Item 17
TPA and Accreditation
August 2010

Overview
This report presents the recommendations related to the Teaching Performance Assessment and the appropriate review of approved program implementation of the TPA through the Commission's accreditation system as was discussed at the May and June 2010 COA meetings.

This topic was introduced at the April 2010 COA meeting, at which time staff asked whether the COA would be interested in appointing two individuals to work with the TPA Users Advisory Committee (UAC) to consider this topic. The purpose of this collaborative effort would be to identify and refine information provided to and processes that could be used to assist accreditation teams review the standards applicable to implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA).

This work group met for the first time during the afternoon prior to the May 2010 COA meeting. The recommendations from the work group were discussed by the full UAC at its May meeting and then the next day at the May COA meeting. At that time, the COA requested that two of the recommendations return as action item and further work be completed on a third recommendation. The work group met again on June 15, 2010 and an update on the work completed at that meeting was presented as an infolder supplement at the June meeting.

This item presents a review of the items discussed at both the May and June 2010 COA meetings and the related recommendations for action.

Recommendation
That the COA review, and if appropriate, adopt these three recommendations:

1) The expectations for Biennial Reports for preliminary multiple and single subject teacher preparation programs be revised to include additional information about the program's TPA implementation. These include information about the following:
    a. Assessor: The total number of assessors the program uses and the number of assessors who scored in the 2009-10 year.
    b. Assessor Initial Training and Recalibration: The number of assessors who successfully completed initial training in 2009-10 and the number who recalibrated in 2009-10.
    c. Data on Reliability Related to Double Scoring (% of score agreement).
    d. Modifications made to assessor selection, training, recalibration (may be included in Section A, Part I or in Section A, Part IV)

    The information above would be voluntary but highly encouraged for institutions submitting in 2010 and mandatory for institutions submitting in 2011 and beyond.

2) The process for Program Assessment review would be modified whereby a group of BIR members with expertise in the standards and implementation of the teaching performance assessment would review all institutions' responses to Program Standards 17-19. The

remainder of the program narrative for each program will be reviewed by individual pairs of BIR members.

3) That the list of questions (Appendix B) developed by the work group be provided to the subgroup of BIR members reviewing Standards 17-19 as well as site visit team members to help focus their review on critical TPA implementation issues. In addition, that Appendix B be made available to all institutions to help guide and assist in the development of their responses to the standards.

Background

The Teaching Performance Assessment has been a requirement for all Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject candidates since July 1, 2008. There currently are three Commission-approved models: the CalTPA, Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT), and Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST). All three models have some commonalities such as specific tasks that candidates must accomplish, an extensive assessor training system, and rubric scoring based on a four-point scoring scale. In addition, each model has its own unique requirements and processes that distinguish it from the other two models.

Many of the issues related to the implementation of the TPA are highly technical in nature and complex. Yet there is an expectation embodied in the adopted program standards for the Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject program standards that accreditation provide oversight of the TPA implementation process. Standard 17 states that "The TPA is implemented according to the requirements of the Commission-approved model selected by the program." There are four standards that apply to the implementation of the assessment and the program's implementation of these standards is reviewed during the accreditation activities. In particular, these standards are reviewed via an in-depth document review during Program Assessment and then subsequently the findings of Program Assessment are confirmed by interviews and review of other evidence at the site visit.

Staff has indicated to COA and to the TPA Users Group, which is a statewide oversight group comprised of representatives from each of the three models, that it believes there is a need to focus a more in-depth discussion on those standards related to the implementation of the TPA to ensure that the accreditation system and its reviewers are well equipped with both the tools and the expertise to understand or account for the deeply technical nature of the implementation of such complex assessment instruments. In addition, staff indicated that there is a need to further discuss and identify those issues that should be "outside" the accreditation system in that they should appropriately fall within the responsibility of the model developers.

The standards that apply to the implementation of the TPA are Category E: Standards 16-19. The full text of these four standards is included in Appendix A. These standards include the following topics:

Standard 16: Learning, Applying, and Reflecting on the Teaching Performance Expectations

Standard 17: Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA): Program Administration Processes

Standard 18: Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment: Candidate Preparation and Support

Standard 19: Implementation of the Teaching Performance: Assessor Qualifications, Training, and Scoring Reliability

Part I: Modifications to the Biennial Report

At its May 2010 meeting, the COA discussed amending the expectations for the biennial reports submitted by Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject teacher preparation programs to require that information about the program's assessors and scoring practices be submitted. Program Standard 19 states:

> *The program provides assessor training and/or facilitates assessor access to training in the specific TPA model(s) used by the program. The program selects assessors who meet the established selection criteria and uses only assessors who successfully complete the required TPA model assessor training sequence and who have demonstrated initial calibration to score candidate TPA responses.*
>
> *The program periodically reviews the performance of assessors to assure consistency, accuracy, and fairness to candidates within the TPA process, and provides recalibration opportunities for assessors whose performance indicates they are not providing accurate, consistent, and/or fair scores for candidate responses.*
>
> *The program complies with the assessor recalibration policies and activities specific to each approved TPA model, including but not limited to at least annual recalibration for all assessors, and uses and retains only TPA assessors who consistently maintain their status as qualified, calibrated, program-sponsored assessors. The program monitors score reliability through a double-scoring process applied to at least 15% of TPA candidate responses.*

Staff proposed, and the work group agreed in its discussions (with some modification of the originally proposed language), that in the biennial reports all programs should be required to provide information addressing the following:

1. Assessors: The total number of assessors the program uses and the number of assessors who scored in the 2009-2010 year.
2. Assessor Initial Training and Recalibration: The number of assessors who successfully completed initial training in 2009-2010 and the number who recalibrated in 2009-10.
3. Data on Reliability Related to Double Scoring (% of score agreement).
4. Modifications made to assessor selection, training, recalibration.

For the biennial reports due in Fall 2010, the submission of this information would be highly encouraged but voluntary and the institution may submit the information addressing the four

topics in narrative form or by submitting aggregated data. The goal for the future is to have each program submit aggregated data for each of these topics. For all institutions submitting in 2011 and beyond, this information will be mandatory.

The submission of this information on a biennial basis will ensure that programs have information available for both Program Assessment and accreditation site visits related to the standards that govern the implementation of the teaching performance assessment. If the COA takes action at this meeting to modify the requirements for biennial reports submitted by Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject programs, staff will finalize and release a Program Sponsor Alert (PSA) notifying programs of the change. Staff would hold a webcast as quickly as feasible to provide information about new requirement for the biennial report. In addition, the template for submission of the biennial report would be modified to reflect these changes. It would be staff's intent to provide formative feedback related to this expectation to all programs during the first year of implementation of the new requirement and to bring examples of the information submitted to the TPA UAC group to review.

Questions Developed to Assist in the Review of Standards 17-19

At its May 2010 meeting, the Committee on Accreditation asked the workgroup to review a set of proposed questions that had been recently developed by the workgroup. The questions were originally designed to assist institutions in responding to the standards related to the implementation of the teaching performance assessment. During the COA discussion, several members voiced concern about the questions. In particular, there was concern that the questions did not address the quality aspects of the standards and appeared to be more compliance focused instead of quality focused. Further, questions were raised about whether these additional questions added clarity for institution attempting to respond to the standards or another level of confusion. The Committee then asked the workgroup to continue to discuss these questions and to determine whether they were appropriate or if adjustments/alternatives were required.

As a result of the COA discussion, the Administrator of Accreditation posed the following questions to the work group:

- Review the questions/statements that were developed at the last meeting. Do they address all the info in the standards? If yes, does this subgroup want to recommend to the COA that interested institutions MAY use the question/prompts to develop their program narrative for standards 17-19? And therefore, reviewers would use the questions, with consultation to the standards as needed, for review of the narrative.
- If the question/prompts are not 'equivalent' to the standards,
    a. do the question/prompts need some editing or additional language? Or
    b. would the questions/prompts be useful to the specialized BIR members who will review all responses to Standards 17-19? Should staff provide these to the readers for use in PA reading for 10-11?

In the June 15, 2010 meeting of the work group, the group reconsidered the entire approach to the questions. In considering the comments of members of the COA, they determined that a separate set of questions for the institutions to write to, whether in addition to the standard or in lieu of the standard, does, in fact, complicate rather than assist institutions in addressing the TPA

related standards. Instead, they argued, what was needed was a list of questions that program assessors and, to some extent, site visit team members could use to assist them in reviewing responses to the standards. A list of questions that a smaller group of TPA experts could keep in mind as they reviewed program documents could be very beneficial and help keep reviews more consistent across TPA model and types of institutions.

To that end, the work group discussed the original list of questions and edited it from the perspective of a reviewer and what a reviewer should consider as it worked through program documents. This new list of questions is included in Appendix B to this infolder item. The questions for program assessment reviewers may be found in the middle column.

While these questions would be available to institutions to consider as they write their program document, institutions are not the primary intended audience, but rather they are intended primarily for program assessment reviewers. Institutions would continue to be required to write to the standards.

At the June meeting of COA, members expressed general agreement with the questions as they were reformulated. The COA asked for two changes in Appendix B. The first was to reformulate the parenthetical that accompanied the term "administrator" in the final column to "program" or "employer" rather than IHE or K-12 to better reflect what is intended. The second change was to add the words "of candidate responses" to the question related to Standard 19 such that it now reads, "Does the response clearly indicate how the program monitors score reliability and a double scoring process applied to at least 15% *of candidate responses*?" Staff made those changes in the version of the table included in this agenda item.

Site Visit Teams

Unlike the program assessment process, there is no assurance that all site visit teams will have "experts" in one of the models of the teaching performance assessment. There will certainly be individuals who are familiar with the teaching performance assessment and most typically, in how it is implemented at their particular institution. As such, concern exists that team members be adequately prepared and have resources available that will allow them to make informed judgments about whether an institution is aligned with the TPA related standards. The questions that the Administrator of Accreditation posed to the work group prior to the meeting as it relates to the site visit team were the following:

- Discuss the accreditation site visit with respect to the TPA. Are all the question/prompts equally important and should the PA readers identify any that should be asked based on the PA activity? Or are some questions more important and should be bolded or highlighted for site visit team members?
- If there are important questions for site visit team members to ask, are the questions more appropriate for certain stakeholder groups? Should the questions have a code for which stakeholders should be asked the question, i.e. candidate, assessor, faculty, program coordinator, supervisor?

The work group discussed various strategies to better equip site visit team members to review the TPA related standards. With the understanding that, pending COA action, the in depth review of the TPA related standards would be conducted by a subgroup of experts in the various models, some agreement was reached on the following:

1) **Whether to revise the list of questions for site visit team members.**
   The work group agreed that, because the in depth review of an institution's response to the standards would be done by a subgroup of experts during program assessment who would identify what specifically needed to be reviewed at the site visit, there was not a need to devise specific questions for the site visit team outside of that directed by the program assessment reviewers. Several of the work group members added that they did not want to "prescribe" what kinds of questions should be asked at the site visit.

   However, the work group members felt that they could help the site visit team by identifying who at a review might likely have information that could be shared with the review team about specific aspects of the standards. For instance, it is highly unlikely a candidate or program completer would know what the institution's rationale was for the adoption of its passing score standard. Therefore, there would be little need for the reviewer to ask candidates or program completers any questions related to this aspect of the standard. To that end, the work group determined that there was a need for the following:

   a) Identify which constituency group would most likely be able to inform the site reviewer of the specific aspects of the standards. This work is reflected in the right hand column in Appendix B.

2) **Development of Resources for Site Review Team**.
   a) Adjust the program assessment feedback sheet to ensure direction from the program assessment team to the site visit team is included. This is simply a matter of reformatting the existing document template in order to ensure that specific direction on each aspect of the standards can be given to the site visit team by the program assessors.
   b) Develop additional resources for use by the site visit review team. Because it is unlikely that the site visit team will always contain expertise in the particular model used at the institution under review, it was agreed that additional resources could be developed to assist site reviewers in better understanding the required aspects of the three models as well as equip them to understand where there may be possible allowable variability in the implementation of the models.

   To that end, it was suggested that several resource documents would be developed. Pulling from the teaching performance assessment handbooks for each model, a member of the Users Advisory Committee would put together a short (1-2 page document for each model) about the critical components of that model (whether the tasks need to be in sequential order, frequency of required recalibration, whether a video component is required, etc.). In addition, the UAC could put together another short document (1-2 pages) that identifies critical difference in the three models. Having these documents available to assist the review team members would not only inform those members, but

would minimize the bias or misconceptions some have about TPA implementation based on their own experiences implementing the assessment.

Because the UAC does not meet again until November 2010, this work will attempt to be done prior to the next meeting of the UAC. It is anticipated that most of the work can be done electronically while the "differences" piece could be done via teleconference, web conference, or ½ day in person meeting with one representative from each of the three models.

Appendix A
Standards Applicable to the Teaching Performance Assessment Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs

Category E: Teaching Performance Expectations and the Teaching Performance Assessment

Standard 16: Learning, Applying, and Reflecting on the Teaching Performance Expectations

The planned curriculum of coursework and fieldwork embeds multiple opportunities for candidates to learn, apply, and reflect on each Teaching Performance Expectation (TPE).

As each candidate progresses through the program of sequenced coursework and supervised fieldwork, clearly defined pedagogical assignments within the program are increasingly complex and challenging. The candidate is appropriately coached and assisted so he/she can satisfactorily complete these assignments. The scope of the pedagogical assignments (a) addresses the TPEs as they apply to the subjects to be authorized by the credential, and (b) prepares the candidate for the teaching performance assessment (TPA).

Qualified supervisors formatively assess each candidate's pedagogical performance in relation to the TPEs and provide complete, accurate formative and timely performance feedback regarding the candidate's progress toward meeting the TPEs.

Intern Program Delivery Model:
Each internship program includes a preservice component that provides candidates with the opportunity to develop the requisite knowledge and skills prior to entering the classroom as the teacher of record. The preservice component is delivered in a sustained, intensive and classroom-focused manner, and the content of the preservice component includes introductory preparation relative to the TPEs and connects to the remaining preparation that is completed while the intern is serving as the teacher of record.

Standard 17: Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA): Program Administration Processes

The TPA is implemented according to the requirements of the Commission-approved model selected by the program. One or more individuals responsible for implementing the TPA document the administration, scoring, and data reporting processes for all tasks/activities of the applicable TPA model in accordance with the requirements of the selected model. The program adopts a passing score standard and provides a rationale for establishing that passing standard.

The program maintains both program level and candidate level TPA data, including but not limited to individual and aggregated results of candidate performance, assessor calibration status, and assessor performance over time. The program documents the use of these data not only for Commission reporting and/or accreditation purposes, but also for program improvement. The

program assures that candidates understand the appropriate use of their performance data as well as privacy considerations relating to candidate data.

The program establishes and consistently uses appropriate measures to ensure the security of all TPA materials, including all print, online, video candidate, and assessor materials. The program also consistently uses appropriate measures and maintains documentation to assure the privacy of the candidate, the K-12 students, the school site and school district, and other adults involved in the TPA process.

Standard 18: Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment: Candidate Preparation and Support

The teacher preparation program assures that each candidate receives clear and accurate information about the nature of the pedagogical tasks within the Commission-approved teaching performance assessment model selected by the program, the passing score standard adopted by the program, and the opportunities available within the program to prepare for completing the TPA tasks/activities. The program assures that candidates understand that all responses to the TPA that are submitted for scoring must represent the candidate's own unaided work.

The program assures that candidates understand and follow the appropriate policies and procedures to protect the privacy and confidentiality of the K-12 students, teachers, school sites, school districts, adults, and others who are involved in any of the components of the TPA tasks/activities.

The program provides timely formative feedback information to candidates on their performance on the TPA. The teacher preparation program provides opportunities for candidates who are not successful on the assessment to receive remedial assistance with respect to the TPEs, and to retake the task/activity up to the specified number of times established by the program. The program only recommends candidates who have met the passing score on the TPA for a preliminary teaching credential.

The program provides formative assessment information and performance assessment results to candidates who successfully complete the TPA in a manner that is usable by the induction program as one basis for the individual induction plan.

Standard 19: Implementation of the Teaching Performance: Assessor Qualifications, Training, and Scoring Reliability

The teacher preparation program establishes selection criteria for assessors of candidate responses to the TPA. The selection criteria include but are not limited to pedagogical expertise in the content areas assessed within the TPA.

The program provides assessor training and/or facilitates assessor access to training in the specific TPA model(s) used by the program. The program selects assessors who meet the established selection criteria and uses only assessors who successfully complete the required

TPA model assessor training sequence and who have demonstrated initial calibration to score candidate TPA responses.

The program periodically reviews the performance of assessors to assure consistency, accuracy, and fairness to candidates within the TPA process, and provides recalibration opportunities for assessors whose performance indicates they are not providing accurate, consistent, and/or fair scores for candidate responses.

The program complies with the assessor recalibration policies and activities specific to each approved TPA model, including but not limited to at least annual recalibration for all assessors, and uses and retains only TPA assessors who consistently maintain their status as qualified, calibrated, program-sponsored assessors. The program monitors score reliability through a double-scoring process applied to at least 15% of TPA candidate responses.

The program establishes and maintains policies and procedures to assure the privacy of assessors as well as of information about assessor scoring reliability. In addition, the program maintains the security of assessor training materials and protocols in the event that the program uses its own assessors (such as, for example, a designated Lead Assessor) to provide local assessor training.

Appendix B
Standards 17-19
Considerations for Program Assessment and Site Visit

Adopted Standard	**Program Assessment Considerations**	**Site Visit Considerations** ***Site visit team must interview the individual(s) responsible for the implementation of the TPA. Possible/Likely interview subjects for each component of the standards are indicated below:***
Standard 17: Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA): Program Administration Processes		
The TPA is implemented according to the requirements of the Commission-approved model selected by the program.* One or more individuals responsible for implementing the TPA document the administration, scoring, and data reporting processes for all tasks/activities of the applicable TPA model in accordance with the requirements of the selected model.	1. Does the response clearly indicate that the TPA is implemented according to the Commission-approved model selected by the program? – *Hold answering this question until all other aspects of the TPA related standards have been reviewed.* 2. Does the response clearly indicate who is responsible for the implementation of the TPA including? a. Administration b. Scoring c. Data reporting	Administrators (program) Assessment Coordinators Credential Analyst Data Analyst Faculty Lead Assessors Program Coordinator Staff TPA Coordinator
The program adopts a passing score standard and provides a rationale for establishing that passing standard.	3. Does the response clearly state the passing score standard adopted and the rationale for the passing score?	Administrators (program) Assessment Coordinators Faculty Program Coordinator TPA Coordinator

Adopted Standard	Program Assessment Considerations	Site Visit Considerations ***Site visit team must interview the individual(s) responsible for the implementation of the TPA. Possible/Likely interview subjects for each component of the standards are indicated below:***
The program maintains both program level and candidate level TPA data, including but not limited to individual and aggregated results of candidate performance, assessor calibration status, and assessor performance over time.	4. Does the response clearly indicate how the program collects and maintains program level and candidate level data? a) Individual candidate performance results b) Aggregated candidate performance results c) Assessor calibration status d) Assessor performance over time	Administrators (program) Assessment Coordinators Credential Analyst Data Analyst Program Coordinator Staff TPA Coordinator
The program documents the use of these data not only for Commission reporting and/or accreditation purposes, but also for program improvement.	5. Does the response clearly indicate how the data are being used to reflect on the program and used for program improvement?	Administrators (program) Assessment Coordinators Data Analyst Faculty Program Coordinator TPA Coordinator University Supervisors

Adopted Standard	Program Assessment Considerations	Site Visit Considerations ***Site visit team must interview the individual(s) responsible for the implementation of the TPA. Possible/Likely interview subjects for each component of the standards are indicated below:***
The program assures that candidates understand the appropriate use of their performance data as well as privacy considerations relating to candidate data. The program also consistently uses appropriate measures and maintains documentation to assure the privacy of the candidate, the K-12 students, the school site and school district, and other adults involved in the TPA process. The program establishes and consistently uses appropriate measures to ensure the security of all TPA materials, including all print, online, video, candidate, and assessor materials.	6. Does the response clearly indicate processes and policies relevant to the following: a) Informing candidates about appropriate use of data b) Protecting candidate privacy c) Protecting the privacy of K-12 students, school site, and school district, and other adults involved in the TPA process. d) how candidates are informed of the appropriate uses of their performance data and the privacy of candidates and candidate data? e) Does the process clearly describe the process to ensure the security of all TPA materials?	Administrators (program) Assessment Coordinator Candidates Credential Analyst Data Analyst District Based Supervisors Faculty Graduates Lead Assessors Program Coordinator TPA Coordinator University Based Field Supervisors

Adopted Standard	Program Assessment Considerations	Site Visit Considerations ***Site visit team must interview the individual(s) responsible for the implementation of the TPA. Possible/Likely interview subjects for each component of the standards are indicated below:***
Standard 18: Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment: Candidate Preparation and Support		
The teacher preparation program assures that each candidate receives clear and accurate information about the nature of the pedagogical tasks within the Commission-approved teaching performance assessment model selected by the program, the passing score standard adopted by the program, and the opportunities available within the program to prepare for completing the TPA tasks/activities. The program assures that candidates understand that all responses to the TPA that are submitted for scoring must represent the candidate's own unaided work. The program assures that candidates understand and follow the appropriate policies and procedures to protect the privacy and confidentiality of the K-12 students, teachers, school sites, school districts, adults, and others who are involved in any of the components of the TPA tasks/activities.	1. Does the response clearly indicate how the program communicates its particular implementation strategy and requirements to the candidates including? a) passing score standard b) opportunities within the program to prepare for completing the TPA tasks/activities c) that work scored is unaided candidate work d) appropriate policies and procedures to protect privacy and confidentiality of the K-12 students, teachers, school sites, school districts, adults, and others who are involved in any components of the TPA.	Administrators (program, and employers) Assessment Coordinators Candidates District Based Supervisors Faculty Graduates Lead Assessors Program Coordinator TPA Coordinator University Based Field Supervisors

Adopted Standard	**Program Assessment Considerations**	**Site Visit Considerations** ***Site visit team must interview the individual(s) responsible for the implementation of the TPA. Possible/Likely interview subjects for each component of the standards are indicated below:***
The program provides timely formative feedback information to candidates on their performance on the TPA. The teacher preparation program provides opportunities for candidates who are not successful on the assessment to receive remedial assistance with respect to the TPEs, and to retake the task/activity up to the specified number of times established by the program.	2. Does the response clearly indicate how the program provides: a) timely formative feedback to candidates? b) remedial assistance on any element of the TPA? c) How many times a candidate may retake the TPA or a portion of the TPA?	Assessment Coordinators Candidates District Based Supervisors Faculty Graduates Program Coordinator TPA Coaches/Remediation TPA Coordinator University Based Field Supervisors
The program only recommends candidates who have met the passing score on the TPA for a preliminary teaching credential.	3. Does the response clearly indicate a documentation process that ensures that only those candidates who have passed the TPA are recommended for a preliminary teaching credential? (Also Common Standard 9)	Credential Analyst Data Analyst Program Coordinator TPA Coordinator
The program provides formative assessment information and performance assessment results to candidates who successfully complete the TPA in a manner that is usable by the induction program as one basis for the individual induction plan.	4. Does the response clearly describe how the program provides formative assessment and performance information to candidates that are usable by the induction program?	Administrators (program and employers) Assessment Coordinators Candidates District Based Supervisors Faculty Graduates Induction Personnel Program Coordinator TPA Coordinator University Based Field Supervisors
* *unaided candidate work—original candidate work which does not include input from other candidates, faculty, or any others. "Unaided candidate work" is work that has not been pre-scored by an instructor.*		

Standard 19: Implementation of the Teaching Performance: Assessor Qualifications, Training, and Scoring Reliability		
The teacher preparation program establishes selection criteria for assessors of candidate responses to the TPA. The selection criteria include but are not limited to pedagogical expertise in the content areas assessed within the TPA. The program provides assessor training and/or facilitates assessor access to training in the specific TPA model(s) used by the program. The program selects assessors who meet the established selection criteria and uses only assessors who successfully complete the required TPA model assessor training sequence and who have demonstrated initial calibration to score candidate TPA responses.	1. Does the response clearly indicate the selection criteria for TPA assessors and that they document that assessors meet the selection criteria? 2. Does the response clearly indicate how the program provides the assessor training process? 3. Does the response clearly indicate how the program documents successful completion of assessor training for all assessors?	Administrators (program) Assessment Coordinators Assessors Lead Assessors Program Coordinator TPA Coordinator

The program periodically reviews the performance of assessors to assure consistency, accuracy, and fairness to candidates within the TPA process, and provides recalibration opportunities for assessors whose performance indicates they are not providing accurate, consistent, and/or fair scores for candidate responses. The program complies with the assessor recalibration policies and activities specific to each approved TPA model, including but not limited to at least annual recalibration for all assessors, and uses and retains only TPA assessors who consistently maintain their status as qualified, calibrated, program-sponsored assessors.	4. Does the response clearly describe the programs recalibration policies and processes including: a) how the program periodically reviews assessor performance, b) identify assessors who are in need of recalibration, and the program provides those additional training opportunities? and c) Annual recalibration for all assessors	Administrators (program) Assessment Coordinators Assessors Lead Assessors Program Coordinator TPA Coordinator
The program monitors score reliability through a double-scoring process applied to at least 15% of TPA candidate responses.	5. Does the response clearly indicate how the program monitors score reliability and a double-scoring process applied to at least 15% of candidate responses?	Administrators (program) Assessment Coordinators Assessor Lead Assessors Program Coordinator TPA Coordinator
The program establishes and maintains policies and procedures to assure the privacy of assessors as well as of information about assessor scoring reliability.	6. Does the response clearly describe the policies and procedures to assure the privacy of assessors?	Administrators (program) Assessment Coordinators Assessors Lead Assessors Program Coordinator TPA Coordinator

In addition, the program maintains the security of assessor training materials and protocols in the event that the program uses its own assessors (such as, for example, a designated Lead Assessor) to provide local assessor training.	7. If applicable, does the response clearly describe how the program maintains the privacy of assessor materials?	Administrators (program) Assessment Coordinators Assessors Lead Assessors Program Coordinator TPA Coordinator