has declared a conflict of interest is required to participate in a meeting, the conflict will be declared in writing and managed during the process. EAG meetings will consist of no less than four people, in order to provide extra assurance that the decisions made are fair and rigorous.

Quality assurance

Rigorous, consistent and defensible decisions are critical to the success of the AITSL's TPA services. The following processes are in place to ensure they operate as intended and that relevant data is captured and analysed.

1. Collection of quantitative and qualitative data to evaluate the functioning of the EAG and formative advisors:
 - Individual expert assessment data, including professional judgement and comments against evidence.
 - EAG recommendations and comments
 - Authorities' final accreditation decisions
 - Regular feedback from providers, advisory group members, and Authorities to be sought
 - Self-assessment.

2. AITSL to act as secretariat for the EAG and support communication between the group and Authorities. This will provide another mechanism to support consistency in terms of approach and decision-making. AITSL's observations will inform ongoing improvements and feed into the review process.
 - Authorities should not contact individual members of the EAG in relation to their specific role as an EAG member.
3. Information and support to the appointed experts to ensure they are fully briefed on the purpose, role and scope of EAG decisions and advice. This will include:
 - An 'induction pack' for the experts to support shared understanding of both roles, EAG and formative advisors, in the accreditation process, Program Standard 1.2 and the evidence requirements.
 - Access to the online modules used as part of the 'Becoming an ITE accreditation panellist' learning program to build knowledge of the broader accreditation process.
 - Where available, access to confidential information, including endorsed TPAs, to assist in their advisory capacity.
4. AITSL will lead activities to support nationally consistent decision-making in the assessment of evidence supplied against Program Standard 1.2. These activities will be undertaken on an as-needs basis.
5. AITSL will conduct, on an as-needs basis, a review of the performance of the EAG and Formative Advisors. The method of conducting the review, the extent of that review and its outcomes, are for AITSL to determine. AITSL will action each review and obtain any assistance required from relevant third parties. Any relevant findings that affect EAG responsibilities and operations will be incorporated into these operational principles. The EAG is bound by the decisions of the performance review.
6. These operational principles are to be reviewed annually or at such other intervals as AITSL may determine so that they remain consistent with the EAG's objectives and responsibilities.

Information sharing

Publication of information around the operation of the Services will, where possible, be provided publicly, to assist the sector in understanding the role of formative advisors and the EAG, the requirements of the TPA and the considerations of ongoing maintenance

Expert Advisory Group Evidence Criteria

Program Standard 1.2: Program design and assessment processes require pre-service teachers to have successfully completed a final-year teaching performance assessment prior to graduation that is shown to:

- a) be a reflection of classroom teaching practice including the elements of planning, teaching, assessing and reflecting
- b) be a valid assessment that clearly assesses the content of the Graduate Teacher Standards
- c) have clear, measurable and justifiable achievement criteria that discriminate between meeting and not meeting the Graduate Teacher Standards
- d) be a reliable assessment in which there are appropriate processes in place for ensuring consistent scoring between assessors
- e) include moderation processes that support consistent decision-making against the achievement criteria.

The evidence criteria included in the table below is what Expert Advisory Group (EAG) members will need to see when making professional judgements on whether a Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) meets the requirements of Program Standard 1.2.

Elements requiring professional judgement	Evidence criteria on which the EAG will base their judgement
<p>Content validity: Does the assessment represent the content it is designed to measure, in this case, pre-service teachers' performance against the Graduate Teacher Standards?</p>	<p>This professional judgement is concerned with the extent to which the TPA assesses the breadth of the Graduate Teacher Standards.</p> <p>To meet Program Standard 1.2, the TPA will need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assess Graduate Teacher Standards 1–5, with assessment of Standards 6 and 7 where possible. It is desirable that the TPA assesses all focus areas' descriptors within Graduate Teacher Standards 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5; at a minimum, most focus areas' descriptors within Graduate Teacher Standards 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 should be assessed. <p>The EAG will need to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evidence that the TPA measures what it is supposed to measure (a pre-service teacher's readiness and ability to teach). That is, there must be demonstrated alignment between the assessment task, marking criteria and the Graduate Teacher Standards and standard descriptors • evidence of agreement from content experts that the assessment tasks chosen will assess specific elements of the Graduate Teacher Standards and descriptors. This involves mapping the assessment tasks against the chosen Graduate Teacher Standards and descriptors, using different stakeholders with expertise in teaching • evidence of consultation with stakeholder/reference groups to confirm the TPA as an authentic assessment

Elements requiring professional judgement	Evidence criteria on which the EAG will base their judgement
	<p>with respect to content validity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> that any mapping exercise that links an assessment task(s) to the Graduate Teacher Standards and descriptor/s must be supported by suitable evidence to demonstrate that the assessment is assessing those Standards and descriptors. Suitable evidence may include but is not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> matrix showing the assignment of the items (tasks) to the Graduate Teacher Standards summary of the extent that there is agreement in assigning items (tasks) to the Graduate Teacher Standards item analysis statistics showing the extent to which the assessment items are functioning in accordance with expectations empirical evidence and student response exemplars supporting how each assessment task assesses what it is designed to assess. Where evidence is not yet available, a detailed plan for this evidence collection over time is required. evidence of a methodical analysis of the performance of the assessment tasks will be required once a TPA has been trialled, i.e. do pre-service teachers' responses provide evidence about the specific Graduate Teacher Standards that each task was designed to test?
<p>Construct validity: To what degree does the assessment measure the actual practices of teaching (including planning, teaching, reflecting and assessing) across a sequence of lessons?</p>	<p>This professional judgement is concerned with the appropriateness of the design of the TPA for eliciting evidence that is relevant to the Graduate Teacher Standards.</p> <p>To meet Program Standard 1.2, the TPA will need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> explicitly state how a pre-service teacher demonstrates learning, reflection and development in teaching practice over a sequence of lessons include a range of authentic assessment types, formats and contexts in order to produce evidence relevant to planning, teaching, reflecting and assessing student learning identify which of the Graduate Teacher Standards are assessed by the TPA and identify the balance of achievement required to meet the standards be designed to include common, specific and coherent summative assessment task(s) which cover the breadth of teaching practices be more than a collection of artefacts made in a student's final year, or final practicum. If students collect their own artefacts in different contexts with too much latitude, they will not be able to be evaluated consistently and the variability will threaten the assessment's validity. <p>The EAG will need to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an explanation of the relationship between the assessment tasks within the TPA and the focus areas within the

Elements requiring professional judgement	Evidence criteria on which the EAG will base their judgement
	<p>Graduate Teacher Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • instructions provided to pre-service teachers to support consistent understanding and shared interpretation of the assessment task(s) • evidence to demonstrate that pre-service teachers who completed the TPA also experienced the assessment task(s) as an authentic reflection of teaching and had a shared interpretation of the assessment task(s) (e.g. pre-service teacher surveys) • evidence of the approach for supporting ITE provider staff to describe the assessment task(s) in a shared and consistent format • evidence of consultation with stakeholder/reference groups to confirm the TPA as an authentic assessment with respect to construct validity • instructions for pre-service teachers that refer to a specific subset of the assessment task(s) focusing on a specific sequence of lessons • evidence can include, but is not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ formalised feedback of structured classroom observation (artefacts) ○ audio or video records of actual teaching ○ artefacts such as lesson plans, assessment strategies and feedback. All artefacts need to be justified and demonstrate alignment to the relevant Graduate Teacher Standards and descriptors ○ annotated samples of student work.
<p>Standard-setting: Has a recognised standard-setting process been used to: determine the passing level of the assessment(s) that reflects the content of the Graduate Teacher Standards and differentiate between responses to the assessment(s) which do or do not meet the determined standard?</p>	<p>This professional judgement is concerned with the selection and implementation of a recognised standard-setting methodology to determine cut-scores that meet the performance level of the Graduate Teacher Standards.</p> <p>This professional judgement is concerned with the extent to which the TPA tasks and scoring approaches have been designed to effectively differentiate between pre-service teachers at each level of performance.</p> <p>The EAG will need to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a technical explanation of the recognised standard-setting methodology that has been used (or will be used) to identify benchmark performances at three levels: above, at and below the level expected of graduating teachers • a consideration of the qualities required for a pre-service teacher to be regarded as 'meeting the Graduate Teacher Standards' as distinct from 'borderline' and 'not meeting the Graduate Teacher Standards' • evidence of the consistency of standard-setting judgements • empirical and descriptive evidence from a range of assessed TPAs to ensure that the passing standard (or cut-score) is sufficiently explicit for the levels of performance, e.g. 'unsatisfactory', 'satisfactory' and 'exceeding'

Elements requiring professional judgement	Evidence criteria on which the EAG will base their judgement
	<p>or unsatisfactory', 'satisfactory', and 'borderline' cases.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a sample of completed, scored and analysed TPAs that have been assessed as below, above and at the passing standard • evidence that the assessment rubrics used in the TPA feature descriptors that differentiate pre-service teacher performance at different levels, e.g. 'unsatisfactory', 'satisfactory' and 'exceeding' or 'unsatisfactory', 'satisfactory', and 'borderline' • empirical and descriptive evidence of the review of items and tasks to improve the rubric informed by data from pre-service teachers' responses • evidence of the extent to which the task design enables pre-service teachers to demonstrate evidence at different levels against the Graduate Teacher Standards.
<p>Scoring and moderation: Are there appropriate processes in place to ensure consistent scoring between assessors and consistent decision- making against the achievement criteria, including to separate those that meet the standard and those that do not?</p>	<p>This professional judgement is concerned with assessor training and moderation, and the extent to which assessors assign scores reliably and consistently.</p> <p>To meet Program Standard 1.2, the TPA will need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have processes in place to ensure reliable and consistent scoring of TPA assessment tasks. <p>The EAG will need to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evidence of training and moderation processes to ensure reliable and consistent assessments, including plans to demonstrate ongoing formalised training of internal and external assessors' overtime • inclusion of well-trained assessors, including those external to the providers using the TPA, in moderation processes both within and across institutions. The EAG have noted that reliability can be difficult to achieve in practice if there are a large number of assessors, especially if assessors are loosely connected to an ITE provider i.e. every pre-service teacher's final practicum supervisor • evidence of well-designed rubrics that have been applied consistently across all assessors and programs • information about the scoring processes and steps to minimise bias, and any other processes to support consistent assessment by ITE provider staff • evidence of appropriate processes and resources to periodically build a shared understanding between TPA assessors of the criteria and scoring approaches to support ongoing consistency • evidence of a process for cross-institutional moderation for providers within a consortium, including the expectation that users of the TPA submit a selection of TPA submissions for the purposes of moderation and data analysis • confirmation of robust processes for ongoing internal and cross-institutional moderation which determine the reliability of the passing standard of a TPA. If these activities have not occurred at the time of submission to the EAG, then a detailed plan for how and when they will be undertaken in the future should be included as part of

Elements requiring professional judgement	Evidence criteria on which the EAG will base their judgement
	<p>the submission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• evidence of inter-rater reliability or other relevant coefficients to determine if the training has been effective.

Terms of Reference

Expert Advisory Group (EAG)

Background

1. Teaching performance assessments (TPAs) are prepared by either a consortium, with a lead institution, or individual providers in order to meet agreed implementation timelines and accreditation requirements.
2. Recognising that accreditation panellists in jurisdictions didn't necessarily have the required expertise to review TPAs against Program Standard 1.2, AITSL established the Expert Advisory Group in 2017, to which nineteen members were appointed between October 2017 and March 2018.
3. On 14 September 2018, the Education Council endorsed an updated version of the [*Accreditation of initial teacher education programs in Australia: Standards and Procedures*](#), which reflect the Education Council decision of 22 June 2018 to further embed the TEMAG reforms, including the requirement for AITSL's EAG to provide advice to all teacher regulatory authorities (Authorities) on whether all teaching performance assessments used by ITE providers align with the requirements of Program Standard 1.2
4. To better effect these recent changes, AITSL has established a group out of the existing EAG members which consists of six experts (of which four or more would be drawn for assessing a TPA) to review all TPAs that are developed by providers.
5. EAG members will convene and discuss the ~~five~~^{four} professional judgements that are used when reviewing TPAs and to make explicit the criteria for what constitutes an 'acceptable' TPA before they review more TPAs in 2019.

Purpose

6. The purpose of the EAG is to review all teaching performance assessment tools (TPAs) being implemented by Australian initial teacher education providers and advise Authorities on the alignment of the TPA with the requirements of Program Standard 1.2, as articulated in the [*Accreditation of initial teacher education programs in Australia: Standards and Procedures*](#).

Function and scope

Function

7. The primary role of the EAG is to provide advice to Authorities on TPA tools against the requirements of Program Standard 1.2. For each TPA reviewed, this will involve:
 - receiving, reviewing and making a judgement in the evidence in the prescribed Assessment Record Template
 - participating in a meeting via teleconference to discuss the evidence supplied in support of a TPA and come to a recommendation on whether the TPA meets or doesn't meet the requirements of Program Standard 1.2
 - submitting the completed Assessment Record Template to AITSL before the teleconference

- reviewing and providing endorsement on the final report outlining the agreed position of members.
8. EAG members will also meet once to discuss the five professional judgements that are used to make decisions against Program Standard 1.2 as articulated in the [*Guidelines for the accreditation of initial teacher education programs in Australia*](#). The outcomes of this meeting will be endorsed by all members and will be used as assessment criteria when reviewing all TPAs.

Authority

9. The EAG act in an advisory capacity.
10. The EAG will have access to confidential information relating to the development and implementation of TPAs. Members cannot report on any information, or engage in communications with external stakeholders or other parties on TPA information provided in submissions for review by the group.
11. AITSL reserves the right to mention the names of EAG members in external communications with the public.

Expertise of individual members

12. Members have been appointed to the EAG in one of the following categories:
- Expert knowledge of the design and delivery of all aspects of initial teacher education, including in the context of accreditation.
 - Technical expertise in statistical data analysis including expertise on standard setting methodology and the development of scoring strategies.
 - Assessment expertise, including expert knowledge in monitoring the reliability, validity, and fidelity of assessments.

Composition

13. AITSL will act as Chair and Secretariat for the meetings convened to review TPAs.

Proxies

14. No proxies are acceptable to replace members, who have been selected due to their expertise.
15. A quorum for each meeting to review a TPA shall be at least four members with all appointment categories represented.

Observers and guests

16. An independent note taker will observe and record all meetings convened to review the TPAs and will prepare the final report for endorsement by all members.

Confidentiality and conflict of interest

17. Members will be required to enter into a Panel Agreement with AITSL to confirm their membership of the EAG. The Panel Agreement has specific confidentiality obligations stipulated at clause 17 under which members are bound.
18. Members will also complete a general conflict of interest form as part of their agreement to form the EAG. This conflict of interest form will be updated annually. Members will also complete an additional conflict of interest forms prior to reviewing each individual TPA.

Governance

19. It is an expectation that members:

- Review all documentation thoroughly prior to the teleconference.
- Make expert judgements on whether the evidence supplied aligns with the requirements of Program Standard 1.2 and submit a record of their judgements to AITSL prior to meeting.
- Actively participate in discussion with other members of the EAG to reach consensus on a decision.
- Support the provision of timely expert advice to Authorities.

Reporting

20. Members will be required to provide individual reports to AITSL outlining their judgements prior to meetings to discuss the evidence against the requirements of Program Standard 1.2 for each TPA.

Terms of Reference

TPA formative advisors

Background

1. Teaching performance assessments (TPAs) are prepared by either consortiums, with a lead institution, or individual providers in order to meet agreed implementation timelines and accreditation requirements.
2. Recognising that TPAs can be complex, AITSL has established a service where providers are able to access expert advice from a formative advisor on the development, validation or implementation of TPAs.
3. Providers are able to request this service through the AITSL website, indicating the type of advice required and the stage of development of their TPA. Once AITSL receives the request, an appropriate formative advisor will be engaged on behalf of the provider.

Purpose

4. The purpose of the formative advisors is to review teaching performance tools (TPAs) being developed by Australian initial teacher education providers and provide advice on the alignment of the TPA against the requirements of Program Standard 1.2 as articulated in the [*Accreditation of initial teacher education programs in Australia: Standards and Procedures*](#).

Function and scope

Function

5. The primary role of Formative advisors is to provide expert advice to providers on the development, validation and/or implementation of TPA tools against the requirements of Program Standard 1.2. This will involve:
 - receiving and reviewing evidence provided in support of a TPA
 - formulating individual advice against the requirements of Program Standard 1.2
 - participating in a meeting via teleconference and provide advice in accordance with the elements requiring verification and those requiring professional judgement and associated assessment criteria.
 - providing a written summary of any advice provided to AITSL within five working days of the teleconference with the provider.

Authority

6. Formative advisors will act in an advisory capacity, noting the advice is in the form of guidance, and neither AITSL nor the individual advisor is responsible for ensuring appropriate consideration and implementation of that advice.
7. Formative advisors will have access to confidential information relating to the development and implementation of TPAs. Members cannot report on any information, or engage in communications with external stakeholders or other parties on TPA information provided in requests for advice.

8. AITSL reserves the right to mention the names of Formative advisors in external communications with the public.

Expertise of individual members

9. Members have been appointed to this group in one of the following categories:
 - Expert knowledge of the design and delivery of all aspects of initial teacher education, including in the context of accreditation.
 - Technical expertise in statistical data analysis including expertise on standard setting methodology and the development of scoring strategies.
 - Assessment expertise, including expert knowledge in monitoring the reliability, validity, and fidelity of assessments.

Composition

Confidentiality and conflict of interest

10. Members will be required to enter into a Panel Agreement with AITSL to confirm their membership as Formative advisors. The Panel Agreement has specific confidentiality obligations stipulated at clause 17 under which members are bound.
11. Members will also complete a general conflict of interest form as part of their agreement to be engaged as formative advisors. This conflict of interest form will be updated annually. Members will also complete an additional conflict of interest forms prior to reviewing a TPA for the provision of advice.

Governance

12. It is an expectation that when required, formative advisors will:
 - Review documentation thoroughly to determine if a TPA aligns with the requirements of Program Standard 1.2.
 - Provide timely and expert advice to providers on considerations of what could be undertaken to meet the requirements of Program Standard 1.2.

Reporting

13. Members will be required to provide individual reports to AITSL outlining their advice to providers against the requirements of Program Standard 1.2 for each TPA reviewed.

Glossary

[illegible]



aitsl.edu.au

Telephone: +61 3 9944 1200
Email: info@aitsl.edu.au

AITSL is funded by the Australian Government