2C

Information/Action

Professional Services Committee

Update on and Policy Directions for the Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA)

Executive Summary: This item presents an update on the implementation of the teaching performance assessment, identifies a range of policy issues relating to the design of the next generation of teaching performance assessments for California, and presents several TPA implementation policy issues for the 2014-15 academic year for the Commission's input and potential direction.

Policy Question: Are the design considerations identified thus far for the next generation of California TPAs consistent with the Commission's priorities and expectations for performance assessments? Do the proposed TPA implementation policies reflect the Commission's priorities and direction for the 2014-15 academic year, and does the Commission wish to adopt any of the proposed TPA implementation policies for 2014-15?

Recommended Action: That the Commission indicate if the design considerations identified thus far for the next generation of California TPAs are consistent with Commission priorities for performance assessments, and that the Commission discuss the proposed TPA implementation policies for the 2014-15 academic year presented in this agenda item and provide input and possible direction regarding these TPA implementation issues.

Presenter: Phyllis Jacobson, Administrator, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal:

I. Educator Quality

- Develop, maintain, and promote high quality authentic, consistent educator assessments and examinations that support development and certification of educators who have demonstrated the capacity to be effective practitioners.

Update on and Policy Directions for the Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA)

Introduction

This item presents an update on the implementation of the teaching performance assessment, discusses the current TPA system and the next generation of teaching performance assessments for California, and presents several TPA implementation policy issues for the 2014-15 academic year for the Commission's input and direction.

Background

The Commission has heard multiple prior agenda items on the implementation of the TPA. Most recently, in February 2014, the Commission discussed issues relating to the reliability and consistency of TPA scoring and reporting within programs, within models, and across the TPA system as a whole (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2014-02/2014-02-6D.pdf). In the February agenda item the concept of a next generation of TPAs was also raised, and several design considerations for this future iteration of the assessments were identified. In May 2014 staff facilitated a TPA Stakeholder Meeting to gather input from the larger TPA community regarding TPA implementation issues (Appendix A). The input from the stakeholder community will be provided, as applicable, to the workgroups established to address revisions to the Commission's Accountability System (see agenda item 2E).

Current TPA Models and the Next Generation of TPA Models

California has over twelve years of experience implementing a teaching performance assessment, more than any other state in the nation. Although the TPA has been informally administered to candidates since the 2002-03 program year, this assessment became mandatory for all candidates as of July 2008. Both the Commission and program sponsors implementing the TPA have learned much about (a) what works well in the current TPA system; (b) what types of issues need to to be addressed in the design of a next generation of TPA models; and (c) what within the current TPA system that will continue to be administered in the interim between this generation and the next generation of TPA models most needs the Commission's policy attention for the 2014-15 academic year.

It is a difficult but critical task to be operating a statewide TPA system that needs to continue to meet standards of reliability and validity throughout the range of multiple assessment models and a variety of local program implementation processes while at the same time being engaged with stakeholders in designing the next generation of what teaching performance assessment should look like. This is the current situation, however, in California as the Commission moves the TPA from the present generation of models that are products of their initial development time to a new generation of TPA models that reflect what has been learned about the value of

the performance assessment for promoting candidate readiness to teach and, at the same time, also promoting faculty engagement in using TPA results for preparation program improvements.

This agenda item focuses primarily on those aspects of the TPA system that need to be addressed during this interim period of 2014-15 in order to strengthen current implementation of the TPA, but still keeps in mind future policy issues and priorities for the next generation of the TPA. The table below identifies which aspects of the TPA system most need the Commission's policy attention and direction for the 2014-15 program year, and provides examples of which aspects of the TPA system will be addressed in future policy decisions regarding the design and implementation of the next generation of TPA models.

2014-15 TPA Implementation Policy Issues	**Sample Next Generation of the TPA Policy Implementation Issues** *(to be considered by the TPA task group within the Accountability System work plan)*
• Who should score the TPAs from California candidates • The relationship between TPA model owners and program sponsors implementing that model, and the relationship between model owners and the Commission • Addressing the CCSS and the NGSS within the TPA • Candidate and program results data reporting	• Determining whether scorable TPA tasks may be distributed across the program year, used as an end of program culminating assessment, or a combination of approaches. • Examining and making recommendations regarding appropriate support and guidance to candidates during the TPA process • Establishing common TPA implementation policies, including but not limited to: Which content areas should be assessed for Multiple Subject candidates; what are appropriate and inappropriate candidate support policies for work to be submitted for scoring; what should the scoring rubrics be based on; how can scoring reliability and consistency best be addressed; should the scoring process be centralized in some manner, and if so, how local program faculty can be involved in the process • Establishing what data elements should be collected for reporting purposes and program improvement purposes • Designing standard templates for reporting data to candidates and to programs in a manner helpful for candidates during Induction and for program improvement use by preparation program faculty • Establishing which candidate competencies should be assessed by the program, which by the TPA, and which areas require multiple measures in order to assure that candidates have the appropriate knowledge, skills, and abilities (e.g., English learners)

Discussion of Policy-Related TPA Implementation Issues for the 2014-15 Program Year

Although the upcoming Accountability Systems revision work will take a thorough approach to requirements and design principles for the next generation of TPA assessments, there are some important policy decisions to be implemented during this interim period, in 2014-15, to improve statewide TPA implementation across all current programs and TPA models. These are:

- Who should score candidate responses on TPA models used in California
- Responsibilities of TPA model owners to programs using that model and to the Commission
- Reporting of Candidate and Program Results
- Addressing the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) within the TPA

A. Who Should Score Candidate Responses on TPA Models Used in California

To date, all of the approved TPA models used in California have been locally-developed models using California scorers. Now, however, there are national models of a TPA that are interested in being approved for use within California that use a national scorer pool.

Policy Issue: Should a TPA approved for use in California be allowed to use national scorers?

Stakeholders expressed concern that California candidates may not be scored appropriately or accurately by assessors not sufficiently familiar with issues important to teaching and learning in California such as English learners, California's student academic content standards, and California's expectations for beginning teachers as expressed in the TPEs. Some stakeholders did agree that national assessors could bring a potentially valuable national perspective to scoring California candidates. A third option is that a mix of California scorers and national scorers could be a viable approach to scoring, if the national scorers were required to demonstrate they had an appropriate background in issues important to California. For example, a national scorer assessing California candidates could be required to hold an EL authorization from his/her home state.

Many programs have also spoken passionately about the perceived importance of holding to the value of local scoring, to promote both faculty engagement in the TPA process so they are better able to help prepare candidates for the assessment, and to facilitate faculty use of TPA data for program improvement purposes. These programs have expressed concern about the potential loss of these key educative faculty and program benefits from the TPA if national scorers were to be used and local program faculty are not involved in scoring.

Staff Analysis: Staff review of stakeholder input indicates there is considerable support for requiring national models to use only California scorers so that California candidates are assessed by scorers familiar with California academic content standards, TPEs, instructional programs and materials, and expectations for candidate competencies. However, it has been suggested that it might be possible to achieve fair and equitable assessment of candidates if scorers from a national pool were required to hold certification in specific areas important to California such as, for example, an English learner authorization from their home state.

Staff is also cognizant of the strong sentiment in the TPA stakeholder community for the value of local faculty participation in scoring the TPA and for faculty, even if not directly involved in scoring, to be sufficiently knowledgeable about the TPA so they can provide appropriate preparation to candidates and be able to use TPA outcomes data for program improvement purposes.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Commission allow for national scorers to score California TPA candidate responses, with the provisos that (1) national scorers scoring California candidates be required to demonstrate they hold an English learner authorization from their home state, and (2) the national model owner be required to demonstrate after the first year of implementation in California that California candidates scored by national scorers are being scored fairly and equitably as compared with California candidates who are scored by California assessors.

Staff recommends that the Commission establish a policy to require faculty within preliminary preparation programs using the TPA to be sufficiently knowledgeable about the TPA so they can provide appropriate preparation to candidates and be able to use TPA outcomes data for program improvement purposes.

B. Responsibilities of TPA Model Owners to Programs and to the Commission

Current Commission standards do not directly address the ongoing relationship between model developers and programs implementing that model, nor do they address the ongoing relationship between model owners and the Commission.

Policy Issue: Should the Commission adopt expectations for model owners during this interim time period?

Staff suggests that, based on feedback from many program sponsors, the Commission adopt specific expectations for model owners for the 2014-15 program year. These expectations include that model owners must be attentive to the support needs of programs using that model, to the extent possible, and that each model owner must report annually to the Commission on the following:

- The institutions using the model, including (a) continuous users of the model, (b) institutions that choose to adopt the particular model during the program year, and (c) institutions who cease using that model and change to a different TPA model during the program year
- Substantive changes to the model, including but not limited to changes in or to rubrics, training processes and/or materials, and the assessment itself

Staff Analysis: Programs have consistently been interested in receiving more support for local implementation of TPA models, and the Commission's standards do not address this issue. It is reasonable to expect model developers to support programs choosing to use that model with technical support for training and scoring issues, and for implementing the model as designed, within the limits of available resources. Staff suggests that requiring model owners to report to

the Commission each year is also a reasonable idea since the original proposals on which the current models' approval has been based have been modified over time but yet there is no requirement that the model owners update the Commission on these changes and/or modifications to the model as it was originally approved.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Commission adopt expectations for model owners to be supportive of program needs to the extent possible, for model owners to report annually on the status of which institutions are using that model, and for model owners to report annually on substantive changes to the model, as described above.

C. Addressing the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) Within the TPA

As state academic content standards change, it is appropriate to consider if changes are needed within Commission-approved TPA models. With respect to the Common Core State Standards, the Commission has already revised the TPEs to be consistent with the CCSS, and has also revised the subject matter requirements for Multiple Subjects, Single Subject English and Single Subject Mathematics to be consistent with the CCSS.

Policy Issue: How should the TPA system address incorporating the Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards for 2014-15?

Within the TPA system, the candidate task instructions for all models prescribe that candidates should be using the current state-adopted standards for designing their lessons, instructional approaches, and assessments, and ask them to cite the specific standards being reflected in the responses. This means that candidate responses to the TPA should be reflecting instruction consistent with the CCSS, as these are the currently-adopted state academic content standards. Addressing NGSS-related issues is on the list of items still to be considered by the Commission in the near future. Most of the work relating to how TPA models should address the CCSS and the NGSS would fall within the parameters of the Accountability Systems work plan on the next generation of TPA models.

Staff Analysis: During 2014-15, it would be reasonable to expect TPA model owners to begin updating training materials with exemplars that reflect incorporation of the CCSS in candidate responses, and to modify assessor training as needed to focus on the key concepts within the CCSS' interdisciplinary literacy focus that should be expected in candidate responses.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Commission require TPA model owners to begin to incorporate in 2014-15 CCSS-reflective candidate responses into training materials and assessor training as needed to focus on the key concepts within the CCSS' interdisciplinary literacy focus that should be expected in candidate responses.

D. Reporting of Candidate and Program Results

Currently there is a variety of locally-developed formats in which candidate results are provided to candidates, and in which programs report outcomes data within the Biennial Report and/or for other accreditation/accountability purposes.

Policy Issue: Should the Commission require all approved models to develop a standard template for reporting results to candidates and to programs, and should there be a standard model template to facilitate program reporting of outcomes data within the Accountability System?

Having a standard template in which candidate results would be provided to candidates would help the candidate understand the TPA results, help programs use the data for program improvement purposes, and also help the candidate and the induction program use these results for developing an Individual Induction Plan. All TPA models, including national models using a centralized rather than a local scoring system, would be responsible for using this template to provide candidate and program level outcomes data to the programs implementing that model. The template would be developed in consultation with programs and model owners for use in 2014-15.

Staff Analysis: The variability in how data are reported to candidates inhibits the use of these data when candidates transfer between programs, and when induction programs have to deal with the multiple ways in which candidates bring results from their TPA to the induction program for use in developing the initial individual induction plan. Having a standard template for candidate outcomes data by model would seem a reasonable approach to improving this process for 2014-15 and will assist programs in preparing TPA data for Biennial Reports.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that all approved TPA models provide input to and then implement a standard template for reporting results to candidates and to programs, as appropriate, and also a standard template for facilitating program reporting of outcomes data within the Accountability System.

Summary of Staff Recommendations

1. Staff recommends that the Commission allow for national scorers to score California TPA candidate responses, with the provisos that (1) national scorers scoring California candidates be required to demonstrate they hold an English learner authorization from their home state, and (2) the national model owner be required to demonstrate after the first year of implementation in California that California candidates scored by national scorers are being scored fairly and equitably as compared with California candidates who are scored by California assessors.

2. Staff recommends that the Commission establish a policy to require faculty within preliminary preparation programs using the TPA to be sufficiently knowledgeable about the TPA so they can provide appropriate preparation to candidates and be able to use TPA outcomes data for program improvement purposes.

3. Staff recommends that the Commission adopt expectations for model owners to be supportive of program needs to the extent possible, for model owners to report annually on the status of which institutions are using that model, and for model owners to report annually on substantive changes to the model, as described above.

4. Staff recommends that the Commission require TPA model owners to begin to incorporate in 2014-15 CCSS-reflective candidate responses into training materials and assessor training as needed to focus on the key concepts within the CCSS' interdisciplinary literacy focus that should be expected in candidate responses.

5. Staff recommends that all approved TPA models provide input to and then implement a standard template for reporting results to candidates and to programs, as appropriate, and also a standard template for facilitating program reporting of outcomes data within the Accountability System.

Next Steps

The input from the stakeholder community summarized in Appendix A will be provided, as applicable, to the workgroups established to address revisions to the Commission's Accountability System (see agenda item 2E).

Appendix A
Input from the TPA Stakeholder Meeting, May 16, 2014

Staff facilitated a stakeholder input forum on May 16, 2014 concerning a variety of TPA implementation issues. Approximately 50 stakeholders participated in the TPA forum either in person at the Commission Office or via various technologies including email chat groups, Skype, and Google Hangouts.

A summary of the discussions by topic is provided below.

Increasing Scoring Consistency

Staff communicated to stakeholders the Commission's direction that increasing scoring consistency was an important expectation for 2014-15. Stakeholders were asked to discuss potential ways to improve scoring consistency and if they had any specific suggestions to the Commission on this topic.

Many stakeholders surfaced concerns about the availability of scorers and of scorer "drift;" the importance of the involvement of local faculty in scoring and in analyzing and using the TPA results; and the length of student TPA submissions. No specific suggestions for the Commission regarding ways to improve scorer consistency were identified.

Responsibilities of Model Owners

Stakeholders were asked what they felt the responsibilities of the model owners should be to programs implementing the model and to the Commission.

Most participants agreed that there should be more regular and consistent communication between the model owners and programs using that model, and more scorer training/retraining/monitoring by model owners, than is presently the case. Redundancy in the TPA task requirements was seen as a potential area that could be improved by model owners.

Participants also questioned what degree of changes (for example, new TPEs, EL standards, CCSS, etc.) should require model owners to revise the assessment and provide retraining/new scoring and candidate support materials.

Program Standards Requirements vs. What is Assessed on the TPA

Participants were asked to consider what should be more appropriately assessed in the preparation program and what should be more appropriately assessed within a performance assessment, in order to streamline the assessment process and for the assessments to not be duplicative for candidates.

Participants mentioned the concern that candidate responses on the assessment are overly lengthy and that some of the tasks contain redundancies that could potentially be eliminated. However, they also felt that some areas needed more measurement than just one type of

assessment, for example teaching English learners, as either type of assessment (TPA/local program) would be insufficient on its own for this purpose.

Addressing All Learners within the Assessment

Stakeholders were asked to consider whether the TPA models were robust enough in this area, and whether all models addressed all learners within the assessment tasks.

Many participants cited difficulties in placing students where there were English learners and/or special needs students, and also cited candidate placement difficulties with programs that were entirely online or offered by a program sponsor not located in California.

Addressing Core Content Areas for Multiple Subject Candidates

Participants whose small groups chose to discuss this topic were asked whether the TPA should include all four multiple subject core content areas. Participants did not come to consensus on this issue. Some questioned whether just because a candidate could teach English and Math, for example, that was sufficient evidence that they could also appropriately teach a different content area such as Science, where the pedagogy differed in significant ways. Others indicated that the TPA was overly long and redundant, and this could be an area where the scope of the assessment might be able to be reduced.

Who Should Score the TPA, and Faculty Involvement in Scoring

Participants were asked to consider who should score the TPA and what the appropriate involvement level of faculty should be in the assessment process.

All participants cited the value to local program faculty of not only being knowledgeable about scoring, but also participating in the scoring. Participants discussed the issue of national scorers vs. local scorers; there was common sentiment that scoring for California candidates should be in the hands of California scorers. Some participants suggested that the Commission should revise the standards to require scoring participation by local faculty.

Moving to TPA 2.0 (i.e., the next generation of the TPA)

Participants were asked to consider a number of questions relating to what the future generation of TPA assessments should look like.

Regarding the issue of how many times a candidate should be allowed to take the TPA, all participants felt that the Commission should establish a limit for how many times a candidate can retake the assessment, and not allow retakes for passing candidates for purposes of raising the candidate's score. Currently these are program-level decisions and thus the number of time a candidate can retake the assessment varies across programs and models.

Regarding the use of TPA scores, participants felt that model owners should provide a clear statement of the appropriate/inappropriate use of the TPA and of candidate results on the assessment. Some participants cited instances where employers were requiring candidates to

provide their scores and were inappropriately using the scores as a basis for employment decisions.

Regarding whether the Commission should require all models to do an equating study with the Commission's model, participants did not see the need for this and cited several perceived difficulties with the concept such as the fact that the models have already been approved for use, the significant differences between model formats and implementation timing within the preparation program year, the cost of the activity, and who would do these analyses. One group suggested that perhaps the study should be refocused instead on whether all the TPA models are measuring the same things. Some participants suggested the Commission seek legislation to reduce the number of allowable TPA models.

With respect to including the CCSS and NGSS within the TPA models, participants agreed these areas should be addressed but also pointed out practical or implementation difficulties because different districts implement these standards differently, and low incidence single subject content areas are hard to address.

With respect to whether TPA scores should be valid indefinitely or should be limited, participants were divided on the issue. Some indicated that things change in education so the validity of the score should be limited in terms of years and that 5 years was a reasonable term; others stated that there were opinions of both yes and no in their groups and no consensus was reached.

Finally, regarding the issue of whether TPA models should be required to include some type of balance between the different modes of assessment with the design of the model (e.g., a balance between writing, video, student work analysis, etc.), participants cited the difficulty of changing an existing TPA model in radical fashion and the system-wide difficulties such a change might engender.

Some suggested the Commission's Assessment Design Standards should specify how a TPA should look in terms of its design rather than allowing a model developer to come up with its own design. Deciding whether the assessment should be defined as being formative or summative, and when it should occur in the sequence of the preparation program coursework/fieldwork/clinical practice were also thought to be significantly relevant to this issue of model design and what the Commission should require.