

---

# 3F

## Action

### *Professional Services Committee*

## Recommended Passing Score Standard for the Use of the edTPA in California

---

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item provides further information for the Commission's consideration in establishing a passing score standard for the use of the edTPA with California candidates.

**Policy Question:** What recommended passing score standard for the edTPA meets the Commission's expectations for teacher preparation candidates in California?

**Recommended Action:** That the Commission approve a passing standard for use of the edTPA in California, and reevaluate the passing standard after two years of implementation.

**Presenter:** Michael Taylor, Consultant, 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.

October 2014

---

# Recommended Passing Score Standard for the Use of the edTPA in California

---

## Introduction

This item provides further information regarding establishing a passing score standard for the use of the edTPA with California candidates and options for the Commission's consideration.

## Background

The Education Code (EC) specifies in section 44320.2(b) that beginning July 1, 2008 all multiple and single subject candidates must pass a teaching performance assessment that is aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and congruent with state content and performance standards for pupils. Since 2008, three Commission-approved TPA models (CalTPA, FAST, and PACT) have been operating in the state. At its August 2014 meeting the Commission approved the edTPA as a fourth TPA model available for use by Commission-approved teacher preparation programs in California.

## Overview of the edTPA

The edTPA is owned by Stanford University, through the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity (SCALE). SCALE contracts with Evaluation Systems (group of Pearson), a national testing contractor that administers and manages the scoring of the assessment. The edTPA is a national model of teaching performance assessment usable by multiple states. According to the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) website (<http://edtpa.aacte.org/faq#17>), the following states are participating in the edTPA: Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

The edTPA assessment model provides three key tasks for candidates: Planning, Instruction, and Assessment, all three of which include aspects of academic language and analyzing teaching. Candidates are provided with instructions and prompts that guide their reflections, responses, artifacts and other portfolio evidence, including several video clips of the candidate's instruction, lesson plans, student work samples, analysis of student learning, and reflective commentaries.

Candidate responses are scored according to a total of 15 rubrics (5 per task) except for the Elementary Education task, which is scored according to a total of 18 rubrics (15 rubrics addressing the English Language Arts tasks and 3 addressing the mathematics assessment task) and the World Language/Classical Language tasks, which have 13 rubrics each. All rubrics are on a five point scale, which the developers of the edTPA regard as a developmental scale indicating

increasing candidate performance across the scale range. A sample rubric is provided in Appendix A.

Scorers of the edTPA are drawn from a national “academy” of trained, calibrated assessors. Scorer training and calibration is provided by SCALE; the implementation of candidate registration, portfolio submission, and scoring processes are provided by Evaluation Systems.

### **Piloting of the edTPA in California**

In September 2012, the Commission approved a small pilot of the edTPA with three California multiple and single subject teacher preparation programs. Three institutions (San Diego State University, UCSB, and USC) that wanted to pilot the edTPA requested that the Commission approve a waiver so that these institutions could pilot the edTPA with some of their candidates. (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-09/2012-09-2F.pdf>)

In September 2013 the Commission approved an expanded pilot of the edTPA. A total of eleven institutions participated in the 2013-14 edTPA pilot. Appendix B provides a list of the pilot institutions, how many candidates participated, and which content areas were included in the pilot.

In August 2014 the Commission approved the use of the edTPA as a fourth Teaching Performance Assessment model usable by California teacher preparation programs.

### **Establishing a California passing score standard**

On July 1, 2014 edTPA conducted a standard setting study at Stanford University for California candidates. Commission staff participated as observers in the standard setting activities and process. The following chart documents the individuals who participated as members of the standard setting panel:

<b>Participant</b>	<b>Affiliation/Representing</b>
Nathan Avani	California State University – San Francisco State University
Lynne Bercau	California State University – Chico
Nadine Bezuk	California State University – San Diego State University
Jo Birdsell	National University and California Council of Teacher Educators (CCTE)
Marta Fuentes	Teacher and former edTPA Candidate
Vicki Laboskey	Mills College
Antoinette Linton	Washington Preparatory High School and University of Southern California
Helene Mandell	University of San Diego
Noni Reis	California Teachers Association and San Jose State University
Kip Tellez	University of California at Santa Cruz
Keith Walters	California Baptist University
Darby Williams	Sacramento County Office of Education and Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment

Panelists were informed of the purpose of the assessment and provided with a Briefing Book to guide their activity. The Briefing Book Method (Appendix C) is an evidence-based standard setting method intended to develop an appropriate and defensible cut score that can be supported with a validity argument. During the facilitated one-day session, panelists familiarized themselves with the assessment and with the information contained in the briefing book. After a series of “Policy Capture Activities,” panelists recommended an initial cut score (which is also referred to as a “passing standard”), which was then discussed and evaluated. Following that, panelists recommended a final cut score. Discussion was held, and a final “consensus cut score” was obtained from the panelists.

### **SCALE-Recommended edTPA Passing Standard**

Based on the Standard Setting activities described in this report, the sample included in the validation study, the median of the panelist recommendations (a score of 43), and the calculated standard error of measurement (SEM) of 4 points, SCALE proposes the following passing standards for the edTPA, as specified below:

- An edTPA California state passing standard of **39 points** for 15-rubric fields
- An edTPA California state passing standard of **34 points** for 13-rubric fields (e.g., World Language, Classical Language)
- An edTPA California state passing standard of **47 points** for 18-rubric fields (e.g., Elementary Education)

*Conditions:* Conditions are rules around how many score points on the low end of the scoring across the rubric scale candidates are allowed to have and to still pass the assessment. For example, a condition might be that candidates can have no more than a certain number of scores of “1” on a five-point rubric in order to pass the assessment. Based on the Standard Setting activities, feedback received from the panelists, and a preliminary review of the data, SCALE recommends that currently no conditions be applied to the edTPA passing standards indicated above for the first year of implementation. However, SCALE also recommends evaluating the potential application of conditions relating to the passing standards the following year when more candidates have taken edTPA and a more robust data set is available for examining patterns related to scores of 1 within a variety of fields and for different rubrics.

If the Commission wishes to consider applying conditions to the edTPA passing standard, this issue should be referred back for further discussion by the standard setting expert panel in order to maintain both the legal defensibility and the integrity of the standard setting process.

### **Staff Analysis:**

Staff notes that initially the raters in the standard setting study recommended a California passing standard between 40 and 44, based on a review of candidate portfolios and both small and whole group discussion. A score of 43 represents the mean of rater recommendations, with individual raters recommending final passing scores ranging from 42 to 44.

SCALE has proposed applying the Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) of -4 points to the mean panel-recommended cut score of 43 to reduce potential false negatives, thereby

preventing candidates who likely possess the knowledge necessary to pass the edTPA from receiving a failing score.

Applying half of the standard error of measurement would result in a passing standard that falls between the current SCALE-recommended score of 39 and the standard setting panel mean recommendation of 43. The table below shows the impact, in terms of pass rates, of three possible passing scores: the panel's recommendation of 43, SCALE's SEM-adjusted recommendation of 39, and the midpoint of that range. The impact data provided by SCALE includes pass rates for both national and California participants in the edTPA pilot studies at each of these score points.

**Overall Pass Rates by Cut Score (15 Rubric Fields)**

<b>Cut Score</b>	<b>National Pass Rate</b>	<b>California Pass Rate</b>
43	64%	89%
41	74%	93%
39	78%	96%

The sample for the edTPA California pilot studies was concentrated among a specific segment of institutional type, with more than half of participating institutions being in the University of California (UC) system, and all but two of the institutions being users of the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). The UC system produces approximately 5% of the new teachers in California and the UC preparation programs are almost universally full time teacher preparation programs. While the sample was large enough to support the standard setting process, it may not be representative of all California candidates and therefore it is not known how these pass rates might differ given a larger sample of California candidates and institutions. The California candidates who participated in the pilot did outperform their non-California counterparts who participated in the national pilot of edTPA. Though the reasons for California's scores being higher than the national scores are unknown, it can reasonably be inferred that this was to be expected given California candidates' status as graduate students (as opposed to mostly undergraduate candidates in the national sample) and the long history of TPA use in California programs.

Approving a passing standard of 39, as recommended by SCALE, would allow for the application of a full standard error of measurement, which could be warranted if the pilot population of candidates is not representative of the population of California candidates and institutions. This passing standard would support institutions seeking to transition to edTPA by allowing time to ramp up and put in place the supports that candidates will need in order to successfully complete the edTPA. This passing standard falls outside the range recommended by the standard setting panel, however. Approving a passing standard of 41 would fall within the range of scores recommended by the standard setting panel, and allow for the application of one half of the standard error of measurement, based on sample size and uncertainties about the representativeness of the sample. Approving a passing standard of 43 would be consistent with the recommendations of the standard setting panel, but would not take SEM into consideration. Staff notes that it would be appropriate in this context for the Commission to

consider applying a standard error of measurement, whether a full or a half, because of the limited size of the California sample, the fact that the sample may not be sufficiently representative of the candidates in preparation programs as a whole, and that the edTPA is a new assessment for California programs. Whatever the Commission decides on this matter, staff recommends that the passing standard be revisited after a larger pool of California candidates has the opportunity to take the edTPA.

The tables below show what pass rates would be for California candidates in each content area at each of the three possible cut scores discussed in this item. Pass rates are not reported for content areas with fewer than ten candidates and are indicated by an asterisk.

<b>California First Attempt Pass Rates at Alternative Cut Scores</b>	<b>Total N candidates</b>	<b>% Pass at 43</b>	<b>% Pass at 41</b>	<b>% Pass at 39</b>
<b>Field Name</b>				
<b>Elementary Literacy</b>	68	88.24	92.65	94.12
<b>Elementary Mathematics</b>	150	95.33	97.33	97.33
<b>K-12 Performing Arts</b>	15	66.67	66.67	80.00
<b>K-12 Physical Education</b>	4	*	*	*
<b>Secondary English-Language</b>	55	98.18	100.00	100.00
<b>Secondary History/ Social Studies</b>	42	88.10	97.62	97.62
<b>Secondary Mathematics</b>	67	94.03	94.03	94.03
<b>Secondary Science</b>	70	98.57	100.00	100.00
<b>Visual Arts</b>	2	*	*	*

The table below shows what pass rates would be for National (non-California) candidates in each content area at each of three possible cut scores.

<b>National First Attempt Pass Rates at Alternative Cut Scores</b>	<b>Total N candidates</b>	<b>% Pass at 43</b>	<b>% Pass at 41</b>	<b>% Pass at 39</b>
<b>Field Name</b>				
<b>Agricultural Education</b>	40	85.00	92.50	92.50
<b>Business Education</b>	40	25.00	40.00	45.00
<b>Elementary Literacy</b>	1,506	61.49	70.45	73.64
<b>Elementary Mathematics</b>	1,732	73.33	83.89	86.89
<b>English as an Additional Language</b>	188	82.98	87.23	89.36
<b>Family and Consumer Science</b>	45	60.00	71.11	71.11
<b>Health Education</b>	67	31.34	34.33	35.82
<b>K-12 Performing Arts</b>	761	62.81	73.46	78.06
<b>K-12 Physical Education</b>	466	59.23	70.17	72.96
<b>Secondary English-Language Arts</b>	1,082	76.16	83.83	87.43

<b>National First Attempt Pass Rates at Alternative Cut Scores</b>	<b>Total N candidates</b>	<b>% Pass at 43</b>	<b>% Pass at 41</b>	<b>% Pass at 39</b>
<b>Secondary History/Social Studies</b>	1,087	69.09	77.74	82.15
<b>Secondary Mathematics</b>	937	73.21	82.50	85.91
<b>Secondary Science</b>	801	70.54	78.65	81.40
<b>Special Education</b>	1,633	42.44	50.52	54.13
<b>Technology and Engineering</b>	21	38.10	38.10	47.62
<b>Visual Arts</b>	348	74.14	84.48	87.93

The table below shows pass rates for California candidates by demographic group membership at each of three possible cut scores. Pass rates are not reported for groups with fewer than ten candidates and are indicated by an asterisk.

<b>California First Attempt Pass Rates by Group</b>	<b>Total N candidates</b>	<b>% Pass at 43</b>	<b>% Pass at 41</b>	<b>% Pass at 39</b>
<b>Gender</b>				
<b>Male</b>	118	87.29	92.37	94.07
<b>Female</b>	343	95.63	97.38	97.96
<b>Decline to State</b>	13	84.62	84.62	84.62
<b>Race</b>				
<b>African American/Black</b>	12	91.67	91.67	100.00
<b>American Indian/Alaskan Native</b>	2	*	*	*
<b>Asian/Pac Islander</b>	78	92.31	97.44	98.72
<b>Hispanic</b>	89	88.76	93.26	93.26
<b>White (non Hispanic)</b>	214	95.33	96.73	97.20
<b>Multiracial</b>	43	93.02	93.02	93.02
<b>Other</b>	10	90.00	90.00	100.00
<b>Decline to State</b>	26	96.15	100.00	100.00
<b>Primary language</b>				
<b>English</b>	425	93.41	96.00	96.94
<b>Non-English</b>	34	91.18	94.12	94.12
<b>Decline to State</b>	15	93.33	93.33	93.33

Finally the table below shows pass rates for National (non-California) candidates by demographic group membership at each of three possible cut scores.

<b>National First Attempt Pass Rates by Group</b>	<b>Total N candidates</b>	<b>% Pass at 43</b>	<b>% Pass at 41</b>	<b>% Pass at 39</b>
<b>Gender</b>				
<b>Male</b>	3,338	59.86	69.44	73.19

<b>National First Attempt Pass Rates by Group</b>	<b>Total N candidates</b>	<b>% Pass at 43</b>	<b>% Pass at 41</b>	<b>% Pass at 39</b>
<b>Female</b>	10,004	65.72	75.10	78.78
<b>Decline to State</b>	173	60.12	69.94	75.72
<b>Race</b>				
<b>African American/Black</b>	346	50.58	60.69	64.45
<b>American Indian/Alaskan Native</b>	43	67.44	72.09	74.42
<b>Asian/Pac Islander</b>	349	74.79	84.24	86.25
<b>Hispanic</b>	435	59.31	70.57	76.32
<b>White (non Hispanic)</b>	11,506	64.24	73.73	77.36
<b>Multiracial</b>	303	69.64	78.88	81.85
<b>Other</b>	130	59.23	64.62	70.00
<b>Decline to State</b>	403	67.99	75.43	81.14
<b>Primary language</b>				
<b>English</b>	13,206	64.18	73.59	77.30
<b>Non-English</b>	195	66.15	78.46	82.05
<b>Decline to State</b>	114	63.16	71.05	76.32

### Staff Recommendations

1. Staff recommends the Commission select one of the following options for approving a minimum passing standard for use of the edTPA in California:
  - a. Approve the SCALE-recommended passing score of 39 for edTPA including the application of the calculated SEM of -4 with no conditions.
  - b. Approve the SCALE-recommended passing score of 39 for edTPA including the application of the calculated SEM of -4 and place specified conditions on the number and distribution of “1s” that would be allowable while still earning a passing score on edTPA. To develop the specific conditions, direct staff to work with SCALE and the standard setting panel and return with a recommendation for the conditions at the December 2014 Commission meeting.
  - c. Apply one half of the calculated SEM and approve the passing standard of 41 for edTPA with no conditions.
  - d. Apply one half of the calculated SEM, approve the passing standard of 41 for edTPA and place specified conditions on the number and distribution of “1s” that would be allowable while still earning a passing score on edTPA. To develop the specific conditions, direct staff to work with SCALE and the standard setting panel and return with a recommendation for the conditions at the December 2014 Commission meeting.
2. Staff also recommends that following the first two operational years of edTPA administration in California, SCALE reexamine scoring and impact data and provide the

Commission with a recommendation as to whether modifying the approved passing score standard is warranted.

**Next Steps**

If the Commission takes action to establish a California passing standard for edTPA, staff will work with SCALE to provide the necessary information to programs interested in using the edTPA for the 2014-15 academic year and/or the 2015-16 academic year and beyond.

## Appendix A

### Sample edTPA Scoring Rubric

Instruction Rubrics continued

#### Rubric 8: Deepening Student Learning

How does the candidate elicit responses to promote thinking and develop understanding of mathematical concepts?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Candidate does most of the talking and students provide few responses.</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>Candidate responses include significant content inaccuracies that will lead to student misunderstandings.</p>	<p>Candidate primarily asks surface-level questions and evaluates student responses as correct or incorrect.</p>	<p>Candidate elicits student responses related to mathematical reasoning or problem solving to develop understanding of a mathematical concept.</p>	<p>Candidate elicits and builds on students' mathematical reasoning or problem solving to explicitly portray, extend, or clarify a mathematical concept.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 plus:</b> Candidate facilitates interactions among students to develop understanding of a mathematical concept.</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Profile of edTPA Pilot Participation in California**

	Elementary			Secondary								Total
	Literacy	Math	Education (Literacy & Math)	English	Social Science	Math	Science	P.E.	Art	World Languages	Music	
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo		37		8	10	7	21					83
CalState TEACH			15									15
San Diego State University	19			15	12	17	10	4	2	3	4	86
San Francisco State University							10				12	22
UC Berkeley		19										19
UC Irvine		70										70
UC Los Angeles	48			15	16	11	12					102
UC Riverside				6		16						22
UC San Diego				1		5	8					14
UC Santa Barbara		28		11	4	10	10			7		70
Western Governors University (California)			3			2						5
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>508</b>

## Appendix C

### Overview of the Briefing Book Standard Setting Method

July 27, 2013

Standard setting is a process of determining what score on a test or assessment demonstrates a specified level of performance. Very broadly, the process begins with a statement of the intended *performance standard* – that is, a description of what people meeting the performance standard know and are able to do. The goal is then to determine a *cut score* on an accompanying test or assessment that separates those who meet the performance standard from those who do not. From a technical standpoint it is important that the cut score accurately and reliably distinguish between people who do and do not meet the performance standard. However, because articulation of a performance standard and the accompanying cut score entail value judgments, it is also important to ensure the performance standard and cut score are appropriate for the intended use.

The Briefing Book Method (BBM) is an evidence-based standard setting method intended to develop an appropriate and defensible cut score that can be supported with a validity argument. The BBM provides a framework and approach to standard setting rather than a specific set of steps or procedures that must be followed exactly. The primary aim is to follow a process that allows a body with the appropriate authority and knowledge to reach a defensible and appropriate judgment of a passing cut score.

The BBM proceeds in a number of steps, including an articulation of the purpose for the standard setting, data collection and synthesis, a standard setting session, and continued evaluation.

1. *Define purpose of assessment and standard setting.* Here the purpose of setting a cut score is outlined. This describes how the assessment and cut score will be used. An articulation of the performance standard is formulated. When the performance standard is articulated here, it is essential that the performance standard represent an appropriate level for the intended use and that it be directly aligned to what the assessment measures.
2. *Initial administration and data collection.* The intended use of the assessment will dictate the data that need to be collected during this stage. Minimally, information about the distribution of scores on the target assessment across relevant groups is needed for construction of the briefing book. Additional data might include the results of validity or reliability studies conducted to inform what different scores on the assessment mean and how consistent they are for the intended use.

3. *Briefing book assembly.* The briefing book is the primary source of information for participants who will recommend a cut score. The briefing book describes the nature of the assessment and the goal of the standard setting process. In addition, the briefing book contains evidence to a) characterize the level of performance at different potential cut scores and b) provide contextual information about the likely impact and appropriateness of different potential cut scores (e.g., passing rates). The characterizations of performance at different potential cut scores serve as performance standards corresponding to each cut score. Contextual information informs participants about the likely impact of a potential cut score. Additional information can be included as available and necessary.
4. *Standard setting session.* A group of domain experts and relevant policy makers are convened as panelists for the standard setting session. These panelists are informed of the purpose of the assessment and provided with the briefing book. During a facilitated 1 or 2 day session panelists familiarize themselves with the assessment and with the information contained in the briefing book. Panelists recommend an initial cut score, which is then discussed and evaluated. At least one additional round of recommendations is usually conducted during the session, before the panel recommends a final cut score that best meets the needs of relevant stakeholders and the intended use of the assessment. Ideally this score is reached via consensus.
5. *Follow-up evaluation.* Following adoption of the cut score, subsequent administrations of the assessment are monitored to ensure the cut score is functioning as anticipated and is being used appropriately. This might include determining whether passing rates are at an acceptable level, whether those achieving passing scores demonstrate the intended level of performance in subsequent activities, and whether there is evidence of unequal passing rates or adverse impact across different groups of examinees.

## **References**

- Haertel, E. H. (2002). Standard setting as a participatory process: Implications for validation of standards-based accountability programs. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 21*, 16–22. doi:10.1111/j.1745-3992.2002.tb00081.x
- Haertel, E. H. (2008). Standard setting. In K. E. Ryan & L. A. Shepard (Eds.), *The future of test-based educational accountability* (pp. 139–154). New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Haertel, E. H., Beimers, J. N., & Miles, J. A. (2012). The briefing book method. In G. J. Cizek (Ed.), *Setting performance standards: Foundations, methods, and innovations* (2nd ed., pp. 283–299). New York, NY: Routledge.
- McClarty, K. L., Way, W. D., Porter, A. C., Beimers, J. N., & Miles, J. A. (2013). Evidence-based standard setting: Establishing a validity framework for cut scores. *Educational Researcher, 42*(2), 78–88. doi:10.3102/0013189X1247085