
6D

Information/Action

Professional Services Committee

The Teaching Performance Assessment: Implementation Update and Proposed Process for Moving Forward

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents an overview of the current status of the statewide implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment, and also presents a proposed process for Commission input in order to move the teaching performance assessment process in California forward.

Policy Question: Does the proposed plan presented in this agenda item address the Commission's priorities for improving the consistency of TPA outcomes as well as for providing data useful for a revised accreditation system focused on performance outcomes?

Recommended Action: That the Commission provide input and guidance concerning how it wishes to proceed with the future of TPA implementation in the state.

Presenter: Phyllis Jacobson, Administrator, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal:

I. Educator Quality

- ◆ Develop, maintain, and promote high quality authentic, consistent educator assessments and examinations that support development and certification of educators who have demonstrated the capacity to be effective practitioners.

February 2014

The Teaching Performance Assessment: Implementation Update and Proposed Process for Moving Forward

Introduction

California has been working with teaching performance assessments (TPAs) since 2000, when the idea was first introduced legislatively into the requirements for earning a teaching credential. In the early years, the agency developed and adopted standards for the design and implementation of TPAs, and worked with experts, contractors and stakeholders to build a state model for use in teacher preparation programs. Other locally developed TPAs were also designed and submitted for review and approval by the Commission. During this time, faculty in teacher education programs developed a significant base of knowledge and skill around the assessment of candidates through TPAs, which has had a positive impact on the quality of teacher preparation in California. In 2008, the TPA pilot process ended, and passage of a TPA became a requirement for every candidate for the Preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Credential.

This agenda item presents an overview of the current status of the statewide implementation of Teaching Performance Assessments. The item also presents for Commission consideration a potential plan for updating the teaching performance assessment process consistent with the Commission's strategic plan and priorities.

Background

The Commission has heard multiple prior agenda items relating to the statewide implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment (Appendix A). Currently, there are three approved TPA models with a fourth (national) model being piloted with approximately 500 candidates. Education Code section 44320.2 allows for programs and institutions to submit locally-developed models of the TPA to the Commission for potential approval.

This update begins with a review of some of the key requirements of the Education Code governing the Commission's responsibility for the TPA, including identifying areas where the Commission could strengthen implementation processes to better meet statutory expectations. The update continues next with a summary of several meetings held with assessment experts and the TPA user community to discuss key implementation issues, particularly issues around allowable support for candidates in the assessment process and improving the scoring consistency of the TPA. Finally, a potential plan is presented for moving forward in a manner that would increase implementation and scoring consistency of the TPA in order to strengthen validity and reliability in candidate outcomes as well as provide meaningful and reliable program data that sheds light on the quality of preparation programs.

Review of Education Code Requirements Relating to TPA Implementation and Oversight

The Education Code specifies the Commission's responsibilities with respect to TPA implementation and oversight. Appendix B presents a table outlining the full Education Code sections pertaining to the TPA. A summary discussion of some of the key statutory requirements and their implications for current and future Commission action follows.

EC 44225(a): Among the powers and duties assigned to the Commission is the establishment of “professional standards, assessments, and examinations for entry and advancement in the education profession.”

EC 44259: The initial citation of Commission responsibility with respect to the TPA occurs in Education Code section 44259, wherein it is stated that “...each program shall include a teaching performance assessment that is aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession...” and “The Commission shall ensure that each candidate recommended for a credential or certificate has demonstrated satisfactory ability to assist pupils to meet or exceed academic content and performance standards for pupils adopted by the state board pursuant to Section 60605.” The Commission has used the TPA, in combination with the accreditation system, as the proxy measure by which to fulfill its responsibility to ensure that candidates demonstrate their ability to teach students effectively. However, in order for the Commission to meet the requirement of this section of the Education Code, the Commission needs to have confidence that programs are assessing each individual candidate on the TPA and that the assessment and the scores on the assessment are valid and reliable for each individual candidate.

EC44320.2: This section of the Education Code contains the major provisions applicable to the TPA. Subsection (b) states that “in implementing this requirement, institutions or agencies may do the following: (1) voluntarily develop an assessment for approval by the commission....” or (2) participate in an assessment training program for assessors and implement the commission developed assessment.” Although there is no specific language to this effect, this section of statute seems to imply that the Commission will develop a TPA model for use by programs. Despite the lack of a specific statutory mandate for the Commission to develop and maintain a TPA model, statute nonetheless assigns the Commission a number of additional responsibilities related to the Commission-developed TPA model, including:

- Offering an “assessment training program for assessors” (44320.2 (b)(1));
- Designing, developing and implementing “assessment standards and an institutional assessor training program for the sponsors of professional preparation programs to use if they choose to use the Commission development assessment” (44320.2 (d)(2)).

Staff notes that the Commission has met these provisions of statute through the development and maintenance of the CalTPA model, including offering assessor training, calibration, and recalibration activities to any interested program.

In addition to the language regarding the Commission developed TPA model, statute assigns a number of statewide oversight responsibilities to the Commission, relating to all TPA models. These responsibilities include but are not limited to:

- Establishing review panels to examine assessments developed by other entities in relation to the Commission’s assessment quality standards (44320.2 (d)(3));
- Establish standards for satisfactory performance in assessments under this section of statute (44320.2 (d)(5));
- Collect and analyze background information provided by candidates, and report and interpret the individual and aggregated results of the assessment (44320.2 (d)(7));

- Examine and revise as necessary the accreditation system to provide a strong assurance to candidates regarding ongoing opportunities to acquire the knowledge, skills, and abilities measured by the TPA; and
- Ensure that the aggregated results of the assessment for groups of candidates...are used as one source of information about the quality and effectiveness of that program (44320.2 (d)(9)).

It is important to note that all of the statutory provisions pertaining to Commission responsibilities for the TPA within 44320.2 (d) were to be carried out “subject to the availability of funds in the annual Budget Act,” but yet there have never been any funds allocated in the annual Budget Act for the TPA. The initial development of the Commission’s model, the CalTPA, was supported by a \$10 million federal grant awarded under the U.S. Department of Education’s State Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant competition in 2002. This funding allowed the Commission to work with a contractor and California educators to complete the development, validation, pilot and field testing of the CalTPA model. These were start-up funds that enabled the Commission to move forward with TPA development and early implementation prior to the required statewide TPA implementation date, but once the federal funding ended there has been no additional fiscal support for the TPA. The Commission has nonetheless attempted to implement all of the applicable sections of statute, as documented in Appendix B.

EC 44320.2 (c): This section of the Education Code requires the Commission to “implement the TPA in a manner that does not increase the number of assessments required of teacher candidates in the state.” This provision of statute has been interpreted by viewing the TPA as a replacement for the variety of local programmatic assessments previously used by programs to meet Common Standard 9 concerning required assessment of candidate competency:

Common Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence

Candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the program standards.

This approach to implementing the TPA by replacing a variety of local candidate competency assessments would reduce a number of summative candidate competency assessments previously required of teacher candidates across the state by local preparation programs in accordance with Common Standard 9.

EC 44320.2 (d)(4): This section of statute requires the Commission to “initially and periodically analyze the validity of assessment content and the reliability of assessment scores established pursuant to this section.” Prior agenda items in April 2012, August 2012, and September 2013 all discussed at length issues relating to local implementation of multiple TPA models and the effects on scoring consistency across programs and models.

Consistency and reliability of assessment scores is largely related to the methods used to calibrate, recalibrate and monitor assessors during the scoring process. In most large-scale

standardized assessments, the scoring agency (whether a contractor, a county office of education, or other responsible entity) typically trains and initially calibrates assessors, then follows each assessor during the scoring process by reviewing scores to make sure the assessor does not “drift” in applying the applicable scoring standards, periodically using checks such as pre-scored papers given to the assessor to score as though it were a regular candidate paper, recalibrating assessors after a certain number of papers scored, and other such methods. Records are maintained for each assessor, including results of scoring and of the validity check outcomes. Scorers who are “drifting” or not maintaining appropriate scoring are identified by the scoring agency and can be recalibrated or ultimately dismissed as an official scorer if the assessor is unable to maintain calibration status. This type of scoring and oversight process represents the highest industry standard and produces consistently valid and reliable candidate results.

However, a process such as this is labor-intensive, and requires considerable knowledge and attention on the part of the scoring agency. Implementing such a robust scoring system within the current implementation conditions of local training and supervision of assessors would be very difficult for a number of reasons. Increasing local scoring consistency would require programs to invest additional time and resources that they do not necessarily have available for scorer training, calibration, recalibration, oversight, monitoring, double scoring, and other technical assessment processes. Local teacher preparation programs are not typically set up or staffed to be testing agencies responsible for large-scale assessments. Given the lack of local and state resources for supporting local implementation and scoring of the TPA, programs have largely done as well as they can in managing TPA implementation and scoring within a context that includes constant turnover of TPA coordinators and scorers and varying degrees of faculty involvement and support. However, program sponsors have indicated that they do not have the staff or resources to undertake or sustain additional investments in oversight of the scoring process.

A robust scoring system is critical to meeting the statutory requirement that the Commission ensure that every candidate demonstrates his/her ability to teach prior to being awarded a teaching credential (44259(b)(3)). Further, it is necessary if these data are to be used to make consequential judgments about program quality that inform accreditation decisions (44320.2(d)(9)). This situation poses a significant issue for the Commission as well as for local preparation programs responsible for TPA implementation.

A second aspect of concern is the requirement also in this section of statute to “initially and periodically analyze the validity of assessment content...” A recent factor affecting the currently approved TPA models is the advent of the Common Core State Standards, which requires the review and possible updating of all TPA models’ tasks and scoring rubrics in order for the assessment content to remain valid for these subject areas. Revising an assessment such as the TPA would require more than changing the questions and/or candidate directions. It could also involve revising candidate preparation materials/candidate handbooks; revising scorer training; identifying new marker papers for training assessors; identifying and selecting new benchmark papers for assessor training, and identifying and selecting new calibration and recalibration papers. Depending on the level of revisions needed, this could be a costly and resource-intensive effort since it affects the reliability and validity of the assessments themselves.

The Commission does not have sufficient fiscal resources to update the CalTPA at the current time. It is not clear that the sponsors of other approved models are adequately resourced to update their systems either.

EC44320.2 (d)(8): This section of statute addresses the relationship of the Accreditation System to the TPA. In addition to increasing scoring consistency across the TPA, the Commission has also indicated an interest in revising the Accreditation System to increase the use of valid and reliable program and candidate performance outcomes and decrease reliance on programmatic “inputs” and paper documentation, lengthy reports, and site visits. In order to rebalance the evidence base for accreditation in this way, however, the data on which programs and the Commission rely in terms of performance outcomes must be consistently valid and reliable. Reviews of biennial reports and other information provided through the accreditation process have indicated substantial variation in implementation both within programs and across programs using the same TPA model. The accreditation system may not be well suited to monitor or enforce the level of consistency needed to ensure a balanced view of the program’s performance outcomes.

EC 44320.2 (d)(9): This section of statute speaks to the need for the Commission to 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. This section is closely related to the use of TPA data within the accreditation system to inform accreditation decisions about the quality and effectiveness of preparation programs, and emphasizes the need to have consistently valid and reliable data reported in a more uniform manner across programs and TPA models.

In addition to California’s statutory mandate to focus on the use of aggregated data results as a source of information about the quality and effectiveness of each teacher preparation program, there is also now a parallel increased national focus on using TPA performance data to identify effective candidates and preparation programs. National organizations and entities are also looking to statewide data to make judgments about the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs and how well prepared their graduates are.

Issues and Recommendations Discussed with Assessment Experts and TPA Users

The Commission has had five years of full implementation of the TPA for licensure and accreditation purposes. Staff has presented agenda items to the Commission examining outcomes, the varying implementation processes within and across models, and the relationship of TPA implementation to the Commission’s strategic goals around accreditation and performance outcomes. Recently, staff held several meetings with assessment experts and TPA stakeholders to gain additional perspectives on some of the key issues that have arisen over time, several of which are related to the statutory provisions discussed above.

In May 2013, staff met with assessment experts and some TPA implementers to consider several key issues, including but not limited to the following:

- The formative and summative nature of the TPA, and how this plays out across scoring and support provided to candidates within the assessment process (EC 44320.2 (e), (e)(1), (e)(2), and (e)(3))

- How programs provide candidates with opportunities to learn what is assessed on the TPA (EC 44320 (d)(8))
- Scoring consistency within a locally-scored, multiple TPA model system
- The context that each model approaches formative assessment differently, and takes a different approach to supporting candidates within programs as they prepare candidates for their respective TPAs

The following individuals attended the meeting:

Participant	Affiliation
Lee Shulman	Retired, Carnegie Foundation
Lloyd Bond	Retired, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards
Joan Herman	CRESST Center, UCLA
Elaine Chin	Dean, School of Education, San Jose State University
Amy Reising	High Tech High School
Tine Sloan	UC Santa Barbara
Mary Vixie Sandy	Executive Director, CTC
Phyllis Jacobson	Administrator, CTC
Wayne Bacer	Consultant, CTC
Tonja Jarrell	Consultant, CTC

The purpose of the meeting was to gain advice of assessment experts as well as practitioners regarding policies governing implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment requirement in California. The format of the meeting was a free-ranging discussion around a number of TPA-related policy questions provided to the group and around other educational issues of interest to the participants brought up during the meeting.

Appropriate support for candidates within the assessment process: The issue of what type of support is appropriate to provide candidates within an assessment process that is both formative and summative arose during the first year of mandatory TPA statewide implementation. At that time, the Commission had established the TPA Implementation Task Force, a representative advisory group that operated to help establish statewide implementation processes across models and programs that were just starting to develop local capacity to implement and score the TPA. The policy that was established by the Implementation Task Force became codified within the CalTPA candidate handbook, but over time, the policy was modified in practice by other models to fit their particular contexts. Early in 2013, in order to assure consistency in candidate preparation for and treatment during the assessment, Commission staff provided clarification to the field about the limits of appropriate candidate support. However, this guidance did not take into consideration the fact that other models had evolved and modified the original policy over time. The Commission guidance became a source of concern to the field, and thus the Commission sought advice from assessment experts about this issue in order to refine the policy so that it was consistent with best practice in performance assessment and appropriate for all approved TPA models.

The participants at the May 2013 meeting of assessment experts discussed this issue from the point of view of identifying the limits of appropriate candidate support within an assessment that was intended to be both formative and summative at the same time. The experts felt it was important to be transparent on this issue to candidates and to faculty, that support could include coaching, discussing candidate responses and stimulating the thinking of candidates, but that appropriate support would not include actual editing of candidate work.

In summary, it was felt that acceptable levels of candidate support during the assessment would include such actions as:

- Explaining scoring rubrics, and using these rubrics on assignments other than the candidate responses submitted for scoring
- Assisting candidates in understanding how to use the electronic platforms for models/programs using electronic uploading of candidate responses
- Providing candidates with access to handbooks and other explanatory materials about the TPA and expectations for candidate performance on the assessment
- Asking probing questions about candidate draft responses without providing answers or specific suggestions about the candidate's work
- Providing support documents such as advice on making good choices of what to use within the assessment responses
- Arranging technical assistance for the video portion of the assessment

Unacceptable forms of candidate support during the assessment would include such actions as:

- Editing candidate materials
- Providing actual candidate TPA materials on public access websites
- Providing specific analyses of candidate responses prior to submission for scoring
- Sharing materials across candidates or with others that are intended to be submitted or have been submitted for scoring

Staff is currently working on developing revised guidance to the field about appropriate and acceptable candidate support.

Consistency in scoring: A detailed discussion about the importance of assuring that assessors are appropriately trained, calibrated, and supervised on a consistent basis was provided earlier in this agenda item. The topic of how to assure consistency within the current context of multiple, locally-scored models with limited personnel and resources was an area of interest to both the assessment experts and the TPA users at the meeting.

The wide-ranging discussion started by considering who within teacher preparation programs actually stood behind the actual scoring, when programs were operating in a context where some programs use full time faculty, some use adjunct faculty and/or individuals outside the institution, programs may not be able to sufficiently verify which assessors have been maintaining calibrated status, programs experience considerable turnover in both TPA coordinators and assessors, and programs lack resources to consistently supervise the entire scoring process to ensure that all assessors are not drifting. These are complex issues for programs to address.

To help programs provide a minimum level of oversight to the scoring process, and on the recommendation of the TPA Users Advisory Committee (a successor advisory body established during the third year of full TPA implementation that included representatives of the approved models, psychometricians from each of the models, and program users), the Commission adopted a policy whereby programs are required to rescore (i.e., double score) a minimum of 15% of candidate responses.

Although programs have been following this policy, several TPA user participants at the meeting pointed out the difficulty programs have had in addressing instances where the two scorers differed significantly, and were not sure what could be done about the situation. It was noted that centrally managed scoring would be more likely to address effectively the issue of consistency in scoring, since within a centrally managed scoring process someone would be assigned specifically to look at the issue of scorer calibration, recalibration and drift. However, it was acknowledged that there could be a cost to implementing centrally managed scoring even on a local/regional basis.

Some further discussion ensued regarding whether, for example, if the Commission were to require centrally-managed scoring of all models that the scorers could be required to be program faculty, or if others could also serve as scorers. The experts agreed that local faculty involvement in scoring was valuable, and that a centrally managed system would strengthen the assessment outcomes and support use of aggregated scores as a source of information about program quality. It was universally supported that whatever scoring system or approach was used, specified feedback/reports should be provided to candidates and programs, including diagnostic feedback useful for program improvement.

The assessment experts questioned what the purpose of the actual TPA candidate scores were, and how these were to be used. They also questioned what the scope of the TPA in general should be, and what the appropriate content scope should be – for example, should the TPA be structured to address integrated English Language Arts and Science, or History-Social Science, for example. Finally, the assessment experts advised that it would be important to consider how state level policies could be created that encouraged but didn't mandate specific practices as a means of moving the profession forward.

Meeting with the PACT User Community, Stanford University, August 2013

Executive Director Sandy and Phyllis Jacobson, Administrator, discussed the issue of appropriate candidate support within the TPA process at a PACT meeting held at Stanford University in August 2013. The PACT community was in agreement with the updated policy around candidate support summarized above.

Meeting with TPA Users, Oakland, September 2013

A third meeting was held with additional TPA users in Oakland in September 2013. This was a wide ranging discussion about a number of TPA-related policy issues, and also included a discussion of the appropriate support for candidates within the TPA process and issues around scoring consistency.

Proposed Process for Moving the TPA Forward in California

The teaching performance assessment process in California is at a crossroads. The Commission and the field are looking to strengthen the TPA process so that scoring for all models and candidates produces consistently valid and reliable results for use in looking at program quality and in streamlining the accreditation system's focus on and effective use of performance data. The current TPA models may need to be revised and revalidated in order to address Common Core State Standards and soon the Next Generation Science Standards; the Commission's CalTPA model rubrics and scoring system also need to be updated to focus more specifically on TPE-related outcomes and to provide for more detailed candidate and program feedback for program improvement and accreditation purposes.

Based on its extensive prior experience with teaching performance assessment, and given what we now know about the strengths and limitations of our current TPA system, California is well-positioned for the next generation of TPA design and a new, stronger TPA implementation paradigm.

The Commission could decide to take a new approach to a second-generation TPA by issuing a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the development, adaptation or adoption of a new statewide TPA model. The RFP would be "no-cost," that is, the Commission would pay no funds to the successful bidder for the work, but the bidder would recoup the development cost through the fee-based administration of the assessment for a specified period of time.

This model would become the Commission developed model and would ultimately adapt or replace the CalTPA as the official Commission developed model. The model would be aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and all of California's K-12 standards, including but not limited to the Common Core State Standards, the Next Generation Science Standards, and the K-12 standards for other content areas, as specified by statute (EC 44320.2 (b)). It would provide for a centrally-managed scoring system that would increase consistency of scoring outcomes for use in the licensing and program review (accreditation) process.

It is anticipated that the RFP might include some or all of the following provisions to provide guidance to potential respondents about the nature of the required teaching performance assessment model:

- A comprehensive teaching performance assessment designed specifically to measure California's revised TPEs (general education and special education)
- Alignment within the candidate tasks to Common Core State Standards and principles
- A set of meaningful candidate tasks that allow candidates to demonstrate their range of knowledge, skills, and abilities with respect to the TPEs in an efficient, non-repetitive manner
- An assessment that addresses multiple subject, single subject, and education specialist teachers
- An implementation process that provides a one-stop, online system of candidate registration for the assessment
- An electronic platform for the uploading of candidate responses and for the distributed scoring of these responses to the trained scorers

- Options for the centralized and/or locally mediated scoring of candidate responses, whether online or in-person
- A system of scorer training, calibration, recalibration, oversight, and review of performance over time
- A system of recruitment and use of California faculty and other qualified individuals as scorers
- A comprehensive system of providing score reporting and feedback to candidates
- A comprehensive system of providing formative and summative score reporting and data access for programs as well as to the Commission in formats as specified by the Commission
- A comprehensive system of providing program-level data to be specified by the Commission in a manner useful to the accreditation process

This approach could provide all of the following benefits:

- A new, state of the art statewide TPA assessment that assesses California's *Teaching Performance Expectations* and aligns with the *Standards for the Teaching Profession* and the Common Core Student Standards
- Consistent, and comparable candidate and program outcomes data for use within the accreditation system and for identifying high quality preparation programs
- Provision of consistent program-specific data for program improvement and data reporting purposes, with the ability to produce meaningful reports to programs, stakeholders, the legislature and others about outcomes of the state's TPA system

As part of this bidding process to develop a new state TPA model, staff would consult with the sponsors of teacher preparation programs and other stakeholders to assure that the requirements and specifications of the RFP, many of which are suggested above, would meet state and program expectations and needs.

Implications for Current Models

Consistent with the provisions of statute (EC 44320.2 (b)(1)), multiple TPA models could still continue to be used in California. However, TPA models that wish to remain viable for use in California once the Commission has developed its new model would need to demonstrate that they:

- Are comparable in scope to the new state TPA model
- Are consistent and reliable in their candidate scoring
- Have a passing standard that is equivalent to the state model passing standard

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission discuss the future of the implementation of the TPA and provide guidance to staff as appropriate.

Next Steps

Staff would move forward as directed by the Commission.

Appendix A

Selected Prior Agenda Items Pertaining to the TPA

September 26, 2013

Potential Approval of an Additional Teaching Performance Assessment

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-09/2013-09-4B.pdf>

March 7, 2013

Proposed Adoption and Implementation of Revised California Teaching Performance Expectations

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-03/2013-03-3B.pdf>

September 27, 2012

Continuation of the Discussion of the Teaching Performance Assessment

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-09/2012-09-2C.pdf>

August 8, 2012

Increasing the Reliability (Scoring Consistency) of Candidate Results on the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA)

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-08/2012-08-4A.pdf>

June 14, 2012

Plan for Work Related to the Teaching Performance Expectations

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-06/2012-06-6D.pdf>

April 26, 2012

Update on the Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment Requirement

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-04/2012-04-6B.pdf>

January 27, 2011

Teaching Performance Assessment Data for 2008-09 Submitted by Approved Programs

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-01/2011-01-2D.pdf>

December 9, 2009

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

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2009-12/2009-12-3C.pdf>

October 1, 2009

Report on the Meeting of the Teaching Performance Assessment Users Advisory Group

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2009-10/2009-10-2F.pdf>

June 3, 2009

Update on the Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) Requirement

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2009-06/2009-06-6C.pdf>

June 5, 2008

Recommendation for Approval of the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST)

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2008-06/2008-06-3G-insert.pdf>

October 4, 2007

Proposed Approval of an Alternative Teaching Performance Assessment, the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT)

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2007-10/2007-10-3C.pdf>

June 27, 2007

Perspectives on Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2007-06/2007-06-2K.pdf>

March 8, 2007

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

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2007-03/2007-03-6D.pdf>

February 7, 2007

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

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2007-02/2007-02-6B.pdf>

Appendix B

California Education Code Pertaining to the TPA

44259

(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 (c) 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 proficiency test 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 that 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 academic content and performance standards for pupils adopted by the state board pursuant to Section 60605.

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.