

CalTPA Steering Committee Minutes

Sept 29, 2011

General

- Discussed implementation of common core – don't need to do anything before 15-16
- Keith asked if there was any discussion regarding the law, Terry thought that rather than modifying the law in California the opposite might be true, other states are jumping on the band wagon that California has been leading
- After lunch, Mike C suggested that we should maybe continue the way things are, get some more time "under our belt" with CalTPA as it exists
- Mike C indicated that the one thing he would like is a better aligned ROE and rubric, Wayne indicated that it would be a very big revision to the CalTPA model
- Katie suggested there isn't anything on this agenda that seems so pressing that we want to do it right now
- Mick asked, if we are going to keep this all in place, what can this committee do to help the programs, discussed potential specific guidelines for what to pay assessors, etc.
 - Katie asked about rules surrounding minimum qualifications for assessors, team discussed that there are guidelines, but they are open ended enough to be fairly flexible
 - Keith indicated that part of the problem is that the fee structure was implemented 8 years ago, in terms of what they are paying assessors
 - There was some discussion on how assessors are recruited
 - Looked up and discussed assessor qualifications as defined in the implementation manual
 - Mike C says they are constantly training and constantly recalibrating because they can't retain assessors
 - There was some discussion about what different programs are paying assessors
- Keith asked if it is within the purview of the commission to establish best practices for implementation
 - Wayne suggested that we could facilitate some discussion among programs regarding best practices, get information from the field
 - Mick suggested that maybe the members of the committee who are not associated with the commission could each contact a number of institutions to discuss concerns and best practices and come back together to discuss at future meetings
- Keith expressed some concern about pass rates by ethnicity and what it says about the achievement gap, which is something universities are particularly concerned with
 - There was some discussion regarding the reasons candidates do not pass on the first attempt
- Katie brought the discussion back to validation, asked for ideas about what we could do about that

- Keith mentioned that he hears from candidates who say that what they hear from their master teacher is different from what the TPA expects
- Consensus is that candidates always value what the practitioner tells them over what the professor tells them
- Some discussion about predictive validity and whether or not CalTPA should be making better teachers
- Some discussion about CalTPA being a basic skills assessment
- Some more discussion about reasons different candidates score the way they do
- Which new elements will require an additional developmental contract with ETS?
- Will CalTPA 2.0 need to be resubmitted and reapproved by the Commission, including new pilot studies?
- Keep a 4 Task Model?
 1. **SSP** - Do away with SSP Task
 - a. If so, how do we address the fact that multiple subject candidates need to be assessed in the four major content areas, Math, Science, SS, and LA
 - b. Need to develop new SSP single subject English Language Development (ELD) task
 - i. Need to find two ELD specialists to work with ETS
 1. Terry explained the work of the ELD panel and ELD assessments to the group, process for developing the test, will be 2 or 3 years out before the stand-alone credential is in place
 - ii. Already have SSP Languages Other Than English (LOTE) task
 1. One thing we can be sure of is the name will change from LOTE to World Language. Wayne will do that now, update the website.
 2. **DI** - Keep as is
 3. **AL** - Keep as is
 4. **CTE** – Do away with the CTE video
 - a. Teacher candidate lessons will be assessed by direct assessor observation
 - b. Could this be changed so that the video is not turned in and not scored? Candidates would theoretically record video, watch it , then turn in a reflection
 - i. Would candidates actually complete the video, or just fake the reflection?

5. Realign rubrics and ROEs with TPEs so that each TPE yields a specific score
 - a. Mick says they have done this, but they have moved to task stream now so they are not going to do it anymore, says the way the ROE is structured does not lend itself well to this, can be done with a lot more prescription for how to fill out the ROE, but you get a lot of blanks
 - b. Could end up being a major redesign of the model, would also need to redo the tasks to make sure they were aligned
 - c. Some of the local rubrics shared at coordinators meeting might help with this, though there is some question about how valuable those local rubrics really are
 - d. To do it right you really would need to revamp the whole scoring process, would be a multi-year task and would require an additional contract with ETS
 - e. Katie asked if there is really something that, as a group, we feel like we need to fix?
 - i. Wayne says he feels like at this point we have worked the bugs out of the system, and overall it is working
 - ii. Keith is wondering, even though the “system” is in place, we don’t know if it makes any difference
 - iii. Wayne says anecdotal evidence suggests that candidates and programs feel like the TPA really is making a difference and creating better teachers, but isn’t sure how to convert anecdotal information into actual research, TPA was never designed for predictive validity
6. All tasks to be scored by local content specific assessors
 - a. The group feels like this type of requirement would be a disaster
7. Contract with a third-party vendor and implement centralized scoring
 - a. All tasks to be scored by content specific assessors
 - i. Survey two years ago indicated that programs were not interested in this
 - ii. Conversation may just be coming up as a response to fiscal issues on campus

- iii. Discussed how we recently heard from a program interested in signing up for a program like TPAC, where everything could be done for them
 - iv. The only way this would work would be to remove the benchmark portion of it
 - v. Implementation would need to be more standardized than it is now
 - vi. Katie says ETS has at least one contract where they just score a product administered by another entity
 - vii. New technology could fix traditional problems with turn around time in central scoring
 - viii. Keith asked if this is something people are really asking for anymore.
 - ix. Wayne says he doesn't think any of these are necessarily hot issues, we are in a good place with this, but we don't want to become complacent, we want to make sure we continue to look forward
 - x. Katie says we definitely want to be doing some kind of ongoing validation, Mike mentioned that we aren't really doing any of that any more
 - xi. Mick says the one thing he hears most about is getting rid of SSP, others feel like it is really valuable, and many people perceive it as being particularly valuable
8. Discontinue CTC model and turn the assessment over to a third-party vendor who will develop and implement a National assessment as well as California specific assessment
- a. California TPA needs to evaluate California TPEs
 - b. National TPA would need to evaluate national and /or other state specific standards
 - i. Getting to be time we looked at revision of the TPEs
9. Realign CalTPA with Common Core Standards, when?
- a. See above
10. Score Reliability – How can we or do we need to monitor this
11. Other suggested options?