
3C

Action

Professional Services Committee

Recommendations from the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) Users Advisory Committee

Executive Summary: On September 29, 2009 the Teaching Performance Assessment Users Advisory Committee held its first meeting. Following a report of this meeting, the Commission directed the committee to continue its discussion of the issues raised and to report again to the Commission at the December 2009 meeting. This agenda item reports on the second meeting of the TPA Users Advisory Committee held on October 27, 2009 and provides recommendations for the Commission's consideration.

Recommended Action: That the Commission adopt the recommendations from the Teaching Performance Assessment Users Advisory Committee, including recommendations from the CalTPA Steering Committee.

Presenter: 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 and performance of professional educators and for the accreditation of credential programs

Recommendations from the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) Users Advisory Committee

Introduction

On September 29, the Teaching Performance Assessment Users Advisory Committee held its first meeting. A report of this meeting was presented to the Commission at the October 2009 meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2009-10/2009-10-2F.pdf>). The Commission instructed the committee to continue meeting and to obtain additional implementation and cost data from programs to inform any recommendations that the panel might make to the Commission regarding potential modifications that could reduce TPA implementation costs for programs. This agenda item reports on the second meeting of the TPA Users Advisory Committee held on October 27, 2009 and on the data obtained through a survey of programs implementing the TPA requirement, and presents recommendations for the Commission's 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. Appendix A provides the full text of the applicable Education Code sections.

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

During the 2008-09 fiscal year, 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 and UC representatives. This ad hoc group made a number of suggested potential recommendations for cost reduction. These recommendations are outlined in the October 2009 Commission meeting agenda (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2009-10/2009-10-2F.pdf>).

The recommendations from the CSU and UC representatives were discussed in detail at the first meeting of the TPA Users Advisory Committee held on September 29, 2009 (see Appendix B for Committee membership). A report of their discussions was presented to the Commission at the October 2009 meeting. The report from the TPA Users Advisory Committee noted the complexity and difficulty of potentially modifying the implementation of an assessment such as the TPA while still meeting the statutory requirements for an assessment that is valid, reliable, fair and equitable to candidates.

The Commission directed the committee to continue the discussion begun at its initial meeting regarding potential ways to reduce implementation costs, and to inform the discussion with implementation and cost information obtained from teacher preparation programs, if such information could be obtained within the short time frame between the October and the December 2009 Commission meetings.

Survey of Teacher Preparation Programs Implementing the TPA Requirement

To respond to the Commission's direction to obtain data to inform potential recommendations from the committee, a survey for all teacher preparation programs implementing the TPA requirement was developed in early October 2009. The survey's questions were based on both Commission discussion and suggestions from a subcommittee consisting of the four performance assessment 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. This working group met immediately following the conclusion of the full committee meeting on September 29, 2009 to identify potential data needs relating to the ad hoc group's recommendations.

Commission staff received a large number of responses to the survey despite the relatively short time frame programs had in which to respond. The survey went out via email to TPA Coordinators, teacher preparation program deans and directors on October 8, 2009 with a closing date of 5:00 p.m. on October 19, 2009. Responses were received from approximately 80-85% of the teacher preparation programs implementing the TPA, including responses from all three TPA models and user segments. Respondents not only shared quantitative data but also provided extended comments.

Following the close of the survey input period, staff tabulated the results and prepared summaries of the raw data by all programs, by TPA model, and by program sponsor type (i.e., UC, CSU, Private/independent, District/County) to share with the committee at its second meeting of October 27, 2009. Staff also prepared a listing of enrollment and program completer data obtained from the Title II report that was cross-referenced by segment and by TPA model used to share with the committee. Although programs had been requested to provide outcomes data in terms of candidate scores by TPA attempts, no data were available from programs using the CalTPA model. PACT was able to provide candidate outcomes data.

Second Meeting of the TPA Users Advisory Committee, October 27, 2009

At its second meeting in October 2009 the committee discussed the survey results both in general and specifically as the results applied to the recommendations made in September 2009 by the CSU and UC representatives. The overall theme of the committee's discussion focused on looking at 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.

Results from the TPA Implementation Survey

As indicated above, the survey results represented information from a significant segment of the TPA user community. Given the high survey response rate, the TPA Users Advisory Committee felt it would be appropriate to use the survey results to inform its recommendations.

Survey Results: Background Information about Respondents and Their TPA Implementation Practices

Approximately 62% of survey respondents used the CalTPA model; 38% used the PACT model, and one respondent used the FAST model. Approximately 32% of responses were from the CSU, 9% were from the UC, 53% were from private/independent institutions, and 7% were from a school district/county office of education.

Virtually all program responders indicated they require assessors to recalibrate at least once per year, and within that group, 46% indicated that they require assessors who have not scored within a six months time period to recalibrate before scoring. Methods typically used for accomplishing recalibration included using the Commission's online system for CalTPA and participating in a collegial activity of varying types in which candidate responses were reviewed and discussed. Most programs (88% of respondents) indicated they were complying with the current 15% random double scoring requirement, and virtually all programs (91%) indicated they always double scored failing candidate responses. Assignment of scorers to double scoring activities is for the most part the responsibility of the TPA program coordinator.

Programs used two major avenues of training scorers: participating in centralized training, whether offered through the Commission or through opportunities offered by other preparation programs, and training their own assessors onsite through using a local qualified lead assessor (training of trainers).

Programs were divided closely on the issue of whether the same assessor scored all of the TPA responses from a given candidate, and the majority of programs (78%) indicated that candidates were scored anonymously. An additional 16% indicated that some candidates were scored anonymously and others were not. Most programs also do not allow supervisors to score responses from their own candidates (79%).

Survey Results: Cost Issues

A majority of programs (65%) indicated they pay assessors for their time in scoring above and beyond their salary or other regular compensation. Most of these programs (86%) pay assessors by task rather than by time spent on scoring. On the other hand, most programs (66%) do not pay assessors above and beyond their salary or other regular compensation for their time spent on recalibration. Of those who do pay assessors for their time spent on recalibration above and beyond their salary or other regular compensation, the majority (55%) pay by time spent.

Programs indicated a range of responses to the question about how many TPA tasks/activities each assessor would typically score in a year. The interpretation of these responses should be mediated by considering the design difference in TPA models: the PACT has a single teaching event scored with multiple rubrics, for example, whereas the CalTPA has four separately scored individual tasks that each use a similar rubric. The data provided by respondents to this question are not particularly instructive, as the number of tasks scored by an individual assessor over the course of a year ranges from a reported low of 3 to a high of 400. The average range across all responses is approximately between 10-35.

Respondents were asked two questions regarding double scoring. The first question asked if cost were not an issue, whether programs would prefer to continue to do their own double scoring or to have the Commission assume responsibility for double scoring. Respondents clearly chose (86%) the option of keeping their own double scoring. The second question asked if, given that cost was now an issue, respondents would prefer to continue to do their own double scoring or to have the Commission assume responsibility for double scoring. Again, the majority of respondents chose (68%) to continue to do their own double scoring. The consistency of program responses in favor of doing their own double scoring regardless of cost issues stems from the perceived value that double scoring provides for programs in terms of knowing how their candidates as well as their assessors are performing, and in terms of maintaining an assessment process that is fair to candidates and provides reliable scoring data. These data are seen as vital for program improvement purposes.

Respondents were asked for their best “guesstimate” of how much per candidate the program expends, including both monetary payments outside of/in addition to salary and the value of people’s time in monetary terms. Again, these data were widely variable and do not provide a clear guideline. Responses ranged from a low of \$50 to a high of \$2,000. Most responses, however, clustered within the range of \$200-\$500 per candidate per year.

Respondents were asked to guesstimate what their cost savings might be if the Commission were to assume responsibility for double scoring. These data were also variable, ranging from “none” and “not enough worth mentioning” to \$29,000 per year. Many responses clustered around the range of \$7,000 or less.

Similarly, respondents were asked to guesstimate what their cost savings might be if the Commission were to adopt a policy of requiring recalibration only once per year regardless of TPA model. These cost data also indicated that savings would be relatively small. Responses ranged from a low of \$0 to a high of \$10,400.

Finally, respondents were asked if their program would be in favor of a system where all TPA scoring regardless of model was centralized similar to the scoring of examinations like CBEST, RICA, and CSET. Respondents were virtually evenly divided 50.5% in favor and 49.5% not in favor. This item received a lot of comments, many of which could be summarized on the one hand as expressing the perceived value to programs of the assessment, its results for candidates and its results for program improvement purposes, and on the other hand as expressing frustration with a perceived “unfunded mandate.”

Recommendations from the TPA Users Advisory Committee

With respect to the recommendations made by the CSU and UC representatives, the TPA Users Advisory Committee makes the following recommendations:

CSU and UC Representatives Recommendation 1

With respect to PACT, that a “slimmed down” version of the CATS (content area tests) be developed and implemented.

The TPA Users Advisory Committee makes no recommendation in this regard as the developer of the PACT model is already addressing this issue.

CSU and UC Representatives Recommendation 2

With respect to CalTPA, that the Subject Specific Pedagogy Task be eliminated as a scored task within the CalTPA model.

The TPA Users Advisory Committee indicated that it does not support this recommendation but recommends that this issue be referred to the CalTPA Steering Committee for a formal recommendation to the Commission. The CalTPA Steering Committee is comprised of program implementation and program psychometric experts representing all segments using the CalTPA model. The CalTPA Steering Committee met on October 28, 2009 to discuss this issue as well as others pertaining specifically to the CalTPA model. The CalTPA Steering Committee wishes to communicate to the Commission that it does not support this recommendation.

The rationale for the CalTPA Steering Committee's recommendation is that the Subject-Specific Pedagogy task represents one-fourth of the CalTPA and that to eliminate a full fourth of the assessment weakens the overall reliability and validity of the assessment to an unacceptable degree. The CalTPA Steering Committee also noted that this task assesses each of the four multiple subject core content areas. If this task were eliminated, one of the four core multiple subject core content areas would not be assessed given that there would be only three remaining tasks in the CalTPA.

CSU and UC Representatives Recommendation 3

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.

The TPA Users Advisory Committee does not support this recommendation.

The rationale for the Committee's non-support of the recommendation is that anonymity of scoring protects against bias as well as promotes fairness and equity in the assessment, as required by statute. The Committee also noted that survey results indicate that approximately 80% of programs responding to the survey score their candidates anonymously and that there was no compelling reason to change existing practice.

CSU and UC Representatives Recommendation 4

With respect to all three TPA models, that the requirement for random double scoring of a 15% sample of candidate responses be suspended for a period of two years. Double scoring for non-passers, however, would be retained.

The TPA Users Advisory Committee does not support suspending the double scoring requirement, but recommends instead that a sliding scale of double scoring be implemented as follows:

- Programs having 500 or more candidates: 5% random double scoring
- Programs having 250-499 candidates: 10% random double scoring

- Programs having 249 or fewer candidates: 15% random double scoring

The rationale for this recommendation is provided through psychometric analysis of the extent of double scoring required to maintain at least a minimally acceptable level of reliability and validity in scoring the assessment. Larger programs could reduce the original 15% random double scoring to 5% and still include sufficient candidate responses to maintain an appropriate check on scoring reliability and validity, and the same would be the case for programs with 249-500 candidates if they reduced double scoring to 10% instead of the original 15%. Smaller programs, however, would still need to maintain the 15% random double scoring level in order to assure that a sufficient sample of responses would be included.

CSU and UC Representatives Recommendation 5

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:

The TPA Users Advisory Committee does not support recalibration being required every two years of scorers and recommends that the present requirement of recalibration of each assessor at a minimum of once per year be maintained. The TPA Users Advisory Committee made no recommendation concerning the six months recalibration requirement but referred the issue instead to the CalTPA Steering Committee for discussion and a recommendation to the Commission. The CalTPA Steering Committee discussed this issue at its meeting on October 28, 2009. The CalTPA Steering Committee does not support the recommendation to suspend the six months recalibration requirement for scorers who have not scored a particular task within a six month period and recommends that the present requirement be maintained.

The rationale for both of the recommendations presented above reflects the statutory requirement for assessment scoring reliability as well as for fairness and equity to candidates. Assessor drift from an established scoring rubric is a fact well-established in the literature of educational psychology and psychometrics. When scoring standardized assessments such as the RICA, CBEST and CSET, the scorers are typically calibrated every day and sometimes more than once per day. Establishing a once per year required recalibration for scorers who continuously score during the year is an absolute minimum for an assessment such as the TPA. Similarly, assessors for the CalTPA who have not scored a given task within a six months time period are at even greater risk for drifting away from the established rubric scoring. The CalTPA Steering Committee felt that requiring these assessors to recalibrate before scoring again after a break of that long a time period was a minimum requirement to meet the statutory assessor scoring reliability and validity requirements.

CSU and UC Representatives Recommendation 6

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.

The TPA Users Advisory Committee indicates to the Commission that a streamlining of data elements has already been accomplished by the Commission and that the committee supports the streamlined version of the data elements as indicated in Chart A – TPA Data Elements (see Appendix C).

The TPA Users Advisory Committee discussed the elements indicated in Chart A – TPA Data Elements (see Appendix C) and noted the purpose of each data element and its relationship to the information required by statute. The Committee felt that the data elements shown in Chart A had been reduced to the absolute minimum. The Committee also noted that information will be coming to the field from the CTC regarding procedures for TPA-related data collection and reporting in alignment with the data elements specified.

CSU and UC Representatives Recommendation 7

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.

The TPA Users Advisory Committee does not support this recommendation and strongly recommends to the Commission that all programs implement the TPA in the same manner as consistent with the design of the chosen TPA model.

The rationale for not supporting this recommendation stems from the need to meet the statutory requirement for fairness and equity in the assessment process. Commission standards require that programs choose and implement one of the three approved TPA models, and the models themselves require that programs implement the model as it was designed and validated. Allowing programs to choose which modifications they might want to make at any given time would result in a non-standard administration of a given model, different and potentially inequitable treatment of candidates, potential bias in the administration and scoring, and a lack of fairness to candidates. Candidate outcomes data would also not be able to be aggregated across TPA models since the scores would not represent similar administrations of a given model across programs.

Additional Recommendation from the TPA Users Advisory Committee

The TPA Users Advisory Committee strongly recommends to the Commission that any and all of the recommendations presented above that are adopted by the Commission be implemented on a permanent rather than a temporary basis.

The rationale for this recommendation stems from the need to support the legal defensibility of the TPA and to support fairness and equity for all candidates in the assessment. Once a different standard or a modification to the process is adopted, it then becomes the standard of practice for all programs. To then go back to a previous standard and/or process after a temporary implementation period of a different standard/process would create another set of conditions under which candidates would be differently and differentially assessed over time. Implementing this recommendation would potentially put programs at risk of legal action by candidates.

Staff Recommendations

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the recommendations from the TPA Users Advisory Committee and the CalTPA Steering Committee concerning the CSU and UC representatives' original recommendations. Staff further recommends that the Commission adopt the additional recommendation presented by the TPA Users Advisory Committee concerning the permanent nature of any recommendations that are adopted by the Commission with regard to the implementation of the TPA.

Next Steps

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 different; how can the urgent discussion regarding the viability and sustainability of the TPA over the short and the long term be advanced?
- What should be the next steps in the development and evolution of TPA models over time?
- How can effective practices be shared effectively across programs and across models?
- What would a joint PACT-FAST-CalTPA statewide implementation conference look like, and should we conduct such a conference next year?

Appendix 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.

Appendix B
Members of the TPA Users Advisory Committee

Name	Representing
Wayne Bacer*	CalTPA
Katharine Bassett	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
Caryl Hodges*	AICCU
Eloise Lopez Metcalfe*	UC
Steve Turley*	CSU
Lori Misaki*	CCSESA (County Superintendents)
Dale Janssen	CTC Executive Director
Larry Birch	CTC
Phyllis Jacobson	CTC
Suzanne Sullivan	CTC/CalTPA
Margaret Olebe	CTC
Teri Clark	CTC
Michael Taylor	CTC

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

Appendix C

Chart A – TPA Data Elements

All Approved Multiple and Single Subject Preparation Programs will Submit the following Data

New Data Elements to be Collected

Data Element	Description	Data Format
Candidate ID	A unique identifier—the same identifier is used each time data is submitted for this candidate	SEID/SSN
Program-TPA Model	Identification of the approved model—CalTPA, PACT, FAST	PACT/ CalTPA/FAST
Candidate highest degree previously earned	The highest degree held by the candidate—None, Bachelor’s, Master’s, Doctorate	
Candidate Native English Speaker	Yes or No	1=Yes/2=No
Candidate’s scores on tasks--Submitted each time the candidate takes complete task – also includes date of each score	CalTPA—Score on each of the 4 tasks, plus date PACT—Score on each of the 11 rubrics, plus date FAST— S core on each of the 4 tasks, plus date	1-4 and date 1-4 and date 1-4 and date
Candidate Initial Task	Indicate if this is the score is for the initial time the task is completed	

Data Elements Already Collected and Therefore Not Duplicated In the Above List

Data Element	Where Collected	Description
Candidate Age	Collected as part of credential application: CAW-SIEBEL	The candidate’s age
Candidate Gender	Will be collected as part of the Title II reporting process	The candidate’s gender
Candidate Ethnicity (Optional)	Will be collected as part of the Title II reporting process	The candidate’s ethnicity, select from one or more of the options according to federal categories.
Candidate route used to satisfy subject matter	Collected as part of credential application: CAW-SIEBEL	Satisfaction of the subject matter requirement by passage of an examination or completion of an approved subject matter preparation program
Program Model	Collected as part of credential application: CAW-SIEBEL	Description of the types of program models: is the candidate an intern or student teacher.
Candidate Credential	Collected as part of credential application: CAW-SIEBEL	Multiple Subject or Single Subject—identify the subject for initial credential.
Candidate Additional Credential	Collected as part of credential application: CAW-SIEBEL	Multiple Subject or Single Subject—identify the subject for additional credential.