

---

# 6D

## Information

### *Professional Services Committee*

#### **Update on the Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment Requirement for Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Teacher Preparation Programs**

---

### **AGENDA INSERT**

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item provides an update on the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CA TPA) model and reports on the outcomes of a meeting held on February 21, 2007 regarding the tasks of the CA TPA.

**Recommended Action:** For information only.

**Presenter:** Dr. Phyllis Jacobson, Administrator,  
Professional Services Division

**Strategic Plan 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.

March 2007

---

---

## **Update on the Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment Requirement for Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Teacher Preparation Programs**

---

---

### **Introduction**

At its meeting of November-December 2006, the Commission took action to reinstate the Assessment Quality Standards for multiple and single subject professional teacher preparation programs and to approve the initial implementation plan for the teaching performance assessment requirement pursuant to SB 1209 (Chap. 517, Stats. 2006). At the February 2007 Commission meeting a further update was provided concerning the plan for providing technical assistance to program sponsors and upcoming training opportunities. This agenda item provides further information concerning the overall implementation plan for the teaching performance assessment requirement, particularly with respect to the tasks of the California Teaching Performance Assessment model (CA TPA).

### **Background**

Senate Bill 2042 (Chap. 548, Stats.1998) required all candidates for a preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credential to pass an assessment of teaching performance in order to earn a teaching credential. This assessment of teaching performance is designed to measure the candidate's knowledge, skills and ability with relation to California's adopted *Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP)*, as these are exemplified in the *Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs)*. Implementation of the TPA requirement of SB 2042 was delayed by the Commission in 2003 in response to requests received from the Legislature and others during the state's fiscal crisis at that time. SB 1209, however, mandated the implementation of the teaching performance assessment requirement for all multiple and single subject professional teacher preparation programs as of July 1, 2008.

### **Review of The Tasks of the CA TPA**

#### Introduction

The CA TPA was originally developed as a series of four performance-based tasks that would provide coverage of the *Teaching Performance Expectations*. At the time the CA TPA was developed, the expectation was that this would be a centrally-managed system in which at least one of the four tasks, namely Task One, would be common across all programs and would be centrally scored to serve as an "anchor task." The four tasks increase in complexity but not necessarily in difficulty.

Below is the description of each of the four tasks as originally developed for the CA TPA.

- Task One, the *Content Specific Pedagogy* task, asks the candidates to use information provided within the prompt about specific students to identify appropriate content-specific instruction and assessment plans, and to adapt this information for these students. This task is done based on written scenarios provided to the candidate that describe fictional students in hypothetical classrooms.

The following TPEs are measured in the *Content Specific Pedagogy* task:

- Specific pedagogical skills for subject matter instruction (TPE 1)
  - Interpretation and use of assessments (TPE 3)
  - Making content accessible (TPE 4)
  - Developmentally appropriate teaching practices (TPE 6)
  - Instructional Planning (TPE 9)
- Task Two, the *Designing Instruction* task, requires the candidate to make appropriate connections between what the teacher knows about the students in the class and his/her instructional planning for those students. This written task contains a five-step set of prompts that focuses the candidate on first identifying and then applying the connections between the students' characteristics and learning needs and the teacher's instructional planning and adaptations for those specific students. This task is done based on actual K-12 students in classrooms in which the student teacher is present as part of fieldwork and/or student teaching experiences.

The following TPEs are measured in the *Designing Instruction* task:

- Specific pedagogical skills for subject matter instruction (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 Three, the *Assessing Learning* task, requires candidates to demonstrate their ability to design standards-based, appropriate student assessment activities in the context of a small group of students using a specific standards-based lesson of the candidate's choice. In addition, candidates demonstrate their ability to conduct assessment activities appropriately to assess student learning and to diagnose student instructional needs based on the results of the assessment(s). This task is done based on actual K-12 students in classrooms in which the student teacher is present as part of fieldwork and/or student teaching experiences.

The following TPEs are measured in the *Assessing Learning* task:

- 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 Four, the *Culminating Teaching Experience* task, is the culminating activity of the set of three TPA tasks. In this task, the candidate designs a standards-based lesson for a class of students and teaches that lesson to actual K-12 students within the classroom setting, while making appropriate use of class time and instructional resources; meeting the differing needs of individual students within the class; managing instruction and interactions with and between students; and assessing student learning. Following the lesson, the candidate demonstrates the ability to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson. To ensure equity to all candidates in the scoring of the *Culminating Teaching Experience* task, a videotape of the lesson is collected and reviewed as evidence during the scoring process.

All TPEs except for TPE 12 (Professional, Legal and Ethical Obligations) are measured in the *Culminating Teaching Experience* task:

- Specific pedagogical skills for subject matter instruction (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)

#### Brief History of Task One Within the CA TPA

As indicated above, Task One (Content Specific Pedagogy) was originally designed to be an anchor task done in common across all programs and centrally scored. At the time of the initial development of the CA TPA, Task One was designed to be the only task in the model that provided scenarios for candidates to use during the task activities rather than asking candidates to perform the activities within this task with actual K-12 students. These scenarios were built for multiple subject candidates and for four of the core content single subject areas. It was the intention at the time that the “shell” of Task One (i.e., the overall structure of the task itself and the directions) would be further built out to cover all of the single subject credential areas plus additional multiple subject scenarios. The process by which the build-out was envisioned was to bring together groups of content experts who would, under the guidance of ETS (the original contractor and developer of the CA TPA), apply the “shell” of Task One to all of the needed content areas.

This plan, however, did not come to fruition. As time went on, funding for the CA TPA ceased to be available, the state budget crisis resulted in further delay in the development and implementation of the CA TPA, and the contract with ETS ended. As a result, Task One was not built out and remained as it was at the time of initial development; the

model of implementation ultimately adopted by the Legislature called for local implementation rather than central administration and/or facilitation, and only limited additional funding was made available to support the implementation of the TPA as a statewide requirement under SB 1209.

During the period between 2002-03 and 2006-07, however, local programs have voluntarily been implementing the CA TPA. During this process, programs were free to use the TPA model in the manner that best suited their needs and their program design. As a result, there were numerous ways in which Task One was being implemented in the field. Over time, the discussions in the TPA Users Network (an informal group of CA TPA voluntary pilot programs) surfaced some of these differing usages and purposes of Task One across programs. Several meetings were held with the CA TPA Users Network participants to elicit their feedback regarding Task One. Summarized below are the issues that were raised concerning Task One with the CA TPA:

- Some programs were using Task One as is with all candidates and were satisfied with the task as is. These programs tend to be primarily multiple subject programs, mostly at smaller and independent institutions, but are not exclusively so.
- Some programs that were using Task One and are satisfied with the task as it is nonetheless want additional multiple subject scenarios to be developed because the current scenarios have been used by so many candidates that the “answers” are readily available to candidates.
- Some programs were using Task One but not in sequence as the first task, whereas other programs were insistent that the value of Task One was as the first, and introductory, task.
- Some programs were creating their own scenarios for Task One in the absence of the scenarios that were not built for the single subject areas. Because this development work was done independently by programs, the scenarios were not necessarily the same for all candidates, and the quality of the work was not reviewed by assessment experts or by ETS.
- Some programs indicated that their candidates were finding it difficult or non-productive to work with the static scenarios of hypothetical students that were provided in Task One, and that they were struggling with this issue.
- Some programs had ceased to use Task One at all, and were insistent that Task One provided no added value to the system and that it was an added cost that was not necessary for them to bear. Some of these programs had done an analysis to show that the candidates’ pass rates were not affected by the non-use of Task One scores.
- Finally, some programs suggested that Task Four by itself was sufficient to determine if candidates had demonstrated sufficient mastery of the *Teaching Performance Expectations*.

### Discussion of Potential Task One Options

Because it was difficult to determine what the appropriate direction was to take with respect to Task One within the CA TPA, given the diversity of professional opinion among the TPA users, the limited timeframe remaining before the required implementation of the TPA in July 2008, and the limitations on resources available to the Commission, staff identified three possible directions that might be taken with respect to the future of Task One. These three directions are:

***Option 1: Removing Task One as a Scored Task from the CA TPA.*** Under this option, Task One would be removed from the CA TPA as one of the scored tasks, and as a result, the CA TPA would consist of three scored tasks, the *Designing Instruction* task (previously known as Task Two), the *Assessing Instruction* task (previously known as Task Three), and the *Culminating Teaching Experience* task (previously known as Task Four). The passing score standard would be reset and readopted as a total score of 9 across the three tasks, with no score allowed to be lower than two. The information from Task One that most users deemed to be valuable in terms of helping to orient candidates and programs to the idea of performance assessment, to the notion and application of scoring rubrics, and to the terminology used throughout the tasks, would not be lost but would instead be retained through enhancing the Foundations and Orientation Day training to include this information. This option would not require any additional development work on the CA TPA and could be implemented quickly. Exercising this option, however, raises questions of content validity and scoring reliability for the CA TPA.

***Option 2: Retaining Task One within the CA TPA but fully developing the task to include all of the single subject content areas plus additional multiple subject scenarios.*** Under this option, Task One would continue as is, but would be fully developed by groups of content experts under the direction of assessment experts such as ETS to include all single subject areas. If this option were to be pursued, an RFP would need to be issued as soon as possible in order to contract with a qualified assessment entity that could both guide the development process and conduct revalidation studies of the new scenarios/versions of Task One. The costs of the development and revalidation processes are unknown. This option would require the Commission to periodically redevelop scenarios for all content areas/grade levels, as over a relatively short period of time the “answers” to the static scenarios within Task One that use hypothetical rather than actual students would become widely known (and potentially shared) by candidates. This option would not address the concerns of those programs that find this task inappropriate, not useful, and overly costly, but it would satisfy those programs that find this task useful for a variety of reasons. There is also a time constraint on this option, as the work would need to be completed in an extremely compressed time frame in order to allow for the necessary training of trainers and of program level assessors to take place, and to provide information to candidates about the assessment, prior to the required implementation date of July 1, 2008.

***Option 3: Retaining a Task One within the CA TPA but redeveloping this task from scratch to be similar to the more generic nature of the other three tasks and not use***

*static scenarios of hypothetical students.* Under this option, a new Task One would be developed that would focus on the same TPEs as the current Task One, but in a different manner. This task would be generic enough so that all candidates could use this task appropriately regardless of grade level and/or content area(s). If this option were to be pursued, an RFP would need to be issued as soon as possible for the development of such a task. The cost of the development of the task, and of the initial validity and reliability studies of this task, plus the revalidation of the revised CA TPA with the addition of this new task, are unknown. There is also a time constraint on this option, as the development and validity work would need to be completed in an extremely compressed time frame in order to allow for the necessary training of trainers and of program level assessors to take place, and to provide information to candidates about the assessment, prior to the required implementation date of July 1, 2008.

### **Meeting of CA TPA Users on February 21, 2007**

The purpose of the CA TPA Users meeting of February 21, 2007 was to conduct a content validity study of Task One in order to address issues of content validity and scoring reliability relative both to this task and to its potential removal as a scored task within the CA TPA. Attendees at the meeting included eighteen representatives from teacher preparation programs that have been voluntarily using all four tasks of the CA TPA, plus four representatives from ETS (Jerry DeLuca, Director, Client Relations; Cindy Tocci, Director, Learning and Teaching Research Center; Laura Rodriguez, Policy Analyst, Governmental Relations; and Sooyoung Kim, psychometrician), plus Commission staff from the Professional Services Division. In addition to the attendees, one program whose representative could not attend the meeting sent a written communication stating that program's point of view.

As explained to the participants by ETS, two central issues lie at the heart of the potential removal of Task One from the CA TPA, as referenced in Option 1 outlined above. The first would be the effect on the reliability and validity of the assessment. The second and more pertinent issue would be to determine if the TPEs were sufficiently addressed by the three remaining tasks if Task One were removed.

ETS addressed first the issue of the psychometric soundness of the assessment if Task One were removed. ETS had received, prior to the meeting, some limited candidate outcomes data from a few of the participants' programs on which to conduct some preliminary analysis. It was determined that for all practical purposes, all candidates pass the TPA. While it is true that the reliability of the assessment would be affected by the removal of one of the four tasks, the decision accuracy about individual candidates remains virtually unchanged. The nature of this type of performance assessment is quite different than a typical multiple choice test in which items typically represent discrete content. Since the TPEs being measured are found throughout all four tasks, what would otherwise be a justifiable concern regarding the psychometric soundness of the assessment is in fact much less an issue.

Therefore, ETS determined that the fundamental issue to be addressed would be one of content validity rather than scoring reliability. This issue concerns whether the TPEs are

covered in sufficient depth and breadth in Tasks Two, Three, and Four to make an appropriate judgment about the candidate if Task One is removed.

Cindy Tocci, lead ETS developer of the CA TPA, provided the participants with an overview of the initial development effort with supporting rationale for many of the early decisions relative to the development of the CA TPA. She focused the group specifically on the TPEs, concentrating on the salient features of each of the relevant TPEs covered in Task One.

The process that was then followed at the meeting was designed to address three fundamental questions relative to the content validity of the CA TPA if Task One were removed. These questions were:

1. With the removal of Task One, is each of the Teaching Performance Expectations covered in that task sufficiently addressed in the three remaining tasks of the CA TPA assessment?
2. If not, what is being measured in Task One that is not being measured in the three remaining tasks?
3. If not, and carefully considering what is not being measured in the three remaining tasks, is there still adequate information across the three remaining tasks to assess each of the particular Teaching Performance Expectations appropriately?

Following the explanation above was an activity in which the participants reviewed each relevant TPE for each of the four scenarios of Task One to determine what was being measured in each of the scenarios relative to the TPEs. The participants had to document their judgments. After completing the first scenario, a general discussion was held to determine the participants' understanding and comfort level with the process. Participants were then asked if further clarification was needed before completing the process for the remaining three scenarios within Task One.

After completing their judgments on each of the scenarios of Task One, the participants were then asked to turn their attention to the remaining three tasks and determine what was measured in each of the steps in Tasks Two, Three, and Four relative to each of the TPEs covered in Task One. Again, the participants were asked to record their judgments, working through each of the TPEs for each of the tasks. At the end of each TPE, the participants were asked to consider questions one and two above and told to document their findings. They completed this process for all the TPEs relevant to Task One.

The final judgment for the participants to make was to carefully consider in light of what, if anything, was lost by removing Task One, whether there is still adequate information across the three remaining tasks to assess the relevant TPEs appropriately. The participants were to make a judgment on each TPE with accompanying written rationale.

ETS noted that similar to prior discussions that have taken place within the TPA user community, there were also several opinions expressed during the meeting regarding the value and utility of Task One. These ranged from Task One being a very valuable piece of the TPA to there being no value whatsoever in keeping Task One. The most persuasive argument for keeping Task One was that it did focus candidates on the basics of content specific pedagogy and instructional and assessment planning, and would provide an indication via the candidates' responses if this area were covered sufficiently by the teacher preparation programs. It also provided information and guidance to the programs as they reviewed and modified the scope and sequence of their curriculum. The most persuasive arguments advanced by participants at this meeting for eliminating Task One was that one school had data that showed no effect whatsoever on the performance of their candidates with the elimination of Task One; that Task One was costly in both money, and more importantly time, and therefore it was not worth the trouble for an activity deemed to be contrived by candidates that adds little value for the candidate and does not affect the decision accuracy; and that the scenarios for Task One were not available for all single subject areas and needed additional scenarios to be developed for the multiple subject areas. ETS concluded that since the discussion revealed there were a number of participants that supported eliminating Task One and some that supported keeping the task, it was difficult to gauge the collective orientation of the group as a whole about the issue.

Further topics of discussion among the participants at the meeting included:

- issues of fairness to those already invested in the voluntary pilot process if a change was made now.
- whether or not a compromise might be to have Task One be an optional task.
- the fact that there was not sufficient quantitative evidence to support keeping Task One
- that Task One, while not an important assessment piece, was a good instructional piece.
- a suggestion that the first three tasks be used as the formative part of the assessment and that Task Four be used as the Summative assessment piece.

ETS psychometrician Sooyoung Kim further addressed the issue of decision accuracy. While she qualified that the data sets she looked at were relatively small volumes, the decision accuracy was basically unchanged when removing Task One and adjusting the passing score from 12 to 9. One of the programs stated at that point they had collected data on candidate outcomes based on eliminating Task One (N of 4,000 candidates) and there was no value for their candidates in requiring Task One, although this data set was not presented or reviewed at the meeting.

ETS noted in conclusion to the content validity process completed at the meeting that more telling than the general discussion summarized above was the written documentation provided by the participants. Of the 18 participant forms collected regarding the fundamental question of whether or not the TPEs relevant to Task One were covered sufficiently in Tasks Two, Three and Four, 17 out of the 18 participants documented that all six TPEs were sufficiently covered by the remaining Tasks if Task

One were removed. Only one of the eighteen individuals felt that there was insufficient coverage of four of the six TPEs across Task Two, Three, and Four. In addition, the written communication received prior to the meeting from a program whose representative could not attend the meeting also was in favor of eliminating Task One.

ETS also summarized that in most assessment contexts, moving from a four part assessment to a three part assessment would decrease the reliability of the assessment. Typically, such reduction is a source of concern because the decisions based on the assessment evidence would be more tenuous than is desirable. However, the TPE is not a typical standardized assessment and psychometric considerations must be made in light of its use.

ETS further indicated that in its opinion, it is clear from participants' reports that the TPA in general, and particularly Task One, is administered in very idiosyncratic ways across institutions. It has become obvious that institutions have tailored the content and administration of Task One in a variety of ways per perceived needs by the institution. What this means is that standard judgments of reliability may not be appropriate. If different candidates are taking different assessments due to the institutional tailoring of Task One, then we are no longer comparing candidate performance on the same set of tasks. Thus, reliability loses its meaning and purpose.

The most important measure for TPA is decision consistency, which is very much tied to reliability. Decision consistency refers to the consistency with which decisions are made as to whether a candidate succeeded or not on the TPA. Based on the data ETS has available, it seems that virtually all students pass the assessment. Given the score distributions ETS sees, it appears that the removal of Task One would continue to result in virtually all students passing. Hence, there is little basis for keeping Task One to improve decision consistency.

Thus, the most important consideration is that of coverage of the TPEs addressed in Task One and whether or not those TPEs are adequately addressed by the remaining three tasks if Task One were removed. While there were some differences of opinion expressed by the participants relative to the necessity and value of Task One during the discussion, it was overwhelmingly clear, as documented by the group in writing, that the TPEs covered in Task One are adequately addressed in Tasks Two, Three, and Four.

While the purpose of this summary on the part of ETS is not to suggest a course of action to the Commission regarding the elimination, modification, or redevelopment of Task One, it is to provide additional information to the Commission to assist them in making an informed decision on how to effectively deal with Task One.

A final consideration to the discussion was the reminder that the TPA represents only one means of measuring the candidates' competencies with respect to the TPEs within the overall teacher preparation program sequence. Coursework, fieldwork and student teaching experiences also provide evidence of candidate competence in addition to the information obtained through the performance assessment.