
2F

Action

Professional Services Committee

Report on the Meeting of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) Users Advisory Committee

AGENDA INSERT

Executive Summary: This report provides the Commission with information concerning the initial meeting of the Teaching Performance Assessment Users Advisory Committee held on September 29, 2009 and provides recommendations for the Commission's consideration.

Recommended Action: That the Commission continue the discussion at the December 2009 Commission meeting of the issues raised by the TPA Users Advisory Committee.

Presenter: Phyllis Jacobson, Ed.D., Administrator, and Lawrence Birch, Director, Professional Services Division, 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 and performance of professional educators and for the accreditation of credential programs

Report on the Meeting of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) Users Advisory Committee

Introduction

This agenda item insert presents information concerning the first meeting of the TPA Users Advisory Committee, held on September 29, 2009. This Committee was established in accordance with the plan presented to the Commission at the June 2009 meeting for the continuing implementation and oversight of the teaching performance assessment requirement pursuant to EC 44320.2 and EC 44259. The agenda item also identifies several issues arising from the Committee's initial discussions for the Commission's further consideration.

Background

Education Code Sections 44320.2 and 44259 mandate the implementation of a Commission-approved teaching performance assessment for all multiple and single subject candidates for an initial teaching credential. Attachment A provides the full text of the applicable Education Code sections.

Full statewide implementation of the teaching performance assessment requirement began as of July 1, 2008. A report on the first full year of statewide implementation was presented at the Commission meeting of June 2009 (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2009-06/2009-06-6C.pdf>)

During 2008-09, however, the state has faced an unprecedented budget crisis. In August 2009, a joint communication was received from the Chancellor of the California State University system and the President of the University of California system requesting a meeting with Commission staff to discuss ways of reducing the costs of TPA implementation. Commission staff met with representatives from the CSU and the UC systems on September 10, 2009 to listen to concerns and information presented by the CSU/UC representatives. A list of the attendees at this meeting is provided in Attachment B.

Summary of the September 10, 2009 Ad Hoc TPA Meeting Requested by the CSU/UC

During the meeting a number of cost-related issues concerning implementation of the TPA requirement were raised, and a variety of opinions were expressed by attendees concerning the ways in which these cost issues differentially affected the various segments (CSU, UC, and private institutions) as well as the different campuses within the individual segments. Commission staff listened to the information presented.

Following the meeting, a communication was issued by Dr. Beverly Young of the CSU Chancellor's Office which included a summary of recommendations arising from the September 10, 2009 meeting that, from the perspective of the attendees at the meeting, could potentially

reduce the cost of implementing the teaching performance assessment requirement. These recommendations are as follows:

- With respect to PACT, that a “slimmed down” version of the CATS be developed and implemented
- With respect to CalTPA, that the Subject Specific Pedagogy Task be eliminated as a scored task within the CalTPA model
- With respect to scoring of all three TPA models, that faculty and supervisors be allowed to score their own students’ tasks without anonymity for the students
- With respect to all three TPA models, that the requirement for random double scoring of a 15% sample of candidate responses be suspended. Double scoring for non-passers, however, would be retained.
- With respect to all three TPA models, that recalibration of assessors would be required once every two years instead of once every year for assessors who are continuously scoring, and the requirement for recalibration for scorers who have not scored within a six month period would be suspended
- With respect to data reporting requirements for all three TPA models, that CTC would modify the data elements to be reported to include only what is mandated by law and essential for records
- With respect to all teacher preparation programs implementing the TPA requirement, that local teacher preparation program sponsors would individually and voluntarily select which, if any, potential modifications would be implemented for that specific program.

During and following the September 10, 2009 meeting, a variety of informal opinions have been indicated by individual teacher preparation programs concerning the issues raised by the recommendations emanating from that meeting. Some programs do not want to see any modifications to the current requirements while others are in favor of several or all of the recommendations. However, all programs indicated the severity of the effects that budget cuts were having on their efforts to implement the TPA requirement. Commission staff indicated at the September 10, 2009 meeting that the concerns and recommendations of the CSU/UC Ad Hoc group would be discussed at the September 29, 2009 initial meeting of the TPA Users Advisory Committee.

TPA Users Advisory Committee Meeting of September 29, 2009

The TPA Users Advisory Committee was constituted in accordance with the plan presented in the June 2009 Commission agenda item concerning TPA implementation. The members of the TPA Users Advisory Committee are indicated in Attachment C.

In preparation for the meeting, Commission staff provided the members with background information concerning the legal requirements for the implementation of the teaching performance assessment contained within EC 44320.2, and with information about how the legal mandates were being met by the Commission. Attachment D provides a copy of the information provided to the TPA Users Advisory Committee members. The members were also provided with copies of the applicable teacher preparation program standards pertaining to the implementation of the teaching performance assessment and the Assessment Quality Standards.

Background information concerning reliability, validity, and fairness considerations with respect to approved TPA models and their implementation. The following information provides context to thinking about the implications of the recommendations presented by the CSU/UC Ad Hoc committee. This information was reviewed during the TPA Users Advisory Committee meeting within the discussion about the Education Code requirements and what the Commission has done to meet these requirements.

All approved TPA models meet the Commission's Assessment Quality Standards. The TPA models maintain their approved status by continuing to implement the approved assessment in a manner that is valid, reliable, fair and equitable to all candidates. Each approved TPA model has developed implementation policies, practices, and guidelines to assist teacher preparation programs responsible for local implementation of the TPA to implement the assessment in the manner in which it was designed, to maintain standards of assessment validity and of scorer reliability, and to assure fairness and equity to all candidates. These standards are in alignment with accepted psychometric practices as exemplified in the joint 1999 American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and National Council on Measurement in Education *National Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*.

In particular, the three TPA models approved by the Commission are aligned with the following joint national standards:

- 1: Test Validity
- 2: Test Reliability (including assessor reliability)
- 3: Test Development and Revision (including scorer training)
- 5: Test Administration Scoring and Reporting (including procedures for assuring accuracy of scoring)
- 7: Fairness in Test Taking
- 8: Rights and Responsibilities of Test Takers (including identifying information about a test taker)
- 11: Responsibilities of Test Users (including rescoring as necessary)
- 13: Educational Testing and Assessment (including adherence to instructions from the test developer)

Any potential modifications to the manner in which the approved TPA models are implemented could also have potential implications for the continuing validity, reliability, fairness and equity of these models.

Given (a) this framework and context; (b) the necessity for the Commission to remain in compliance with the provisions of the Education Code; (c) the potential intended and unintended consequences of changing any of the current statewide TPA implementation processes; and (d) the severity of the budget crisis facing teacher preparation program sponsors across all segments, a lengthy discussion was held at the initial meeting of the TPA Users Advisory Committee concerning the recommendations provided by the CSU/UC Ad Hoc group.

Discussion of the Recommendations from the CSU/UC Ad Hoc TPA Group

During the TPA Users Advisory Committee meeting, each of the recommendations from the CSU/UC Ad Hoc group was discussed both individually and as part of an interrelated set of potential modifications to the TPA and/or to TPA implementation processes. Members eloquently identified the inherent tension between wanting to maintain the integrity, validity, fairness and equity of the TPA assessment models and needing at the same time to be able to sustain the implementation of the assessment in practice given the current state budget context and the severe resource constraints affecting teacher preparation program operations in general. All of the members agreed that they wanted the TPA to continue in its role as a valued and valuable source of information about candidate and program performance. All of the members also agreed, however, that both short-term implementation cost relief and a longer-term plan for the sustainability of the TPA needed to be addressed.

The committee's discussions were also informed by the contributions of the four psychometricians present who provided an analysis of the potential effects on reliability, validity, and legal defensibility of each of the recommendations. The committee members acknowledged that changing any one aspect of the current implementation processes of the TPA, regardless of model, has implications for the reliability, validity, fairness, and/or equity of the assessment as well as potential unintended consequences.

The committee members decided that given the complexity of the information concerning the validity, reliability, fairness, equity, and legal defensibility implications of making any of the changes to the assessment contained with the CSU/UC Ad Hoc group's recommendations, and also given the extremely short time interval between the committee's meeting of September 29, 2009 and the Commission meeting of October 1-2, 2009, that there was insufficient time to allow Commissioners the opportunity to become sufficiently informed about these issues and make decisions about any of the recommendations. The committee members also decided that further discussion was needed within the group about the recommendations and their assessment implications, and that additional data were needed to help inform any recommendations that might be formally agreed on by the group and subsequently sent forward to the Commission for potential adoption.

To that end, a subcommittee consisting of the four psychometric experts (one from each of the three approved TPA models and one independent expert) plus the official committee representatives from each of the three models met immediately following the conclusion of the full committee meeting to discuss a plan for obtaining data needed to help make decisions concerning the implications for reliability, validity, fairness, equity, and legal defensibility of the recommendations proposed by the CSU/UC Ad Hoc group. These data would be presented and discussed at the TPA Users Advisory Committee's second meeting scheduled for October 27, 2009.

Before adjourning, however, the group agreed that in order to provide context and background information about the committee's work that this agenda item insert would contain a summary of the CSU/UC Ad Hoc group's recommendations. The members of the committee also wished to communicate to the Commission their personal and segmental commitment to the TPA while at the same time expressing to the Commission the urgent need to look at short-term and longer-

term sustainability issues relating to the TPA. Several program sponsors expressed that they simply do not know how the TPA can be sustained not only in the longer term but even for the second semester of this school year given the current budget situation, furloughs, layoff, and other cost constraints affecting teacher preparation program operations.

Some possible approaches offered by members included moving towards a centralized model where the TPA would be scored on a statewide basis similar to other California standardized licensure examinations; suspending all or part of the TPA requirement temporarily; implementing all or some of the recommendations from the CSU/UC Ad Hoc committee, or other solutions yet to be thought of. As the committee indicated, these are serious and complex issues that need more time and more study before changes could be made.

At its second meeting in October 2009 the committee will discuss the following issue:

- What short-term cost relief could appropriately be provided to program sponsors implementing the TPA requirement within the context of maintaining an acceptable level of assessment validity, reliability, equity, fairness, and legal defensibility for program sponsors?

At future meetings, the committee will continue to look at the following longer-term issues:

- How could the overall burden on teacher preparation program sponsors be reduced given the demands of implementing the TPA as well as the accreditation system on top of the current status of reduced program fiscal and personnel resources?
- The TPA was put into place as a mandatory requirement during a period when fiscal conditions were much different; how can the urgent discussion regarding the viability and sustainability of the TPA over the short and the long term be advanced?

TPA Users Advisory Committee Recommendation

The TPA Users Advisory Committee recommends that the Commission continue the discussion of the issues raised at the committee's initial and second meetings, and also consider any recommendations that might be made by the committee following its second meeting, at the Commission meeting of December 2009.

Attachment A

Education Code Sections 44320.2 and 44259

Education Code Section 44320.2

(a) The Legislature finds and declares that the competence and performance of teachers are among the most important factors in influencing the quality and effectiveness of education in elementary and secondary schools.

(b) Commencing July 1, 2008, for a program of professional preparation to satisfy the requirements of paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) of Section 44259, the program shall 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 adopted pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 60605. In implementing this requirement, institutions or agencies may do the following:

(1) Voluntarily develop an assessment for approval by the commission. Approval of any locally developed performance assessment shall be based on assessment quality standards adopted by the commission, which shall encourage the use of alternative assessment methods including portfolios of teaching artifacts and practices.

(2) Participate in an assessment training program for assessors and implement the commission developed assessment.

(c) The commission shall implement the performance assessment in a manner that does not increase the number of assessments required for teacher credential candidates prepared in this state. Each candidate shall be assessed during the normal term or duration of the preparation program of the candidate.

(d) Subject to the availability of funds in the annual Budget Act, the commission shall perform all of the following duties with respect to the performance assessment:

(1) Assemble and convene an expert panel to advise the commission about performance standards and developmental scales for teaching credential candidates and the design, content, administration, and scoring of the assessment. At least one-third of the panel members shall be classroom teachers in California public schools.

(2) Design, develop, and implement assessment standards and an institutional assessor training program for the sponsors of professional preparation programs to use if they choose to use the commission developed assessment.

(3) Establish a review panel to examine each assessment developed by an institution or agency in relation to the standards set by the commission and advise the commission regarding approval of each assessment system.

(4) Initially and periodically analyze the validity of assessment content and the reliability of assessment scores that are established pursuant to this section.

(5) Establish and implement appropriate standards for satisfactory performance in assessments that are established pursuant to this section. The commission shall ensure that oral proficiency in English is a criterion for scoring the performance of each candidate in each assessment.

(6) Analyze possible sources of bias in the performance assessment and act promptly to eliminate any bias that is discovered.

(7) Collect and analyze background information provided by candidates who participate in the performance assessment, and report and interpret the individual and aggregated results of the assessment.

(8) Examine and revise, as necessary, the institutional accreditation system pursuant to Article 10 (commencing with Section 44370), for the purpose of providing a strong assurance to teaching candidates that ongoing opportunities are available in each credential preparation program that is offered pursuant to Section 44320, Article 6 (commencing with Section 44310), Article 7.5 (commencing with Section 44325), or Article 3 (commencing with Section 44450) of Chapter 3 for candidates to acquire the knowledge, skills, and abilities measured by the assessment system.

(9) Ensure that the aggregated results of the assessment for groups of candidates who have completed a credential program are used as one source of information about the quality and effectiveness of that program.

(e) The commission shall ensure that each performance assessment pursuant to subdivision (b) is state approved and aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and is consistently applied to candidates in similar preparation programs. To the maximum feasible extent, each performance assessment shall be ongoing and blended into the preparation program, and shall produce the following benefits for credential candidates, sponsors of preparation programs, and local education agencies that employ program graduates:

(1) The performance assessment shall be designed to provide formative assessment information during the preparation program for use by the candidate, instructors, and supervisors for the purpose of improving the teaching knowledge, skill, and ability of the candidate.

(2) The performance assessment results shall be reported so that they may serve as one basis for a recommendation by the program sponsor that the commission award a teaching credential to a candidate who has successfully met the performance assessment standards.

(3) The formative assessment information pursuant to paragraph (1) and the performance assessment results pursuant to paragraph (2) shall be reported so that they may serve as one basis for the individual induction plan of the new teacher pursuant to Section 44279.2.

(f) It is the intent of the Legislature that assessments in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2) of subdivision (b), including the administrative costs of the commission, be fully funded.

Excerpt from Education Code Section 44259 (Section 3 applicable to TPA)

(a) Except as provided in subparagraphs (A) and (C) of paragraph (3) of subdivision (b), each program of professional preparation for multiple or single subject teaching credentials shall not include more than one year of, or the equivalent of one-fifth of a five-year program in, professional preparation.

(b) The minimum requirements for the preliminary multiple or single subject teaching credential are all of the following:

(1) A baccalaureate degree or higher degree from a regionally accredited institution of postsecondary education. Except as provided in subdivision I of Section 44227, the baccalaureate degree shall not be in professional education. The commission shall encourage accredited institutions to offer undergraduate minors in education and special education to students who intend to become teachers.

(2) Passage of the state basic skills examination that is developed and administered by the commission pursuant to Section 44252.5.

(3) Satisfactory completion of a program of professional preparation that has been accredited by the committee on accreditation on the basis of standards of program quality and effectiveness that have been adopted by the commission. In accordance with the commission's assessment and

performance standards, each program shall include a teaching performance assessment as set forth in Section 44320.2 which is aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. The commission shall ensure that each candidate recommended for a credential or certificate has demonstrated satisfactory ability to assist pupils to meet or exceed state content and performance standards for pupils adopted pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 60605. Programs that meet this requirement for professional preparation shall include any of the following:

(A) Integrated programs of subject matter preparation and professional preparation pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 44259.1.

(B) Postbaccalaureate programs of professional preparation, pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 44259.1.

(C) Internship programs of professional preparation, pursuant to Section 44321, Article 7.5 (commencing with Section 44325), Article 11 (commencing with Section 44380), and Article 3 (commencing with Section 44450) of Chapter 3.

(4) Study of alternative methods of developing English language skills, including the study of reading as described in subparagraphs (A) and (B), among all pupils, including those for whom English is a second language, in accordance with the commission's standards of program quality and effectiveness. The study of reading shall meet the following requirements:

(A) Commencing January 1, 1997, satisfactory completion of comprehensive reading instruction that is research-based and includes all of the following:

(i) The study of organized, systematic, explicit skills including phonemic awareness, direct, systematic, explicit phonics, and decoding skills.

(ii) A strong literature, language, and comprehension component with a balance of oral and written language.

(iii) Ongoing diagnostic techniques that inform teaching and assessment.

(iv) Early intervention techniques.

(v) Guided practice in a clinical setting.

Attachment B
Attendees at the CSU/UC Ad Hoc TPA Meeting Held on September 10, 2009

Name	Representing
Beverly Young	CSU Chancellor's Office
Steve Turley	CSU
Maggie Payne	CSU
Barbara Goldman	UC
Chris Faltis	UC
Kip Tellez	UC
Elaine Chin	UC
Kendyll Stansbury	PACT
Tine Sloan	UC
Anne Jones	UC
Nina Moore	UC President's Office
Peggy Kelly	CSU

Attachment C
Members and Attendees of the TPA Users Advisory Committee

Name	Representing
Wayne Bacer*	CalTPA
Jerry DeLuca	ETS (Educational Testing Service)/CalTPA
Kathryn Pedley*	ETS (Educational Testing Service)/CalTPA
Ted Bartell*	LAUSD (retired)
Kendyll Stansbury*	PACT
Susan Macy*	FAST
Jason Immekus*	FAST
Edmundo Litton*	AICCU
Steve Turley*	CSU
Barbara Goldman	UC
Chris Faltis	UC
Eloise Metcalfe*	UC
Lori Misaki*	CCSESA (County Superintendents)
Dale Janssen	CTC Executive Director
Larry Birch	CTC
Phyllis Jacobson	CTC/CalTPA
Suzanne Sullivan	CTC/CalTPA
Margaret Olebe	CTC
Teri Clark	CTC
Michael Taylor	CTC

** indicates official segment representative or TPA model representative on the Committee*

Attachment D
TPA Legal Requirements and Commission Implementation Actions

EC Requirement 44320.2	Current TPA Implementation
<i>(b) Programs shall include a TPA that is aligned with CSTP and congruent with state student content and performance standards</i>	<i>All programs required to implement a TPA. All models approved by CTC are aligned with CSTP and congruent with state student content and performance standards. State standards are reflected in the specifics of the performance tasks; the rating scales are congruent with the CSTP</i>
(b1) Voluntary development of TPA assessment for CTC approval, based on assessment quality standards adopted by the Commission	CTC adopted Assessment Quality Standards. Two models reviewed and approved against the AQ Standards
(c) Implement the performance assessment in a manner that does not increase the number of assessments required of candidates	Models provide for embedding TPA within coursework activities. However, local programs implement the TPA as they choose
(d1) Convene an expert panel to advise the Commission about performance standards and developmental scales, and the design, content, administration and scoring of the assessment	Expert panels worked on the design and development of the CalTPA model
(d2) Design, develop, implement assessment standards and an institutional training program for sponsors choosing to use the CTC model	Implementation of standards and assessor training program completed and is ongoing. No charge for training for programs using the CTC model (CalTPA)
(d3) Review panel to review alternative TPA models submitted to CTC	Expert review panel convened, two models reviewed and approved
<i>(d4) Initially and periodically analyze the validity of assessment content and the reliability of assessment scores.</i>	<i>Candidate and assessor outcomes data need to be collected, analyzed, and reported.</i>
<i>(d5) Establish appropriate standards for satisfactory performance</i>	<i>CTC adopted CalTPA performance standards and approved performance standards for the two alternative models. Any change would require CTC approval.</i>
<i>(d6) Analyze possible sources of bias in the performance assessment and act promptly to eliminate any bias discovered</i>	<i>Double scoring requirement (15%) Assessor reliability data collected and analyzed by programs</i>
<i>(d7) Collect and analyze background information about candidates; interpret individual and aggregated results of the assessment</i>	<i>Candidate background information data; local program interpretation of the individual results; local program reporting of the aggregated results (also Title II)</i>

(d8) Examine the accreditation system to assure candidates have opportunities to prepare for the TPA	Accreditation system includes looking at TPA implementation and data (biennial reports)
<i>(d9) Ensure aggregated candidate results are used as a source of information about program quality and effectiveness</i>	<i>Local program reporting of aggregated results (also Title II)</i>
<i>(d9e) Each performance assessment is state approved, aligned with CSTP, and consistently applied to candidates in a similar prep program</i>	<i>Candidate outcomes data; bias review data; assessor reliability data</i>
(d9e1) Performance assessment designed to provide formative assessment for use by candidate	Program feedback to candidates; program candidate remediation processes
<i>(d9e2) Results reported so they may serve as one basis for candidate recommendation</i>	<i>Program data records of numbers of attempts per candidate and outcomes</i>
(d9e3) Formative assessment information results reported so they may serve as one basis for the individual induction plan	Candidates may share assessment information provided to them by programs

Italics indicate sections of the Education Code that could be affected by making changes to current TPA implementation processes.