
2G

Information

Professional Services Committee

Report on Stakeholder Meetings Regarding the Commission Examination System

Executive Summary: At the August 12, 2004 meeting of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, staff was directed to establish stakeholder and technical advisory panels to study possible ways to streamline the structure and number of current licensure exams. This item discusses the panels' comments and concerns that might form the basis for future study.

Recommended Action: This is an information item and requires no action.

Presenter: Beth Graybill, Former Director;
Yvonne Novelli, Consultant, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal(s):

Goal 1: Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators

- Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators
- Sustain high quality standards for the performance of credential candidates

Report on Stakeholder Meetings Regarding the Commission Examination System

Background

In August 2004, staff presented the Commission with information regarding the streamlining of the examinations and assessments used for teacher certification in California. The Commission directed staff to consult with stakeholders to suggest appropriate actions that might be considered to aid in this endeavor and to have a group of technical advisors knowledgeable in testing review these suggestions for feasibility. In a series of meetings held at the Commission from November 2004 through March 2005, the discussion groups addressed the following four topics:

1. What is the appropriate way to assess basic skill competency?
2. Is there overlapping content across the current teacher licensure exams?
3. What are the implications of appropriate and secure on-line, test center exams?
4. How should the SB 2042 teaching performance assessment requirement be maintained and implemented?

The Commission held three stakeholders meetings, two one-day and one two-day, with each day covering a separate topic. Notification of these meetings was placed on the Commission's website, distributed at various meetings, such as the Credential Counselors and Analysts of California (CCAC) Fall 2004 Conference, and sent to numerous educational organizations and others who might be interested in these topics. Interested stakeholders were asked, but not required, to notify staff of their possible attendance prior to the meetings so informational materials could be e-mailed to them in advance. These background materials included Education Code sections, regulations, content specifications, test structures, and other information appropriate to the topic. Attachment A partial list of the individuals who attended some or all of these meetings. The results of each meeting were e-mailed to interested stakeholders, including those who attended the specific meeting.

For the technical advisors, staff sought nominations from the Chancellor of the California State University, the President of the University of California, and the President of the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities. They were each asked to nominate three advisors who were knowledgeable about large scale test development and implementation, including knowledge about performance assessment. All nominees were invited, and many were able to attend each of the three one-day meetings, which covered topic 1, topics 2 and 3, and topic 4, respectively, and were held at the Commission following the corresponding stakeholders' meeting. The technical advisors are listed in Attachment B. As with the stakeholders, prior to each meeting the technical advisors were sent the same background materials as the stakeholders in addition to the

summary of the stakeholders' meeting covering that topic. An interactive website was also established to promote further discussions.

The examination requirements discussed at these meetings included the basic skills, subject matter competency, reading instruction, and teaching performance assessments. Because of the enormity of the topics, the discussions focused on the exam requirements as they relate to the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential, which utilizes the relevant examinations at a higher volume than other teaching credentials. Attachment C is a brief overview of the examinations, as they apply to the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential.

Because of the potential legislative activity related to the basic skills examination, (SB 428 (Scott)), presenting the results of this study to the Commission was postponed until now. With the current discussions related to examination restructuring, staff is hoping that the stakeholders' thoughtful insight will add to the exchange of ideas.

General Findings from the Stakeholders' Meetings

Both the stakeholders and technical advisors proved to be well-informed and innovative when tackling these four topics. The following focuses on three of the main suggestions:

1. The reduction in the number of required examinations,
2. The implementation of an electronic testing format, and
3. The future of the teaching performance assessment.

1. Reduce the number of required examinations:

Because the teacher certification examinations offered by the Commission cover content required by law for either certification or employment, none of the broad areas tested can be eliminated without legislative intervention. Given that, both panels supported studying the feasibility of using passage of the California Subject Examinations for Teachers: Multiple Subjects (CSET: MS) in lieu of passage of all or part of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST). If the study substantiates this, other CSET subject areas may possibly be reviewed for consolidation in the future. Even though this concept was strongly supported, there were a number of concerns raised by the groups that would need further review, such as the following:

Different Knowledge Assessed

The CBEST and CSET: MS exams assess distinctly different sets of knowledge. The CBEST tests basic comprehension skills (reading, writing, and mathematics) while the CSET: MS tests content knowledge. Within these distinctions, CBEST multiple-choice Reading and constructed response Writing sections test how well the examinee reads, interprets, and responds to the general prompts without needing prior knowledge of the specific content presented in the question. The questions found in the CSET: MS test the examinees' prior knowledge of the various subjects. Considering the ramifications of using the CSET: MS to verify reading and writing skills raised numerous questions, including the following:

- Would it be appropriate to infer that if an individual correctly answers CSET: MS multiple-choice questions that they not only know the content tested but have appropriate reading skills needed for a beginning teacher?
- Currently, the examinees' answers to the CSET: MS constructed response questions are only reviewed in terms of content and the scorers are expressly instructed to ignore spelling, grammar, sentence structure, and so forth. Would it be fair to ask candidates to answer a constructed-response question so it reflects both writing skills and content knowledge? How would they respond if they either did not know the content or had already satisfied the basic skills requirement? Should there be a separate, optional writing component? Should examinees be allowed additional time to complete either a "dual" or separate question?
- Because there is currently a single score given to the combined CSET: MS multiple-choice and constructed-response questions, would separate passing standards be needed to determine competent reading skills equivalent to those required for the CBEST?
- If the CSET: MS is altered, will any test development, including validity studies and review of passing standards, be required to determine that the content covered and difficulty level is equivalent to the current CSET: MS? Will the resulting test be legally defensible for both the CSET: MS and the CBEST purposes? Would combining the two tests result in a "watered down" version of either the basic skill or subject matter competency standards to the point of being ineffectual?

Different Test Specifications

The CBEST and CSET: MS exams are derived from different test specifications. For example, even though both examinations contain mathematical components, the CBEST mathematics specifications reflect what a beginning teacher or other certificated employee needs to function in an educational setting. This includes knowledge of estimation, measurement, statistics, computation, problem solving, and numerical and graph relationships. In contrast, the CSET: MS specifications reflect the level of mathematics needed to teach math to K-8 students, covering number sense, algebra, functions, measurement, geometry, statistics, data analysis, and probability. When considering the appropriateness of using the mathematics section of the CSET: MS to satisfy the mathematics basics skills requirement, the following concerns were raised.

- Will the mathematical areas tested in the CSET: MS be sufficient to satisfy the purpose of the CBEST mathematics test?
- The CBEST mathematics section contains 40 multiple-choice questions and the mathematics portion of the CSET: MS has 26 multiple-choice and 2 constructed-response questions. Will the difference in testing format pose any problems? Do the CSET: MS 26 multiple-choice and 2 constructed-response questions equate in content coverage and rigor to the CBEST 40 multiple-choice questions?
- Because the CSET: MS: Science and Mathematics subtest has a single score, would a separate mathematics passing standards be required?
- Will the resulting test be legally defensible for both the CSET: MS and the CBEST purposes?

Other Concerns

The consolidation of the CBEST and CSET: MS exams may have an impact on other aspects of an individual's academic career. Currently, the CBEST is used to verify basic skills for employment and certification in addition to the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential. Also, many special education credential candidates use the CSET: MS to satisfy subject matter competency. The following are some concerns regarding the effects of possibly consolidating the CBEST into the CSET: MS.

- Should the CBEST continue to be offered as an independent examination for its other uses?
- Will passing the consolidated version of the CSET: MS legally satisfy all other basic skill requirements for employment and other types of certification?
- If an individual has already passed CBEST, will they need to take any portion of the CSET: MS added as a result of the consolidation?
- Will passing the CBEST satisfy any portion of the CSET: MS?

2. Move to an Electronic Testing Format

Currently, all examinations administered for certification are either paper-based, e.g., CBEST, CSET, and Reading Instruction Competence Assessment: Written Examination (RICA: WE), or portfolio-based, e.g., Reading Instruction Competence Assessment: Video Performance Assessment (RICA: VPA) and Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA). None use an electronic testing platform that allows the examinee to take the test by using a computer. The stakeholders' meeting concerning computer-based testing was greatly enhanced by presentations from John Mattar, representing National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES) and Jerry Deluca, representing Educational Testing Service (ETS). The topics included practical matters to consider when adapting an exam to this testing format, initiating an electronically administered examination, and continuing its administration. Also adding to the dialogue was a discussion of exams currently offered using this format.

The stakeholders and technical advisors felt that transitioning to computer-based tests would add a positive aspect to California testing by possibly having the exam more readily available through out the year, graded with unofficial score results more quickly given, and offered in a more comfortable testing environment for the increasingly computer-literate examinee population. Before fully supporting its implementation, the panels felt that there were questions and concerns that needed further investigating, which fall into the broad areas below.

Initiating and Maintaining a Computer-Based Testing Structure:

- Will secure, computer-based testing sites be sufficiently available, considering location, capacity, and frequency of administrations and computer compatibility? Will tests offered by other entities be competing for these sites? Are there a sufficient number of trained personnel at these sites? What options are there if either a site or the entire system fails?
- How well will the current paper-based tests adapt to a computer-based format? If not all of the current test items are adaptable, is it significant enough to affect the assessment of their related standards? Based on the frequency of the administrations,

will new test items be needed? If adopted, would it be best to begin with the multiple-choice CBEST reading and mathematics sections?

- Will unique computer programs be required for any of the different testing tasks? How often will they need to be upgraded? Will they be usable at all sites through out California?
- Will computer-based tests have any impact on the scoring process?

Equity to the Examinees

- Will the computer knowledge and comfort level of the examinees and their familiarity with computer test-taking strategies affect their results?
- If a paper-based option remains, will there be any inconsistencies between this and the computer-based version that might affect the examinees' results? Will score results from the computer-based version be available sooner than the paper-based, giving these examinees an advantage when applying for program admission or employment? Will individuals taking the computer-based examination be allowed to re-take it more frequently than those taking the paper-based version?
- Would both the paper-based and computer-based versions of a test form be legally defensible?
- Would this format create any unique problems or benefits for examinees requesting alternative testing arrangements based on health issues or religious beliefs?
- What safeguards are there against individuals hacking into the system, copying or altering information electronically, or illegally using electronic writing or mathematical aids?

Funding

- What costs will be incurred to initiate and maintain the computer-based format? These may include costs related to modifying test sites, revising test items and formats, and developing computer programs.
- Who will pay for any added costs to the testing program? Should all examinees pay for it through test fees, or should it be considered an additional service charged only to those using it? Are there other funding sources?
- Do any laws, regulations, or other budgetary restrictions impact the funding amount or source?

3. The Future of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA)

The Stakeholders' meeting regarding the TPA was the most highly attended. Guest speakers, Wayne Bacer, from Azusa Pacific University, and Jerry Deluca, from ETS, added greatly to the meeting by sharing their experiences with a computerized version of the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CA TPA) and a national electronically-administered portfolio exam, respectively. At both meetings, the stakeholders and technical advisors actively discussed numerous aspects of the TPA, ranging from questioning its necessity to standardizing it across institutions. Some of the concerns addressed included the following:

Funding for the TPA

During the meetings, a number of individuals commented that their candidates and faculty feel that individuals who complete the TPA, even though it requires intensive

work, feel better prepared when facing their first classroom assignment. Transitioning to and maintaining the TPA has proven to be a somewhat costly endeavor for many institutions facing financial challenges. The following funding options were discussed at the meetings:

- Could candidates assist in the funding through added fees or would this create an undue burden when considering the declining availability of financial aid? Could other requirements, such as examinations, be consolidated or eliminated to offset the candidates' TPA fee? Could part of the TPA be completed during induction, a point when candidates have transitioned into paid teaching positions and could better afford the costs?
- Could institutions re-assess their programs to determine if any of the work has become redundant or no longer needed, then use any saved funds to support the TPA? Are institutions duplicating any work that is now completed through the TPA? Are there ways to streamline the TPA that will reduce its cost without affecting its integrity?
- If the TPA becomes mandated, would the state allocate resources toward funding this requirement? Are there other funding sources, such as grants or endowments, which might assist?

The Option of an Online TPA Administration

Stakeholders showed a strong interest in Dr. Bacer's presentation of Azusa Pacific University's online CA TPA and the possibilities of adapting it to meet their own institution's needs. Dr. Bacer's program is accessible anywhere by faculty and students and contains all CA TPA information needed by candidates, such as instructions, sample lesson plans, rubrics, and benchmarks. Candidates may also download the worksheets for the different tasks, complete them, and then submit them electronically to the university for scoring. Additionally, Dr. Deluca's informative discussion regarding the electronic administration and scoring of the existing the National Board Exam, which has both portfolio and constructed response assessments, was well received at the stakeholders' meeting.

- Are there any financial expenditures or savings associated with implementing and maintaining an online TPA administration?
- Could an existing TPA online program be easily adapted to meet another institution's unique needs?
- Do the candidates, faculty, or scorers need any extensive training to use an electronic version of the TPA?
- Would there be any impact to the statistical analysis of the assessment results?

Centralized TPA Scoring

One key aspect of the legal defensibility of any assessment is equitable scoring. This is true whether it is an assessment unique to an institution or one, such as the CA TPA, that has been adopted by numerous institutions. Under the current process, every institution is responsible for scoring its candidates' TPA. Those approved for the CA TPA have personnel trained by the Commission who, in turn, train their own institution's scorers.

Local scoring versus centralized scoring is an area of interest for many of the panel members, as noted by the following questions raised:

- Who would administer a centralized scoring system if it were established, a consortium of institutions, the Commission, an outside testing agency, or someone else? If an outside testing agency were used, who would be responsible to contract with them?
- It was noted that because of assignment changes and “burn-out,” it was difficult to retain a sufficient number of experienced scorers. Would a centralized scoring system have the same difficulties, or would there be a more consistent pool of trained scorers?
- If scoring were centralized, who would fund it? If the candidates are responsible, what costs would they incur and would it place an undue burden on them? If the institutions were relieved of this duty, could they reallocate the funds used for scoring to other aspects of the TPA?
- Would the measurement structure be more likely to erode over time with either the local or centralized scoring structure? Would outside groups, such as induction programs and accrediting agencies, feel more confident or less with the test results that are determined centrally?
- If centralized scoring were adopted, would it be available for only the CA TPA or could the unique TPAs from other programs also be scored? Would using multiple test structures affect the cost or other aspects of the scoring? Would programs with unique TPAs lose any of their creativity or distinction?
- Currently, the Commission has recommended a minimum passing score for the CA TPA, with institutions allowed to establish the actual passing score for their candidates. Would this still be available under a centralized scoring system?
- If centralized scoring was available but some institutions wish to continue evaluating their own candidates, would the Commission consider periodically re-scoring a sampling of their candidates’ TPAs to determine if the scoring remains consistent and valid?

The TPA’s Role in Accreditation

Institutions with Commission-approved programs must be regionally accredited, and, for most institutions, this is through the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). Many institutions also seek accreditation from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). During WASC and NCATE accreditation and Commission accreditation visits, one area reviewed is the type and quality of the assessment used to verify the candidate’s knowledge, skills, and abilities. Additionally, California programs are impacted by federal requirements, including Title II Reporting and No Child Left Behind (NCLB). The concerns expressed by the participants of the meetings included the following:

- Is there any duplication between the Commission’s Teacher Preparation Program Standard 19 and the WASC and NCATE standards? Could the Commission eliminate any redundancy or make revisions so the standards complement each other?

- Is the individuality of an institution's program within the current TPA structure compatible with the preferences of WASC, NCATE, and others? Would these agencies prefer a standardized statewide assessment?

Conclusion

The above discussion summarizes the breadth of the conversations and the range of ideas and issues raised by the participants in the public input forms concerning the potential for consolidation of Commission examinations. The contributions made by participants as well as by technical advisors to the dialogue were greatly appreciated and can provide a basis for informing future Commission policy and direction concerning the feasibility of exams consolidation.

Attachment A Stakeholders

The following is a partial list of the individuals who attended some or all of the three Stakeholders meetings.

Wayne Bacer, Azusa Pacific University	Tootie Killingsworth, CSU San Bernardino-Palm Desert Campus
Janet Bell, National Evaluation Systems, Inc.	Peggy Koshland-Crane, Notre Dame de Namur University
Merilyn Buchanan, CSU Channel Islands	Shirley Lal, CSU Dominguez Hills
R. J. Charkins, California Council on Economic Education	Andy Latham, Educational Testing Service
Sandra B. Chong, CSU Northridge	Robin Love, San Jose State University
Barbara Corfield, Ventura County Office of Education	Paula Lovo, Ventura County Office of Education
Elmano Costa, CSU Stanislaus	Corinne Martinez, CSU San Bernardino
Bonnie Crawford, CCAC/Concordia University	John Mattar, National Evaluation Systems, Inc.
Alfredo Cuellar, CSU Fresno	Les McCallum, National Evaluation Systems, Inc.
Ellen Curtis-Pierce, Chapman University	David L. Moguel, CSU Northridge
Jerry Deluca, Educational Testing Service	Harold M. Murai, CSU Sacramento
Mary Driscoll, San Francisco Unified School District	Ruth Norton, CSU San Bernardino
Kay Duenas, Loyola Marymount University	Claire Palmerino, CSU Fullerton
Stephanie Farland, California School Boards Association	Rose Payan, Educational Testing Service
Alice Flores, Cal State Teach	Raymond L. Pecheone, Stanford University
Barbara Ford, San Francisco State University	Kristeen Pemberton, San Jose State University
Kathy Fuller, Pacific Oaks College	Iris Riggs, CSU San Bernardino
Bea Gibbons, CSU Bakersfield	Sue Schaar, CSU Dominguez Hills
Susan Giboney, Pepperdine University	Claudia Schwartz, University of the Pacific
Barbara Glaeser, CSU Fullerton	Vanessa Sheared, San Francisco State University
Betty Glass, Pepperdine University	Patricia Sheehan, Orange County Department of Education
Bill Gorth, National Evaluation Systems, Inc.	David Simmons, Ventura County Office of Education
Grace Grant, Dominican University	Kendyll Stansbury, Stanford University
Curtis Guaglianone, CSU Bakersfield	Steve Turley, CSU Long Beach
Juan M. Gutierrez, CSU San Bernardino	Kim Uebelhardt, Ventura County Office of Education
Kathy Hess, National Hispanic University	Mary Vixie Sandy, CSU Chancellor's Office
Neva Hofemann, National Hispanic University	Keith Walters, Biola University
Terry Janicki, CSU Chico	Judy Washburn, CSU Los Angeles
Keyes Kelly, Argosy University	Rande Webster, Dominican University of California
Sharon Kennedy, University of Phoenix	Naomi Williams, Alameda County Office of Education
Michelle G. Zachlod, CSU Bakersfield	

Attachment B
Technical Advisory Committee

Representing the President of the University of California:

Barbara Goldman
Douglas Mitchell
Kip Tellez

Representing the Chancellor of the California State University:

Simon Kim
Terry Underwood
Mary Vixie Sandy

Representing the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities:

Robert Ferrera
Sandra Tracy and then Lynne Anderson
David Marsh

Attachment C

Examinations Relevant to the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential

Basic Skills Requirement:

The California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) is the current examination used to satisfy the basic skills requirement, which assesses reading comprehension, writing skills, and knowledge of mathematics at a level needed by educators to interact effectively with parents, peers, and others and to analyze data related to their profession. The CBEST consists of three sections: reading, writing, and mathematics. Each section is separately scored, and, to pass the CBEST, a minimum score must be achieved on each of the three required sections and an overall passing score must be achieved on the entire test. Once the CBEST is passed, it never needs to be retaken. The reading section contains 40 scorable multiple-choice questions, the writing section 2 essays of varying lengths, and the mathematics section 40 scorable multiple-choice questions. Although the CBEST was designed to be completed within the four-hour testing session, any or all of the three components may be taken at a single testing session at the examinee’s discretion.

Basic Skills Examination Requirement

<i>Current Test, including Description</i>	California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST)	Three part written exam: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reading • writing • mathematics
<i>Purpose of Requirement</i>	Requirement implemented in 1982 to verify proficiency in basic English reading and writing, and in basic mathematical skills needed by educators	
<i>Other Uses</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substitute permits • Other teaching and services credentials • Employment 	
<i>Relevant Education Code Section and Description</i>	44252 stipulates that CCTC require candidates to demonstrate proficiency in basic reading, writing, and mathematics skills in the English language	
<i>When Needed</i>	CA trained <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take prior to admission to the program (some institutions require passage at this point) • Pass prior to earning initial credential 	Out-of-State <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment: during first year of preliminary • Credential: before issuance of professional clear credential
<i>2005-06 Cost</i>	\$41	
<i>Current Options Available</i>	CA trained None	Out-of-State None.

Subject Matter Competency Requirement:

The California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET) is the current exam structure that assesses subject matter competency, and the specific CSET that is associated with the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential liberal studies area is the CSET: Multiple Subject (CSET: MS). The CSET: MS tests the individual’s knowledge of liberal studies content in language, literature, history, reading, social science, science, mathematics, physical education, human development, and visual and performing arts, all of which are aligned with the Student Academic Content Standards (Grades K-8). The CSET: MS consists of three subtests which address the following content:

Subtest I: Reading, Language, and Literature; and History and Social Science

Subtest II: Science and Mathematics

Subtest III: Physical Education, Human Development, and Visual and Performing Arts

The three subtests are scored separately, and a minimum passing score must be achieved on each subtest. The individual content areas within each subtest do not have a separate passing score. The CSET must be applied towards certification within five years of the earliest passing subtest administration date. Subtest I contains fifty-two multiple-choice and four constructed-response questions evenly divided between the two content areas, as does Subtest II. Each of the three content areas in Subtest III has thirteen multiple-choice and one constructed-response questions. The three subtests were designed to be completed within the five hour testing session, but an examinee may take any or all of the subtests during the session.

Liberal Studies Subject Matter Examination Requirement

<i>Current Test, including Description</i>	California Subject Examinations for Teachers: Multiple Subjects (CSET: MS)	Three part written exam: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reading, language, & literature; history & social science • science, & mathematics • physical education; human development; visual & performing arts.
<i>Purpose of Requirement</i>	Requirement implemented in the 1970’s as part of the Ryan Act to verify subject matter competence needed by a beginning teacher. CSET: MS is the newest assessment tool and was first administered on January 25, 2003.	
<i>Other Uses</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education Specialist Instruction Credential • Establish subject matter competency pursuant to No Child Left Behind 	
<i>Relevant Education Code Section and Description</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 44281 requires CCTC to select, administer, and interpret subject matter examinations to assure minimum levels of subject matter knowledge. • 44282 requires that the multiple subjects examination test the candidate's knowledge of language studies, literature, mathematics, science, social studies, history, the arts, physical education, and human development. 	
<i>When Needed</i>	CA trained: Pass all required subtests prior to advancement to student teaching or to obtaining intern certification. Some institutions require passage prior to program enrollment	Out-of-State: Pass prior to obtaining the professional clear credential
<i>2005-06 Cost</i>	\$222 total	
<i>Current Options Available</i>	CA trained: None. (Note: A few may be grand-parented in under the liberal studies subject matter program option for credentialing but not employment.)	Out-of-State: Yes, equivalent out-of-state subject matter program or out-of-state experience

Reading Instruction Requirement:

The examination program used to verify reading instruction knowledge and skills for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential is the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA). Candidate may satisfy this requirement by passing either the RICA Written Examination (WE) or RICA Video Performance Assessment (VPA) and must use their RICA results towards certification within five years of the passing administration date. Both are developed from the same content standards, which reflect teacher knowledge and skills important for effective reading instruction to K-8 students. The content standards consist of the following four domains:

- Domain I: Planning and Organizing Reading Instruction Based on Ongoing Assessment
- Domain II: Developing Phonological and Other Linguistic Processes Related to Reading
- Domain III: Developing Reading Comprehension and Promoting Independent Reading
- Domain IV: Supporting Reading through Oral and Written Language Development

The candidates' RICA: WE score is based on their response to 60 scorable multiple-choice and 5 constructed response questions. The multiple-choice questions reflect both content questions that assess knowledge about reading and reading instruction and contextualized questions that assess the candidate's ability to apply specific knowledge, to analyze specific problems, or to conduct specific tasks related to reading instruction. Within the constructed-response questions, there are four focused educational problems and instructional tasks that require candidates to consider information about students or instructional situations and provide appropriate instructional strategies or assessment approaches. Each question assesses one or more competencies in one of the four domains, and there is one problem or task for each domain. The last constructed-response question is a case study that is based on a student profile, and candidates are asked to assess the student's reading performance, describe appropriate instructional strategies, and explain why these strategies would be effective. This question includes content related to all four of the RICA domains. Individuals have up to four hours to complete the RICA WE, and the resulting single score reflects all components in the entire exam.

The RICA VPA allows candidates taking this assessment to submit responses to three unique prompts that exhibit their best work teaching reading and include candidate-created videotapes and supporting material. The candidates supply details about each lesson they are planning, including relevant background information such as student profiles, assessment methods, and anticipated results, all of which the candidate used to determine the lesson's appropriateness. It also requires their self-appraisal in which they reflect on their choice of lesson and their teaching abilities displayed in each of the 10 minute video tapes. As with the RICA WE constructed-response items, two independent scorers assess each video, and, when there is a two or more point discrepancy between the scorers, it is assessed by a third scorer. Candidates receive a single score based on all of the information they submit.

Reading Instruction Examination Requirement

<i>Current Test, including Description</i>	Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA)	May be satisfied by <i>either</i> the RICA Written Examination (WE) or RICA Video Performance Assessment (VPA). Both cover: 1: Planning and organizing reading instruction based on ongoing assessment 2: Developing phonological and other linguistic processes related to reading 3: Developing reading comprehension and promoting independent reading 4: Supporting reading through oral and written language development
<i>Purpose of Requirement</i>	Requirement implemented in 1998 for the Multiple Subject to verify knowledge and skills necessary for effective teaching of reading by a beginning teacher	
<i>Other Uses</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education Specialist Instruction Credential • Option to reading methods course for those who are out-of-state trained or adding an authorization 	
<i>Relevant Education Code Section and Description</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 44283 requires CCTC to develop, adopt, and administer a reading instruction competence assessment to measure knowledge, skill, and ability needed by first-time credential applicants for effective reading instruction that CCTC determines to be essential to reading instruction. It will also be consistent with the state's reading curriculum framework adopted after July 1, 1996, and the 1996 Reading Program Advisory published by the State Department of Education. 	
<i>When Needed</i>	CA trained: Pass prior to earning initial credential	Out-of-State: Not required
<i>2005-06 Cost</i>	RICA: WE: \$140 and RICA: VPA: \$232	
<i>Current Options Available</i>	CA trained: None	Out-of-State: Not required

Teaching Performance Assessment Requirement:

Senate Bill 2042 established the teaching performance assessment (TPA) requirement, which is embedded within the California teacher preparation program requirements and assesses a candidate's ability to demonstrate competency in the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). Even though Teacher Preparation Program Standard 19 requires assessment of the TPEs, the TPA has not become the mandatory form of measurement because, based on current interpretation, its implementation by public institutions "shall be subject to the annual Budget Act." As instructed by SB 2042, the Commission established a prototype TPA, the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CA TPA), which may be adopted by any institution for its own use.

The CA TPA provides a series of four performance tasks that candidates complete during their professional preparation program and that collectively measure the attributes of the TPEs. All tasks are available prior to the actual assessment so that candidates can consider appropriate, accurate, and complete responses and so they may practice the task prior to final submission. Candidates may base Task I on hypothetical students, while Tasks II-IV require interaction with actual K-12 California students. All tasks require written responses to given prompts, and Task IV requires a videotaped teaching experience. Below is a description of the four tasks, followed by the TPEs measured by each task.

Task I: Principles of Content-Specific and Developmentally Appropriate Pedagogy

Within this task, the candidate will respond to four distinct scenarios, each addressing different content areas, that cover developmentally appropriate pedagogy, assessment practices, adaptation of content-specific pedagogy for English learners, and adaptation of content-specific pedagogy for students with special needs, respectively.

- Making subject matter comprehensible to students (TPE 1)
- Assessing student learning (TPE 3)
- Engaging and supporting students in learning (TPE 4, 6, 7)

Task II: Connecting Instructional Planning to Student Characteristics for Academic Learning

Task II connects learning about student characteristics to instructional planning. This written task contains a five-step set of prompts that focuses on the connections between (1) students' characteristics and learning needs and (2) instructional planning and adaptations.

- Making subject matter comprehensible to students (TPE 1)
- Engaging and supporting students in learning (TPE 4, 6, 7)
- Planning instruction and designing learning experiences for students (TPE 8, 9)
- Developing as a professional educator (TPE 13)

Task III: Classroom Assessment of Academic Learning Goals

Task III gives candidates the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to design standards-based, developmentally appropriate student assessment activities in the

context of a small group of students using a specific lesson of their choice. In addition, candidates demonstrate their ability to assess student learning and to diagnose student needs.

- Assessing student learning (TPE 3)
- Engaging and supporting students in learning (TPE 6, 7)
- Planning instruction and designing learning experiences for students (TPE 8, 9)
- Developing as a professional educator (TPE 13)

Task IV: Academic Lesson Design, Implementation, and Reflection after Instruction

This task asks the candidates to design a standards-based lesson for a class of students, implement that lesson making appropriate use of class time and instructional resources, meet the differing needs of individuals within the class, manage instruction and student interaction, assess student learning, and analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson.

- Making subject matter comprehensible to students (TPE 1)
- Assessing student learning (TPE 2, 3)
- Engaging and supporting students in learning (TPE 4, 5, 6, 7)
- Planning instruction and designing learning experiences for students (TPE 8, 9)
- Creating and maintaining effective environments for student learning (TPE 10, 11)
- Developing as a professional educator (TPE 13)

Teaching Performance Assessment Requirement

<i>Current Test, including Description</i>	The California Teaching Performance Assessment (CA TPA) prototype is available or an institution may develop a TPA based on equivalent standards subject to Commission approval.	The CA TPA is a performed-based assessment taken over the duration of the preparation program, which includes four progressively more in-depth performance tasks.
<i>Purpose of Requirement</i>	Assessment initiated in 1998 as part of SB 2042 to verify knowledge and skills of pedagogy based on the Teaching Performance Expectations, which are needed by beginning teachers	
<i>Other Uses</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TPA results may be used by the individual and induction programs to aid in planning professional development 	
<i>Relevant Education Code Section and Description</i>	44320.2 requires that the Multiple and Single Subject professional preparation programs include a teaching performance assessment that is aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and that is congruent with state content and performance standards for pupils. ...subject to the annual Budget Act.	
<i>When Needed</i>	CA trained: Pass prior to earning initial credential	Out-of-State: Not required
<i>2005-06 Cost</i>	Cost determined by institution	
<i>Current Options Available</i>	CA trained: An approved institutional assessment that satisfies Teacher Preparation Program Standard 19. (The CA TPA is not currently mandatory.)	Out-of-State: Not required