



Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE) Validation Study

Prepared for: Evaluation Systems Group of Pearson
and the
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Authors: Laura Ford
Susan D'Mello
Cheryl Paullin
Arthur Thacker

Date: May 16, 2016

Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE) Validation Study

Table of Contents

Introduction	iv
Chapter 1: TPE Validation Survey Approach	1
Data Collection Method	1
Survey Instructions and Questions	3
Survey Data Analyses	5
Defining Respondent Eligibility	6
Screening for Data Quality	7
Missing Data	7
Random Responding.....	7
Final Data Set	8
Chapter 2: Survey Sample Demographics	9
Chapter 3. TPE Element Importance	16
Descriptive Statistics–Importance	18
Subgroup Comparisons–Importance.....	27
Chapter 4. TPE Element Clarity	30
Descriptive Statistics–Clarity	31
Subgroup Comparisons–Clarity.....	40
Chapter 5. TPE Element Frequency	41
Descriptive Statistics–Frequency	42
Subgroup Comparisons–Frequency.....	51
Chapter 6. TPE Set of Elements Representation	53
Descriptive Statistics–Set of Elements Representativeness	53
Subgroup Comparisons–Set of Elements Representativeness	54
Chapter 7. TPE Narratives	55
Descriptive Statistics–TPE Narratives	55
Subgroup Comparisons–TPE Narratives.....	56
Chapter 8. Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives	57
Descriptive Statistics–Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives	58
Chapter 9. TPE Overall Representativeness	67
Descriptive Statistics–Overall Representativeness.....	67
Subgroup Comparisons–TPE Overall Representativeness	68
Chapter 10. TPE Element Calculated Criticality	69
Critical TPE Elements	69

Chapter 11. Content Analysis of Open-Ended Survey Comments	73
Content Analysis Methodology	73
Content Summaries for Comments on Clarity of TPE Elements	75
TPE 1	75
TPE 2	75
TPE 3	76
TPE 4	77
TPE 5	77
TPE 6	78
Comments on Importance of TPE Elements	80
Chapter 12: TPE Focus Group Data Collection.....	81
Data Collection Method	81
Focus Group Demographics	81
Content Analysis Methodology	84
Content Analysis Results	85
Focus Group Results and Low Ranked TPE/Elements from Survey	100

List of Tables

Table 1. Number of Eligible and Ineligible Respondents by Survey Version	8
Table 2. Primary Position, Ethnicity/Race, and Gender for Full Survey Sample	9
Table 3. Demographic Information for Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample	10
Table 4. Education Field and Level for Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample	13
Table 5. Demographic Information for Teacher Educator Survey Sample	14
Table 6. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Importance–Full Survey Sample	18
Table 7. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Importance–Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample	21
Table 8. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Importance–Teacher Educator Survey Sample	24
Table 9. TPE Element Importance by Gender	28
Table 10. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Clarity–Full Survey Sample	31
Table 11. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Clarity–Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample	34
Table 12. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Clarity–Teacher Educator Survey Sample	37
Table 13. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Frequency–Full Survey Sample	42
Table 14. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Frequency–Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample	45
Table 15. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Frequency–Teacher Educator Survey Sample	48

Table 16. TPE Element Frequency by Gender	51
Table 17. Descriptive Statistics for Set of TPE Elements Representativeness–Full Survey Sample	53
Table 18. Descriptive Statistics for Set of TPE Elements Representativeness–Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample	54
Table 19. Descriptive Statistics for Set of TPE Elements Representativeness–Teacher Educator Survey Sample	54
Table 20. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Narratives–Full Survey Sample.....	55
Table 21. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Narratives–Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample	56
Table 22. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Narratives–Teacher Educator Survey Sample	56
Table 23. Descriptive Statistics for Multiple Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives–Full Survey Sample	58
Table 24. Descriptive Statistics for Multiple Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives–Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample	59
Table 25. Descriptive Statistics for Multiple Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives–Teacher Educator Survey Sample	60
Table 26. Descriptive Statistics for Single Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives–Full Survey Sample	61
Table 27. Descriptive Statistics for Single Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives–Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample	63
Table 28. Descriptive Statistics for Single Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives–Teacher Educator Survey Sample	65
Table 29. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Overall Representativeness–Full Survey Sample	67
Table 30. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Overall Representativeness–Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample.....	68
Table 31. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Overall Representativeness–Teacher Educator Survey Sample	68
Table 32. Critical TPE Elements-Full, Public School Teacher/Administrator, and Teacher Educator Samples.....	71
Table 33. TPE Elements by Number of Survey Comments (>1% of Respondents Commented)	74
Table 34. Focus Group Locations and Number of Participants.....	81
Table 35. Focus Group Sites, Facilitators, and Meeting Details	81
Table 36. Focus Group Demographics.....	82

List of Figures

Figure 1. Sample email containing links to online survey.	2
Figure 2. Rating questions and scales for the TPE elements.	4
Figure 3. Narrative questions and rating scales.....	5
Figure 4. Final question about representativeness of TPEs as a whole.....	5
Figure 5. Illustration of rating combinations and their relationship to the criticality threshold.....	69

Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE) Validation Study

Introduction

This report documents results of two efforts to gather additional information from California Educators on the draft Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) prepared by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). These efforts included (a) a comprehensive survey offered to all California public school teachers, administrators, and teacher educators in the state and (b) statewide focus group sessions with California educators.

The report has 12 chapters. Chapter 1 describes administration of the TPE validation survey and the data analysis approach. Chapters 2-10 summarize the survey results and Chapter 11 presents the results of qualitative content analysis of open-ended comments from the survey. Finally, Chapter 12 describes the qualitative content analysis and themes that emerged from a series of focus groups conducted in April 2016 to facilitate discussion and provide feedback on the draft TPEs.

Chapter 1: TPE Validation Survey Approach

Data Collection Method

The Evaluation Systems group of Pearson (“Evaluation Systems”), in consultation with HumRRO, prepared a survey tool and vetted it with the CTC. It was important to take a comprehensive view of the TPEs by collecting judgments about each element and narrative associated with each TPE, the narratives that describe subject-specific pedagogy requirements, and the TPEs as a whole.

The survey included 4 major sections: (a) grouping and eligibility screening questions, (b) background questions, (c) TPEs and their elements and corresponding narratives [labeled Part 1], and (d) subject-specific pedagogy narratives [labeled Part 2].

To balance fatigue and the potential for respondent drop-off, the order of the TPEs within Part 1 was randomized across participants. Respondents could also leave the survey in-progress and return later to complete it.

The CTC and Evaluation Systems publicized the survey widely through the CTC’s website, flyers; email blasts to professional organizations, schools, districts, and teacher preparation programs; during other regularly-scheduled meetings with educators and teacher preparation professionals; and through personal referral networks.

An email containing links to the online survey was distributed to all public school administrators and Commission-approved teacher preparation programs in the state. School administrators were asked to share the survey links with all teachers in their school system and to strongly encourage teachers to participate. A reminder email, shown in Figure 1, was sent out while the survey was open.

As Figure 1 shows, there were 16 versions of the survey, tailored for respondents with (a) Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials, (b) any of 14 Single Subject Teaching Credentials, or (c) respondents who primarily work in special education. The content of Part 1 was the same for all versions. Part 2 included only narratives corresponding to the subject area selected by the respondent. The special education version of the survey was actually the same as the Multiple Subject survey. The email explained that special education respondents should complete as much of the survey as they felt was relevant to their situation. Each respondent selected the survey link that he/she deemed most relevant.

The online survey opened on April 25, 2016, and closed early in the morning on May 9, 2016.

Subject Line: CTC Survey on Revised Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs)

Dear Educator:

This is a reminder to let you know that the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) Validation Survey is still available, and it is not too late for you and other qualified educators to participate.

 NOTE ON SPECIAL EDUCATION: Teachers who hold a credential to teach in Special Education and educators who prepare teacher candidates for special education credentials are eligible to participate in this survey. Please click on the Special Education link below to access the survey and complete as much of the survey as applies to your educator role.

The survey is now available for completion on any computer with Internet access. To take the survey, click on the appropriate link below associated with your content area(s) of expertise, and then enter your unique access code of CZ51084 as indicated. Please note that the unique access code is case sensitive.

Content Area	Survey Link
Agriculture	https://www.testing.nesinc.com/a6b.htm
Art	https://www.testing.nesinc.com/a6c.htm
Business	https://www.testing.nesinc.com/a6d.htm
English Language Development	https://www.testing.nesinc.com/a6e.htm
English-Language Arts	https://www.testing.nesinc.com/a6f.htm
Health	https://www.testing.nesinc.com/a6g.htm
History/Social Science	https://www.testing.nesinc.com/a6h.htm
Home Economics	https://www.testing.nesinc.com/a6j.htm
Industrial and Technology Education	https://www.testing.nesinc.com/a6k.htm
Mathematics	https://www.testing.nesinc.com/a6m.htm
Multiple Subject	https://www.testing.nesinc.com/a6n.htm
Music	https://www.testing.nesinc.com/a6p.htm
Physical Education	https://www.testing.nesinc.com/a6t.htm
Science	https://www.testing.nesinc.com/a6r.htm
Special Education	https://www.testing.nesinc.com/a6n.htm
World Languages	https://www.testing.nesinc.com/a6s.htm

Eligible participants of the survey include public school administrators and teachers who hold a Preliminary or Clear Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential. In addition, faculty members and sponsors of a Commission-approved teacher preparation or subject-matter waiver program are also eligible. Please distribute this email to eligible participants who may use the same access code indicated above. Should you encounter background questions that do not apply to your situation, you may skip the question.

Please complete the survey by May 6, 2016. Survey responses will be confidential. Individuals, districts/counties, or institutions will not be identified in the analysis of survey results.

Your participation in this survey is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions about the survey, please contact us at es-caltpa@pearson.com.

If you wish to obtain further information regarding the revised TPEs or the redevelopment of the CalTPA, please contact the Examinations and Research Unit of the Commission by emailing TPA@ctc.ca.gov.

Once again, thank you for your participation in this very important activity.

Figure 1. Sample email containing links to online survey.

Survey Instructions and Questions

Throughout the survey, respondents were instructed to describe performance expectations for *entry-level general education teachers*. This message was defined and repeated at several places in the instructions, as shown below:

- “In Part 1, you will review six TPEs that are aligned to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP). These TPEs comprise the pedagogical competencies expected of general education teachers who are deemed ready to begin professional practice.” [from the survey introduction]
- “In each part of the survey, you will be asked to rate the elements and narratives in terms of beginning teachers, that is, preliminary candidates (including interns) who are at the entry level and just starting the job of teaching in California.” [from the survey introduction]
- “When making your ratings, respond to each rating question in terms of beginning teachers, that is, preliminary candidates (including interns) who are at the entry level and just starting the job of teaching in California. The ratings provided should be in terms of this reference group, not experienced educators or in terms of knowledge and skills that will be learned on the job (i.e., not required for entry level). Consider the pedagogical knowledge, skills, and abilities that beginning general education teachers have the opportunity to learn during preparation in California prior to being recommended for a preliminary teaching credential. The focus of this survey is on the requisite capabilities that a beginning teacher must have at the time of assignment.” [from Part 1 Rating Instructions]
- “On the following screens you will be asked to rate subject-specific narratives. When making your ratings, consider the subject-specific pedagogies and strategies that a beginning general education teacher must have at the time of assignment. Respond to each rating question in terms of beginning teachers, that is, preliminary candidates (including interns) who are at the entry level and just starting the job of teaching in California. The ratings provided should be in terms of this reference group, not experienced educators or in terms of knowledge and skills that will be learned on the job (i.e., not required for entry level). The focus of this survey is on the requisite capabilities that a beginning teacher must have at the time of assignment.” [from Part 2 Rating Instructions]

Figure 2 shows the questions and rating scales used to evaluate each element within each TPE and the representativeness of the set of elements associated with each TPE. Figure 3 shows the questions and rating scales used to evaluate the narrative for each TPE in Part 1 and the narrative descriptions of subject-specific pedagogy in Part 2. Finally, Figure 4 shows the closing question that asked about the comprehensiveness of the TPEs as a whole.

How important are the pedagogical knowledge, skills, and abilities described by this element for competently performing the job of a beginning teacher during the first few months of teaching in California?

- No importance/Not performed
- Little importance
- Moderate importance
- Great importance
- Very great importance

Do you agree that the pedagogical knowledge, skills, and abilities in this element are written clearly?

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Undecided
- Agree
- Strongly agree

How frequently are the pedagogical knowledge, skills, and abilities described by this element used by a beginning teacher during the first few months of teaching in California?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Very often
- Continuously

How well does this set of elements as a whole represent important pedagogical knowledge, skills, and abilities required for competent performance by beginning teachers during the first few months of teaching in California? (For your reference, the elements are repeated below.)

- Poorly
- Somewhat
- Adequately
- Well
- Very well

Figure 2. Rating questions and scales for the TPE elements.

How well does the narrative below represent important knowledge, skills, and abilities required for competently performing the job of a beginning teacher during the first few months of teaching in California?

- Poorly
- Somewhat
- Adequately
- Well
- Very well

How well does the narrative below represent important knowledge, skills, and abilities required for competently performing the job of a beginning teacher in this subject area during the first few months of teaching in California?

- Poorly
- Somewhat
- Adequately
- Well
- Very well

Figure 3. Narrative questions and rating scales.

How well does the set of TPEs as a whole (elements and narratives) represent important knowledge, skills, and abilities required for competent performance by beginning teachers in California? [For your reference, click here to view the full set of TPEs and subject-specific narratives.](#)

- Poorly
- Somewhat
- Adequately
- Well
- Very well

Figure 4. Final question about representativeness of TPEs as a whole.

Survey Data Analyses

HumRRO analyzed the survey data following a plan established by Evaluation Systems. It included:

- Defining respondent eligibility
- Screening for data quality
- Displaying the distribution of responses for each question in the survey

- Calculating descriptive statistics for each rating question in the survey, including arithmetic mean, standard deviation, standard error of the mean, as well as for clusters of related statements, such as elements within a TPE
- Calculating a criticality value for each TPE element based on a combination of importance and frequency and applying a decision rule to identify the “critical” elements

Defining Respondent Eligibility

A total of 4,478 individuals went at least as far as opening the link to the online survey. The first question asked them to self-identify their primary position as follows:

Which of the following best describes your primary position?

- Public School Teacher/Administrator*
- Teacher Educator*

Almost ¼ of those who opened the survey link did not answer this question (N=1,098, 24.5%), and thus went no further in the survey. Among the 3,380 participants who did answer this question, 2,088 participants (61.8%) selected Public School Teacher/Administrator and 1,292 participants (38.2%) selected Teacher Educator. The respondent was branched to one of two sets of eligibility questions based his/her response to this question.

For the 2,088 participants who indicated their primary position is Public School Teacher/Administrator, the eligibility questions were:

- *Do you hold a teaching credential from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing?*
- *Within the past 3 years, have you taught classes in the subject area indicated above in California TK-12 public schools?*

Respondents who answered “no” to both of these questions (N=41; 2.0%) were thanked for their interest and informed that they did not meet the eligibility requirements to complete the survey. Those who answered “yes” to one or both questions were branched to a set of background questions relevant for public school teachers/administrators, and then moved on to the rest of the survey. It is likely that the majority of these respondents are teachers, but this sample does include administrators who possess one or both of the qualifications listed above. Recall that all respondents were asked to evaluate the TPEs for *beginning general education teachers*, not their own position.

For the 1,292 respondents who indicated their primary position is Teacher Educator, the eligibility question was:

- *Within the past 3 years, have you taught in a California Commission-approved teacher preparation or subject-matter waiver program?*

Respondents who answered “no” to this question (N=627; 48.5%) were thanked for their interest and informed that they did not meet the eligibility requirements to complete the survey. Those who answered “yes” were branched to a set of background questions relevant for teacher educators, and then moved on to the rest of the survey.

Screening for Data Quality

Beyond eligibility screening, we examined missing data and looked for indicators of random responding.

Missing Data

There was a substantial amount of missing data. In Part 1 of the survey, 423 respondents (15.6%) answered all of the questions, while 965 respondents (35.6%) did not answer any questions even though they had answered at least some of the background questions. A somewhat higher proportion (N=571, 21.1%) answered all of the questions about TPE element *importance* but did not necessarily answer all questions about TPE element clarity or frequency, or element narratives. Recall that the order of the TPEs was randomized in Part 1, so missing responses are distributed evenly across the TPEs. A common response pattern was answering most of the questions about the elements in the first TPE encountered, and then ending the survey at or shortly after encountering the second TPE randomly presented. We compared the demographic profiles of respondents who did not answer any of the questions in Part 1 with those who answered at least 50% of the questions in Part 1. The profiles were very similar; so there was no tendency for particular types of respondents (e.g., those from urban schools) to drop out of the survey. The only mild exception to this finding is that a higher percentage of White respondents tended to end the survey before answering any questions in Part 1 than for respondents of any other ethnicity/race.

In Part 2 of the survey, 25.1% of respondents (N=434) who selected one of the Single Subject surveys evaluated the representativeness of at least one of the 3 subject-specific pedagogy narratives relevant for their field (23.9% of respondents evaluated all 3 narratives). Among those who selected the Multiple Subject survey, 21.7% of respondents (N=213) evaluated the representativeness of at least one of the 9 subject-specific pedagogy narratives included in their survey (18.2% of respondents evaluated all 9 narratives).

It is not surprising to find substantial missing data for a survey of this length conducted in a short timeframe. The fact that there is substantial missing data does not necessarily detract from the quality of the responses that were provided. The survey was voluntary, so it is reasonable to assume that individuals who completed at least part of it did so thoughtfully. Therefore, we did not establish any missing data screening rule (e.g., “screen out those with 95% missing responses”) because doing so would have eliminated feedback from a relatively large number of respondents. We wanted to preserve as much input as possible.

Random Responding

There was little reason to expect random responding, and we did not find evidence that it occurred. First, the survey tool prevented respondents from making out-of-range or nonsensical responses. Second, the survey was completely voluntary, so those who were not motivated to respond carefully were not compelled to participate. Third, the fact that there was so much missing data suggests that respondents generally chose to end the survey early rather than randomly complete it. Therefore, we did not screen out any cases due to evidence of random responding. Every eligible individual who completed at least part of the survey was included in subsequent analyses.

Final Data Set

The final data set includes 2,047 public school teacher/administrator respondents and 665 teacher educator respondents, for a total sample of 2,712 participants. Table 1 shows the breakdown by survey type. Recall that the TPEs and elements (Part 1) are exactly the same for all survey versions, but the subject-specific pedagogy narratives (Part 2) varied. Almost two-thirds of respondents (N=1,715, 63.7%) selected one of the Single Subject surveys (e.g., English-Language Arts, Health) and about one-third of respondents (N=978, 36.3%) selected the Multiple Subject survey. The sample size for Single Subject surveys ranged from 23 respondents (Business) to 242 respondents (Mathematics).

Table 1. Number of Eligible and Ineligible Respondents by Survey Version

Full Sample					
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey		Number of Eligible Respondents: 2712			
Description		Eligible		Ineligible	
		Absolute Frequency	Relative Percent	Absolute Frequency	Relative Percent
1. Survey selected by respondent					
	Multiple Subject	983	36.2	609	34.3
	Single Subject: Agriculture	110	4.1	78	4.4
	Single Subject: Art	65	2.4	40	2.3
	Single Subject: Business	23	0.8	13	0.7
	Single Subject: English Language Development	95	3.5	48	2.7
	Single Subject: English-Language Arts	310	11.4	223	12.6
	Single Subject: Health	31	1.1	15	0.8
	Single Subject: History/Social Science	233	8.6	139	7.8
	Single Subject: Home Economics	55	2.0	52	2.9
	Single Subject Industrial and Technology Education	39	1.4	46	2.6
	Single Subject: Mathematics	242	8.9	169	9.5
	Single Subject: Music	85	3.1	44	2.5
	Single Subject: Physical Education	105	3.9	79	4.4
	Single Subject: Science	242	8.9	145	8.2
	Single Subject: World Languages	94	3.5	66	3.7

Note. Holders of Multiple Subject Teaching and Educator Specialist Instruction Credentials were asked to complete the Multiple Subject survey. Within each survey type, the content of Part 1 (TPE Elements) was exactly the same. The content of Part 2 (Subject-Specific Pedagogy) varied across survey types.

Chapter 2: Survey Sample Demographics

This section includes four tables illustrating the characteristics of sample respondents.

Table 2. Primary Position, Ethnicity/Race, and Gender for Full Survey Sample

Full Sample				
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey		Number of Respondents: 2712		
Description	Absolute Frequency	Relative Percent	Adjusted Percent	
1. Which of the following best describes your primary position?				
Public School Teacher/Administrator	2047	75.5	75.5	
Teacher Educator	665	24.7	24.7	
2. Which of the following options best describes your ethnic or racial background? (Check all that apply.)				
No response	411	15.2		
African American/Black	82	3.0		
Asian Indian American/Asian Indian	33	1.2		
Cambodian American/Cambodian	3	.1		
Chinese American/Chinese	31	1.1		
Filipino American/Filipino	32	1.2		
Guamanian	2	.1		
Hawaiian	10	.4		
Japanese American/Japanese	35	1.3		
Korean American/Korean	13	.5		
Laotian American/Laotian	6	.2		
Latino/Latin American/Puerto Rican/Other Hispanic	143	5.3		
Mexican American/Chicano	200	7.4		
Native American/American Indian/Alaskan Native	65	2.4		
Other Pacific Island American/ Other Pacific Islander	6	.2		
Other Southeast Asian American/Southeast Asian (e.g., Hmong, Khmer)	10	.4		
Samoan	3	.1		
Vietnamese American/Vietnamese	9	.3		
White (non-Hispanic)	1758	64.8		
Other	108	4.0		
3. What is your gender?				
No response	403	14.9		
Female	1619	59.7	70.1	
Male	690	25.4	29.9	

Note. Respondents could choose more than one ethnic/racial background, so the absolute frequency values can sum to more than total sample size. Adjusted percent values have no meaning for these variables and so were not computed.

Table 3. Demographic Information for Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample

Public School Teacher/Administrator				
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey			Number of Respondents: 2047	
Description	Absolute Frequency	Relative Percent	Adjusted Percent	
1. Do you hold a teaching credential from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing?				
No response	0	0		
Yes	2028	99.1	99.1	
No	19	0.9	0.9	
2. Within the past 3 years, have you taught classes in the subject area indicated above in California TK-12 public schools?				
No response	2	.1		
Yes	1503	73.4	73.5	
No	542	26.5	26.5	
3. Counting this year, how many years have you served as a teacher in California schools?				
No response	225	11.0		
Less than 2 years	116	5.7	6.4	
2-5 years	177	8.6	9.7	
6-9 years	267	13.0	14.7	
10 or more years	1262	61.7	69.3	
4. Are you currently teaching the subject area indicated above in a California public school?				
No response	230	11.2		
Yes	1265	61.8	69.6	
No	552	27.0	30.4	
5. Which of the following options best describes your current primary assignment?				
No response	366	17.9		
General education in a self-contained classroom (multiple subjects to the same group of students, typically in an elementary school)	502	24.5	29.9	
General education in departmentalized classes (single subject to multiple groups of students, typically in a secondary school)	1066	52.1	63.4	
Exclusively special education in a self-contained classroom	66	3.2	3.9	
Exclusively special education in a resource room	47	2.3	2.8	
6. Approximately what percentage of your current students are identified as English learners?				
No response	276	13.5		
None	81	4.0	4.6	
1%-25%	936	45.7	52.9	
26%-50%	416	20.3	23.5	
51%-75%	203	9.9	11.5	
76%-100%	135	6.6	7.6	

(continued)

Table 3. Demographic Information for Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample (continued)

Public School Teacher/Administrator				
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey			Number of Respondents: 2047	
Description	Absolute Frequency	Relative Percent	Adjusted Percent	
7. Approximately what percentage of your current students are eligible for Free or Reduced Priced Meals (FRPM)?				
No response	284	13.9		
None	33	1.6	1.9	
1%-25%	490	23.9	27.8	
26%-50%	340	16.6	19.3	
51%-75%	345	16.9	19.6	
76%-100%	555	27.1	31.5	
8. What is the geographic location of your school district?				
No response	252	12.3		
Bay	346	16.9	19.3	
Capital	74	3.6	4.1	
Central Valley	374	18.3	20.8	
Costa Del Sur	34	1.7	1.9	
Delta Sierra	17	.8	.9	
Los Angeles	274	13.4	15.3	
North Coast	105	5.1	5.8	
Northeastern	42	2.1	2.3	
RIMS	78	3.8	4.3	
South Bay	150	7.3	8.4	
Southern	301	14.7	16.8	
9. In which type of community is your school located?				
No response	257	12.6		
Urban	392	19.1	21.9	
Suburban	1001	48.9	55.9	
Rural	397	19.4	22.2	
10. With which grade level(s) have you worked in the last three years? (Check all that apply.)				
No response	312	15.2		
Transitional Kindergarten	238	11.6		
Kindergarten	375	18.3		
Grade 1	379	18.5		
Grade 2	389	19.0		
Grade 3	398	19.4		
Grade 4	426	20.8		
Grade 5	435	21.3		
Grade 6	458	22.4		

(continued)

Table 3. Demographic Information for Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample (continued)

Public School Teacher/Administrator				
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey		Number of Respondents: 2047		
Description		Absolute Frequency	Relative Percent	Adjusted Percent
10. With which grade level(s) have you worked in the last three years? (Check all that apply.)				
	Grade 7	471	23.0	
	Grade 8	499	24.4	
	Grade 9	740	36.2	
	Grade 10	810	39.6	
	Grade 11	813	39.7	
	Grade 12	806	39.4	
11. Which of the following options best describes your ethnic or racial background? (Check all that apply.)				
	No response	289	14.1	
	African American/Black	59	2.9	
	Asian Indian American/Asian Indian	25	1.2	
	Cambodian American/Cambodian	3	0.1	
	Chinese American/Chinese	23	1.1	
	Filipino American/Filipino	27	1.3	
	Guamanian	2	0.1	
	Hawaiian	10	0.5	
	Japanese American/Japanese	26	1.3	
	Korean American/Korean	9	0.4	
	Laotian American/Laotian	5	0.2	
	Latino/Latin American/Puerto Rican/Other Hispanic	110	5.4	
	Mexican American/Chicano	154	7.5	
	Native American/American Indian/Alaskan Native	46	2.2	
	Other Pacific Island American/ Other Pacific Islander	5	0.2	
	Other Southeast Asian American/Southeast Asian (e.g., Hmong, Khmer)	5	0.2	
	Samoan	2	0.1	
	Vietnamese American/Vietnamese	6	0.3	
	White (non-Hispanic)	1362	66.5	
	Other	71	3.5	
12. What is your gender?				
	No response	285	13.9	
	Female	1234	60.3	70.0
	Male	528	25.8	30.0

Note. Respondents could choose more than grade level and more than one ethnic/race background so the absolute frequency values for these questions can sum to more than the total sample size. Adjusted percent values have no meaning for these variables and so were not computed.

Table 4. Education Field and Level for Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample

Public School Teacher/Administrator						
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey					Number of Respondents: 2047	
Education Field	Highest Degree				Total with bachelor's or advanced degrees	Percent
	Bachelor's	Advanced	Not Applicable	No Response		
Liberal Studies/Liberal Arts	436	184	360	1067	620	30.3
Agriculture	45	46	576	1380	91	4.4
Art	50	18	580	1399	68	3.3
Business	68	23	580	1376	91	4.4
Child Development	72	27	554	1394	99	4.8
English	164	48	535	1300	212	10.4
History/Social Science	200	46	510	1291	246	12.0
Health	26	8	590	1423	34	1.7
Home Economics	34	12	588	1413	46	2.2
Industrial and Technology Education	16	39	584	1408	55	2.7
Mathematics	76	38	560	1373	114	5.6
Music	53	24	576	1394	77	3.8
Physical Education	75	23	569	1380	98	4.8
Science	160	59	517	1311	219	10.7
Special Education	20	103	562	1362	123	6.0
Visual and Performing Arts	35	14	580	1418	49	2.4
World Languages	69	39	576	1363	108	5.3
Other	101	572	318	1056	673	32.9
Total	1700	1323	9715			

Note. There were 247 (12.1%) participants who did not respond to this question. Respondents were asked to indicate their highest degree in each of the education fields, marking "Not Applicable" if they did not possess any degree in a given field. As a consequence, respondents could have more than one "highest degree," so the sum of values in each column can exceed the total sample size.

Table 5. Demographic Information for Teacher Educator Survey Sample

Teacher Educator			
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey		Number of Respondents: 665	
Description	Absolute Frequency	Relative Percent	Adjusted Percent
1. Within the past 3 years, have you taught in a California Commission-approved teacher preparation or subject-matter waiver program?			
No response	0	0.0	0.0
Yes	665	100.0	100.0
No	0	0	0
2. Counting this year, how many years have you served as a preparer of teacher candidates for California Multiple Subject or Single Subject Teaching Credential?			
No response	120	18.0	
Less than 2 years	128	19.2	23.5
2-5 years	108	16.2	19.8
6-9 years	82	12.3	15.0
10 or more years	227	34.1	41.7
3. Counting this year, how many years have you served as a TK-12 teacher in California schools?			
No response	113	17.0	
None	71	10.7	12.9
Less than 2 years	33	5.0	6.0
2-5 years	61	9.2	11.1
6-9 years	75	11.3	13.6
10 or more years	312	46.9	56.5
4. Which of the following best describes your California Commission-approved teacher preparation program? (Check all that apply.)			
No response	114	17.1	
California State University	291	43.8	
California State University Intern Program	49	7.4	
Private College/University	170	25.6	
Private College/University Intern Program	58	8.7	
University of California	40	6.0	
University of California Intern Program	3	0.5	
District Intern Program	58	8.7	
5. What is the geographic location of your teacher preparation program?			
No response	114	17.1	
Bay	81	12.2	14.7
Capital	31	4.7	5.6
Central Valley	110	16.5	20.0
Costa Del Sur	16	2.4	2.9
Delta Sierra	3	.5	.5

(continued)

Table 5. Demographic Information for Teacher Educator Survey Sample (continued)

Teacher Educator			
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey		Number of Respondents: 665	
Description	Absolute Frequency	Relative Percent	Adjusted Percent
5. (continued) What is the geographic location of your teacher preparation program?			
Los Angeles	131	19.7	23.8
North Coast	32	4.8	5.8
Northeastern	11	1.7	2.0
RIMS	16	2.4	2.9
South Bay	22	3.3	4.0
Southern	98	14.7	17.8
6. Which of the following options best describes your ethnic or racial background? (Check all that apply.)			
No response	122	18.3	
African American/Black	23	3.5	
Asian Indian American/Asian Indian	8	1.2	
Cambodian American/Cambodian	0	0.0	
Chinese American/Chinese	8	1.2	
Filipino American/Filipino	5	0.8	
Guamanian	0	0.0	
Hawaiian	0	0.0	
Japanese American/Japanese	9	1.4	
Korean American/Korean	4	0.6	
Laotian American/Laotian	1	0.2	
Latino/Latin American/Puerto Rican/Other Hispanic	33	5.0	
Mexican American/Chicano	46	6.9	
Native American/American Indian/Alaskan Native	19	2.9	
Other Pacific Island American/ Other Pacific Islander	1	0.2	
Other Southeast Asian American/Southeast Asian (e.g., Hmong, Khmer)	5	0.8	
Samoan	1	0.2	
Vietnamese American/Vietnamese	3	0.5	
White (non-Hispanic)	396	59.5	
Other	37	5.6	
7. What is your gender?			
No response	118	17.7	
Female	385	57.9	70.4
Male	162	24.4	29.6

Note. Respondents could choose more than teacher preparation program and more than one ethnic/racial background so the absolute frequency values for these questions can sum to more than the total sample size. Adjusted percent values have no meaning for these variables and so were not computed.

Chapter 3. TPE Element Importance

The survey question examined in this chapter is: *How important are the pedagogical knowledge, skills, and abilities described by this element for competently performing the job of a beginning teacher during the first few months of teaching in California?*

- () No importance/Not performed
- () Little importance
- () Moderate importance
- () Great importance
- () Very great importance

Tables 6-8 show descriptive statistics for the **importance** of each of 47 TPE elements, Table 9 shows the same information for gender subgroups in the full sample and in the two primary position samples (Public School Teacher/Administrator and Teacher Educator), and Appendices A and B show the same information for ethnicity/race and several subgroups. For each TPE, we also calculated summary statistics for the elements within that TPE by calculating the average importance across elements within each TPE for each respondent and then calculating descriptive statistics for this new variable across respondents.

TPE Element Importance Highlights

All 47 TPE elements received an average importance rating of 3.0 or higher in the full sample and in all subgroup comparisons, with three very minor exceptions.

There is virtually no evidence of subgroup differences in the importance of the TPE elements for beginning teachers.

In the full sample, the lowest average importance rating for any element is 3.26 (TPE 6, Element 8). The lowest average importance when elements are aggregated within TPEs is 3.99 (TPE 4).

In this analysis and all subsequent analyses, it is important to note that the sample size for individual TPE elements is typically much smaller than the total available sample due to missing data. (We excluded non-responses when calculating descriptive statistics.) Columns labeled “N” show the number of responses on which the descriptive statistics for each element are based and columns labeled “NR” show the percentage of non-responses for each element. Generally, about 30-40% of the sample responded to each TPE element. The amount of missing data is similar across TPE elements because the TPEs were presented in random order.

The TPE element with the highest average importance rating in the full sample and in the Public School Teacher/Administrator and Teacher Educator samples is TPE 2, Element 6: “Establish and maintain clear expectations for positive classroom behavior and for student to student and student to teacher interactions by communicating classroom routines, procedures, and norms to students and families.” The TPE element with the lowest average importance rating in the same samples is TPE 6, Element 8: “Understand how the context, structure, and history of public education in California affects and influences state, district, and school governance as well as state and local education finance.”

The TPE with the highest average importance rating aggregated across elements is TPE 2: “Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning” in the full sample and each primary position sample. The TPE with the lowest average importance rating aggregated across elements in the same samples is TPE 4: “Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students.”

Descriptive Statistics–Importance

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Importance–Full Survey Sample

Full Sample																	
California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA)																	
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6							Number of Respondents: 2712										
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Importance Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)											
						NR	Relative					Adjusted					
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
1	1	949	4.23	.75	.02	65.0	.1	.5	4.5	15.9	14.0		.3	1.4	13.0	45.3	40.0
	2	909	4.25	.70	.02	66.5	.1	.1	4.0	16.2	13.1		.3	.4	12.0	48.3	38.9
	3	893	4.38	.68	.02	67.1	.0	.3	2.6	14.2	15.8		.1	.8	8.0	43.1	48.0
	4	872	4.09	.80	.03	67.8	.2	.5	6.2	14.6	10.7		.7	1.5	19.3	45.3	33.3
	5	864	4.34	.70	.02	68.1	.1	.2	3.0	13.9	14.6		.3	.6	9.5	43.8	45.8
	6	856	4.17	.79	.03	68.4	.2	.6	4.6	14.4	11.8		.7	1.8	14.5	45.7	37.4
	7	840	3.71	.93	.03	69.0	.6	1.8	10.2	11.7	6.7		1.8	6.0	33.0	37.6	21.7
	8	834	4.55	.63	.02	69.2	.1	.1	1.2	10.6	18.7		.4	.5	3.8	34.4	60.9
	All	954	4.22	.54	.02												
2	1	930	4.27	.76	.02	65.7	.1	.5	4.6	13.9	15.2		.2	1.4	13.5	40.6	44.2
	2	899	4.19	.75	.03	66.9	.0	.3	5.6	14.4	12.8		.1	1.0	16.9	43.5	38.5
	3	877	4.48	.63	.02	67.7	.0	.1	2.0	12.4	17.8		.1	.2	6.3	38.4	55.0
	4	862	4.00	.87	.03	68.2	.3	1.0	7.5	12.7	10.3		.8	3.1	23.5	40.0	32.5
	5	850	4.52	.62	.02	68.7		.1	1.6	11.5	18.1			.5	5.2	36.6	57.8
	6	843	4.65	.55	.02	68.9		.0	1.0	8.8	21.3			.1	3.2	28.2	68.4
	All	933	4.34	.52	.02												
3	1	951	4.37	.71	.02	64.9		.3	3.7	13.7	17.3			.9	10.5	39.1	49.4
	2	910	4.23	.75	.02	66.4	.0	.3	5.4	14.3	13.6		.1	.8	16.0	42.6	40.4
	3	881	4.06	.81	.03	67.5	.1	.7	7.2	13.8	10.7		.3	2.0	22.1	42.5	33.0
	4	864	4.20	.73	.02	68.1	.1	.3	4.5	15.2	11.8		.3	.8	14.2	47.7	36.9

(continued)

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Importance–Full Survey Sample (continued)

Full Sample																		
California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA)																		
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6										Number of Respondents: 2712								
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Importance Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)												
						NR	Relative					Adjusted						
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5		
	5	838	4.25	.72	.02	69.1	.1	.3	3.6	14.7	12.2		.4	.8	11.7	47.6	39.5	
	6	826	3.96	.83	.03	69.5	.3	.6	7.6	13.5	8.5		.8	2.1	24.8	44.3	28.0	
	7	813	3.86	.86	.03	70.0	.1	1.4	8.4	12.5	7.5		.5	4.6	28.2	41.8	25.0	
	8	800	3.35	1.05	.04	70.5	1.8	3.2	11.8	8.5	4.3		6.0	10.8	40.0	28.8	14.5	
	All	954	4.06	.59	.02													
4	1	964	4.06	.81	.03	64.5	.2	.6	7.8	15.2	11.8		.5	1.7	21.9	42.7	33.2	
	2	919	3.76	.88	.03	66.1	.4	1.8	10.7	13.8	7.2		1.1	5.3	31.4	40.8	21.3	
	3	891	4.04	.80	.03	67.1	.2	.8	6.5	15.5	9.9		.6	2.5	19.6	47.3	30.1	
	4	869	4.21	.74	.03	68.0	.1	.4	3.9	15.7	11.8		.5	1.4	12.1	49.1	36.9	
	5	850	4.02	.81	.03	68.7	.2	.7	6.7	14.2	9.4		.6	2.4	21.5	45.4	30.1	
	6	832	4.09	.81	.03	69.3	.1	.6	6.0	13.4	10.5		.5	1.9	19.6	43.8	34.3	
	7	814	4.27	.69	.02	70.0	.0	.3	3.1	14.9	11.7		.1	1.0	10.2	49.6	39.1	
	8	810	3.87	.87	.03	70.1	.3	1.2	8.0	12.9	7.4		1.0	4.0	26.9	43.2	24.9	
	9	798	3.55	.89	.03	70.6	.4	2.4	11.5	10.7	4.4		1.5	8.0	39.1	36.3	15.0	
	All	966	3.99	.60	.02													
5	1	924	4.22	.75	.02	65.9	.1	.5	4.5	15.6	13.4		.3	1.4	13.1	45.9	39.3	
	2	889	4.20	.77	.03	67.2	.1	.7	4.6	14.9	12.6		.2	2.0	13.9	45.3	38.5	
	3	872	4.05	.80	.03	67.8	.2	.5	6.8	14.5	10.1		.6	1.6	21.2	45.2	31.4	
	4	854	3.92	.84	.03	68.5	.2	1.0	8.2	13.7	8.4		.7	3.0	26.1	43.6	26.6	
	5	843	4.17	.70	.02	68.9	.1	.2	4.4	16.2	10.3		.2	.7	14.0	52.0	33.1	
	6	823	3.86	.87	.03	69.7	.3	1.2	8.1	13.2	7.4		1.1	4.0	26.9	43.6	24.4	

(continued)

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Importance–Full Survey Sample (continued)

Full Sample																		
California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA)																		
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6										Number of Respondents: 2712								
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Importance Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)												
						NR	Relative					Adjusted						
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5		
	7	808	3.93	.85	.03	70.2	.4	.8	7.0	13.7	7.9		1.2	2.8	23.5	46.0	26.4	
	8	792	4.23	.71	.03	70.8	.0	.1	4.2	13.5	11.4		.1	.4	14.4	46.1	39.0	
	All	925	4.06	.61	.02													
6	1	962	4.33	.72	.02	64.5	.0	.4	3.7	14.7	16.6		.1	1.2	10.5	41.4	46.8	
	2	911	4.19	.74	.02	66.4	.1	.4	4.7	16.0	12.4		.3	1.3	14.1	47.5	36.8	
	3	883	4.02	.79	.03	67.4	.0	.7	7.4	14.8	9.6		.1	2.2	22.9	45.5	29.3	
	4	854	4.42	.70	.02	68.5	.1	.2	2.7	12.1	16.4		.2	.7	8.5	38.3	52.2	
	5	847	4.42	.72	.02	68.8	.1	.2	3.2	10.9	16.9		.2	.7	10.2	34.8	54.1	
	6	832	4.31	.72	.02	69.3	.0	.4	3.3	13.3	13.6		.1	1.2	10.8	43.4	44.5	
	7	818	4.37	.70	.02	69.8	.0	.1	3.2	12.0	14.8		.1	.4	10.8	39.7	49.0	
	8	812	3.26	.99	.03	70.1	1.3	4.4	13.3	7.3	3.7		4.2	14.7	44.3	24.4	12.4	
	All	963	4.17	.55	.02													

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=No importance/Not performed, 2=Little importance, 3=Moderate importance, 4=Great importance, 5=Very great importance.

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Importance—Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample

Teacher/Administrator																	
California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA)																	
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6							Number of Respondents: 2047										
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Importance Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)											
						NR	Relative					Adjusted					
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
1	1	683	4.17	.74	.03	66.6	.1	.4	4.9	16.3	11.6		.3	1.3	14.6	48.9	34.8
	2	651	4.24	.68	.03	68.2	.0	.0	4.1	15.6	12.1		.2	.2	12.7	49.0	37.9
	3	642	4.34	.67	.03	68.6	.0	.2	2.5	14.6	13.9		.2	.8	8.1	46.6	44.4
	4	626	4.03	.80	.03	69.4	.2	.5	6.4	14.4	9.0		.6	1.8	20.9	47.1	29.6
	5	620	4.31	.70	.03	69.7	.0	.2	3.0	13.8	13.2		.2	.8	10.0	45.5	43.5
	6	613	4.11	.81	.03	70.1	.2	.6	5.1	13.9	10.2		.8	2.0	17.0	46.3	33.9
	7	604	3.67	.89	.04	70.5	.3	1.9	10.6	11.2	5.5		1.2	6.3	35.8	38.1	18.7
	8	598	4.54	.62	.03	70.8	.1	.0	1.0	10.6	17.3		.5	.2	3.5	36.5	59.4
	All	686	4.18	.52	.02												
2	1	672	4.25	.74	.03	67.2	.0	.3	4.5	14.3	13.6		.1	1.0	13.8	43.5	41.5
	2	645	4.13	.76	.03	68.5	.0	.4	5.7	14.6	10.7		.2	1.4	18.1	46.4	34.0
	3	629	4.45	.63	.03	69.3		.1	2.0	12.8	15.9			.3	6.4	41.5	51.8
	4	620	3.95	.88	.04	69.7	.2	1.2	7.5	12.4	9.0		.8	3.9	24.7	41.0	29.7
	5	610	4.49	.62	.03	70.2		.1	1.6	11.6	16.4			.5	5.4	39.0	55.1
	6	602	4.65	.54	.02	70.6			.9	8.4	20.1				3.2	28.4	68.4
	All	673	4.30	.51	.02												
3	1	700	4.34	.72	.03	65.8		.4	3.8	13.8	16.3			1.1	11.0	40.3	47.6
	2	667	4.18	.76	.03	67.4	.0	.3	5.8	14.2	12.3		.1	.9	17.8	43.5	37.6
	3	642	4.01	.80	.03	68.6	.1	.6	7.7	13.7	9.3		.3	1.9	24.5	43.6	29.8
	4	632	4.19	.71	.03	69.1	.1	.1	4.4	15.2	10.9		.3	.5	14.4	49.4	35.4
	5	610	4.20	.72	.03	70.2	.1	.3	3.9	14.9	10.6		.3	1.1	13.0	49.8	35.7

(continued)

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Importance– Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample (continued)

Teacher/Administrator																	
California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA)																	
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6							Number of Respondents: 2047										
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Importance Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)											
						NR	Relative					Adjusted					
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
	6	599	3.92	.81	.03	70.7	.2	.6	7.8	13.4	7.3		.7	2.0	26.5	45.9	24.9
	7	591	3.86	.84	.03	71.1	.1	1.3	8.2	12.4	6.9		.3	4.4	28.4	42.8	24.0
	8	582	3.30	1.05	.04	71.6	1.8	3.6	11.3	7.9	3.9		6.2	12.7	39.7	27.7	13.7
	All	702	4.02	.59	.02												
4	1	701	4.00	.80	.03	65.8	.1	.6	8.5	15.1	9.9		.4	1.7	24.7	44.2	29.0
	2	663	3.65	.86	.03	67.6	.4	1.9	11.6	13.3	5.3		1.2	5.7	35.7	41.0	16.3
	3	640	3.98	.80	.03	68.7	.2	.9	6.4	15.6	8.2		.6	2.8	20.5	50.0	26.1
	4	627	4.16	.74	.03	69.4	.1	.5	3.9	15.9	10.2		.5	1.6	12.6	52.0	33.3
	5	613	3.97	.82	.03	70.1	.2	.9	6.8	13.9	8.2		.7	2.9	22.7	46.3	27.4
	6	600	4.11	.81	.03	70.7	.1	.7	5.3	13.0	10.2		.3	2.5	18.2	44.3	34.7
	7	585	4.23	.68	.03	71.4		.4	3.0	15.0	10.2			1.4	10.4	52.5	35.7
	8	582	3.86	.86	.04	71.6	.3	1.2	7.5	12.7	6.8		1.0	4.3	26.3	44.5	23.9
	9	571	3.54	.88	.04	72.1	.4	2.3	10.6	10.9	3.7		1.6	8.2	38.0	39.1	13.1
	All	701	3.94	.58	.02												
5	1	676	4.17	.74	.03	67.0	.1	.4	4.8	16.2	11.5		.3	1.3	14.6	49.0	34.8
	2	648	4.14	.77	.03	68.3	.0	.9	4.5	15.2	10.9		.2	2.8	14.4	48.1	34.6
	3	635	3.99	.81	.03	69.0	.2	.6	7.2	14.4	8.6		.6	2.0	23.1	46.3	27.9
	4	619	3.90	.83	.03	69.8	.1	1.0	8.2	13.3	7.7		.5	3.2	27.0	43.9	25.4
	5	614	4.13	.70	.03	70.0	.1	.2	4.4	16.2	9.0		.3	.8	14.7	54.1	30.1
	6	597	3.79	.88	.04	70.8	.4	1.4	8.5	12.7	6.2		1.3	4.7	29.1	43.6	21.3

(continued)

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Importance– Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample (continued)

Teacher/Administrator																	
California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA)																	
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6							Number of Respondents: 2047										
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Importance Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)											
						NR	Relative					Adjusted					
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
	7	587	3.84	.87	.04	71.3	.4	1.1	7.8	12.7	6.7		1.4	3.9	27.1	44.3	23.3
	8	573	4.18	.72	.03	72.0	.0	.1	4.4	13.5	9.9		.2	.5	15.7	48.3	35.3
	All	676	4.01	.60	.02												
6	1	703	4.28	.73	.03	65.7	.0	.5	3.8	15.1	14.8		.1	1.6	11.1	44.1	43.1
	2	661	4.18	.74	.03	67.7	.1	.4	4.4	16.0	11.4		.5	1.2	13.6	49.5	35.2
	3	641	3.98	.78	.03	68.7	.0	.8	7.1	15.2	8.1		.2	2.5	22.8	48.7	25.9
	4	617	4.41	.69	.03	69.9	.0	.2	2.4	12.0	15.4		.2	.8	8.1	39.9	51.1
	5	609	4.41	.71	.03	70.2	.0	.2	2.9	10.8	15.7		.2	.7	9.9	36.5	52.9
	6	596	4.27	.73	.03	70.9	.0	.4	3.3	13.2	12.1		.2	1.5	11.4	45.5	41.4
	7	585	4.38	.67	.03	71.4			3.0	11.8	13.8				10.6	41.2	48.2
	8	579	3.18	.98	.04	71.7	1.3	4.8	12.8	6.5	2.9		4.5	16.9	45.3	23.0	10.4
	All	703	4.14	.54	.02												

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=No importance/Not performed, 2=Little importance, 3=Moderate importance, 4=Great importance, 5=Very great importance.

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Importance–Teacher Educator Survey Sample

Teacher Educator																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6									Number of Respondents: 665								
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Importance Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)											
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	Relative					Adjusted					
							1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
1	1	266	4.41	.74	.05	60.0	.2	.6	3.5	14.4	21.4		.4	1.5	8.6	36.1	53.4
	2	258	4.27	.75	.05	61.2	.3	.5	3.9	18.0	16.1		.8	1.2	10.1	46.5	41.5
	3	251	4.48	.67	.04	62.3	.0	.3	2.9	12.9	21.7		.0	.8	7.6	34.3	57.4
	4	246	4.24	.79	.05	63.0	.3	.3	5.6	15.0	15.8		.8	.8	15.0	40.7	42.7
	5	244	4.41	.71	.05	63.3	.3	.0	3.0	14.4	18.9		.8	.0	8.2	39.3	51.6
	6	243	4.34	.72	.05	63.5	.2	.5	3.0	16.1	16.8		.4	1.2	8.2	44.0	46.1
	7	236	3.83	1.02	.07	64.5	1.2	1.8	9.2	12.9	10.4		3.4	5.1	25.8	36.4	29.2
	8	236	4.58	.64	.04	64.5	.0	.5	1.7	10.4	23.0		.0	1.3	4.7	29.2	64.8
	All	268	4.33	.58	.04												
2	1	258	4.33	.81	.05	61.2	.2	.9	5.0	12.9	19.8		.4	2.3	12.8	33.3	51.2
	2	254	4.36	.71	.04	61.8	.0	.0	5.3	13.8	19.1		.0	.0	13.8	36.2	50.0
	3	248	4.56	.65	.04	62.7	.2	.0	2.3	11.4	23.5		.4	.0	6.0	30.6	62.9
	4	242	4.14	.84	.05	63.6	.3	.5	7.5	13.7	14.4		.8	1.2	20.7	37.6	39.7
	5	240	4.59	.60	.04	63.9	.0	.2	1.7	11.0			.0	.4	4.6	30.4	64.6
	6	241	4.64	.57	.04	63.8	.0	.2	1.2	10.1	24.8		.0	.4	3.3	27.8	68.5
	All	260	4.42	.54	.03												
3	1	251	4.45	.68	.04	62.3	.0	.2	3.5	13.5	20.6		.0	.4	9.2	35.9	54.6
	2	243	4.36	.69	.04	63.5	.0	.2	4.1	14.7	17.6		.0	.4	11.1	40.3	48.1
	3	239	4.20	.82	.05	64.1	.2	.9	5.7	14.1			.4	2.5	15.9	39.3	41.8
	4	232	4.22	.78	.05	65.1	.2	.6	4.8	15.0	14.3		.4	1.7	13.8	43.1	40.9
	5	228	4.40	.68	.04	65.7	.2	.0	2.9	14.3	17.0		.4	.0	8.3	41.7	49.6

(continued)

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Importance–Teacher Educator Survey Sample (continued)

Teacher Educator																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6							Number of Respondents: 665										
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Importance Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)											
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	Relative					Adjusted					
							1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
	6	227	4.07	.88	.06	65.9	.5	.8	6.9	13.7	12.3		1.3	2.2	20.3	40.1	36.1
	7	222	3.87	.90	.06	66.6	.3	1.7	9.2	13.1	9.2		.9	5.0	27.5	39.2	27.5
	8	218	3.48	1.01	.07	67.2	1.8	1.8	13.4	10.4	5.4		5.5	5.5	40.8	31.7	16.5
	All	252	4.15	.61	.04												
4	1	263	4.25	.81	.05	60.5	.3	.6	5.7	15.3	17.6		.8	1.5	14.4	38.8	44.5
	2	256	4.03	.89	.06	61.5	.3	1.7	7.8	15.5	13.2		.8	4.3	20.3	40.2	34.4
	3	251	4.18	.80	.05	62.3	.2	.6	6.6	15.2	15.2		.4	1.6	17.5	40.2	40.2
	4	242	4.33	.73	.05	63.6	.2	.3	3.9	15.2	16.8		.4	.8	10.7	41.7	46.3
	5	237	4.16	.78	.05	64.4	.2	.3	6.6	15.3	13.2		.4	.8	18.6	43.0	37.1
	6	232	4.06	.81	.05	65.1	.3	.2	8.1	14.7	11.6		.9	.4	23.3	42.2	33.2
	7	229	4.37	.69	.05	65.6	.2	.0	3.3	14.6	16.4		.4	.0	9.6	42.4	47.6
	8	228	3.90	.87	.06	65.7	.3	1.1	9.8	13.7	9.5		.9	3.1	28.5	39.9	27.6
	9	227	3.59	.93	.06	65.9	.5	2.6	14.3	10.1	6.8		1.3	7.5	41.9	29.5	19.8
	All	265	4.10	.64	.04												
5	1	248	4.38	.75	.05	62.7	.2	.6	3.3	14.0	19.2		.4	1.6	8.9	37.5	51.6
	2	241	4.35	.73	.05	63.8	.2	.0	4.7	13.7	17.7		.4	.0	12.9	37.8	49.0
	3	237	4.23	.76	.05	64.4	.2	.2	5.7	15.0	14.6		.4	.4	16.0	42.2	40.9
	4	235	3.97	.87	.06	64.7	.5	.9	8.4	15.0	10.5		1.3	2.6	23.8	42.6	29.8
	5	229	4.28	.69	.05	65.6	.0	.2	4.2	15.9	14.1		.0	.4	12.2	46.3	41.0
	6	226	4.06	.81	.05	66.0	.2	.8	7.1	14.9	11.1		.4	2.2	20.8	43.8	32.7

(continued)

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Importance–Teacher Educator Survey Sample (continued)

Teacher Educator																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6									Number of Respondents: 665								
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Importance Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)											
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	Relative					Adjusted					
							1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
	7	221	4.18	.73	.05	66.8	.3	.0	4.7	16.8	11.4		.9	.0	14.0	50.7	34.4
	8	219	4.38	.68	.05	67.1	.0	.0	3.6	13.2	16.1		.0	.0	11.0	40.2	48.9
	All	249	4.21	.61	.04												
6	1	259	4.47	.67	.04	61.1	.0	.2	3.5	13.2	22.1		.0	.4	8.9	34.0	56.8
	2	250	4.22	.76	.05	62.4	.0	.6	5.7	15.9	15.3		.0	1.6	15.2	42.4	40.8
	3	242	4.13	.81	.05	63.6	.0	.5	8.4	13.5	14.0		.0	1.2	23.1	37.2	38.4
	4	237	4.43	.72	.05	64.4	.2	.2	3.5	12.2	19.7		.4	.4	9.7	34.2	55.3
	5	238	4.43	.75	.05	64.2	.2	.3	3.9	11.0	20.5		.4	.8	10.9	30.7	57.1
	6	236	4.42	.68	.04	64.5	.0	.2	3.3	13.5	18.5		.0	.4	9.3	38.1	52.1
	7	233	4.36	.76	.05	65.0	.2	.5	3.9	12.6	17.9		.4	1.3	11.2	36.1	51.1
	8	233	3.47	1.00	.07	65.0	1.2	3.2	14.7	9.8	6.2		3.4	9.0	42.1	27.9	17.6
	All	260	4.25	.56	.03												

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=No importance/Not performed, 2=Little importance, 3=Moderate importance, 4=Great importance, 5=Very great importance.

Subgroup Comparisons–Importance

We examined average importance ratings separately according to variables that *might* influence the pedagogical knowledge and skills that beginning teachers need, including primary position (public school teacher/administrator or teacher educator), gender, ethnicity/race, primary teaching assignment (general education or special education), and student body characteristics such as percentage of students eligible for Free or Reduced Price Meals (FRPM) and percentage of students identified as English Learners (ELs). Some of the comparisons are based on very large samples where even small differences in average ratings are statistically significant ($p \leq .05$). Others are based on subgroups with very few members. To avoid over-interpreting data, we highlighted *only* comparisons in which each subgroup had 25 or more responses *at the element level* and one of the subgroups had an average rating lower than 3.0. Our purpose was to identify any elements that may truly be of relatively low importance for a subgroup of beginning teachers, indicating that special attention should be paid to that element.

Table 9 shows that all 47 elements received an average rating of 3.0 or higher for both females and males in the full sample and in the two primary position samples. The same is true for virtually all of the subgroup comparisons, as shown in Appendices A (ethnic/racial subgroups) and B (FRPM, ELs, and primary teaching assignment). Across many comparisons, only three instances met the criteria just outlined, and in each of those instances one of the group means was above 3.0 and the other was above 2.90. For TPE 6, Element 8, there are two subgroups in which the mean rating is 2.94 or 2.96, respectively, one in the category of teachers/administrators in schools with 51%-75% of students eligible for FRPM and one in the “Other” ethnic/racial group. For TPE 3, Element 8, there is one subgroup in which the average importance rating is 2.98—for teachers/administrators in schools with 51%-75% of students eligible for FRPM. While the difference in mean ratings between comparison groups is statistically significant in all three instances, the differences are not practically significant. The average rating in each instance is only barely below 3.0 and these findings could be an anomaly. There is no clear rationale for why these particular subgroups might experience relatively lower importance for these two TPE elements.

Table 9. TPE Element Importance by Gender

California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA)										
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6										
TPE Number	Element Number	Full Sample (2712)			Teachers/Administrators (2047)			Teacher Educators (665)		
		Male	Female		Male	Female		Male	Female	
		Mean	Mean	p-value	Mean	Mean	p-value	Mean	Mean	p-value
1	1	4.09	4.30	.00	4.04	4.22	.00	4.26	4.48	.04
	2	4.12	4.32	.00	4.14	4.29	.01	4.07	4.37	.01
	3	4.28	4.43	.00	4.25	4.38	.03	4.35	4.56	.04
	4	3.89	4.18	.00	3.84	4.12	.00	4.03	4.32	.01
	5	4.24	4.38	.01	4.23	4.35	.04	4.28	4.46	.11
	6	4.03	4.24	.00	3.97	4.17	.00	4.20	4.41	.05
	7	3.68	3.73	.44	3.67	3.66	.96	3.71	3.89	.23
	8	4.42	4.61	.00	4.40	4.61	.00	4.48	4.63	.13
2	1	4.12	4.33	.00	4.07	4.33	.00	4.26	4.34	.46
	2	4.05	4.25	.00	3.98	4.19	.00	4.24	4.41	.09
	3	4.30	4.55	.00	4.25	4.54	.00	4.46	4.59	.17
	4	3.86	4.07	.00	3.81	4.01	.01	4.01	4.20	.14
	5	4.40	4.56	.00	4.38	4.53	.01	4.43	4.65	.01
	6	4.51	4.71	.00	4.52	4.72	.00	4.51	4.70	.02
3	1	4.24	4.43	.00	4.21	4.40	.00	4.33	4.50	.08
	2	4.09	4.28	.00	4.04	4.23	.00	4.23	4.41	.09
	3	3.96	4.11	.01	3.92	4.05	.05	4.07	4.25	.17
	4	4.03	4.28	.00	4.03	4.27	.00	4.02	4.31	.02
	5	4.07	4.33	.00	4.04	4.26	.00	4.17	4.49	.00
	6	3.88	4.01	.04	3.84	3.97	.08	3.98	4.11	.33
	7	3.81	3.88	.26	3.80	3.88	.27	3.84	3.89	.73
	8	3.32	3.36	.68	3.24	3.32	.41	3.56	3.45	.47
4	1	3.91	4.14	.00	3.83	4.08	.00	4.14	4.30	.16
	2	3.66	3.81	.02	3.55	3.70	.03	3.99	4.06	.56
	3	3.92	4.09	.00	3.85	4.04	.01	4.14	4.20	.53
	4	4.04	4.29	.00	3.99	4.25	.00	4.19	4.39	.06
	5	3.88	4.09	.00	3.84	4.03	.01	4.01	4.22	.06
	6	3.98	4.15	.00	4.00	4.16	.03	3.90	4.13	.03
	7	4.18	4.31	.01	4.14	4.27	.03	4.29	4.40	.27
	8	3.77	3.92	.02	3.75	3.91	.04	3.82	3.94	.31
	9	3.55	3.56	.86	3.56	3.53	.65	3.50	3.63	.33

(continued)

Table 9. TPE Element Importance by Gender (continued)

California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA)										
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6										
TPE Number	Element Number	Full Sample (2712)			Teachers/Administrators (2047)			Teacher Educators (665)		
		Male	Female		Male	Female		Male	Female	
		Mean	Mean	<i>p</i> -value	Mean	Mean	<i>p</i> -value	Mean	Mean	<i>p</i> -value
5	1	4.12	4.27	.01	4.08	4.20	.06	4.22	4.45	.04
	2	4.01	4.28	.00	4.00	4.21	.00	4.06	4.48	.00
	3	3.93	4.10	.00	3.87	4.04	.01	4.14	4.27	.24
	4	3.82	3.98	.01	3.79	3.97	.01	3.92	3.99	.57
	5	4.04	4.23	.00	4.01	4.18	.01	4.13	4.35	.03
	6	3.73	3.93	.00	3.68	3.84	.05	3.87	4.15	.04
	7	3.82	3.99	.01	3.72	3.90	.02	4.13	4.20	.57
	8	4.05	4.32	.00	3.99	4.27	.00	4.23	4.44	.04
6	1	4.24	4.38	.01	4.22	4.31	.10	4.32	4.54	.03
	2	4.10	4.24	.01	4.07	4.23	.01	4.17	4.25	.41
	3	3.88	4.08	.00	3.83	4.05	.00	4.01	4.18	.14
	4	4.20	4.51	.00	4.18	4.51	.00	4.26	4.50	.02
	5	4.30	4.47	.00	4.28	4.47	.00	4.38	4.46	.46
	6	4.14	4.39	.00	4.09	4.35	.00	4.26	4.49	.03
	7	4.33	4.39	.20	4.36	4.39	.62	4.25	4.41	.13
	8	3.21	3.29	.32	3.11	3.20	.33	3.46	3.48	.89

Note. P-value = probability value. A value of .05 or lower is considered statistically significant. Comparisons are against the total sample, excluding the target comparison group. We only highlighted the *p*-value when (a) the mean importance rating for one or both of the two groups was below 3.0 and (b) each group in the comparison had at least 25 responses for that TPE element. A dash in the cell means we did not conduct a statistical test for that comparison. Rating scale anchors are: 1=No importance/Not performed, 2=Little importance, 3=Moderate importance, 4=Great importance, 5=Very great importance.

Chapter 4. TPE Element Clarity

The survey question examined in this chapter is: *Do you agree that the pedagogical knowledge, skills, and abilities in this element are written clearly?*

- Strongly disagree*
- Disagree*
- Undecided*
- Agree*
- Strongly agree*

Tables 10-12 show descriptive statistics for the **clarity** of each of the 47 TPE elements. For each TPE, we also calculated summary statistics for the elements within that TPE.

The TPE element with the highest average clarity rating in the full sample and in the Public School Teacher/Administrator and Teacher Educator samples is TPE 2, Element 6: “Establish and maintain clear expectations for positive classroom behavior and for student to student and student to teacher interactions by communicating classroom routines, procedures, and norms to students and families.”

TPE Element Clarity Highlights

All 47 TPE elements received an average clarity rating of 3.0 or higher in the full sample. The same pattern occurred in all subgroup comparisons.

No TPE element stands out as being particularly unclear.

In the full sample, the lowest average clarity rating for any element is 3.67 (TPE 3, Element 8). Forty-seven percent of the elements (N=19) received an average clarity rating between 3.67 and 4.0.

There is only .15 points difference between the highest and lowest rated TPEs as reflected in the aggregate clarity judgments across elements within each TPE. (Average aggregated rating ranges from 3.94-4.09.)

The TPE element with the lowest average clarity rating in the same samples is TPE 3, Element 8: “Demonstrate knowledge of effective teaching strategies aligned with the internationally-recognized educational technology standards of the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) and the International Association for K-12 Online Learning (iNACOL).”

In the full sample, the TPE with the highest average clarity rating aggregated across elements is TPE 2: “Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning” (average=4.34). The TPE with the lowest average clarity rating aggregated across elements is TPE 4: “Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students” (average=3.99).

Descriptive Statistics–Clarity

Table 10. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Clarity–Full Survey Sample

Full Sample																		
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																		
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6										Number of Respondents: 2712								
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Clarity Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)												
						NR	Relative					Adjusted						
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5		
1	1	944	3.99	.78	.03	65.2	.3	1.8	3.7	21.4	7.7		1.0	5.1	10.5	61.4	22.0	
	2	906	4.13	.68	.02	66.6	.2	.6	2.5	21.3	8.7		.7	1.9	7.6	63.7	26.2	
	3	887	4.21	.65	.02	67.3	.1	.6	2.1	19.6	10.4		.2	1.7	6.3	60.0	31.8	
	4	871	3.87	.84	.03	67.9	.3	2.0	5.8	17.5	6.5		.9	6.3	18.1	54.4	20.2	
	5	862	4.15	.68	.02	68.2	.1	.6	2.8	19.2	9.1		.5	1.7	8.7	60.4	28.7	
	6	852	3.89	.87	.03	68.6	.5	2.0	4.8	17.2	6.9		1.5	6.5	15.4	54.7	21.9	
	7	840	4.01	.72	.02	69.0	.3	.7	4.2	19.2	6.6		1.0	2.1	13.6	62.0	21.3	
	8	833	4.28	.69	.02	69.3	.1	.4	2.1	16.0	12.1		.5	1.4	6.7	52.0	39.4	
	All	947	4.05	.56	.02													
2	1	924	3.99	.83	.03	65.9	.5	1.5	4.1	19.5	8.4		1.5	4.4	12.1	57.4	24.6	
	2	897	4.04	.71	.02	66.9	.2	.8	4.2	20.1	7.8		.6	2.3	12.8	60.8	23.5	
	3	877	4.12	.78	.03	67.7	.4	1.0	2.8	18.2	10.0		1.1	3.1	8.8	56.2	30.8	
	4	863	4.02	.75	.03	68.2	.3	.8	4.2	19.0	7.4		1.0	2.7	13.1	59.8	23.4	
	5	852	4.18	.76	.03	68.6	.2	1.0	2.4	17.0	10.7		.6	3.3	7.7	54.2	34.2	
	6	841	4.31	.71	.02	69.0	.2	.5	1.8	15.5	13.1		.6	1.7	5.7	49.9	42.1	
	All	930	4.09	.59	.02													
3	1	938	4.10	.73	.02	65.4	.3	.9	3.5	20.3	9.7		.7	2.6	10.1	58.6	27.9	
	2	907	4.01	.79	.03	66.6	.5	1.2	3.8	20.0	8.0		1.5	3.5	11.2	59.9	23.8	
	3	878	3.88	.86	.03	67.6	.5	1.9	5.1	18.0	6.8		1.6	5.9	15.8	55.7	21.0	
	4	862	4.00	.79	.03	68.2	.3	1.5	3.6	18.9	7.6		.9	4.6	11.3	59.4	23.8	

(continued)

Table 10. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Clarity–Full Survey Sample (continued)

Full Sample																		
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																		
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6										Number of Respondents: 2712								
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Clarity Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)												
						NR	Relative					Adjusted						
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5		
	5	839	4.02	.75	.03	69.1	.3	1.2	3.4	19.0	7.1		.8	3.8	11.1	61.4	22.9	
	6	821	3.91	.78	.03	69.7	.3	1.4	4.9	18.0	5.8		.9	4.5	16.1	59.4	19.1	
	7	815	3.97	.73	.03	69.9	.1	1.0	4.9	17.9	6.2		.4	3.2	16.2	59.6	20.6	
	8	804	3.67	.86	.03	70.4	.6	1.6	9.1	14.1	4.3		2.1	5.3	30.6	47.5	14.4	
	All	939	3.94	.58	.02													
4	1	954	3.93	.76	.02	64.8	.4	1.3	5.2	21.6	6.6		1.2	3.7	14.9	61.5	18.8	
	2	916	3.87	.76	.03	66.2	.4	1.2	6.5	20.3	5.5		1.1	3.5	19.1	60.2	16.2	
	3	886	3.97	.78	.03	67.3	.5	1.3	3.9	20.3	6.7		1.5	3.8	12.0	62.2	20.5	
	4	868	3.98	.81	.03	68.0	.5	1.3	3.8	19.1	7.3		1.6	4.0	12.0	59.6	22.8	
	5	844	3.95	.79	.03	68.9	.5	1.0	4.2	19.0	6.3		1.7	3.3	13.5	61.1	20.4	
	6	829	4.03	.72	.03	69.4	.3	.6	4.2	18.4	7.1		.8	1.9	13.6	60.3	23.3	
	7	819	4.06	.75	.03	69.8	.3	1.0	3.0	18.3	7.7		1.0	3.2	9.9	60.6	25.4	
	8	807	4.03	.71	.03	70.2	.3	.6	3.5	18.8	6.5		1.0	2.0	11.9	63.2	21.9	
	9	791	3.94	.73	.03	70.8	.2	.9	4.9	17.7	5.5		.6	3.0	16.9	60.7	18.7	
	All	959	3.95	.58	.02													
5	1	913	4.05	.72	.02	66.3	.2	1.0	3.6	20.9	8.0		.7	3.1	10.6	62.0	23.7	
	2	885	4.13	.66	.02	67.4	.1	.5	2.8	20.6	8.6		.5	1.6	8.6	63.1	26.3	
	3	865	4.05	.68	.02	68.1	.1	.7	3.6	20.4	7.0		.3	2.3	11.3	63.9	22.1	
	4	850	4.05	.67	.02	68.7	.1	.6	3.4	20.4	6.7		.5	2.0	10.8	65.2	21.5	
	5	842	4.13	.64	.02	69.0	.1	.4	2.8	19.8	7.9		.4	1.3	9.1	63.8	25.4	
	6	818	3.93	.76	.03	69.8	.3	1.1	4.6	18.3	5.8		1.1	3.5	15.4	60.8	19.2	

(continued)

Table 10. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Clarity–Full Survey Sample (continued)

Full Sample																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6						Number of Respondents: 2712											
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Clarity Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)											
	7	802	4.01	.69	.02	70.4	.2	.6	4.0	18.9	5.9		.7	1.9	13.5	63.8	20.1
	8	788	4.10	.70	.03	70.9	.3	.5	2.4	18.5	7.4		1.1	1.6	8.2	63.6	25.4
	All	916	4.04	.56	.02												
6	1	951	4.09	.72	.02	64.9	.1	1.2	3.3	21.2	9.2		.3	3.5	9.5	60.5	26.3
	2	911	4.09	.69	.02	66.4	.1	.9	3.4	20.5	8.6		.2	2.7	10.2	61.1	25.7
	3	878	3.91	.81	.03	67.6	.5	1.4	4.9	19.1	6.4		1.5	4.4	15.3	59.0	19.8
	4	853	4.04	.86	.03	68.5	.6	1.6	3.0	17.1	9.1		1.8	5.0	9.6	54.5	29.1
	5	844	4.26	.74	.03	68.9	.2	.7	2.2	15.8	12.2		.7	2.3	7.0	50.7	39.3
	6	827	4.01	.83	.03	69.5	.3	1.5	3.8	16.5	8.3		1.1	5.0	12.6	54.2	27.2
	7	815	4.14	.76	.03	69.9	.2	.9	2.8	16.5	9.6		.7	3.1	9.4	55.0	31.8
	8	807	3.79	.76	.03	70.2	.5	.8	7.2	17.4	3.8		1.6	2.6	24.3	58.6	12.9
	All	955	4.02	.58	.02												

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Undecided, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree.

Table 11. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Clarity–Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample

Teacher/Administrator																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6							Number of Respondents: 2047										
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Clarity Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)											
						NR	Relative					Adjusted					
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
1	1	678	3.96	.75	.03	66.9	.2	1.6	4.0	21.0	6.4		.7	4.7	11.9	63.3	19.3
	2	651	4.16	.63	.02	68.2	.1	.3	2.3	20.7	8.4		.5	.9	7.4	65.0	26.3
	3	639	4.20	.62	.02	68.8	.1	.3	2.0	19.6	9.2		.3	.9	6.4	62.9	29.4
	4	627	3.85	.82	.03	69.4	.2	1.9	5.9	16.9	5.7		.8	6.1	19.3	55.2	18.7
	5	620	4.16	.63	.03	69.7	.0	.4	2.4	19.2	8.2		.2	1.3	8.1	63.4	27.1
	6	612	3.87	.84	.03	70.1	.4	1.8	5.0	16.9	5.9		1.3	6.0	16.7	56.4	19.6
	7	605	3.98	.69	.03	70.4	.2	.6	4.3	18.9	5.6		.7	2.1	14.4	64.0	18.8
	8	598	4.29	.64	.03	70.8	.1	.2	1.9	16.2	10.9		.3	.7	6.4	55.4	37.3
	All	681	4.04	.53	.02												
2	1	666	3.98	.77	.03	67.5	.3	1.3	4.1	19.7	7.1		1.1	4.1	12.5	60.7	21.8
	2	645	4.01	.67	.03	68.5	.1	.8	4.0	20.5	6.2		.3	2.5	12.6	65.1	19.5
	3	628	4.13	.73	.03	69.3	.2	.7	2.9	17.7	9.1		.6	2.4	9.6	57.8	29.6
	4	619	4.02	.67	.03	69.8	.1	.5	4.2	19.2	6.2		.5	1.6	13.7	63.7	20.5
	5	611	4.17	.72	.03	70.2	.0	1.0	2.4	16.9	9.6		.2	3.3	8.0	56.5	32.1
	6	602	4.33	.66	.03	70.6	.0	.3	1.8	15.0	12.3		.2	1.2	6.0	51.0	41.7
	All	671	4.08	.56	.02												
3	1	692	4.08	.71	.03	66.2	.1	.9	3.8	20.2	8.7		.4	2.6	11.3	59.8	25.9
	2	664	4.01	.75	.03	67.6	.4	.8	4.0	20.0	7.2		1.4	2.4	12.3	61.6	22.3
	3	639	3.87	.82	.03	68.8	.3	1.8	5.4	17.7	6.0		.9	5.8	17.4	56.8	19.1
	4	630	4.02	.75	.03	69.2	.2	1.2	3.5	18.8	7.1		.6	3.8	11.4	61.0	23.2
	5	612	4.01	.70	.03	70.1	.1	.9	3.5	19.2	6.2		.5	3.1	11.6	64.2	20.6
	6	595	3.91	.74	.03	70.9	.1	1.3	4.8	17.8	5.1		.3	4.5	16.5	61.2	17.5

(continued)

Table 11. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Clarity–Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample (continued)

Teacher/Administrator																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6										Number of Respondents: 2047							
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Clarity Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)											
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	Relative					Adjusted					
							1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
	7	591	3.99	.68	.03	71.1	.0	.6	4.6	17.9	5.7		.2	2.2	16.1	61.9	19.6
	8	582	3.62	.85	.04	71.6	.5	1.6	9.5	13.1	3.6		1.9	5.7	33.5	46.2	12.7
	All	693	3.93	.55	.02												
4	1	691	3.92	.71	.03	66.2	.3	1.0	5.1	21.9	5.5		.9	3.0	15.1	64.8	16.2
	2	662	3.82	.74	.03	67.7	.3	1.2	6.7	20.0	4.2		1.1	3.6	20.7	61.8	12.8
	3	637	3.98	.71	.03	68.9	.2	1.0	3.8	20.3	5.8		.8	3.1	12.1	65.3	18.7
	4	626	3.99	.73	.03	69.4	.2	.9	3.9	19.2	6.3		.8	3.0	12.8	62.8	20.6
	5	608	3.96	.73	.03	70.3	.3	.8	3.9	19.2	5.4		1.2	2.8	13.0	64.8	18.3
	6	597	4.05	.68	.03	70.8	.1	.5	4.0	17.8	6.7		.3	1.7	13.7	61.1	23.1
	7	589	4.07	.69	.03	71.2	.1	.7	3.0	18.2	6.8		.5	2.4	10.4	63.2	23.6
	8	581	4.06	.62	.03	71.6		.4	3.5	18.6	5.9			1.4	12.4	65.6	20.7
	9	566	3.94	.67	.03	72.3	.0	.6	5.0	17.4	4.6		.2	2.1	18.0	62.9	16.8
	All	696	3.95	.54	.02												
5	1	669	4.03	.66	.03	67.3	.0	.9	3.8	21.3	6.7		.1	2.7	11.7	65.0	20.5
	2	646	4.11	.62	.02	68.4	.0	.5	2.7	21.1	7.2		.2	1.7	8.5	66.7	22.9
	3	631	4.04	.64	.03	69.2	.0	.6	3.6	20.4	6.2		.2	2.1	11.6	66.1	20.1
	4	617	4.03	.65	.03	69.9	.1	.6	3.5	20.0	6.0		.3	2.1	11.5	66.3	19.8
	5	612	4.10	.62	.03	70.1	.0	.4	2.9	19.6	6.9		.2	1.3	9.6	65.7	23.2
	6	594	3.90	.73	.03	71.0	.2	.9	4.9	18.2	4.7		.8	3.2	17.0	62.6	16.3
	7	584	4.01	.62	.03	71.5	.0	.2	4.3	18.8	5.2		.2	.9	14.9	65.8	18.3
	8	572	4.10	.63	.03	72.1	.2	.2	2.4	18.7	6.4		.7	.9	8.6	67.0	22.9
		All	671	4.03	.51	.02											

(continued)

Table 11. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Clarity–Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample (continued)

Teacher/Administrator																		
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																		
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6							Number of Respondents: 2047											
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Clarity Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)												
						NR	Relative					Adjusted						
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5		
6	1	693	4.08	.71	.03	66.1	.1	1.1	3.4	20.8	8.5		.3	3.2	10.1	61.3	25.1	
	2	661	4.08	.68	.03	67.7	.1	.8	3.4	20.2	7.8		.3	2.4	10.6	62.5	24.2	
	3	635	3.90	.78	.03	69.0	.5	1.0	5.0	19.0	5.5		1.6	3.3	16.1	61.3	17.8	
	4	614	4.05	.83	.03	70.0	.3	1.5	3.1	16.4	8.7		1.1	4.9	10.4	54.6	29.0	
	5	606	4.28	.72	.03	70.4	.2	.5	2.1	15.0	11.8		.7	1.7	6.9	50.8	39.9	
	6	592	3.98	.79	.03	71.1	.1	1.5	4.1	16.3	6.9		.3	5.2	14.0	56.4	24.0	
	7	582	4.16	.71	.03	71.6	.0	.8	2.7	15.9	9.0		.2	2.7	9.5	56.0	31.6	
	8	577	3.76	.73	.03	71.8	.4	.8	6.9	17.1	3.0		1.4	2.8	24.4	60.8	10.6	
	All	695	4.02	.56	.02													

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Undecided, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree.

Table 12. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Clarity–Teacher Educator Survey Sample

Teacher Educator																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6									Number of Respondents: 665								
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Clarity Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)											
						NR	Relative					Adjusted					
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
1	1	266	4.06	.86	.05	60.0	.6	2.4	2.7	22.7	11.6		1.5	6.0	6.8	56.8	28.9
	2	255	4.05	.79	.05	61.7	.5	1.7	3.2	23.2	9.9		1.2	4.3	8.2	60.4	25.9
	3	248	4.25	.73	.05	62.7		1.4	2.3	19.5	14.1			3.6	6.0	52.4	37.9
	4	244	3.91	.88	.06	63.3	.5	2.6	5.6	19.2	8.9		1.2	7.0	15.2	52.5	24.2
	5	242	4.13	.80	.05	63.6	.5	1.1	3.8	19.2	11.9		1.2	2.9	10.3	52.9	32.6
	6	240	3.95	.94	.06	63.9	.8	2.7	4.4	18.2	10.1		2.1	7.5	12.1	50.4	27.9
	7	235	4.07	.79	.05	64.7	.6	.8	4.1	20.2	9.8		1.7	2.1	11.5	57.0	27.7
	8	235	4.28	.81	.05	64.7	.3	1.2	2.7	15.3	15.8		.9	3.4	7.7	43.4	44.7
	All	266	4.08	.63	.04												
2	1	258	4.02	.95	.06	61.2	1.1	2.1	4.4	18.9	12.3		2.7	5.4	11.2	48.8	31.8
	2	252	4.13	.80	.05	62.1	.5	.8	5.1	18.8	12.8		1.2	2.0	13.5	49.6	33.7
	3	249	4.10	.90	.06	62.6	.9	1.8	2.6	19.5	12.6		2.4	4.8	6.8	52.2	33.7
	4	244	4.01	.93	.06	63.3	.9	2.0	4.2	18.3	11.3		2.5	5.3	11.5	50.0	30.7
	5	241	4.21	.84	.05	63.8	.6	1.2	2.6	17.6	14.3		1.7	3.3	7.1	48.5	39.4
	6	239	4.27	.82	.05	64.1	.6	1.1	1.8	17.0	15.5		1.7	2.9	5.0	47.3	43.1
		All	259	4.12	.66	.04											
3	1	246	4.17	.79	.05	63.0	.6	.9	2.6	20.5	12.5		1.6	2.4	6.9	55.3	33.7
	2	243	4.00	.90	.06	63.5	.8	2.4	3.0	20.2	10.2		2.1	6.6	8.2	55.1	28.0
	3	239	3.92	.96	.06	64.1	1.2	2.3	4.2	18.9	9.3		3.3	6.3	11.7	52.7	25.9
	4	232	3.96	.89	.06	65.1	.6	2.4	3.8	19.2	8.9		1.7	6.9	10.8	55.2	25.4
	5	227	4.03	.88	.06	65.9	.6	2.0	3.3	18.3	9.9		1.8	5.7	9.7	53.7	29.1
	6	226	3.93	.87	.06	66.0	.8	1.5	5.1	18.6	8.0		2.2	4.4	15.0	54.9	23.5

(continued)

Table 12. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Clarity–Teacher Educator Survey Sample (continued)

Teacher Educator																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6									Number of Respondents: 665								
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Clarity Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)											
						NR	Relative					Adjusted					
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
	7	224	3.92	.84	.06	66.3	.3	2.0	5.6	18.0	7.8		.9	5.8	16.5	53.6	23.2
	8	222	3.79	.90	.06	66.6	.9	1.5	7.7	17.0	6.3		2.7	4.5	23.0	50.9	18.9
	All	246	3.96	.66	.04												
4	1	263	3.95	.89	.05	60.5	.8	2.1	5.7	20.9	10.1		1.9	5.3	14.4	52.9	25.5
	2	254	4.00	.80	.05	61.8	.5	1.2	5.7	21.4	9.5		1.2	3.1	15.0	55.9	24.8
	3	249	3.93	.94	.06	62.6	1.2	2.1	4.4	20.3	9.5		3.2	5.6	11.6	54.2	25.3
	4	242	3.94	.99	.06	63.6	1.4	2.4	3.6	18.6	10.4		3.7	6.6	9.9	51.2	28.5
	5	236	3.93	.93	.06	64.5	1.1	1.7	5.3	18.3	9.2		3.0	4.7	14.8	51.7	25.8
	6	232	3.99	.82	.05	65.1	.8	.9	4.7	20.3	8.3		2.2	2.6	13.4	58.2	23.7
	7	230	4.04	.89	.06	65.4	.8	1.8	3.0	18.6	10.4		2.2	5.2	8.7	53.9	30.0
	8	226	3.97	.91	.06	66.0	1.2	1.2	3.6	19.4	8.6		3.5	3.5	10.6	57.1	25.2
	9	225	3.93	.87	.06	66.2	.6	1.8	4.8	18.6	8.0		1.8	5.3	14.2	55.1	23.6
	All	263	3.96	.67	.04												
5	1	244	4.10	.86	.06	63.3	.8	1.5	2.9	19.7	11.9		2.0	4.1	7.8	53.7	32.4
	2	239	4.21	.75	.05	64.1	.5	.5	3.2	19.1	12.8		1.3	1.3	8.8	53.1	35.6
	3	234	4.08	.76	.05	64.8	.3	1.1	3.8	20.5	9.6		.9	3.0	10.7	58.1	27.4
	4	233	4.11	.70	.05	65.0	.3	.6	3.2	21.8	9.2		.9	1.7	9.0	62.2	26.2
	5	230	4.18	.70	.05	65.4	.3	.5	2.7	20.3	10.8		.9	1.3	7.8	58.7	31.3
	6	224	4.01	.85	.06	66.3	.6	1.5	3.8	18.8	9.0		1.8	4.5	11.2	55.8	26.8
	7	218	3.99	.86	.06	67.2	.8	1.5	3.2	19.2	8.1		2.3	4.6	9.6	58.7	24.8
	8	216	4.10	.86	.06	67.5	.8	1.2	2.4	17.7	10.4		2.3	3.7	7.4	54.6	31.9
	All	245	4.08	.66	.04												

(continued)

Table 12. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Clarity–Teacher Educator Survey Sample (continued)

Teacher Educator																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6									Number of Respondents: 665								
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Clarity Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)											
						NR	Relative					Adjusted					
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
6	1	258	4.12	.75	.05	61.2	.2	1.7	3.0	22.6	11.4		.4	4.3	7.8	58.1	29.5
	2	250	4.13	.72	.05	62.4		1.4	3.5	21.7	11.1			3.6	9.2	57.6	29.6
	3	243	3.93	.89	.06	63.5	.5	2.7	4.8	19.4	9.2		1.2	7.4	13.2	53.1	25.1
	4	239	4.01	.94	.06	64.1	1.2	2.0	2.7	19.5	10.5		3.3	5.4	7.5	54.4	29.3
	5	238	4.21	.80	.05	64.2	.3	1.4	2.6	18.0	13.5		.8	3.8	7.1	50.4	37.8
	6	235	4.09	.94	.06	64.7	1.1	1.5	3.2	17.1	12.5		3.0	4.3	8.9	48.5	35.3
	7	233	4.09	.87	.06	65.0	.8	1.4	3.3	18.3	11.3		2.1	3.9	9.4	52.4	32.2
	8	230	3.84	.83	.05	65.4	.8	.8	8.3	18.3	6.5		2.2	2.2	23.9	53.0	18.7
	All	260	4.03	.64	.04												

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Undecided, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree.

Subgroup Comparisons–Clarity

All 47 TPE elements received an average rating of 3.0 or higher in all subgroups. Therefore, we did not include the tabled subgroup results in this report.

Chapter 5. TPE Element Frequency

The survey question examined in this chapter is: *How frequently are the pedagogical knowledge, skills, and abilities described by this element used by a beginning teacher during the first few months of teaching in California?*

- () *Never*
- () *Rarely*
- () *Sometimes*
- () *Very often*
- () *Continuously*

Tables 13-15 show descriptive statistics for the **frequency** of each of the 47 TPE elements, Table 16 shows the same information for gender subgroups in the full sample and in the two primary position samples (Public School Teacher/Administrator and Teacher Educator), and Appendix C shows the same information for ethnic/racial subgroups. For each TPE, we also calculated summary statistics for the elements within that TPE.

TPE Element Frequency Highlights

In the full sample, 14 elements received an average frequency rating of 4.0 or higher, falling between rating scale anchors “Very Often” and “Continuously.” Thirty-nine (39) elements received an average rating between 3.0 and 4.0 (“Sometimes” and “Very Often”). Only one element received an average rating below 3.0 (average=2.85; TPE 6, Element 8) which falls between “Rarely” and “Sometimes.”

Two TPE elements may warrant further scrutiny based on relatively large percentages of respondents who indicated that these elements are rarely or never used by beginning teachers:

- TPE 6, Element 8 (29.0% “Rarely”; 9.2% “Never”—full sample)
- TPE 3, Element 8 (17.1% “Rarely”; 8.1% “Never”—full sample)

Both female and male respondents provided mean frequency ratings below 3.0 for TPE 6, Element 8. The difference is not statistically significant. For ethnic/racial subgroups with 25 or more respondents, the only mean frequency rating below 3.0 is for TPE 6, Element 8, for the White and Other subgroups. The differences are not statistically significant.

The TPE element with the highest average frequency rating in the full sample and in both the Public School Teacher/Administrator and Teacher Educator samples is TPE 2, Element 6: “Establish and maintain clear expectations for positive classroom behavior and for student to student and student to teacher interactions by communicating classroom routines, procedures, and norms to students and families.” The TPE element with the lowest average frequency rating in the same samples is TPE 6, Element 8: “Understand how the context, structure, and history of public education in California affects and influences state, district, and school governance as well as state and local education finance.”

The TPE with the highest average frequency rating aggregated across elements is TPE 2: “Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning” (average=4.03). The TPE with the lowest average frequency rating aggregated across elements is TPE 4: “Planning Instruction and Designing Learning” (average=3.73).

Descriptive Statistics–Frequency

Table 13. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Frequency–Full Survey Sample

Full Sample																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6									Number of Respondents: 2712								
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Frequency Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)											
						NR	Relative					Adjusted					
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
1	1	936	3.94	.87	.03	65.5	.1	1.4	9.0	13.7	10.3		.3	4.2	26.1	39.7	29.7
	2	899	4.03	.81	.03	66.9	.0	.8	7.9	13.9	10.5		.1	2.4	23.8	41.8	31.8
	3	885	4.06	.81	.03	67.4		.7	7.6	13.4	11.0			2.1	23.2	41.1	33.6
	4	869	3.80	.93	.03	68.0	.3	2.1	9.8	11.4	8.5		.8	6.6	30.5	35.7	26.5
	5	860	3.98	.87	.03	68.3	.2	1.3	7.4	12.9	9.9		.6	4.1	23.5	40.7	31.2
	6	846	3.85	.91	.03	68.8	.2	1.8	9.0	11.8	8.4		.6	5.8	28.8	37.8	27.0
	7	837	3.39	.95	.03	69.1	.6	4.0	13.5	8.3	4.5		2.0	13.0	43.7	26.8	14.5
	8	827	4.25	.86	.03	69.5	.1	.8	5.1	9.7	14.8		.5	2.5	16.7	31.8	48.5
	All	944	3.91	.69	.02												
2	1	919	4.04	.90	.03	66.1	.1	1.5	8.3	11.4	12.7		.2	4.4	24.4	33.6	37.4
	2	897	3.99	.86	.03	66.9	.0	1.3	8.3	12.7	10.7		.1	3.9	25.1	38.5	32.4
	3	870	4.25	.82	.03	67.9	.0	.5	5.9	10.6	15.0		.1	1.6	18.4	33.0	46.9
	4	856	3.34	.99	.03	68.4	.4	5.6	13.7	6.6	5.2		1.3	17.6	43.5	21.0	16.6
	5	842	4.24	.84	.03	69.0		.7	5.9	9.8	14.6			2.4	18.9	31.6	47.1
	6	841	4.42	.77	.03	69.0		.3	4.4	8.2	18.1			1.0	14.3	26.5	58.3
	All	927	4.03	.68	.02												
3	1	929	4.28	.77	.03	65.7	.0	.6	4.7	13.3	15.6		.1	1.7	13.8	38.9	45.5
	2	901	3.93	.89	.03	66.8	.1	1.2	9.7	11.8	10.4		.4	3.7	29.1	35.6	31.2
	3	876	3.86	.93	.03	67.7	.2	1.8	9.7	11.1	9.5		.7	5.7	29.9	34.4	29.3
	4	857	3.96	.85	.03	68.4	.1	.9	8.5	12.8	9.3		.5	2.8	26.8	40.5	29.4
	5	832	3.98	.84	.03	69.3	.0	.9	8.1	12.2	9.4		.1	3.0	26.6	39.8	30.5

(continued)

Table 13. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Frequency–Full Survey Sample (continued)

Full Sample																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6									Number of Respondents: 2712								
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Frequency Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)											
						NR	Relative					Adjusted					
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
	6	815	3.73	.86	.03	69.9	.1	1.6	10.7	11.5	6.2		.5	5.4	35.5	38.2	20.5
	7	807	3.58	.91	.03	70.2	.3	2.7	11.4	10.4	5.0		1.0	8.9	38.2	35.1	16.9
	8	799	3.14	1.09	.04	70.5	2.4	5.1	11.6	6.9	3.5		8.1	17.1	39.4	23.5	11.8
	All	936	3.83	.67	.02												
4	1	951	3.82	.91	.03	64.9	.2	2.2	10.4	13.1	9.2		.6	6.2	29.8	37.2	26.2
	2	914	3.53	.97	.03	66.3	.5	4.1	12.6	10.3	6.3		1.4	12.0	37.4	30.4	18.7
	3	888	3.77	.93	.03	67.3	.1	2.7	9.9	11.9	8.0		.3	8.3	30.3	36.5	24.5
	4	863	3.99	.86	.03	68.2	.1	1.1	7.8	12.7	10.0		.5	3.5	24.6	40.0	31.5
	5	841	3.67	.91	.03	69.0	.3	2.2	11.5	10.6	6.5		.8	7.0	37.1	34.1	20.9
	6	829	3.80	.92	.03	69.4	.2	2.2	9.0	11.4	7.8		.6	7.1	29.6	37.2	25.6
	7	814	4.05	.81	.03	70.0	.0	.8	6.4	13.0	9.7		.1	2.8	21.3	43.4	32.4
	8	806	3.65	.86	.03	70.3	.1	1.8	11.8	10.8	5.2		.5	6.0	39.7	36.2	17.6
	9	791	3.36	.90	.03	70.8	.5	3.6	13.4	8.4	3.4		1.6	12.3	45.9	28.7	11.5
	All	955	3.73	.67	.02												
5	1	908	4.02	.84	.03	66.5	.1	1.0	8.0	13.6	10.9		.2	3.0	23.8	40.5	32.5
	2	878	3.94	.90	.03	67.6	.1	1.8	8.1	12.2	10.2		.3	5.6	24.9	37.7	31.4
	3	865	3.65	.94	.03	68.1	.3	3.1	10.7	11.4	6.5		.8	9.6	33.4	35.7	20.5
	4	850	3.73	.85	.03	68.7	.1	1.7	10.6	12.8	6.1		.5	5.4	33.9	40.8	19.4
	5	839	3.85	.83	.03	69.1	.0	1.5	8.5	13.9	7.0		.1	4.8	27.5	44.8	22.8
	6	818	3.45	.95	.03	69.8	.6	3.5	12.2	9.4	4.5		2.0	11.6	40.3	31.2	14.9
	7	802	3.56	.94	.03	70.4	.3	3.1	10.9	10.0	5.2		1.1	10.6	36.9	33.9	17.5
	8	786	3.80	.91	.03	71.0	.2	1.6	9.3	10.6	7.3		.8	5.5	31.9	36.6	25.2
	All	915	3.76	.70	.02												

(continued)

Table 13. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Frequency–Full Survey Sample (continued)

Full Sample																		
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																		
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6							Number of Respondents: 2712											
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Frequency Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)												
						NR	Relative					Adjusted						
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5		
6	1	946	4.10	.86	.03	65.1	.1	1.5	6.3	13.9	13.0		.2	4.4	18.2	40.0	37.2	
	2	911	3.96	.84	.03	66.4	.0	1.1	8.9	13.5	10.0		.1	3.3	26.5	40.3	29.9	
	3	878	3.76	.86	.03	67.6	.1	1.3	12.2	11.6	7.2		.5	3.9	37.6	35.8	22.3	
	4	849	4.21	.85	.03	68.7	.1	.5	6.2	10.4	14.1		.5	1.6	19.7	33.1	45.1	
	5	841	3.70	1.07	.04	69.0	.1	4.5	9.6	7.3	9.6		.4	14.4	30.8	23.4	31.0	
	6	826	3.93	.92	.03	69.5	.1	1.3	9.5	9.4	10.2		.4	4.2	31.2	30.8	33.4	
	7	811	4.08	.86	.03	70.1	.0	.8	7.5	10.1	11.5		.1	2.6	25.0	33.7	38.6	
	8	806	2.85	1.06	.04	70.3	2.7	8.6	11.2	4.6	2.5		9.2	29.0	37.7	15.6	8.4	
	All	954	3.84	.66	.02													

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Sometimes, 4=Very Often, 5=Continuously.

Table 14. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Frequency–Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample

Teacher/Administrator																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6							Number of Respondents: 2047										
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Frequency Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)											
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	Relative					Adjusted					
							1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
1	1	676	3.85	.87	.03	67.0	.1	1.7	9.6	13.3	8.4		.3	5.0	29.0	40.4	25.3
	2	647	4.01	.82	.03	68.4		.9	7.8	13.0	9.9			2.9	24.7	41.1	31.2
	3	640	4.01	.80	.03	68.7		.7	7.8	13.3	9.5			2.3	24.8	42.5	30.3
	4	625	3.73	.94	.04	69.5	.3	2.3	9.7	11.0	7.1		1.0	7.7	31.8	36.2	23.4
	5	617	3.92	.89	.04	69.9	.2	1.4	7.6	12.4	8.5		.8	4.5	25.3	41.0	28.4
	6	610	3.76	.92	.04	70.2	.2	2.2	9.0	11.3	7.0		.8	7.4	30.3	38.0	23.4
	7	603	3.33	.96	.04	70.5	.6	4.3	13.0	7.5	3.9		2.2	14.8	44.3	25.5	13.3
	8	597	4.21	.87	.04	70.8	.1	.8	5.3	9.3	13.6		.5	2.7	18.3	32.0	46.6
	All	681	3.85	.69	.03												
2	1	667	4.00	.90	.03	67.4	.1	1.5	8.3	11.2	11.5		.3	4.5	25.5	34.5	35.2
	2	645	3.92	.86	.03	68.5	.0	1.4	8.5	12.5	9.0		.2	4.3	27.1	39.7	28.7
	3	625	4.22	.81	.03	69.5		.6	5.6	10.8	13.5			1.9	18.4	35.4	44.3
	4	615	3.27	.99	.04	70.0	.5	5.9	13.0	6.4	4.3		1.6	19.5	43.4	21.1	14.3
	5	605	4.19	.84	.03	70.4		.7	6.0	9.9	13.0			2.3	20.3	33.4	44.0
	6	603	4.40	.78	.03	70.5		.4	4.3	7.9	16.9			1.3	14.8	26.7	57.2
	All	670	3.98	.68	.03												
3	1	689	4.25	.78	.03	66.3	.0	.7	4.7	13.6	14.6		.1	2.0	14.1	40.5	43.3
	2	664	3.87	.89	.03	67.6	.2	1.3	10.2	11.5	9.2		.6	4.1	31.3	35.5	28.5
	3	641	3.80	.94	.04	68.7	.3	2.0	9.9	10.6	8.5		.9	6.4	31.7	33.7	27.3
	4	629	3.93	.86	.03	69.3	.2	1.0	8.5	12.1	8.9		.6	3.2	27.8	39.4	28.9
	5	609	3.90	.85	.03	70.2	.0	1.2	8.3	12.2	8.0		.2	4.1	27.9	40.9	26.9
	6	593	3.68	.87	.04	71.0	.2	1.7	10.9	10.8	5.4		.7	5.7	37.6	37.3	18.7

(continued)

Table 14. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Frequency–Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample (continued)

Teacher/Administrator																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6							Number of Respondents: 2047										
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Frequency Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)											
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	Relative					Adjusted					
							1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
	7	588	3.56	.92	.04	71.3	.3	2.8	10.9	9.9	4.8		1.0	9.7	38.1	34.4	16.8
	8	581	3.05	1.10	.05	71.6	2.7	5.3	11.1	6.3	3.0		9.6	18.6	39.1	22.2	10.5
	All	692	3.79	.68	.03												
4	1	691	3.74	.91	.03	66.2	.2	2.3	11.1	12.3	7.8		.6	6.9	33.0	36.5	23.0
	2	662	3.41	.96	.04	67.7	.5	4.6	13.1	9.3	4.7		1.7	14.2	40.6	28.9	14.7
	3	641	3.68	.93	.04	68.7	.1	3.1	9.7	11.8	6.5		.5	10.0	31.0	37.8	20.7
	4	623	3.93	.86	.03	69.6	.1	1.1	8.1	12.4	8.7		.5	3.7	26.5	40.6	28.7
	5	609	3.64	.91	.04	70.2	.2	2.3	11.2	10.1	5.9		.8	7.7	37.8	33.8	19.9
	6	599	3.82	.94	.04	70.7	.2	2.3	8.0	10.9	7.8		.7	7.8	27.4	37.4	26.7
	7	588	4.00	.82	.03	71.3	.0	1.0	6.4	12.7	8.6		.2	3.4	22.4	44.0	29.9
	8	583	3.62	.86	.04	71.5	.2	2.0	10.9	10.8	4.6		.7	6.9	38.3	38.1	16.1
	9	569	3.34	.91	.04	72.2	.5	3.9	12.0	8.3	3.1		1.8	14.1	43.2	29.9	11.1
	All	694	3.68	.67	.03												
5	1	667	3.93	.84	.03	67.4	.1	1.1	8.9	13.3	9.2		.3	3.3	27.3	40.9	28.2
	2	642	3.87	.92	.04	68.6	.1	2.1	8.2	12.1	8.8		.5	6.7	26.0	38.6	28.2
	3	633	3.57	.94	.04	69.1	.3	3.4	10.9	10.9	5.4		1.1	10.9	35.2	35.2	17.5
	4	619	3.71	.87	.04	69.8	.1	2.0	10.2	12.0	5.9		.5	6.6	33.8	39.6	19.5
	5	613	3.83	.84	.03	70.1	.0	1.7	8.1	13.5	6.6		.2	5.7	27.1	45.0	22.0
	6	596	3.38	.96	.04	70.9	.7	3.9	11.9	8.6	4.0		2.5	13.4	40.8	29.7	13.6
	7	586	3.46	.95	.04	71.4	.4	3.7	11.0	9.0	4.4		1.5	13.0	38.6	31.6	15.4
	8	571	3.73	.91	.04	72.1	.3	1.8	9.1	10.6	6.1		1.1	6.5	32.7	37.8	21.9
		All	672	3.70	.71	.03											

(continued)

Table 14. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Frequency–Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample (continued)

Teacher/Administrator																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6							Number of Respondents: 2047										
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Frequency Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)											
						NR	Relative					Adjusted					
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
6	1	689	4.04	.90	.03	66.3	.1	1.9	6.6	13.1	11.9		.3	5.7	19.6	39.0	35.4
	2	663	3.95	.84	.03	67.6	.0	1.2	8.4	13.4	9.4		.2	3.8	25.8	41.3	29.0
	3	637	3.73	.86	.03	68.9	.2	1.3	12.0	11.1	6.5		.6	4.1	38.5	35.8	21.0
	4	616	4.18	.86	.03	69.9	.2	.5	6.2	9.9	13.3		.6	1.8	20.5	33.0	44.2
	5	605	3.68	1.09	.04	70.4	.1	4.6	8.8	6.8	9.1		.5	15.7	29.9	23.1	30.7
	6	591	3.87	.92	.04	71.1	.1	1.4	9.4	9.1	8.9		.5	4.7	32.5	31.5	30.8
	7	582	4.09	.85	.04	71.6		.7	7.0	9.7	11.0			2.6	24.7	34.0	38.7
	8	576	2.77	1.06	.04	71.9	2.9	9.0	9.9	4.3	2.1		10.4	31.9	35.2	15.1	7.3
	All	695	3.80	.67	.03												

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Sometimes, 4=Very Often, 5=Continuously.

Table 15. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Frequency–Teacher Educator Survey Sample

Teacher Educator																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6									Number of Respondents: 665								
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Frequency Ratings			NR	Response Distribution (in %)										
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.		Relative					Adjusted					
							1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
1	1	260	4.18	.05	.82	60.9	.2	.8	7.2	14.9	16.1		.4	1.9	18.5	38.1	41.2
	2	252	4.08	.05	.79	62.1	.2	.5	8.1	16.5	12.6		.4	1.2	21.4	43.7	33.3
	3	245	4.20	.05	.80	63.2		.6	6.9	13.8	15.5			1.6	18.8	37.6	42.0
	4	244	3.99	.06	.90	63.3	.2	1.4	9.9	12.6	12.6		.4	3.7	27.0	34.4	34.4
	5	243	4.14	.05	.82	63.5		1.1	6.9	14.6	14.0			2.9	18.9	39.9	38.3
	6	236	4.08	.05	.82	64.5		.6	8.9	13.2	12.8			1.7	25.0	37.3	36.0
	7	234	3.53	.06	.94	64.8	.6	3.0	14.9	10.5	6.2		1.7	8.5	42.3	29.9	17.5
	8	230	4.35	.05	.82	65.4	.2	.8	4.4	10.8	18.5		.4	2.2	12.6	31.3	53.5
	All	263	4.08	.04	.66												
2	1	252	4.14	.06	.89	62.1		1.5	8.1	11.9	16.4			4.0	21.4	31.3	43.3
	2	252	4.17	.05	.84	62.1		1.1	7.5	13.4	15.9			2.8	19.8	35.3	42.1
	3	245	4.32	.05	.83	63.2	.2	.3	6.8	9.9	19.7		.4	.8	18.4	26.9	53.5
	4	241	3.52	.06	.99	63.8	.2	4.7	15.8	7.5	8.1		.4	12.9	43.6	20.7	22.4
	5	237	4.35	.05	.83	64.4		.9	5.4	9.6	19.7			2.5	15.2	27.0	55.3
	6	238	4.48	.05	.72	64.2			4.7	9.3	21.8				13.0	26.1	60.9
	All	257	4.16	.04	.68												
3	1	240	4.38	.05	.74	63.9		.3	4.7	12.3	18.8			.8	12.9	34.2	52.1
	2	237	4.11	.05	.84	64.4		.9	8.1	12.8	13.8			2.5	22.8	35.9	38.8
	3	235	4.02	.06	.87	64.7		1.4	8.9	12.8	12.3			3.8	25.1	36.2	34.9
	4	228	4.03	.05	.79	65.7		.6	8.3	14.9	10.5			1.8	24.1	43.4	30.7
	5	223	4.17	.05	.78	66.5			7.7	12.3	13.5				22.9	36.8	40.4
	6	222	3.86	.06	.85	66.6		1.5	9.9	13.5	8.4			4.5	29.7	40.5	25.2

(continued)

Table 15. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Frequency–Teacher Educator Survey Sample (continued)

Teacher Educator																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6									Number of Respondents: 665								
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Frequency Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)											
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	Relative					Adjusted					
							1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
	7	219	3.62	.06	.88	67.1	.3	2.3	12.6	12.2	5.6		.9	6.8	38.4	37.0	16.9
	8	218	3.36	.07	1.03	67.2	1.4	4.4	13.2	8.9	5.0		4.1	13.3	40.4	27.1	15.1
	All	244	3.96	.04	.64												
4	1	260	4.03	.06	.89	60.9	.3	1.7	8.3	15.3	13.5		.8	4.2	21.2	39.2	34.6
	2	252	3.85	.06	.94	62.1	.3	2.4	11.0	13.1	11.1		.8	6.3	29.0	34.5	29.4
	3	247	3.98	.06	.89	62.9		1.5	10.5	12.3	12.8			4.0	28.3	33.2	34.4
	4	240	4.12	.05	.85	63.9	.2	1.1	7.1	13.8	14.0		.4	2.9	19.6	38.3	38.8
	5	232	3.75	.06	.90	65.1	.3	1.8	12.3	12.2	8.3		.9	5.2	35.3	34.9	23.7
	6	230	3.76	.06	.88	65.4	.2	1.8	12.2	12.6	7.8		.4	5.2	35.2	36.5	22.6
	7	226	4.18	.05	.77	66.0		.5	6.2	14.1	13.2			1.3	18.1	41.6	38.9
	8	223	3.71	.06	.84	66.5		1.2	14.6	10.5	7.2			3.6	43.5	31.4	21.5
	9	222	3.41	.06	.85	66.6	.5	2.6	17.6	8.6	4.2		1.4	7.7	52.7	25.7	12.6
	All	261	3.86	.04	.67												
5	1	241	4.26	.05	.78	63.8		.8	5.1	14.3	16.1			2.1	14.1	39.4	44.4
	2	236	4.13	.05	.84	64.5		.9	7.8	12.5	14.3			2.5	22.0	35.2	40.3
	3	232	3.88	.06	.89	65.1		2.1	9.9	12.9	9.9			6.0	28.4	37.1	28.4
	4	231	3.79	.05	.79	65.3	.2	.8	11.9	15.3	6.6		.4	2.2	34.2	44.2	19.0
	5	226	3.92	.05	.79	66.0		.8	9.8	15.0	8.4			2.2	28.8	44.2	24.8
	6	222	3.64	.06	.87	66.6	.2	2.3	13.1	11.7	6.2		.5	6.8	39.2	35.1	18.5
	7	216	3.82	.06	.83	67.5		1.4	10.5	13.1	7.5			4.2	32.4	40.3	23.1
	8	215	3.99	.06	.87	67.7		.9	9.6	10.8	11.0			2.8	29.8	33.5	34.0
		All	243	3.93	.04	.66											

(continued)

Table 15. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Element Frequency–Teacher Educator Survey Sample (continued)

Teacher Educator																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6									Number of Respondents: 665								
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Frequency Ratings			Response Distribution (in %)											
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	Relative					Adjusted					
							1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
6	1	257	4.25	.05	.74	61.4		.5	5.6	16.4	16.2			1.2	14.4	42.4	42.0
	2	248	4.00	.05	.83	62.7		.8	10.5	14.0	12.0			2.0	28.2	37.5	32.3
	3	241	3.84	.05	.85	63.8		1.2	12.8	12.9	9.3			3.3	35.3	35.7	25.7
	4	233	4.27	.05	.79	65.0		.5	6.2	11.7	16.7			1.3	17.6	33.5	47.6
	5	236	3.77	.07	1.02	64.5		3.9	11.7	8.6	11.3			11.0	33.1	24.2	31.8
	6	235	4.06	.06	.89	64.7		1.1	9.9	10.2	14.1			3.0	28.1	28.9	40.0
	7	229	4.06	.06	.89	65.6	.2	.9	8.9	11.3	13.2		.4	2.6	25.8	32.8	38.4
	8	230	3.06	.07	1.04	65.4	2.1	7.5	15.2	5.9	3.9		6.1	21.7	43.9	17.0	11.3
	All	259	3.94	.04	.64												

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Sometimes, 4=Very Often, 5=Continuously.

Subgroup Comparisons–Frequency

Table 16 shows an average rating below 3.0 for both female and male respondents for TPE 6, Element 8: “Understand how the context, structure, and history of public education in California affects and influences state, district, and school governance as well as state and local education finance.” The male subgroup mean was slightly below 3.0 in the Public School Teacher/Administrator sample while the female subgroup mean was above 3.0 for TPE 3, Element 8: “Demonstrate knowledge of effective teaching strategies aligned with the internationally-recognized educational technology standards of the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) and the International Association for K-12 Online Learning (iNACOL).” None of the male-female comparisons reached a conventional level of statistical significance.

Table 16. TPE Element Frequency by Gender

California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA)										
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6										
TPE Number	Element Number	Full Sample (2712)			Teachers/Administrators (2047)			Teacher Educators (665)		
		Male	Female		Male	Female		Male	Female	
		Mean	Mean	<i>p</i> -value	Mean	Mean	<i>p</i> -value	Mean	Mean	<i>p</i> -value
1	1	3.79	4.03	-	3.72	3.92	-	3.97	4.28	-
	2	3.85	4.12	-	3.83	4.10	-	3.92	4.16	-
	3	3.88	4.15	-	3.85	4.08	-	3.94	4.33	-
	4	3.59	3.91	-	3.56	3.83	-	3.70	4.12	-
	5	3.85	4.05	-	3.82	3.97	-	3.94	4.24	-
	6	3.73	3.91	-	3.66	3.81	-	3.93	4.16	-
	7	3.36	3.41	-	3.33	3.33	-	3.44	3.58	-
	8	4.11	4.32	-	4.09	4.28	-	4.20	4.43	-
2	1	3.81	4.14	-	3.78	4.10	-	3.90	4.23	-
	2	3.80	4.08	-	3.77	4.00	-	3.90	4.28	-
	3	4.07	4.34	-	4.07	4.30	-	4.06	4.43	-
	4	3.25	3.39	-	3.22	3.30	-	3.37	3.59	-
	5	4.12	4.29	-	4.15	4.21	-	4.04	4.48	-
	6	4.24	4.51	-	4.26	4.46	-	4.16	4.61	-
3	1	4.08	4.37	-	4.06	4.33	-	4.18	4.46	-
	2	3.75	4.02	-	3.66	3.97	-	4.01	4.15	-
	3	3.73	3.92	-	3.67	3.87	-	3.94	4.05	-
	4	3.79	4.03	-	3.75	4.01	-	3.92	4.07	-
	5	3.83	4.05	-	3.78	3.97	-	3.98	4.25	-
	6	3.65	3.76	-	3.59	3.72	-	3.83	3.88	-
	7	3.53	3.60	-	3.52	3.58	-	3.55	3.65	-
	8	3.08	3.16	-	2.96	3.09	.19	3.44	3.32	-

(continued)

Appendix C shows TPE 6, Element 8 as the only one with an average frequency rating below 3.0 for any ethnic/racial group with 25 or more respondents. The mean frequency rating was 2.77 for White respondents and 2.54 for respondents self-identified as “Other”. Both differences are statistically significant from the mean frequency rating in the full sample (excluding the target subgroup). This is not surprising given the large number of respondents in the comparisons.

Table 16. TPE Element Frequency by Gender (continued)

California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA)										
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6										
TPE Number	Element Number	Full Sample (2712)			Teachers/Administrators (2047)			Teacher Educators (665)		
		Male	Female		Male	Female		Male	Female	
		Mean	Mean	<i>p</i> -value	Mean	Mean	<i>p</i> -value	Mean	Mean	<i>p</i> -value
4	1	3.62	3.92	-	3.54	3.85	-	3.88	4.10	-
	2	3.40	3.59	-	3.30	3.46	-	3.69	3.93	-
	3	3.59	3.85	-	3.52	3.76	-	3.81	4.06	-
	4	3.74	4.11	-	3.70	4.06	-	3.84	4.24	-
	5	3.53	3.75	-	3.50	3.72	-	3.61	3.82	-
	6	3.69	3.86	-	3.72	3.87	-	3.57	3.84	-
	7	3.90	4.13	-	3.89	4.06	-	3.94	4.29	-
	8	3.56	3.69	-	3.53	3.66	-	3.63	3.75	-
	9	3.35	3.36	-	3.37	3.32	-	3.30	3.46	-
5	1	3.84	4.10	-	3.79	4.00	-	4.00	4.37	-
	2	3.80	4.01	-	3.78	3.92	-	3.86	4.24	-
	3	3.55	3.70	-	3.48	3.61	-	3.75	3.93	-
	4	3.59	3.80	-	3.57	3.78	-	3.64	3.86	-
	5	3.70	3.93	-	3.68	3.91	-	3.78	3.98	-
	6	3.38	3.49	-	3.32	3.42	-	3.56	3.68	-
	7	3.43	3.62	-	3.34	3.52	-	3.72	3.87	-
	8	3.66	3.87	-	3.59	3.80	-	3.88	4.03	-
6	1	4.00	4.14	-	4.01	4.05	-	3.99	4.36	-
	2	3.87	4.01	-	3.88	3.99	-	3.86	4.06	-
	3	3.62	3.82	-	3.60	3.79	-	3.68	3.91	-
	4	3.98	4.31	-	3.97	4.28	-	4.00	4.39	-
	5	3.63	3.74	-	3.56	3.73	-	3.81	3.75	-
	6	3.83	3.98	-	3.78	3.93	-	3.97	4.10	-
	7	3.98	4.13	-	3.99	4.14	-	3.96	4.11	-
	8	2.83	2.86	.67	2.75	2.78	.75	3.04	3.07	-

Note. P-value = probability value. A value of .05 or lower is considered statistically significant. Comparisons are against the total sample, excluding the target comparison group. We only highlighted the *p*-value when (a) the mean importance rating for one or both of the two groups was below 3.0 and (b) each group in the comparison had at least 25 responses for that TPE element. A dash in the cell means we did not conduct a statistical test for that comparison. Rating scale anchors are: 1=No importance/Not performed, 2=Little importance, 3=Moderate importance, 4=Great importance, 5=Very great importance.

Chapter 6. TPE Set of Elements Representation

The survey question examined in this chapter is: *How well does this set of elements as a whole represent important pedagogical knowledge, skills, and abilities required for competent performance by beginning teachers during the first few months of teaching in California? (For your reference, the elements are repeated below.)*

- () Poorly
- () Somewhat
- () Adequately
- () Well
- () Very well

Tables 17-20 show descriptive statistics for the **representativeness of the set of elements** associated with each TPE.

Descriptive Statistics–Set of Elements Representativeness

Set of Elements Representativeness Highlights

Sixty-eight percent or more of all respondents judged each TPE to be “Well” or “Very Well” represented by its set of elements. The average representativeness rating ranges from 3.84 for TPE 3 to 4.14 for TPE 2.

The average representativeness rating is greater than 3.0 for all gender and ethnic/racial subgroups with 25 or more respondents.

Table 17. Descriptive Statistics for Set of TPE Elements Representativeness–Full Survey Sample

Full Sample																
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6										Number of Respondents: 2712						
Element Number	Representativeness Ratings				Response Distribution (in %)											
	N	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	Relative					Adjusted					
						1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
1	816	4.01	.90	.03	69.9	.3	1.5	5.8	12.5	10.0		.9	5.0	19.4	41.7	33.1
2	830	4.14	.87	.03	69.4	.1	1.5	4.3	12.4	12.2		.5	5.1	14.0	40.5	40.0
3	791	3.84	.91	.03	70.8	.3	1.9	7.1	12.6	7.3		1.1	6.6	24.3	43.1	24.9
4	788	3.86	.89	.03	70.9	.2	2.0	6.9	12.7	7.3		.6	6.9	23.7	43.8	25.0
5	785	3.96	.85	.03	71.1	.2	1.0	6.7	12.7	8.3		.8	3.3	23.3	43.9	28.7
6	801	3.91	.86	.03	70.5	.1	1.5	6.8	13.3	7.8		.5	5.2	23.0	44.9	26.3
All	1190	3.91	.80	.02												

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=Poorly, 2=Somewhat, 3=Adequately, 4=Well, 5=Very well.

Table 18. Descriptive Statistics for Set of TPE Elements Representativeness–Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample

Teacher/Administrator																
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6											Number of Respondents: 2047					
Element Number	Representativeness Ratings					Response Distribution (in %)										
	N	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	Relative					Adjusted					
						1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
1	585	4.04	.85	.04	71.4	.2	.9	5.6	12.6	9.2		.9	3.2	19.7	43.9	32.3
2	595	4.17	.83	.03	70.9	.1	1.2	3.8	12.5	11.5		.3	4.0	13.1	42.9	39.7
3	574	3.86	.88	.04	72.0	.3	1.5	6.8	12.8	6.7		1.0	5.4	24.2	45.5	23.9
4	565	3.88	.84	.04	72.4	.1	1.5	6.4	13.2	6.4		.4	5.3	23.2	47.8	23.4
5	566	3.94	.81	.03	72.3	.1	.7	6.7	13.0	7.0		.5	2.7	24.2	47.2	25.4
6	572	3.92	.83	.03	72.1	.1	1.1	6.6	12.9	7.1		.5	4.0	23.8	46.2	25.5
All	878	3.92	.77	.03												

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=Poorly, 2=Somewhat, 3=Adequately, 4=Well, 5=Very

Table 19. Descriptive Statistics for Set of TPE Elements Representativeness–Teacher Educator Survey Sample

Teacher Educator																
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6											Number of Respondents: 665					
Element Number	Representativeness Ratings					Response Distribution (in %)										
	N	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	Relative					Adjusted					
						1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
1	231	3.95	1.00	.07	65.3	.3	3.3	6.5	12.5	12.2		.9	9.5	18.6	35.9	35.1
2	235	4.07	.98	.06	64.7	.3	2.7	5.7	12.2	14.4		.9	7.7	16.2	34.5	40.9
3	217	3.80	1.00	.07	67.4	.5	3.2	8.0	12.0	9.0		1.4	9.7	24.4	36.9	27.6
4	223	3.78	1.03	.07	66.5	.5	3.6	8.4	11.3	9.8		1.3	10.8	25.1	33.6	29.1
5	219	4.02	.95	.06	67.1	.5	1.7	6.9	11.7	12.2		1.4	5.0	21.0	35.6	37.0
6	229	3.90	.93	.06	65.6	.2	2.9	7.2	14.4	9.8		.4	8.3	21.0	41.9	28.4
All	312	3.88	.89	.05												

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=Poorly, 2=Somewhat, 3=Adequately, 4=Well, 5=Very well.

Subgroup Comparisons–Set of Elements Representativeness

All 6 TPEs received an average rating of 3.0 or higher for representativeness across the set of elements in all subgroups. Therefore, we did not include the tabled results in this report.

Chapter 7. TPE Narratives

The survey question examined in this chapter is: *How well does the narrative [associated with this TPE] represent important knowledge, skills, and abilities required for competently performing the job of a beginning teacher during the first few months of teaching in California?*

- () *Poorly*
- () *Somewhat*
- () *Adequately*
- () *Well*
- () *Very well*

Tables 20-22 show descriptive statistics for the **TPE Narratives**.

Descriptive Statistics–TPE Narratives

TPE Narratives Highlights

Sixty-three percent or more of all respondents judged each TPE to be “Well” or “Very Well” represented by its narrative. The average representativeness rating ranges from 3.74 for TPE 3 to 4.05 for TPE 2.

The average TPE narrative representativeness rating is greater than 3.0 for all gender and ethnic/racial subgroups with 25 or more respondents.

Table 20. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Narratives–Full Survey Sample

Full Sample															
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey															
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6										Number of Respondents: 2712					
Element Number	Representativeness Ratings				Response Distribution (in %)										
	N	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	Relative					Adjusted				
						1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
1	780	3.89	.92	.03	71.2	.5	1.4	6.6	12.5	7.7	1.8	4.9	22.9	43.6	26.8
2	791	4.05	.89	.03	70.8	.3	1.3	5.1	12.3	10.2	1.0	4.6	17.3	42.2	34.9
3	763	3.74	.90	.03	71.9	.3	1.9	8.1	12.0	5.7	1.2	6.8	29.0	42.7	20.3
4	754	3.82	.86	.03	72.2	.3	1.3	7.9	12.3	6.1	1.1	4.5	28.2	44.2	22.0
5	758	3.89	.86	.03	72.1	.3	1.3	6.6	12.8	7.0	.9	4.7	23.6	45.8	24.9
6	775	3.85	.88	.03	71.4	.3	1.5	7.4	12.4	6.9	1.0	5.2	26.1	43.5	24.3
All	1088	3.84	.79	.02											

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=Poorly, 2=Somewhat, 3=Adequately, 4=Well, 5=Very well.

Table 21. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Narratives–Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample

Teacher/Administrator																
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6										Number of Respondents: 2047						
Element Number	Representativeness Ratings				Response Distribution (in %)											
	N	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	Relative					Adjusted					
						1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
1	565	3.92	.87	.04	72.4	.3	1.0	6.4	12.6	7.3	1.2	3.7	23.0	45.7	26.4	
2	567	4.11	.83	.03	72.3	.2	.9	4.3	12.5	9.8	.7	3.2	15.5	45.1	35.4	
3	551	3.76	.85	.04	73.1	.2	1.4	8.1	12.0	5.2	.9	5.1	30.1	44.6	19.2	
4	541	3.83	.82	.04	73.6	.3	.9	7.1	12.8	5.3	1.1	3.3	27.0	48.4	20.1	
5	549	3.88	.83	.04	73.2	.2	1.1	6.4	13.0	6.1	.7	4.2	24.0	48.5	22.6	
6	554	3.85	.85	.04	72.9	.2	1.3	7.0	12.5	6.1	.7	4.7	25.8	46.2	22.6	
All	797	3.86	.75	.03												

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=Poorly, 2=Somewhat, 3=Adequately, 4=Well, 5=Very well.

Table 22. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Narratives–Teacher Educator Survey Sample

Teacher Educator																
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6										Number of Respondents: 665						
Element Number	Representativeness Ratings				Response Distribution (in %)											
	N	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	Relative					Adjusted					
						1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
1	215	3.80	1.04	.07	67.7	1.1	2.6	7.4	12.3	9.0	3.3	7.9	22.8	38.1	27.9	
2	224	3.90	1.02	.07	66.3	.6	2.7	7.4	11.7	11.3	1.8	8.0	21.9	34.8	33.5	
3	212	3.69	1.01	.07	68.1	.6	3.6	8.3	12.0	7.4	1.9	11.3	25.9	37.7	23.1	
4	213	3.77	.96	.07	68.0	.3	2.4	10.1	10.7	8.6	.9	7.5	31.5	33.3	26.8	
5	209	3.92	.95	.07	68.6	.5	2.0	7.1	12.2	9.8	1.4	6.2	22.5	38.8	31.1	
6	221	3.84	.97	.07	66.8	.6	2.1	8.9	12.2	9.5	1.8	6.3	26.7	36.7	28.5	
All	291	3.78	.91	.05												

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=Poorly, 2=Somewhat, 3=Adequately, 4=Well, 5=Very well.

Subgroup Comparisons–TPE Narratives

All 6 TPE narratives received an average rating of 3.0 or higher for representativeness in all subgroups. Therefore, we did not include the tabled results in this report.

Chapter 8. Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives

The survey question examined in this chapter is: *How well does the narrative [associated with this subject-specific pedagogy] represent important knowledge, skills, and abilities required for competently performing the job of a beginning teacher in this subject area during the first few months of teaching in California?*

- Poorly
- Somewhat
- Adequately
- Well
- Very well

Tables 23-28 show descriptive statistics for two narratives common to all versions of the survey (developmentally appropriate practice and English language development) as well as **subject-specific pedagogy narratives**. Tables 23-25 address the seven subject areas associated with the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential. Tables 26-28 address the 14 subject areas in which a Single Subject Teaching Credential is available. We did not examine gender and ethnic/racial subgroups for these analyses because there were too few responses.

Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives Highlights

The important knowledge, skills, and abilities required for beginning Multiple Subject teachers are well represented in the 9 narratives, as indicated by average ratings of 3.75 or higher in the full sample, the Public School Teacher/Administrator sample, and the Teacher Educator sample.

The same is true for each of the narratives of the Single Subject surveys, namely, that the average representativeness rating is 3.75 or higher. The sample size for the Single Subject surveys ranged from 5 (Industrial and Technical Education) to 70 (History/Social Science).

Descriptive Statistics—Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives

Table 23. Descriptive Statistics for Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives: Multiple Subject–Full Survey Sample

Full Sample																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives per respondent: 9										Number of Respondents: 983							
Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narrative		N	Representativeness Ratings				Response Distribution (in %)										
			Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	Relative					Adjusted					
							1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
1.	Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Relation to Subject-Specific Pedagogy	209	4.23	0.79	0.05	78.7	.1	.5	2.6	9.2	8.9		.5	2.4	12.4	43.1	41.6
2.	English Language Development in Relation to Subject-Specific Pedagogy	208	4.05	0.82	0.06	78.8	.1	.8	3.6	10.2	6.5		.5	3.8	16.8	48.1	30.8
3.	Teaching English-Language Arts in a Multiple Subject Assignment	206	4.03	0.94	0.07	79.0	.1	1.6	3.4	8.3	7.5		.5	7.8	16.0	39.8	35.9
4.	Teaching Mathematics in a Multiple Subject Assignment	210	4.05	0.88	0.06	78.6	.3	.6	4.0	9.3	7.2		1.4	2.9	18.6	43.3	33.8
5.	Teaching History-Social Science in a Multiple Subject Assignment	204	3.96	0.87	0.06	79.2	.1	1.1	4.3	9.4	5.9		.5	5.4	20.6	45.1	28.4
6.	Teaching Science in a Multiple Subject Assignment	208	3.96	0.85	0.06	78.8	.2	.8	4.5	9.9	5.8		1.0	3.8	21.2	46.6	27.4
7.	Teaching Physical Education in a Multiple Subject Assignment	205	3.87	0.94	0.07	79.1	.3	1.3	4.8	8.7	5.7		1.5	6.3	22.9	42.0	27.3
8.	Teaching Health Education in a Multiple Subject Assignment	207	3.86	0.91	0.06	78.9	.2	1.4	4.9	9.2	5.4		1.0	6.8	23.2	43.5	25.6
9.	Teaching Visual and Performing Arts in a Multiple Subject Assignment	203	3.82	0.98	0.07	79.3	.4	1.7	4.4	8.9	5.3		2.0	8.4	21.2	42.9	25.6
All		213	3.98	0.75	0.05												

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=Poorly, 2=Somewhat, 3=Adequately, 4=Well, 5=Very well.

Table 24. Descriptive Statistics for Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives: Multiple Subject–Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample

Teacher/Administrator																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives per respondent: 9										Number of Respondents: 716							
Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narrative		Representativeness Ratings				Response Distribution (in %)											
		N	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	Relative					Adjusted					
							1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
1.	Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Relation to Subject-Specific Pedagogy	130	4.28	.760	.067	81.8	.1	.3	1.7	8.2	7.8		.8	1.5	9.2	45.4	43.1
2.	English Language Development in Relation to Subject-Specific Pedagogy	130	4.07	.739	.065	81.8	.0	.6	2.7	9.9	5.0		.0	3.1	14.6	54.6	27.7
3.	Teaching English-Language Arts in a Multiple Subject Assignment	125	4.07	.863	.077	82.5	.0	1.0	2.9	7.4	6.1		0.0	5.6	16.8	42.4	35.2
4.	Teaching Mathematics in a Multiple Subject Assignment	132	4.13	.75	.06	81.6	.0	.3	3.2	8.8	6.1		.0	1.5	17.4	47.7	33.3
5.	Teaching History-Social Science in a Multiple Subject Assignment	128	3.99	.78	.07	82.1	.0	.7	3.4	9.2	4.6		.0	3.9	18.8	51.6	25.8
6.	Teaching Science in a Multiple Subject Assignment	129	3.96	.81	.07	82.0	.1	.7	3.4	9.4	4.5		.8	3.9	18.6	51.9	24.8
7.	Teaching Physical Education in a Multiple Subject Assignment	128	3.91	.85	.07	82.1	.1	.8	3.9	8.7	4.3		.8	4.7	21.9	48.4	24.2
8.	Teaching Health Education in a Multiple Subject Assignment	130	3.85	.85	.07	81.8	.1	1.0	4.3	8.8	3.9		.8	5.4	23.8	48.5	21.5
9.	Teaching Visual and Performing Arts in a Multiple Subject Assignment	126	3.86	.89	.08	82.4	.3	1.0	3.8	8.5	4.1		1.6	5.6	21.4	48.4	23.0
All		132	4.02	0.67	0.06												

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=Poorly, 2=Somewhat, 3=Adequately, 4=Well, 5=Very well.

Table 25. Descriptive Statistics for Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives: Multiple Subject–Teacher Educator Survey Sample

Teacher Educator																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives per respondent: 9										Number of Respondents: 267							
Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narrative		Representativeness Ratings				Response Distribution (in %)											
		N	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	Relative					Adjusted					
							1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
1.	Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Relation to Subject-Specific Pedagogy	79	4.14	0.84	.095	70.4	0.0	1.1	5.2	11.6	11.6		.0	3.8	17.7	39.2	39.2
2.	English Language Development in Relation to Subject-Specific Pedagogy	78	4.01	0.95	.107	70.8	.4	1.5	6.0	10.9	10.5		1.3	5.1	20.5	37.2	35.9
3.	Teaching English-Language Arts in a Multiple Subject Assignment	81	3.96	1.04	.116	69.7	.4	3.4	4.5	10.9	11.2		1.2	11.1	14.8	35.8	37.0
4.	Teaching Mathematics in a Multiple Subject Assignment	78	3.92	1.05	.12	70.8	1.1	1.5	6.0	10.5	10.1		3.8	5.1	20.5	35.9	34.6
5.	Teaching History-Social Science in a Multiple Subject Assignment	76	3.89	1.00	.11	71.5	.4	2.2	6.7	9.7	9.4		1.3	7.9	23.7	34.2	32.9
6.	Teaching Science in a Multiple Subject Assignment	79	3.95	0.92	.10	70.4	.4	1.1	7.5	11.2	9.4		1.3	3.8	25.3	38.0	31.6
7.	Teaching Physical Education in a Multiple Subject Assignment	77	3.82	1.07	.12	71.2	.7	2.6	7.1	9.0	9.4		2.6	9.1	24.7	31.2	32.5
8.	Teaching Health Education in a Multiple Subject Assignment	77	3.88	1.01	.12	71.2	.4	2.6	6.4	10.1	9.4		1.3	9.1	22.1	35.1	32.5
9.	Teaching Visual and Performing Arts in a Multiple Subject Assignment	77	3.75	1.10	.13	71.2	.7	3.7	6.0	9.7	8.6		2.6	13.0	20.8	33.8	29.9
All		81	3.92	0.86	0.10												

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=Poorly, 2=Somewhat, 3=Adequately, 4=Well, 5=Very well.

Table 26. Descriptive Statistics for Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives: Single Subject–Full Survey Sample

Full Sample																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives per respondent: 3										Number of Respondents: 1729							
Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narrative		Response Distribution (in %)															
		Representativeness Ratings				Relative					Adjusted						
		N	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
1.	Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Relation to Subject-Specific Pedagogy	430	4.00	0.85	0.04	75.1	.2	.6	6.1	10.2	7.8	.7	2.3	24.7	40.9	31.4	
2.	English Language Development in Relation to Subject-Specific Pedagogy	431	3.85	0.83	0.04	75.1	.1	.7	8.3	9.8	6.1	.2	2.8	33.2	39.2	24.6	
3.	Teaching Agriculture in a Single Subject Assignment	18	3.72	0.96	0.23	83.6	0	1.8	4.5	6.4	3.6	0.0	11.1	27.8	38.9	22.2	
4.	Teaching Art in a Single Subject Assignment	15	3.80	0.77	0.20	76.9	0	0	9.2	9.2	4.6	0.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	
5.	Teaching Business in a Single Subject Assignment	8	3.75	1.39	0.49	65.2	4.3	0	8.7	8.7	13.0	12.5	0.0	25.0	25.0	37.5	
6.	Teaching English Language Development in a Single Subject Assignment	24	3.96	0.75	0.15	74.7	0	0	7.4	11.6	6.3	0.0	0.0	29.2	45.8	25.0	
7.	Teaching English-Language Arts in a Single Subject Assignment	64	3.88	1.03	0.13	79.4	1.0	.6	4.5	8.4	6.1	4.7	3.1	21.9	40.6	29.7	
8.	Teaching Health in a Single Subject Assignment	9	4.22	0.83	0.28	71.0	0	0	6.5	9.7	12.9	0.0	0.0	22.2	33.3	44.4	
9.	Teaching History/Social Science in a Single Subject Assignment	70	3.91	0.97	0.12	70.0	.4	1.3	9.0	9.0	10.3	1.4	4.3	30.0	30.0	34.3	
10.	Teaching Home Economics in a Single Subject Assignment	16	3.94	1.24	0.31	70.9	1.8	3.6	0.0	12.7	10.9	6.3	12.5	0.0	43.8	37.5	

(continued)

Table 26. Descriptive Statistics for Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives: Single Subject–Full Survey Sample (continued)

Full Sample																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives per respondent: 3										Number of Respondents: 1729							
Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narrative		Representativeness Ratings					Response Distribution (in %)										
		N	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	Relative					Adjusted					
							1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
11.	Teaching Industrial & Technology Education in a Single Subject Assignment	5	3.80	0.84	0.37	87.2	0	0	5.1	5.1	2.6		0.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0
12.	Teaching Mathematics in a Single Subject Assignment	65	3.94	0.73	0.09	73.1	0	.4	6.6	14.0	5.8		0.0	1.5	24.6	52.3	21.5
13.	Teaching Music in a Single Subject Assignment	20	4.20	1.15	0.26	76.5	1.2	1.2	2.4	5.9	12.9		5.0	5.0	10.0	25.0	55.0
14.	Teaching Physical Education in a Single Subject Assignment	23	3.91	1.16	0.24	78.1	1.9	1.0	1.0	11.4	6.7		8.7	4.3	4.3	52.2	30.4
15.	Teaching Science in a Single Subject Assignment	56	3.98	0.82	0.11	76.9	0.0	1.2	4.1	11.6	6.2		0.0	5.4	17.9	50.0	26.8
16.	Teaching World Languages in a Single Subject Assignment	26	4.12	0.91	0.18	72.3	0.0	1.1	6.4	8.5	11.7		0.0	3.8	23.1	30.8	42.3
All		434	3.93	0.77	0.04												

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=Poorly, 2=Somewhat, 3=Adequately, 4=Well, 5=Very well. Each Single-Subject survey include the first two subject-specific pedagogy narratives plus one of the subject-specific pedagogy narratives listed in rows 3-17.

Table 27. Descriptive Statistics for Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives: Single Subject–Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample

Teacher/Administrator																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives per respondent: 3										Number of Respondents: 1331							
Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narrative		Representativeness Ratings				Response Distribution (in %)											
		N	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	Relative					Adjusted					
							1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
1.	Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Relation to Subject-Specific Pedagogy	315	3.98	0.84	0.05	76.3	.2	.3	6.3	9.8	7.1		1.0	1.3	26.7	41.3	29.8
2.	English Language Development in Relation to Subject-Specific Pedagogy	316	3.84	0.81	0.05	76.3	.0	.6	8.0	9.5	5.6		.0	2.5	33.9	40.2	23.4
3.	Teaching Agriculture in a Single Subject Assignment	15	3.73	0.88	0.23												
4.	Teaching Art in a Single Subject Assignment	9	3.56	0.73	0.24												
5.	Teaching Business in a Single Subject Assignment	7	3.57	1.40	0.53												
6.	Teaching English Language Development in a Single Subject Assignment	17	4.12	0.78	0.19												
7.	Teaching English-Language Arts in a Single Subject Assignment	40	3.85	1.03	0.16	83.6	.8	.4	3.7	7.0	4.5		5.0	2.5	22.5	42.5	27.5
8.	Teaching Health in a Single Subject Assignment	7	4.43	0.79	0.30												
9.	Teaching History/Social Science in a Single Subject Assignment	50	4.04	0.90	0.13	72.4	.6	0	7.2	9.9	9.9		2.0	0.0	26.0	36.0	36.0
10.	Teaching Home Economics in a Single Subject Assignment	15	3.93	1.28	0.33												

(continued)

Table 27. Descriptive Statistics for Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives: Single Subject–Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample (continued)

Teacher/Administrator																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives per respondent: 3										Number of Respondents: 1331							
Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narrative		Representativeness Ratings				Response Distribution (in %)											
		N	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	Relative					Adjusted					
							1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
11.	Teaching Industrial & Technology Education in a Single Subject Assignment	5	3.80	0.84	0.37												
12.	Teaching Mathematics in a Single Subject Assignment	49	3.84	0.69	0.10	73.1	0	.5	7.1	15.4	3.8		0.0	2.0	26.5	57.1	14.3
13.	Teaching Music in a Single Subject Assignment	16	4.06	1.24	0.31												
14.	Teaching Physical Education in a Single Subject Assignment	14	4.07	0.83	0.22												
15.	Teaching Science in a Single Subject Assignment	43	4.07	0.74	0.11	77.0	0	.5	3.7	12.3	6.4		0.0	2.3	16.3	53.5	27.9
16.	Teaching World Languages in a Single Subject Assignment	20	3.95	0.94	0.21												
All		318	3.93	0.73	0.04												

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=Poorly, 2=Somewhat, 3=Adequately, 4=Well, 5=Very well. Each Single-Subject survey include the first two subject-specific pedagogy narratives plus one of the subject-specific pedagogy narratives listed in rows 3-17.

Table 28. Descriptive Statistics for Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives: Single Subject–Teacher Educator Survey Sample

Teacher Educator																	
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																	
Number of Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives per respondent: 3										Number of Respondents: 398							
Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narrative		Representativeness Ratings					Response Distribution (in %)										
		N	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	Relative					Adjusted					
							1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
1.	Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Relation to Subject-Specific Pedagogy	115	4.06	0.87	0.08	71.1	.0	1.5	5.5	11.6	10.3		.0	5.2	19.1	40.0	35.7
2.	English Language Development in Relation to Subject-Specific Pedagogy	115	3.87	0.89	0.08	71.1	.3	1.0	9.0	10.6	8.0		.9	3.5	31.3	36.5	27.8
3.	Teaching Agriculture in a Single Subject Assignment	3	3.67	1.53	0.88												
4.	Teaching Art in a Single Subject Assignment	6	4.17	0.75	0.31												
5.	Teaching Business in a Single Subject Assignment	1	5.00														
6.	Teaching English Language Development in a Single Subject Assignment	7	3.57	0.53	0.20												
7.	Teaching English-Language Arts in a Single Subject Assignment	24	3.92	1.06	0.22												
8.	Teaching Health in a Single Subject Assignment	2	3.50	0.71	0.50												
9.	Teaching History/Social Science in a Single Subject Assignment	20	3.60	1.10	0.24												
10.	Teaching Home Economics in a Single Subject Assignment	1	4.00														

(continued)

Table 28. Descriptive Statistics for Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives: Single Subject–Teacher Educator Survey Sample (continued)

Teacher Educator																
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																
Number of Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narratives per respondent: 3										Number of Respondents: 398						
Subject-Specific Pedagogy Narrative		Representativeness Ratings				Response Distribution (in %)										
		N	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	Relative					Adjusted				
							1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Teaching Industrial & Technology Education in a Single Subject Assignment	0														
12.	Teaching Mathematics in a Single Subject Assignment	16	4.25	0.77	0.19											
13.	Teaching Music in a Single Subject Assignment	4	4.75	0.50	0.25											
14.	Teaching Physical Education in a Single Subject Assignment	9	3.67	1.58	0.53											
15.	Teaching Science in a Single Subject Assignment	13	3.69	1.03	0.29											
16.	Teaching World Languages in a Single Subject Assignment	6	4.67	0.52	0.21											
All		116	3.9382	.86659	.08046	116										

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=Poorly, 2=Somewhat, 3=Adequately, 4=Well, 5=Very well. Each Single-Subject survey include the first two subject-specific pedagogy narratives plus one of the subject-specific pedagogy narratives listed in rows 3-17. We did not report the distribution of responses for subject-specific pedagogy narratives with fewer than 25 responses.

Chapter 9. TPE Overall Representativeness

The survey question examined in this chapter is: *How well does the set of TPEs as a whole (elements and narratives) represent important knowledge, skills, and abilities required for competent performance by beginning teachers in California? For your reference, click here to view the full set of TPEs and subject-specific narratives.*

- () Poorly
- () Somewhat
- () Adequately
- () Well
- () Very well

Tables 29-31 show descriptive statistics for **TPE overall representativeness**.

Descriptive Statistics–Overall Representativeness

TPE Overall Representativeness Highlights

Almost ¾ of all survey respondents indicate that the knowledge, skills, and abilities required for competent performance by beginning teachers are “Well” or “Very Well” represented by the TPEs as a whole (including all elements and narratives). In the full sample, only 2.0% of respondents indicated that important knowledge, skills, and abilities are poorly represented in the TPEs as a whole.

The average representativeness of the TPEs as a whole is 3.93 for female respondents and 3.73 for male respondents, both well above 3.0. There are enough respondents in the Latino, Mexican, and White ethnic/racial subgroups to calculate the average representativeness of the TPEs as a whole. These values are 4.00, 4.11, and 3.85, respectively.

Table 29. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Overall Representativeness–Full Survey Sample

Full Sample																
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6										Number of Respondents: 2712						
	Response Distribution (in %)															
	Representativeness Ratings				Relative					Adjusted						
	N	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	NR	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
	640	3.90	.94	.04	76.4	.5	1.4	4.7	10.5	6.5	2.0	5.8	20.0	44.7	27.5	

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=Poorly, 2=Somewhat, 3=Adequately, 4=Well, 5=Very well.

Table 30. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Overall Representativeness—Public School Teacher/Administrator Survey Sample

Teacher/Administrator																
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6							Number of Respondents: 2047									
	Representativeness Ratings				NR	Relative					Adjusted					
	N	Mean	S.D.	S.E.		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
	443	3.94	.86	.04		78.4	.3	.6	4.6	10.3	5.7		1.6	2.9	21.4	47.6

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=Poorly, 2=Somewhat, 3=Adequately, 4=Well, 5=Very well.

Table 31. Descriptive Statistics for TPE Overall Representativeness—Teacher Educator Survey Sample

Teacher Educator																
California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey																
Number of Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs): 6							Number of Respondents: 665									
	Representativeness Ratings				NR	Relative					Adjusted					
	N	Mean	S.D.	S.E.		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
	197	3.80	1.09	.08		70.4	.9	3.6	5.0	11.3	8.9		3.0	12.2	16.8	38.1

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation, S.E. = Standard error of the mean, NR = Non-response percent. Rating scale anchors are: 1=Poorly, 2=Somewhat, 3=Adequately, 4=Well, 5=Very well.

Subgroup Comparisons—TPE Overall Representativeness

The set of TPEs as a whole received an average rating of 3.0 or higher in all subgroups. Therefore, we did not include the tabled results in this report.

Chapter 10. TPE Element Calculated Criticality

We created a criticality value for each TPE element, using a formula that takes into account both importance and frequency judgments, but gives more weight to importance, as follows:

$$\text{Criticality} = (2 \times \text{Importance}) + \text{Frequency}$$

This is a common approach for combining importance and frequency ratings. The criticality value can range from 3.0 to 15.0.

We then defined a criticality threshold as those TPE elements that received:

- a frequency rating of higher than “never” from at least 90% of respondents, keeping in mind that respondents were evaluating the elements for beginning teachers and
- an average criticality rating of 8.0 or higher.

Figure 5 shows the criticality value associated with each possible combination of importance and frequency, and the highlighted cells depict combinations that would surpass the criticality threshold.

Figure 5. Illustration of rating combinations and their relationship to the criticality threshold.

Importance Rating	Frequency Rating				
	1 Never	2 Rarely	3 Sometimes	4 Very Often	5 Continuously
1=No importance/Not performed	3	4	5	6	7
2=Little importance	5	6	7	8	9
3=Moderate importance	7	8	9	10	11
4=Great importance	9	10	11	12	13
5=Very great importance	11	12	13	14	15

Note. Cell values are calculated as follows: Criticality = (2 x Importance) + Frequency. TPE elements with an average criticality value ≥ 8.0 are defined as “critical.” Combinations of importance and time spent that will meet or exceed this threshold are highlighted in green.

This criticality information does not override the importance ratings for the TPE elements described earlier. It simply provides another way to look at the data that takes into account both how important a TPE element is and how often it is performed.

Critical TPE Elements

Table 32 shows that all of the TPE elements surpass the criticality threshold in the full sample, the Public School Teacher/Administrator sample, and the Teacher Educator sample. Appendix D shows the same information for many additional subgroups. With minor exceptions that could easily be anomalies, all of the TPE elements surpass the criticality threshold in all subgroups. A couple of elements with relatively large proportions of respondents indicating that the element is not performed by beginning teachers—TPE 3, Element 8 and TPE 6, Element 8—do not meet the criticality threshold in two or three subgroups. Often, there are very few respondents in the subgroup, so the results could be unstable. In general, the survey results suggest that all of the TPE elements are critical for beginning teachers.

Calculated TPE Element Criticality Highlights

All of the TPE elements surpass the criticality threshold in all of the samples listed below:

- Full sample
- Public School Teacher/ Administrator sample
- Teacher Educator sample
- Multiple Subject respondents
- Special Education primary assignment

Furthermore, all but one or two TPE elements surpass the criticality threshold in all remaining subgroups. When an element missed the threshold, it was due to slightly fewer than 90% of respondents in the subgroup indicating that beginning teachers perform the element. In most instances when this occurred, the sample on which the analysis is based is quite small, so the findings are likely an artifact or small sample size.

There is no evidence that any of the elements are not critical for some beginning teachers.

Table 32. Critical TPE Elements-Full, Public School Teacher/Administrator, and Teacher Educator Samples

California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey														
Number of TPEs: 6		Full Sample (N=2712)				Teachers/Administrators (N=2047)					Teacher Educators (N=665)			
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Criticality Score		Meets Criteria	N	Criticality Score		Meets Criteria	N	Criticality Score		Meets Criteria	
			Mean	S.D.			Mean	S.D.			Mean	S.D.		
1	1	931	12.41	2.08	P	673	12.18	2.07	P	258	13.02	1.99	P	
	2	896	12.54	1.95	P	644	12.50	1.94	P	252	12.65	1.99	P	
	3	882	12.83	1.89	P	638	12.69	1.88	P	244	13.20	1.88	P	
	4	865	12.00	2.30	P	622	11.80	2.30	P	243	12.49	2.21	P	
	5	858	12.67	1.98	P	617	12.54	2.00	P	241	12.99	1.91	P	
	6	845	12.19	2.26	P	609	11.96	2.31	P	236	12.79	2.00	P	
	7	833	10.82	2.59	P	601	10.67	2.50	P	232	11.21	2.77	P	
	8	825	13.35	1.86	P	596	13.30	1.85	P	229	13.50	1.88	P	
2	1	918	12.58	2.13	P	666	12.50	2.08	P	252	12.80	2.26	P	
	2	895	12.38	2.13	P	643	12.18	2.12	P	252	12.89	2.08	P	
	3	868	13.21	1.86	P	624	13.12	1.83	P	244	13.43	1.92	P	
	4	854	11.36	2.40	P	615	11.18	2.38	P	239	11.81	2.40	P	
	5	840	13.27	1.79	P	604	13.17	1.81	P	236	13.53	1.73	P	
	6	840	13.72	1.63	P	602	13.70	1.62	P	238	13.76	1.66	P	
3	1	926	13.03	1.92	P	687	12.94	1.94	P	239	13.27	1.85	P	
	2	900	12.39	2.11	P	663	12.22	2.14	P	237	12.84	1.97	P	
	3	874	11.97	2.36	P	639	11.81	2.36	P	235	12.40	2.33	P	
	4	857	12.35	2.09	P	629	12.31	2.07	P	228	12.47	2.14	P	
	5	828	12.50	2.01	P	606	12.31	2.04	P	222	13.01	1.83	P	
	6	815	11.67	2.30	P	593	11.53	2.25	P	222	12.03	2.42	P	
	7	805	11.31	2.41	P	587	11.28	2.37	P	218	11.37	2.50	P	
	8	795	9.84	3.00	P	580	9.66	3.02	P	215	10.32	2.91	P	
4	1	949	11.95	2.31	P	691	11.74	2.28	P	258	12.54	2.28	P	
	2	910	11.06	2.52	P	658	10.72	2.46	P	252	11.94	2.48	P	
	3	886	11.85	2.30	P	639	11.65	2.28	P	247	12.37	2.28	P	
	4	861	12.40	2.10	P	621	12.26	2.09	P	240	12.76	2.08	P	

(continued)

Table 32. Critical TPE Elements-Full, Public School Teacher/Administrator, and Teacher Educator Samples (continued)

California Teaching Performance Expectations Survey													
Number of TPEs: 6		Full Sample (N=2712)				Teachers/Administrators (N=2047)				Teacher Educators (N=665)			
TPE Number	Element Number	N	Criticality Score		Meets Criteria	N	Criticality Score		Meets Criteria	N	Criticality Score		Meets Criteria
			Mean	S.D.			Mean	S.D.			Mean	S.D.	
	5	840	11.71	2.32	P	608	11.57	2.34	P	232	12.06	2.22	P
	6	826	11.99	2.33	P	597	12.03	2.33	P	229	11.87	2.32	P
	7	807	12.58	1.96	P	583	12.45	1.95	P	224	12.92	1.95	P
	8	804	11.40	2.40	P	581	11.34	2.39	P	223	11.55	2.40	P
	9	791	10.48	2.48	P	569	10.42	2.47	P	222	10.61	2.53	P
5	1	907	12.49	2.06	P	667	12.28	2.05	P	240	13.07	2.00	P
	2	877	12.35	2.17	P	641	12.16	2.20	P	236	12.87	2.02	P
	3	865	11.76	2.25	P	633	11.54	2.26	P	232	12.35	2.11	P
	4	848	11.59	2.32	P	618	11.52	2.32	P	230	11.77	2.32	P
	5	838	12.19	1.98	P	613	12.09	1.98	P	225	12.48	1.93	P
	6	817	11.20	2.40	P	595	10.96	2.44	P	222	11.82	2.20	P
	7	802	11.44	2.37	P	586	11.15	2.44	P	216	12.21	1.97	P
	8	784	12.27	2.06	P	570	12.09	2.07	P	214	12.76	1.96	P
6	1	945	12.76	2.02	P	689	12.61	2.05	P	256	13.19	1.88	P
	2	906	12.35	2.08	P	660	12.32	2.06	P	246	12.44	2.15	P
	3	876	11.80	2.20	P	635	11.69	2.17	P	241	12.09	2.26	P
	4	846	13.04	1.98	P	614	13.01	1.98	P	232	13.13	1.98	P
	5	840	12.55	2.11	P	604	12.51	2.13	P	236	12.67	2.04	P
	6	825	12.56	2.07	P	590	12.42	2.08	P	235	12.89	2.00	P
	7	810	12.82	2.03	P	581	12.84	1.96	P	229	12.79	2.20	P
	8	805	9.38	2.87	P	575	9.13	2.85	P	230	10.02	2.82	P

Note. S.D. = Standard deviation

Chapter 11. Content Analysis of Open-Ended Survey Comments

Content Analysis Methodology

Collectively, 2,712 survey respondents provided almost 4,000 comments on TPEs, TPE elements, TPE narratives, and the overall TPE document. Most respondents did not provide any comments, but many respondents provided multiple comments. The content analysis of the comments focused on those TPE elements that garnered comments from 1% or more of the overall survey respondents ($N \geq 27$). Table 33 lists, by number, the TPE elements where 1% or more of respondents provided comments. The entire set of comments for all open-ended questions on the survey is provided in a separate document (Excel® file: "TPE Survey Comments_All.xlsx").

In the survey, teachers/administrators and teacher educators were asked to rate each TPE element on its importance, its clarity, and its frequency using a 1-5 Likert scale. Possible responses to the *importance* question (How important are the pedagogical knowledge, skills, and abilities described by this element for competently performing the job of a beginning teacher during the first few months of teaching in California?) were: (1) No importance/Not performed, (2) Little importance, (3) Moderate importance, (4) Great importance, or (5) Very great importance. Response choices for the *clarity* question (Do you agree that the pedagogical knowledge, skills, and abilities in this element are written clearly?) were: (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree. For both of the questions, if a respondent rated it lower than a "3," then they were asked to provide an explanation. Note that comments were not requested for low ratings on the frequency scale.

After a first pass through the comments, it was apparent that comments directed at clarity were rich in specific suggestions for revising, adding to, or deleting information from the TPE element statements. Therefore, content analysts concentrated first on coding comments that accompanied clarity ratings and then turned to the importance comments. Each comment was coded with one of four possibilities: "A" if the comment provided a specific addition to the wording of the TPE element, "D" if the comment suggested a specific deletion in the TPE element, "R" if the comment provided a specific revision to the wording of the TPE element, and "O" for "other." For instance, the "other" code was used if the comment was (a) a general statement and did not suggest a specific change to the TPE/element wording, (b) vague, or (c) was not relevant to the question. The results of this coding exercise, along with the original comments, are provided in Appendix E. The comments are organized by TPE/element and those comments with specific suggestions for additions, deletions or revisions are listed first, followed by comments coded as "O."

Content summaries of the clarity comments are provided below for each TPE/element for which more than 1% of the respondents provided comments.

Table 33. TPE Elements by Number of Survey Comments (>1% of Respondents Commented)

TPE	Element	# of Clarity Comments	# of Importance Comments
1	1	57	--
1	2	29	--
1	4	67	30
1	6	69	28
1	7	29	46
2	1	61	29
2	2	27	--
2	3	41	--
2	4	39	42
2	5	37	--
3	1	32	--
3	2	48	--
3	3	64	30
3	4	46	--
3	5	42	--
3	6	45	28
3	7	32	36
3	8	52	111
4	1	48	29
4	2	38	43
4	3	47	31
4	4	56	--
4	5	44	31
4	7	33	--
4	8	--	43
4	9	--	62
5	1	42	--
5	4	--	35
5	6	44	42
5	7	--	34
6	1	40	--
6	2	35	27
6	3	59	--
6	4	61	--
6	5	33	--
6	6	50	--
6	7	36	--
6	8	29	106
Total =		1512	863

Content Summaries for Comments on Clarity of TPE Elements

TPE 1: Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning

TPE 1, Element 1: The most common issue respondents addressed was the meaning of “funds of knowledge.” Many requested that the term either be defined or not used (and replaced with less ambiguous wording). Other comments provided specific suggestions for rewording the element. Seven respondents offered comments to add, delete, or revise information for this TPE element.

TPE 1, Element 2: The focus of comments was twofold: (a) there was a general concern that all teachers and/or students and families may not have technology to communicate; (b) also, several respondent suggested that the element should emphasize “positive” communications. In all, nine respondents offered specific input on revisions to this element.

TPE 1, Element 3: Less than 1% of participants commented on this element.

TPE 1, Element 4: Most of the comments for this element addressed the terms “Universal Design” and “Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS)” —many did not know their meaning. Of more than 60 comments proffered, five gave specific suggestions for adding, deleting, or revising this element.

TPE 1, Element 5: Less than 1% of participants commented on this element.

TPE 1, Element 6: Of all the TPE 1 elements, this one had the most comments. The majority of respondents said that the element statement (a) was too long, (b) addressed more than one concept, and (c) needed to be broken up into more than one sentence. There were 17 comments that offered mostly specific revision suggestions.

TPE 1, Element 7: Comments regarding this element (a) questioned the incorporation of VAPA across the range of subjects (e.g., How does a high school math teacher incorporate VAPA into lessons?), (b) noted that the requirement was addressed in other TPEs, and (c) suggested VAPA be removed from the element. Six comments addressed specific additions, deletions, or revisions to the element.

TPE 1, Element 8: Less than 1% of participants commented on this element.

TPE 2: Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning

TPE 2, Element 1: Many comments directed to this element focused on the term “restorative justice.” Respondents mentioned (a) that they were unfamiliar with the term, (b) that the term was too ambiguous or undefined, and/or (c) that the skills required to apply restorative justice were too advanced for a beginning teacher. Out of 61 comments addressing the clarity of this element, seven provided specific additions, deletions, or revisions.

TPE 2, Element 2: Respondents commented that (a) the term “culturally responsive” was unclear, (b) the requirements were not outlined clearly for beginning teachers, and (c) the requirements may not be measurable. Only one respondent offered a specific revision of the element wording.

TPE 2, Element 3: Respondents commented that (a) the element statement is too “wordy” and vague, (b) beginning teachers would not understand or be able to apply this requirement, and (c) requirements such as classroom management and developmentally appropriate instruction should be added. Six comments offered revisions or additions to the element.

TPE 2, Element 4: Many commenters agreed that this element is an essential component of teachers’ skills. Concerns ranged from (a) whether beginning teachers will have the skills and/or resources to support students in these situations, (b) that these responsibilities should be addressed by school counselors, and (c) that there should be a more specific protocol in place to identify available resources. Of the almost 40 comments on the clarity of this element, only five comments suggested additions or revision.

TPE 2, Element 5: Several commenters remarked that “high expectations” needed clarification; that is, how would high expectations be measured? Another component said to be vague was the term “appropriate support.” Several comments asked that it be defined more specifically. One commenter suggested adding language to clarify “IEPs, IFSPs, or 504 plans,” and three other commenters provided revision suggestions.

TPE 2, Element 6: Less than 1% of participants commented on this element.

TPE 3: Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning

TPE 3, Element 1: Specific revisions typically involved including standards other than California state standards. Additional clarification on the most important standard(s) was also requested. Five comments offered revision or additions to the element.

TPE 3, Element 2: The predominant concern was the focus on the listed examples. Comments requested the addition of (a) gifted students and (b) each individual student’s background. Commenters also asked that acronyms be defined. There were 13 comments that offered mostly specific revision suggestions.

TPE 3, Element 3: Removing the focus on visual and performing arts was the modal suggestion. Commenters suggested either deleting this portion of the element or including a broader focus on integration of various subjects. Of more than 60 comments proffered, 12 gave specific suggestions for adding, deleting, or revising this element.

TPE 3, Element 4: A large portion of comments asked for the meaning of “multiple means of representation.” Other comments addressed the overabundance of information in the element. There were 12 comments that offered suggestions for adding, deleting, or revising this element.

TPE 3, Element 5: Most comments focused on reducing the length and complexity of the element. Comments also questioned the meaning of the concepts (a) adapt, (b) academic language, and (c) least restrictive environment. Ten comments offered revision or additions to the element.

TPE 3, Element 6: Commenters described the specification of “in-person and online” as being unnecessary and requested its removal. Other comments suggested reordering information in the element. There were 17 comments that offered mostly specific revision suggestions.

TPE 3, Element 7: Most comments questioned the listed aspects of digital citizenship by (a) requesting the addition of other aspects (e.g., cyber bullying); (b) requesting the definition of

current aspects, especially creative commons license; or (c) questioning the applicability or feasibility of teaching the suggested aspects. Only five respondents offered a specific addition or revision to the element wording.

TPE 3, Element 8: The modal request was a better description of the standards listed. One common suggestion was to add links to external sources of information. Nine comments offered revision or additions to the element.

TPE 4: Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students

TPE 4, Element 1: The idea that locating information is ambiguous was a common theme. Respondents asked for examples of how to locate or generate information. Other comments suggested that the element had too many parts. Eight comments offered revision or additions to the element.

TPE 4, Element 2: Comments for this element included two themes: (a) “from birth through adolescence” is likely too broad for any one teacher and (b) the meaning of “atypical” is unclear. Seven comments gave specific suggestions for adding, deleting, or revising this element.

TPE 4, Element 3: Comments focused on the limited list of subjects explicitly mentioned and suggested adding Art or Social Studies. Respondents also said that the word “interconnectedness” should be replaced. Some comments simply suggested grammar changes. In all, 20 respondents offered specific input on revisions to this element.

TPE 4, Element 4: The order and number of listed bullet points were the main sources of comment. Another common concern was the fact that the fourth bullet focused only on modifications and not on accommodations. There were 12 comments that offered mostly specific revision suggestions.

TPE 4, Element 5: Respondents questioned the implication that the mentioned plans, such as IEPs, are examples of transition plans, as they are independent. Additionally, respondents disliked the juxtaposition of “students” and “students with specific learning needs” in the same sentence. Eight comments offered revisions or additions to the element.

TPE 4, Element 6: Less than 1% of participants commented on this element.

TPE 4, Element 7: Most comments requested that “communication strategies and activity modes,” or just “activity modes,” be defined or replaced. Other comments suggested reordering or revising the sentence parts. Nine comments offered revisions or additions to the element.

TPE 4, Element 8: Less than 1% of participants commented on this element.

TPE 4, Element 9: Less than 1% of participants commented on this element.

TPE 5: Assessing Student Learning

TPE 5, Element 1: Comments included three general critiques of the element. First, the element was said to communicate unrealistic, or unclear, expectations for new teachers. That is, designing and administering assessments is a skill learned over a period of time. Second, respondents had concerns about terminology and sentence structure. Some suggested revising the list of assessment types, explaining that new teachers would not be familiar with all the

types listed. Others thought the element was saying that scoring rubrics were a type of assessment, rather than a tool for developing assessments. Third, several respondents questioned how “apply knowledge,” as the criterion, would be measured, especially in the context of evaluating new teachers. Nine respondents provided specific suggestions for adding, deleting, or revising this element.

TPE 5, Element 2: Less than 1% of participants commented on this element.

TPE 5, Element 3: Less than 1% of participants commented on this element.

TPE 5, Element 4: Less than 1% of participants commented on this element.

TPE 5, Element 5: Less than 1% of participants commented on this element.

TPE 5, Element 6: A number of comments reflected general confusion about the element. First, respondents said the role of the teacher in working with the specialist was unclear; that is, what exactly is the teacher in terms of interpreting assessments? Related comments indicated confusion over who should be considered to be a “specialist.” Some reported that specialists would not be available. Second, the element did not appear to serve well as a stand-alone requirement to many respondents. Several wanted to combine it with Elements 7 and/or 8, which would expand the teacher requirement beyond simply classifying students. One responder suggested that the narrative communicated a purpose other than student classification, and that the element was inconsistent with the TPE. Third, several respondents took issue with the wording of the element as it related to students with disabilities: they did not consent to the apparent equating of ELs with students with disabilities. Four respondents provided specific suggestions for adding, deleting, or revising this element.

TPE 6: Developing as a Professional Educator

TPE 6, Element 1: Many respondents asked for more clarity on the meaning of reflection, teaching practices, and pedagogical knowledge within the context of the element. This included requests to state the element in more concrete, day-to-day terms. Five respondents provided specific suggestions for adding, deleting, or revising this element.

TPE 6, Element 2: Though most commenters reported understanding the intent, they also expressed overall dissatisfaction with the wording of this element. Mainly, the terminology was viewed as including too much technical jargon, as reflected in this suggested revision: “Learn practical tips from veteran teachers.” Additionally, respondents thought the phrase “by routinely engaging in communication and inquiry with colleagues” was too limiting; other resources and activities were not mentioned. Further, some commenters asked for clarification on the meaning of “colleagues.” A number of comments specifically requested that teachers be pointed toward experienced colleagues. Five respondents provided specific suggestions for adding, deleting, or revising this element.

TPE 6, Element 3: Comments indicate that the overall intent of the statement was unclear. First, the use of the verb “demonstrate” led some to ask if the element was asking teachers to show (i.e., demonstrate to) others how to communicate, as opposed to just communicating (i.e., the intended meaning). Second, commenters asked for clarification of the meaning of “other adults,” what it means to involve other adults, and the purposes for involving other adults. One commenter wanted to know if involving other adults was intended to support (a) student and teacher learning or (b) student learning and teacher performance. Overall, comments can be

interpreted as suggesting that the two base actions of involving other adults and communicating with other adults should be combined into a single action to clarify the requirement. Five respondents provided specific suggestions for adding, deleting, or revising this element.

TPE 6, Element 4: Comments dealt mainly with the breadth and legitimacy of the element, as written. First, numerous respondents suggested that the two base requirements (i.e., demonstrating responsibility and maintaining ethical conduct) were too distinct to be combined into a single element. Second, commenters expressed resistance to holding teachers responsible for student outcomes, as there are other determinants of those outcomes; the requirement was called “unreasonable” more than once, and teachers were said to share the responsibility for student outcomes with the entire school community. Third, some respondents questioned the potential and methods for measuring the requirements included in the element. Fourth, a commenter asked for clarification of the terms “positive disposition,” “fairness,” “acceptance.” Eight respondents provided specific suggestions for adding, deleting, or revising this element.

TPE 6, Element 5: Comments focused on the need to define the meaning of “mandated reporters” and to clarify implied responsibilities and how the element will be measured. Some respondents explained that new teachers are often not trained comprehensively on reporting requirements and that opportunity to “enact” reporting behaviors may not always arise during a given period of time. Only three respondents provided specific suggestions for adding, deleting, or revising this element.

TPE 6, Element 6: The most frequently commented on aspect of this element was its inclusion of two very distinct requirements (i.e., addressing own values/biases and addressing student behavior). Additionally, several comments reflected a desire to expand the list of student intolerance/harassment exemplars provided at the end of the element. Finally, several commenters noted that recognizing one’s own biases is difficult, and that it is especially so for young teachers. Nine respondents provided specific suggestions for adding, deleting, or revising this element.

TPE 6, Element 7: On this element, comments mainly asked for additional clarification. Requests included defining the meaning of “responsible use of social media, specifying the source(s) of relevant laws, and clarifying what is meant by “moral fitness.” However, several respondents took issue with the use of the term “moral fitness,” noting that they believe it contains baggage from its past use in other contexts, regardless of how it might be defined in the present context. Six respondents provided specific suggestions for adding, deleting, or revising this element.

TPE 6, Element 8: The main thread running through comments on this element was that the requirement to understand the history of public education in California is not a necessity for teachers. Some said that it would be more appropriate as an objective for a preparation program. Most teacher/administrator commenters suggested the requirement is irrelevant to their day-to-day performance and of low priority. Others asked what, specifically, teachers would be required to know and understand. It was suggested that “possessing an awareness of” would be a more appropriate requirement than “understanding.” Only one respondent provided a specific suggestion for revising this element.

Comments on Importance of TPE Elements

Our analysts coded more than 850 comments that respondents had made to provide explanation of low importance ratings across the TPE elements. However, the majority of these comments did not offer specific guidance to revise the elements, so no content summaries are provided. The coded comments can be found in Appendix F.

In comparing the survey comments to the survey ratings results, we examined the comments for the two TPE/elements with the lowest importance rating (TPE3, Element 8 and TPE 6, Element 8). As seen in the comments listed in Appendix F, only one respondent suggested that TPE3, Element 8 be dropped. For TPE6, Element 8 there were no specific suggestions to drop the element, although many did remark that the requirement may not be appropriate for a beginning teacher.

Chapter 12: TPE Focus Group Data Collection

Data Collection Method

In April 2016, focus groups were conducted across the state of California in San Jose, Los Angeles, Ventura, Sacramento, and San Diego. Evaluation Systems invited stakeholders (i.e., teacher educators, teachers, and administrators) to participate and reserved the meeting sites. As seen in Table 34, the number of focus groups held at each location was dependent on the number of participating educators. Conducted as part of the California Council on Teacher Education (CCTE) Spring 2016 Conference, the San Jose focus group had the most participants, and so was divided into four separate sessions. A facilitator and note taker were present at each session. In San Jose, focus group sessions lasted one hour each; at the remaining locations, sessions ran for two hours. Lead facilitators used a common set of questions in all sessions; see Appendix G. Location meeting sites, lead facilitators, and date and times of the focus groups are presented in Table 35.

Table 34. Focus Group Locations and Number of Participants

Location	Total # Participants	# of Focus Group Sessions
San Jose	80	4
Los Angeles	31	3
Ventura	13	1
Sacramento	3	1
San Diego	7	1

Table 35. Focus Group Sites, Facilitators, and Meeting Details

	Meeting Site	Lead Facilitator(s)	Date	Start	End
1	Sainte Claire Hotel, San Jose	Nicole Amador, Matt Anderson, Mariah Carlile, Liz Presley	4/1/16	3:15 pm	4:15 pm
2	National University, Los Angeles Campus	Nicole Amador, Matt Anderson, Liz Presley	4/8/16	12:30 pm	2:30 pm
3	Ventura County Office of Education	Tina Frushour	4/21/16	4:30 pm	6:30 pm
4	Sacramento County Office of Education	Nicole Amador	4/19/16	4:30 pm	6:30 pm
5	San Diego County Office of Education	Tina Frushour	4/28/16	4:30 pm	6:30 pm

The following sections describe the focus group participant demographics, content analysis methodology, and content analysis results.

Focus Group Demographics

The demographics of the focus groups, presented in Table 36, are broken out by focus group location. Overall, 134 stakeholders participated in the focus groups. The gender breakout of participants shows 103 female participants (76.9%) and 24 male participants (17.9%). The highest attended location was San Jose (N=80, 59.7%) and the lowest was Sacramento (N=3, 2.2%). Ethnicity breakouts show that the majority of participants were White (N=101, 75.4%), Latino/Latin American/Puerto Rican/Other Hispanic (N=6, 4.5%), and Mexican

American/Chicano (N=5, 3.7%). The top three regions represented were Los Angeles (N=32, 23.9%), the Bay Area (N=27, 20.2%), and Southern California (N=23, 17.2%). Note that the counts for teachers and teacher educators add up to more than 134 participants. There was not a specific question on the demographic questionnaire requesting this information; rather respondents were asked to provide years of teaching experience and years of teacher educator experience—many had both. In fact, several questions on the questionnaire had multiple responses that were acceptable; hence the totals for some categories may not equal the total number of respondents.

Table 36. Focus Group Demographics

	San Jose	Los Angeles	Ventura	Sacramento	San Diego	Total
Total Participated	80	31	13	3	7	134
Ethnicity						
African American/Black	1	1	1	0	0	3
Asian Indian American/Asian Indian	2	0	0	0	0	2
Cambodian American/Cambodian	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chinese American/Chinese	2	0	0	0	0	2
Filipino American/Filipino	2	0	0	0	0	2
Guamanian	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0
Japanese American/Japanese	1	2	0	0	0	3
Korean American/Korean	2	1	0	0	0	3
Laotian American/Laotian	0	0	0	0	0	0
Latino/Latin American/Puerto Rican/Other Hispanic	5	0	0	1	0	6
Mexican American/Chicano	4	0	1	0	0	5
Native American/American Indian/Alaskan Native	2	0	0	0	0	2
Other	1	0	0	0	0	1
Other Pacific Island American/Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Southeast Asian American/Southeast Asian (e.g., Hmong, Khmer)	1	0	0	0	0	1
Samoan	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vietnamese American/Vietnamese	0	0	0	0	0	0
White, not Hispanic	55	25	12	2	7	101
Gender						
Female	63	23	11	0	6	103
Male	11	8	2	2	1	24

(continued)

Table 36. Focus Group Demographics (continued)

	San Jose	Los Angeles	Ventura	Sacramento	San Diego	Total
Total Participated	80	31	13	3	7	134
Region						
Bay	24	3	0	0	0	27
Capital	2	3	0	3	0	8
Central Valley	8	3	0	0	0	11
Costa Del Sur	2	2	10	0	0	14
Delta Sierra	1	0	0	0	0	1
Los Angeles	18	11	3	0	0	32
North Coast	5	0	0	0	0	5
Northeastern	0	0	0	0	0	0
RIMS	1	1	0	0	2	4
South Bay	3	0	0	0	0	3
Southern	12	7	0	0	4	23
Other	1	0	0	0	0	1
Profession*						
Teacher	38	8	8	0	4	58
Teacher Educator	70	29	8	0	4	111
Years of Teaching Experience (Teachers)*						
Less than 2	2	1	0	0	0	3
2-5	2	0	0	0	0	2
6-9	2	2	3	0	0	7
10 or more years	32	5	5	0	4	46
Primary Teaching Assignment (Teachers)						
General education in a self-contained classroom	13	7	0	0	1	21
General education in departmentalized classes	9	1	5	0	2	17
Exclusively special education in a self-contained classroom	8	1	1	0	0	10
Exclusively special education in a resource room	5	1	1	0	0	7
Other	4	1	0	0	0	5
Grade Levels of Expertise (Teachers)*						
Elementary (TK-6)	7	1	1	0	1	10
Middle (4-8)	11	1	3	0	2	17
High (9-12)	4	1	4	0	3	12
All (K-12)	15	2	6	0	4	27

(continued)

Table 36. Focus Group Demographics (continued)

	San Jose	Los Angeles	Ventura	Sacramento	San Diego	Total
Total Participated	80	31	13	3	7	134
Grade Levels of Expertise (Teacher Educators)*						
Elementary (TK-6)	12	4	1	0	0	17
Middle (4-8)	21	6	2	0	1	30
High (9-12)	10	1	2	0	1	14
All (K-12)	26	7	3	0	2	38
Years of Teacher Educator Experience (Teacher Educators)*						
Less than 2	9	2	2	1	0	14
2-5	11	6	1	0	1	19
6-9	11	6	1	0	0	18
10 or more years	39	15	4	2	3	63
California Commission-approved Teacher Preparation Program (Teacher Educators)*						
California State University	35	6	3	1	2	47
California State University Intern Program	5	0	1	0	1	7
Private College/University	30	22	2	0	0	54
Private College/University Intern Program	18	7	0	0	1	26
University of California	5	0	1	1	1	8
University of California Intern Program	1	0	0	0	0	1
District Intern Program	1	1	1	1	1	5
Other	2	1	1	0	0	4

*Totals for this category may not equal the total number of respondents because the question had multiple acceptable responses.

Content Analysis Methodology

Focus group discussions were transcribed into summary notes by at least one note taker per session. The summary notes were then carefully analyzed and content-coded to identify themes for each TPE overall and each TPE element. For a topic to be considered thematic, it had to have at least two associated comments. The following section presents the themes and summary notes (i.e., supporting comments) by (a) overall themes across TPE, (b) themes for each TPE, and (c), themes for TPE elements. Finally, a question in the focus group protocol that was asked at most of the sessions was as follows: “If a common trunk of knowledge was developed for general education and special education teachers, are these TPEs appropriate for special education teachers?” Themes from responses to this question are found at the end of the section.

The order of the themes under each heading is based on the number of comments from a focus group (one per bullet) related to the theme. Themes are listed in descending order (those with the most bullets are first).

Content Analysis Results

Overall Themes (with supporting comments)

Unrealistic expectations - Requirements are overwhelming for beginning teachers

- Are these TPE what our candidates are expected to know how to do? There are 53 bullet points. This is supposed to be streamlined. Overwhelming.
- Shocked by the information. It is overwhelming.
- When we look at these elements I really think they are describing very experienced practicing teacher. For them to be more realistic for a beginning teacher there needs to be a way to say what's the first step in moving towards this. They are important for teaching, but this is a lot for a beginning teacher.
- The depths of each one of these steps don't indicate the knowledge and skills of a beginning teacher but rather, skills that are developed over a long period of practice. If I, as a potential teacher beginning a program saw these, I would run for the door.

TPEs should reflect a developmental pathway/continuum for beginning teachers

- Thinking of this as first couple years, where new teachers need to be, when they finish teacher prep and take TPA, awareness yes, but able to do...the CSTs are developmental, get there over time
- Thought the TPEs were being aligned to the CSTPs so that there is a continuum of practice: so beginning teachers it would look like this for them, for people at the end of induction it would look like this, and for experienced teachers it would look different still.
- Need to clarify. They are in an emerging, developing context. Look with different lenses at each stage.
- This might represent pathways, candidates do not all look the same.

Positive reaction to the structure of the draft TPE document

- More readable version; "people might actually read these now"
- These seem to be less repetitive; appreciate getting the chance to start from scratch
- More concise document
- It makes sense to place elements prior to the narrative.

Align narrative in same order as elements under each TPE

- Alignment of Elements and Narrative - group wanted the narrative to follow in the same order as the elements
- Narrative to follow elements and order should be the same

Add glossary to the TPE document

- Need accommodations and modifications in glossary.
- We need a glossary.

TPE 1: Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning

General themes for TPE 1:

Suggested changes to wording or structure of this TPE

- It might be better to say based on research ('for example' versus 'including'), since they could change over time.

- Some too wordy and vague.
- Elements could be simplified to be less overwhelming.
- Each element needs to focus on one thing.

Agreement that the TPE is at the right level for beginning teachers

- Should be clear to a beginning teacher.
- Appreciated the specificity for new teachers and funds of knowledge. Experienced teachers know those things, but new teachers need them outlined.
- See this as an invitation for teachers to step up, to walk into a door of a profession that is meeting the needs of all students, to access and equity. All beginning teachers need to be held accountable to provide evidence that all students are learning on day one. All students learning is helping to define what this needs to look like, raising the bar, and knowing all students.

Under- or overemphasis of certain student groups should be addressed

- Bilingual standards - Will there be a separate process? Will there be some elements in the TPEs about bilingual. Don't see it.
- Need to explicitly state "bilingual child/learner," or will be forgotten.
- Why are advanced learners not mentioned? Much agreement.

Concern about specific callout of visual and performing arts (VAPA)

- Interesting that visual and performing arts are inserted here, but under planning instruction, focus on math and science. Specifically referencing VAPA as vehicle to gain acceptance of it?
- Group agreed - One English teacher uses Visual arts everyday (as appropriate) is good.
- Do not like removal of VAPA based on 3/31 BRC recommendations.

Expectations for beginning teachers are too high

- Until you know the prior experiences of the student – find incredibly difficult to do. You learn students as you go. That's a stretch for a new teacher.
- I'd be surprised to see teachers with 3-5 years of experience operate at this level. If this is what the TPA is being built on, it's very scary. Most students will be somewhere on a continuum working toward this, but not meeting these levels.

TPE 1, Element 1:

Clarify "funds of knowledge" term

- Too complex beginning teacher is not going to understand what that means.
- "Funds of knowledge" should also include appreciating and validating students' first struggles, dialects, and languages.

TPE 1, Element 2:

Concern that some schools and some parents do not have access to technology

- Concern because not all families have technology, although the narrative clarified concern, but need to add "as appropriate" to the element.
- So much technology out there, was hoping that programs would have a program to teach/show. Families may not have access to technology.

TPE 1, Element 3:

No emergent theme(s)

TPE 1, Element 4:

No emergent theme(s)

TPE 1, Element 5:*Word change suggestions*

- Consider adding “reasoning” to #5. “Promote students’ critical and creative thinking, reasoning, and analysis....”
- Wary of the word “activities” because we’re trying to get away from activity-based teaching. Group thought, “Promote student’s critical and creative thinking and analysis though opportunities for inquiry, problem solving...” was better.

TPE 1, Element 6:*Shorten element, consider splitting into two or more elements*

- Element 6 – too explanatory. Could stop after “approaches.” Explanatory is better in narrative rather than element. And instead of listing specific, just say “For all learners”
- Is really lengthy; potential readability issues (missing the word “have”); better to be broken up, perhaps into 2 or 3 elements
- #6 has two different elements to it: Split to 6a, 6b (elements that support learning) covering two separate areas. A: “Provide a supportive...structured English immersion” and B: “Demonstrate an understanding of the difference...identified disability.”

TPE 1, Element 7:*Visual and performing arts (VAPA) should not be singled out*

- Calling out visual arts (VA) throughout document and why not other academic areas. Like narrative use of “arts integration” but having a standalone element seems out of place. It seems like an advocacy document. There was agreement in the room and reference to last year’s CTE meeting in San Diego. Too narrow, broaden.
- Why are we highlighting performing/visual arts? As a math educator it struck me as weird. Is there a hidden agenda, embedding the arts throughout?
- Why are we particularly pointing out the visual and performing arts; perhaps better to just take it out; perhaps including technology would be a better fit.

TPE 1, Element 8:*See suggested wording changes:*

- Could say “adjust/modify”
- Is language good? – wording on 8 – “while teaching” –is that in the middle of a lesson, during the career – is that a problem for anyone else?
- Need to be explicit, progress monitoring with data collection.

Narrative for TPE 1:

Narrative focuses heavily on English learners (ELs)

- Narrative seem highly focused on ELs, but not as much in the elements
- There's a lot of reference to Standard English and Standard English acquisition.

Visual and performing arts (VAPA) should not be singled out in the narrative

- Take out visual and performing arts, its limiting.
- VAPA why is it there? Is it an engagement strategy? Group agreed it doesn't belong there.

Consider removing mention of technology

- Use of technology, not sure why this is there, it may not belong.
- Some families do not have access to technology and thus this method should not be focused for communications with families.

TPE 2: Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning

General themes for TPE 2:

Clarify meaning of "trauma"

- How about, "Know how to support students who experience trauma (as a possible result of...)" and give some examples.
- Clarify what is trauma – 16 years ago trauma (like homelessness) was not addressed like it is today.
- Debate: It's not our place to define trauma, divorce for a child could be traumatic plus and/or medically fragile – need to include a student in a wheelchair in a gen ed classroom. Trying to be inclusive of all children.
- Kids who are incarcerated may not be traumatized as much as other students. Poverty would be #1 trauma according to research.
- Is this related to trauma research and ratings out now? ACES scale 1-4.

Change order of elements and edit language

- Language from the last sentence in TPE 6, Element 4 needs to go into TPE 2, element 1. "Caring, support, acceptance" needs to be first.
- Move element 6 up to #1, including language from TPE 6, element 4.
- #3 as #1, including caring, support, and acceptance language. Then #6 as new #2. Participants seemed to like this recommendation.
- Reorder as follows: 2, 6, 3, 1, 4, 5

Suggest adding more examples for describing "All Students"

- Instead of listing all students as a list every time, at the beginning of the TPEs list a comprehensive list of all students included throughout the rest of the TPEs.
- Concern that this will quickly become dated. How about just in caps "ALL STUDENTS."
- Listing All Students" is not sufficient, need to include "gifted, migrant, etc."
- Page 4 discusses what "all students" means but readers will only look at TPE 2 elements box. If so, they will miss important pieces.

Gender bias needs to be added

- Homophobia – gender bias needs to be added – to TPE 2 (sexism in glossary to add all projected categories).
- Gender assignment – group agrees: don't hide it in the glossary

Review inclusion of “restorative justice”

- Question about “Restorative Justice” definition. Too narrow. Should not be a specific philosophy. Remove “Restorative justice...practices”. Should be removed from narrative as well. If have to keep in due to political pressure use: (e.g., restorative justice, conflict resolution). Concern that terminology “restorative justice” may be outdated in 15 years.
- I agree 2-6, but 1 to me is very loaded language (restorative justice), falling in line with TPE 1.

Provide additional explanation in narrative

- Many of the elements would be better served in the narrative. Group agreed.
- Is the expectation that beginning teachers will be able to demonstrate ability to create both a physical and online environment or is it either/or? Beginning teacher wouldn't have opportunities to create both environments. Needs to be addressed in the narrative.

TPE 2, Element 1:

No emergent theme(s)

TPE 2, Element 2:

See suggested wording changes:

- Replace “reflect” with “embrace” – less passive.
- Clarify what it means to say “physical/online learning”.
- Do we need to have the word physical/online – virtual classes? You need to maintain both.
- We need to be careful with the language, not be so explicit to avoid being outdated in a few years. Restorative justice, SDAIE may be something different in 5-6 years.

TPE 2, Element 3:

Edit Elements 3 and 4 to be more cohesive

- 3 and 4 together: Better said in the narrative rather than the element.
- In Element 3 add supportive – “Establish, maintain, and monitor inclusive and supportive learning ...: that encapsulates 4 better. Then you could end Element 4 at trauma. Details of trauma should be part of narrative it doesn't need to be part of the element. Group agrees.

TPE 2, Element 4:

Provide more information regarding knowledge of medically fragile students

- Medically fragile: Mild/Mod candidates don't have that knowledge – Covered in Mod/Sev.
- Whole “medically fragile”, for use in special education that goes to medical care, not sure anyone in general education classroom would have that without support?
- Instead of “medically fragile” maybe are “under specialized care”.
- Why does medically fragile need to be in here?

Identify “need to access resources” rather than identifying specific types of trauma in element (list examples in narrative).

- The more you become specific about trauma “types”, the more privilege one problem over another.
- Discrete list? Or should be more general? Maybe make an e.g. list instead?
- Like how it indicates “how to access resources”
- Include “All students” then further list:
 - How do we assess list
 - Change to “Access resources to support all students” and use narrative to provide these examples. Listing in elements means we have to write program to address each and every one of these conditions
 - Should be about accessing resources, but not for each specific situation.

Include additional types of trauma

- Add something about bullying.
- Add experience with bullying. Identify explicitly. Needs to be addressed.
- Should we include “migrant children” – There is an endless list. The more you become specific, the more privilege one problem over another.

Narrow the focus of element requirements

- Big task, but is reality for many K-12 students.
- This element will be difficult. I don’t think our programs cover that range. That is something programs will need to add. I think they need to add to significant content.

TPE 2, Element 5:

Reduce redundancy with Element 4

- 5 seems redundant with 4.
- Is redundant, actually should be “Establish and Maintain...”

TPE 2, Element 6:

No emergent theme(s)

TPE 2 Narrative:

Order topics in narrative to match order of the elements

- Narrative – do not see a 1:1 relationship with elements
- Narrative for TPE1 was easy to follow. In TPE 2 it is lumped together. Group agrees it jumps around. Thought it was supposed to go on.
- Like to see the order of the narrative follow the order of the elements.

TPE 3: Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning

General themes for TPE 3:

Technology will not be available to all

- Very technology heavy...what about when there is no technology?

- Integrate technology is going to be a shift, how to use for student learning, how long programs have to get there: May not be here yet, but will get there.
- Elements 6 & 7 – the ability of new teachers to demonstrate these elements will be primarily based on their experience in student teaching, so many of our schools in which they'll be student teaching are very limited in technology. There is great disparity across CA in technology.

Streamline language in the elements, put details in the narrative

- Overall there is some language that is too specific. Take out all of the specifics.
- Idea of putting more concise but fewer words in elements and supplement with well-developed narrative. NAEYC (*National Association for the Education of Young Children*) standards does this well. Elements are one line and then a long narrative. Most of group agreed. Have narrative align with elements.
- Element 5 is very loaded with specific language

Elements 6 and 7 may be too advanced for beginning teachers

- The ability of new teachers to demonstrate these elements will be primarily based on their experience in student teaching, so many of our schools in which they'll be student teaching are very limited in technology. There is great disparity across CA in technology.
- Is it appropriate to expect a beginning teacher to have had enough formative assessment experiences for 6 & 7?

TPE 3, Element 1:

No emergent theme(s)

TPE 3, Element 2:

Provide more examples of student types (in parentheses)

- Examples are very restrictive
- What is listed or not listed, e.g., although they are important sources, there is a lot of other student background information that a candidate would want to consider. Several agreed – would be better served in the narrative?
- GATE and GIFT is left out.

Streamline language in element, put details in the narrative

- How about “Use knowledge and data about student...” and put details in the narrative.
- “Organize curriculum” is big area but is not mentioned in narrative; Need to blend general education and need more language in narrative.

Consider reordering elements

- Not sure about #2; seems like planning and instruction should come next.
- #2 is out of place.

TPE 3, Element 3:

Consider removing reference to “integrating visual and performing arts...”

- End after “sequences” Remove “including integrating the visual and performing arts”
- Visual and performing arts may be more applicable here, but can go either way on keeping it.

TPE 3, Element 4:

Clarify meaning, reviewers had trouble understanding

- Delete “in a range of ways”
- Restructure #4.
- First sentence...Purpose “Consult with others”, create professional community.
- Needs to be rewritten, we are spending too much time trying to interpret, should be very clear for beginning teacher
- “Multiple means of representation” what does this mean, is there another way to say this? “Show what they know.”

TPE 3, Element 5:

“All Students” language is restrictive (additional student groups should be called out)

- Does not address gifted and talented. Using term “least restrictive environment” references SPE
- Separate “full range of EL, Stand EL, students...” need this to be called out separately so that can inform program.

TPE 3, Element 6:

Clarify the term “in-person or online”

- “In Person/Online” versus “In person or Online”, not consistent.
- Is “in-person or online” needed or can it be deleted? Participants agreed with recommendation to delete.

TPE 3, Element 7:

No emergent theme(s) but many disparate comments from focus groups, listed below:

- Digital literacy is not where the student learns by the teacher using technology. Maybe 7 and 8 can be combined
- Last part “...and maintaining Internet security.” How?
- Digital literacy piece – many of our K-12 students have no access to digital tools.
- But if you take out the digital literacy, you’re creating a big gap for the future.
- I think this is a great piece (DL). If technology isn’t there now, it’s coming. I as an educator should know how to use and monitor it.
- Drifts completely away from 1, when you start talking about copyright laws, fair use, commons license.
- I disagree – I think this totally has to do with understanding and organizing subject matter.

TPE 3, Element 8:

No emergent theme(s)

TPE 3, Narrative:

Order of narrative should follow order of elements

- Narrative order does not match elements.

- Format of the narrative is not conducive to what it follows in the elements. Entire group agrees.

Typo identified

- Editorial note: Page 9, under Integrating Educational Technology, 2nd sentence missing 'to' after needs.

TPE 4: Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students

General Themes for TPE 4:

Requirements are too advanced for beginning teachers

- The focus group strongly believed that there are too many elements for a beginning teacher. They would prefer an assessment with terms like “emerging, developing, mastery” rather than a number. They strongly believed that a new, beginning teacher would not have all of these elements mastered
- Many participants thought that the quantity of elements would set the teacher candidates up for failure.

Note that some student groups are under- or overrepresented

- Overall there was a concern among all group members that not all groups of students were singled out in the TPEs. For instance, the special education students were singled out a lot in the TPEs, but the GATE or advanced students were not singled out. The folks in my room felt like all groups should be singled out.
- All populations thrown together.... Disservice to actual action required of teachers when not disaggregated. Heavily weighted on disabilities on 4 and 5. Not enough on ELs.

MTSS may not have longevity/question inclusion

- Universal Design and MTSS.... For longevity, may need to just describe systems generically rather than name so that last the test of time.
- Is “MTSS” a new buzz word that is here to stay for the next 20 years?

TPE 4 Element 1:

No emergent theme(s)

TPE 4 Element 2:

Prefer “birth through young adulthood” instead of “birth through adolescence”

- “Birth through adolescence” Why stop at adolescence? Many SPED students continue into early adulthood, up to age 22.
- Some credentials go beyond adolescence.
- Remove “birth through Adolescence”
- Adolescence to further explain (group likes young adults better). Birth through adulthood

TPE 4 Element 3:

Explain interconnectedness among high school content areas

- Interconnectedness of academic content areas – at HS level as content area, it took me a long time to figure out what kids were doing in other classes. This might be holding teachers to a standard that doesn't exist in their schools.
- Very difficult to do in the HS, how would we assess this for beginning teachers.

TPE 4 Element 4:

See suggested wording changes:

- Main element statement (1st sentence) - Add “planned” before instructional strategies
- 4th bullet - Replace “disability” with “diverse needs”
- 4th bullet - “appropriate modifications for students in general ed” – this should not be limited to general ed classroom, but in all classrooms.
- 6th bullet - Add “appropriate use of community resources.”

Clarify use of “Universal Design” term

- “Universal Design” is specific to this time period but will be dated if we keep the TPEs for a decade or more. Suggestion: more generic terminology.
- When “Universal Design” is used, it should really be UDL. This also applies to the second paragraph in the narrative.
- Language is very current and could outdate. Why not describe UDL rather than using terminology.

TPE 4 Element 5:

No emergent theme(s)

TPE 4 Element 6:

No emergent theme(s)

TPE 4 Element 7:

No emergent theme(s)

TPE 4 Element 8:

Clarify what is meant by “create new content”

- “Create new content”: Is that digital content? Students not just being consumers but also creating own content?
- What is intended by “create new content”, give some examples.

TPE 4 Element 9:

Clarify what is meant by “Blended technology”

- Define “blended” learning technologies.
- Use of blended and online.... Suggest use of “demonstrate when and how to use a range of online learning technologies”
- #9 is confusing; clarify as to what's intended; perhaps provide an example.
- In reference to term “blended,” we use “hybrid”, suggest “other online”

Consider that “Hand-held devices and phones” may become obsolete

- “Hand-held devices and phones” may become dated in the near future.
- How and when to use phones and other technologies; perhaps end at “technologies” to ensure this statement encompasses future technologies as well
- Instead of hand-held devices and phones – could it be mobile devices, which covers all mobile devices? Debated whether global terminology would be better. Mobile devices such as, give examples but there are many options.

TPE 4 Narrative:

Simplify language in the narrative

- Narrative is too dense.
- Narrative does not follow elements especially in this one.
- Narrative should provide clarity and examples of what we find in the elements.

See suggested wording changes:

- First paragraph of narrative: Use of vernacular; change to academic learning goals? (instead of student learning targets).
- Discrepancy between terminology of “gifted and talented” vs. “advanced learners” (preference for advanced learners – wider net); gifted students does not always pertain to those that are advanced.

TPE 5: Assessing Student Learning

General Themes for TPE 5:

Good presentation of information

- Seems to cover a wide range of assessment and what they may be used for.
- Addresses the different populations (e.g., English learners).
- Seems to reflect more than what a beginning teacher needs to know how to do (includes everything throughout the system).
- Elements are clear.
- Language is user friendly, easy to interpret.
- Very comprehensive.

Bulk of information should be included in the elements, as opposed to the narrative

- Pull from narrative into elements to address formative assessment piece. Participants agree that this is a very good point.
- Group wants bulk of content in elements, not in narratives.
- This TPE doesn’t contain the specificity that other have (referring to particular programs), making it more universal.

Sequence of elements is appropriate

- Participants like order of elements followed by narrative.
- Order is OK

TPE 5 Element 1

No emergent theme(s)

TPE 5 Element 2

No emergent theme(s)

TPE 5 Element 3

No emergent theme(s)

TPE 5 Element 4

More detail needed to define assessment and data analysis

- They felt element # 4 should include both formal and informal assessment and analysis.
- Participants questioned what “data analysis” was referring to in element # 4

TPE 5 Element 5

Combine this element with one of the others

- Move #5 up to #2 or combine with #2.
- It was recommended that elements 4 and 5 be combined.

TPE 5 Element 6

Clarify the term “specialist”

- Who are specialists in number 6? No one knows. Needs additional information.
- “Specialists” sounds medical. This assumes that everyone works in a district/building that has those people, too specific

TPE 5 Element 7

Some aspects of this element are beyond the capacity of beginning teachers

- Some felt that the material in element # 7 was not something that a beginning teacher should be able to do.
- Academic language in English...as well as in their primary language. How can a beginning teacher be able to do this?

TPE 5 Element 8

No emergent theme(s)

TPE 5 Narrative

Edits suggested:

- In the first paragraph of the narrative, the sentence: “Beginning teachers are informed about the IEP, IFSP, ITP, and 504 processes and participate as appropriate” should be changed to “Beginning teachers are informed about the IEP, IFSP, ITEP, and 504 processes and recognize the importance of their role in the process.”
- Some felt that the description of assessments in the narrative was too narrow. They would like to have seen Project Based Lessons, posters, MTSS, and UDLs included in the narrative.

- In the second paragraph of the narrative they felt that the wording should be softened in the sentence: “They understand that assessments should be both valid and reliable, and know how to mitigate potential bias in question development and in scoring. Beginning teachers demonstrate knowledge of and administer a variety of assessments, including diagnostic, formative, summative, and performance assessments.”
- Narrative vs. elements:
 - 1st paragraph – left out advanced learners,
 - Page 12 and 13; fair and unbiased grading practices not mentioned in narrative as they are in the elements.

Good explanation of TPE5

- Like the way the narrative is written.
- Good presentation.
- Well rounded.

TPE 6: Developing as a Professional Educator

General Themes for TPE 6:

Well received/positive feedback

- Comprehensive (includes such things as classroom space)
- Sequence is good
- Thumbs up
- Language and content are understandable
- Love how it calls out “responsible use of social media.”

This TPE should be the first TPE

- If this was the first TPE, the administrative support at the building level would be more focused on supporting this. Group strongly agreed with this.
- TPE 6 should be TPE 1 – this establishes all of the expectations, provides foundation, make this more front and center. This is where teachers get let go over in their first 2-3 years. If we want them to play nice in the sandbox, we’ve got to stress this to raise the profession.

TPE 6 Element 1

No emergent theme(s)

TPE 6 Element 2

No emergent theme(s)

TPE 6 Element 3

Add specificity, rewrite to make more understandable

- Element # 3 recommended rewording: “Understand how to communicate effectively and appropriately with other adults, including peers and colleagues, parents/guardians, and members of the larger school community to support teacher and student learning.”
- Some wanted the term “collaborate” to be included in element # 3.

- “Other adults” should be more specific e.g., school administrations, because there is an “and” who are these other adults? So what is the purpose? # 2 already talks about communication. Again, not sure of what intent of #3 is. As a new teacher it should be ‘administration’:
 - Determine when community resources are needed?
 - Disagree, how to leverage others
 - Clarity is needed.
- Something about the structure of this sentence is awkward – it’s vague.
- Maybe 3 could be clarified by adding collegiality.

TPE 6 Element 4

Shorten or simplify element

- Too long. Break it up into two bullet points.
- They also said element # 4 should be split into two elements.
- Addressing too much? Perhaps break up into two thoughts.
- I would divide 4 and 5 differently.
- 4 and 6 are too long and too big.

TPE 6 Element 6

Rewrite to make less wordy, more concise

- Too wordy and awkward
- reword: “Recognize and reflect on their own values and implicit and explicit biases, the ways in which these may positively and negatively affect teaching and learning, and work to mitigate any negative impact on the teaching and learning of students. Beginning teachers recognize and appropriately address instances of intolerance and harassment among students, such as bullying and racism, and know how to seek appropriate help.”
- Feels repetitive and difficult to understand. “Negative” used a lot and too many “implicit and explicit.”
- 4 and 6 are too long and too big.

TPE 6 Element 7

Define moral fitness, give examples

- “Moral fitness” teachers need to understand that they are becoming “public figures”, maybe “aware of model code of ethics”.
- What is meant by moral fitness?

TPE 6 Element 8

Consider removing or reordering this element

- Element 8 is out of place and inappropriate.
- Get rid of Element 8 – I don’t know veteran teachers outside of the area of single subject Social Studies that have a good grasp of that. If this is about the professional education, a new teacher needs to know how the system works, to be informed
- They felt that element # 8 should be moved to be element # 1. It is kind of an outlier, so they felt if it were element # 1; it would not stand out so much.

TPE 6 Narrative

Recommend wording changes, such as:

- In the narrative, in paragraph five, in sentence number 1, should add: “uphold all relevant” laws.
- Add mitigating impact language from element 6 to paragraph 2 in narrative
- Narrative, last sentence of 4th para: Is it about maintaining currency in field or maintaining credential?

Special Education Question: If a common trunk of knowledge was developed for general education and special education teachers, are these TPEs appropriate for special education teachers?

Special Ed Themes:

Yes, the TPEs are appropriate for special education (SPED) teachers

- Great idea. Common set of TPEs and shared language in field.
- This doc is adequate for all teachers. These TPEs would meet that trunk. Spec Ed could then have specialization. Good to have this level of overlap.
- Yes, because this is the basics, SPE teachers should have this plus additional instruction.
- Yes, it would give SPE a broader range
- Breaking down silos “Teachers of all students” is a good direction. Every student is a Gen Ed student first.
- Yes, these are sufficient to prepare all teachers.
- Absolutely agree that all TPEs apply
- Yes, they need to have an even playing field if they’re going to be evaluated for their “teaching”.

Yes, but there needs to be additional information/qualification for SPED TPEs

- Verbs may be different for general education vs SPED (e.g., Regular education [reg ed] may implement accommodations, SPED may be more involved in the creation of the accommodation. Should be collaborative between reg ed and SPED. Gen ed must know more about subject-specific strategies, SPED needs to know enough to collaborate with gen ed to effectively.
- Maybe add to “creating and maintaining learning environments”; the conceptual idea that addressing behavior is some kind of support that teaches child to function in environment.
- They need to know how to do forms, maintain documentation, proof that students have met the IEP goals, this would need to be included.
- Assessments for SPE would need to be added
- Great beginning, but get more feedback from SPE educators
- Doesn’t include transition planning. Definitely needs to be added

TPEs are not specific enough for SPED teachers

- Not enough depth and complexity for special education
- Concern that preparing SPED teachers that don’t know how to teach, stacked credential
- They should be designed with SPED Teacher – best case would be to design collaboratively

Need additional information regarding IEPs

- Participating in IEP program contributing to the plan is huge and then understanding of the plan
- I've never been asked to create an IEP. I know how to read IEP and look for goals, but for a beginning teacher just to interpret is a high bar. It's a trunk issue to read IEP and get the information you need.
- Objectives in past were not measurable for many beginning teachers. That's something that new teachers need to write a measurable goal for the IEP.

Focus Group Results and Low Ranked TPE/Elements from Survey

We found mixed results while looking to the emergent themes from the focus group content analysis for confirmation regarding the two TPE/elements with the lowest overall importance ratings (TPE3, Element 8 and TPE 6, Element 8). No themes emerged from the focus groups to solidify or explain the low importance rating for TPE3, Element 8. However, for TPE6, Element 8 there was an emergent theme related to deleting (or reordering) this element:

Consider removing or reordering this element

- Element 8 is out of place and inappropriate.
- Get rid of Element 8 – I don't know veteran teachers outside of the area of single subject Social Studies that have a good grasp of that. If this is about the professional education, a new teacher needs to know how the system works, to be informed
- They felt that element # 8 should be moved to be element # 1. It is kind of an outlier, so they felt if it were element # 1; it would not stand out so much.