2D

Information/Action

Educator Preparation Committee

Options to Study and Improve California's Teaching Performance Assessments

Executive Summary: This agenda item provides for Commission consideration options to study and improve California's teaching performance assessments. In addition, next steps are described to further support teacher candidates with a potential adoption of a secondary passing standard for the CalTPA and edTPA models. The secondary passing standard would allow program sponsors to recommend candidates for a preliminary credential who score within -1.0 Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) if the program sponsor has evidence from additional measures that the candidate has demonstrated competency in the seven Teaching Performance Expectation (TPE) domains.

Recommended Action: That the Commission approve study options and adopt a secondary passing standard for the CalTPA and edTPA.

Presenters: Amy Reising, Chief Deputy Director, and David DeGuire, Director, Professional Services Division

Options to Study and Improve California's Teaching Performance Assessments

Introduction

This agenda item provides for Commission consideration options to study and improve California's teaching performance assessments. Options to engage in ongoing research to study teaching performance assessments allow for continual improvements necessary to build validity and ensure reliable scoring. In addition, next steps are described to further support teacher candidates with a potential adoption of a secondary passing standard for the CalTPA and edTPA models. The secondary passing standard would allow program sponsors to recommend candidates for a preliminary credential who score within -1.0 Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) if the program sponsor has evidence from additional measures that the candidate has demonstrated competency in the seven Teaching Performance Expectation (TPE) domains.

Background

At the Commission's October 2023 meeting, staff presented the [Annual Report on the Commission Approved Teaching and Administrator Performance Assessments](#), which reviewed the state statutes that have driven the Commission's work with performance assessments for more than 20 years. An overview of each performance assessment that has been approved for use in California by the Commission, was also provided, as were candidate score results and analysis from the last five years of administration (2018-23), and an update on the development of additional performance assessments focused on literacy, early childhood education, and low incidence areas within the Education Specialist credential. The item closed with ideas for studying and improving the validity and reliability of the teaching performance assessment (TPA) systems based on the research cited and lessons learned through the development and implementation of performance assessments. This agenda item further develops the ideas for potential study and improvements discussed during the October meeting for Commission consideration and possible action.

Use Multiple Measures to Determine Candidate Readiness to Begin Teaching

State statute [Education Code section 44320.2(e)(2)](#) calls for teaching performance assessment scores to be one source of data that informs the preparation program's decision to recommend a candidate for a credential. In addition to passing a teaching performance assessment, candidates must also pass their coursework and clinical practice. Other formative and summative assessment sources may include, but are not limited to, observations of teaching, information gathered from supervising teachers, coursework assignments, and other embedded assessments. The Commission could allow programs to use these additional measures of classroom readiness for candidates who do not meet the performance assessment

passing standard[1]. One option that has been used for other assessments is to apply a Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) of the established TPA passing standard. Applying an SEM would provide a secondary passing standard.

If a preparation program determines, based on the multiple measures of candidate performance it has collected, that a candidate who scored within the SEM should be recommended for a preliminary credential, then the program would document the measures used to determine that the candidate has demonstrated proficiency in each of the seven TPE domains and is therefore classroom ready. The teacher preparation program would work with the candidate to develop an Individual Development Plan (IDP) to inform areas for continued support during induction. Programs are already responsible for working with candidates to develop an IDP at the end of their preliminary program to guide their individual induction experience, as called for in Education Code section 44320.2(e)(3) and Teacher Preparation Program Standard 6 provided below:

> **MS/SS/Education Specialist**
> **Program Standard 6: Induction Individual Development Plan**
> Before exiting the preliminary program, candidates, district-employed supervisors, and program supervisors collaborate on an individual development plan (IDP) consisting of recommendations for professional development and growth in the candidate's clear program. The plan is a portable document archived by the preliminary program and provided to the candidate for transmission to the clear/induction program.

Induction programs are expected to review the IDP with the new teacher to determine targeted supports to include in their Individual Learning Plan (ILP) supporting the candidate's progress toward earning their Clear Credential, as detailed in Induction Standard 3 below. Having the IDP inform ongoing supports during Induction builds a plan for a candidate's connected and continuous improvement from preliminary program experiences (TPEs) to their Induction experiences (CSTP).

> **Induction Standard 3: Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans within the Mentoring System**
> The Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) must address the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and provide the road map for candidates' Induction work during their time in the program along with guidance for the mentor in providing support. The ILP must be collaboratively developed at the beginning of Induction by the candidate and the mentor, with input from the employer regarding the candidate's job assignment, and guidance from the program staff. The ILP must include candidate professional growth goals, a description of how the candidate will work to meet those goals, defined and measurable outcomes for the candidate, and planned opportunities to reflect on progress and modify the ILP as needed. The candidate's specific teaching assignment should provide the appropriate context for the development of the overall

---

[1] Classroom readiness means that the candidate has demonstrated competency in the seven Teaching Performance Expectation (TPE) domains as determined by the preparation program.

ILP; however, the candidate and the mentor may add additional goals based on the candidate's professional interests such as, for example, advanced certifications, additional content area literacy, early childhood education, case management, evidence-based practices supportive of specific disabilities within the candidate's caseload, consultation, collaboration, co-teaching, and collaborating with para-educators and service providers. Within the ILP, professional learning and support opportunities must be identified for each candidate to practice and refine effective teaching practices for all students through focused cycles of inquiry.

If the Commission were to adopt a secondary passing standard for CalTPA and edTPA candidates scoring within a -1.0 SEM plus additional competency measures that indicate the candidate has demonstrated proficiency across the seven TPE domains and is therefore deemed classroom ready, the Commission has several options to consider for implementation:

- The Commission could adopt a -1.0 SEM to establish a secondary passing standard for a pilot period with interested programs participating and ask staff to return in June 2024 with an analysis and recommendations regarding full implementation.
- The Commission could adopt the secondary passing standard of -1.0 SEM for all candidates and TPA scores moving forward.
- The Commission could adopt the secondary passing standard of -1.0 SEM for all candidates and TPA scores moving forward and retroactively extend the secondary passing standard to candidates who have previously completed a TPA but not yet earned their credential (e.g., back to the start of central scoring in 2018, for candidates who did not qualify for a TPA deferral).

For context on how many candidates might be affected, applying a -1.0 SEM would have allowed preparation programs to review other measures of performance for 2,000 of the 2,731 candidates[2] who did not pass CalTPA Cycle 1 on their first attempt, 953 of 1,152 candidates who did not pass CalTPA Cycle 2 on their first attempt, and 360 of the 1,124 candidates who did not pass the edTPA in 2021-22 and 2022-23. Please note that these numbers do not indicate the number of candidates who ultimately were not recommended for a credential. The majority of them resubmitted, received a passing score and were recommended for a preliminary teaching credential.

---

[2] This group represents Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and World Language candidates only. Because Education Specialist candidates were not required to pass a TPA until the 2022-23 academic year, they are not included.

Table 1: CalTPA MS/SS/WL Cycle 1

Year	Number of Candidates Who Passed on First Attempt	Number of Candidates Who Did Not Pass On First Attempt	Number of Candidates Within -1.0 SEM	Number of Candidates Who Would Need to Revise/Retake
2021-22	4,769	1,414	1,044	370
2022-23	5,131	1,317	956	361

Table 2: CalTPA MS/SS/WL Cycle 2

Year	Number of Candidates Who Passed on First Attempt	Number of Candidates Who Did Not Pass On First Attempt	Number of Candidates Within -1.0 SEM	Number of Candidates Who Would Need to Revise/Retake
2021-22	4,661	582	489	93
2022-23	5,914	570	464	106

CalTPA candidates who engage in both instructional cycles (which can be taken in any order) and score within -1.0 of the passing standard of either cycle, programs could, using additional measures, recommend the candidate for the preliminary credential. For example, candidates who take Cycle 1 and fall into the –1.0 SEM would not be required under this policy shift to retake Cycle 1. They would move on and take Cycle 2 after receiving necessary and appropriate support from their programs. If they pass Cycle 2 at the adopted passing score of 21 they would receive actionable feedback across the 9 Cycle 2 rubrics. If they do not pass Cycle 2 and fall into the -1.0 SEM score range, the program would be allowed to rely on multiple other measures to determine if the candidate should be recommended for a preliminary credential. Candidates who fall below the –1.0 SEM on either Cycle 1 or Cycle 2 would be supported by their program to revise or redo the Cycle(s) and resubmit for scoring.

Table 3: edTPA MS/SS/WL

Year	Number of Candidates Who Passed on First Attempt	Number of Candidates Who Did Not Pass On First Attempt	Number of Candidates Within -1.0 SEM	Number of Candidates Who Would Need to Revise/Retake*
2021-22	3,158	514	190	324
2022-23	3,293	610	170	440

Table 3 provides data for the number of candidates who passed the edTPA on the first attempt, number who did not pass on the first attempt, number within the -1.0 SEM, and the number of candidates who would need to revise or retake the edTPA due to a score that is below the –1.0 SEM for the past two years. For those candidates within the –1.0 SEM, the program would be able to use other measures to document that the candidate had demonstrated competency across the TPE domains. Candidates scoring below the –1.0 SEM would receive support from their teacher preparation program to revise or redo the edTPA and resubmit.

*Note: Candidates who score below the SEM of the established passing standard would continue to receive program support and remediation as required in Program Standard 5 and be required to revise and/or redo their TPA and resubmit. Candidates who do not meet the passing standards (initial and secondary) would continue to receive mentoring support provided by their preparation program.

Convene Performance Assessment Work Group
Staff plan to convene a work group of education partners (e.g., teachers and administrators, mentor teachers, National Board Certified teachers, preparation program faculty from all segments, and performance assessment experts) in 2024 to review implementation of California's performance assessments. This group would also review best practices and challenges of implementation along with issues related to reliability in scoring complex sets of evidence of practice, including video evidence, and provide feedback on the structure of the TPAs. The findings and recommendations of this work group would potentially inform policy related to the quality and effectiveness of educator preparation in California. This group would consider all three currently adopted TPAs and engage with the model sponsors on how to increase and build validity and ensure reliable scoring, including how to support local scoring for interested programs as allowed by statute and the Commission's Performance Assessment Design Standards.

Strengthen Common and Program Standards for Candidate Performance on TPAs
The Commission's accreditation standards include expectations for the embedding of TPAs in programs, but this is an area of the Commission's implementation of statute that could be reviewed and strengthened. Education Code sections 44320.2(d)(8) and (9) direct the Commission to examine the accreditation system to ensure that candidates have ongoing opportunities to learn, in each program, the knowledge, skills, and abilities (TPEs) measured by the TPA. These sections further require that the aggregated results of the assessments for groups of candidates be used as one source of information about the quality and effectiveness of the program.

As the Commission's intense period of TPA collaborative development and implementation has unfolded over the last seven years, there has been an expectation that programs are using all available performance assessment data to evaluate the effectiveness of their programs and to make programmatic modifications where the data indicate a need for improvement. Over time, staff have taken steps to provide accreditation teams with data on the performance assessment results to inform their work. Accreditation teams have been asked to review the data and, specifically, to look for evidence that programs are using these data for program improvement and to support candidates in embedded performance assessment experiences. More recently staff have taken steps to include these data on the accreditation data dashboards used by institutions and accreditation teams. Research indicates that the level of program and faculty participation in TPA implementation and candidate support directly impacts candidate success with TPAs. To better track the impact of candidate support, upon submission of a CalTPA, candidates are asked to respond to a set of questions about the support they received during professional preparation as defined in Standard 5. Staff will monitor the supports provided and compare this data to pass rates to determine how supports are impacting pass rates. Programs

whose candidates report low support and who also have low to middle pass rates will be offered targeted technical assistance. In addition, in webinars provided to support programs using CalTPA and edTPA, specific advice and best practices can be shared with the larger community of practice.

While the Commission's accreditation system includes the expectation that performance data is part of an institution's continuous improvement system, the Commission's standards, particularly Common Standard 4 (continuous improvement) and teacher preparation Program Standard 5 (supporting candidates in completing and passing a TPA) could be strengthened and clarified. The proposed work group could make recommendations regarding these and other program standards as appropriate.

In addition, Commission staff, in consultation with preparation program leaders, will develop a more formal process for identifying and supporting programs with lower TPA pass rates. The process could include building a program improvement plan to address the specific rubric level data that indicates low candidate performance, focus on how faculty are informed about teaching performance assessments and trained to score submissions, and consider new or different ways to support candidates in embedded performance assessment experiences as part of their clinical work.

Staff Recommendation
Staff recommends that the Commission adopt a secondary teaching performance assessment passing standard of a -1.0 SEM, recognizing the responsibility of preparation programs to rely on TPA scores in addition to other program measures of candidate readiness and develop with each candidate an Individual Development Plan based that identifies areas for further development during induction. Staff recommends that the Commission choose an implementation plan for the secondary passing standard.

Three options are provided for consideration:
a) The Commission could adopt applying a -1.0 SEM and establish a secondary passing standard for a pilot period with interested programs participating and ask staff to return in June 2024 with an analysis and recommendations regarding full implementation.
b) The Commission could adopt the secondary passing standard for all candidates and TPA scores moving forward.
c) The Commission could adopt the secondary passing standard for all candidates and TPA scores moving forward and retroactively extend the secondary passing standard to candidates who have previously completed a TPA but not yet earned their credential (e.g., back to the start of central scoring in 2018, for candidates who did not qualify for a TPA deferral).

Next Steps
If the Commission adopts the secondary TPA passing standards, staff will disseminate a Program Sponsor Alert detailing a timeline and process for implementation and hold technical assistance webinars to support implementation.