
7A

Action

Professional Services Committee of the Whole

The Teaching Performance Assessment: (I) Overview; (II) The California Teaching Performance Assessment Model; (III) Assessment Quality Standards for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs; and (IV) Request for Proposals for a Validity Study of the California Teaching Performance Assessment

Executive Summary: This agenda item provides an overview of the teaching performance assessment requirement for multiple and single subject professional teacher preparation programs; a description of the *California Teaching Performance Assessment* model; a proposal for the potential modification and reinstatement of the five *Assessment Quality Standards for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs*; and a request for approval to release an RFP (Request for Proposals) for a validity study of the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CA TPA).

Recommended Action: That the Commission (a) adopt the proposed modifications to the original *Assessment Quality Standards for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs* and approve the proposed implementation schedule for these standards; and (b) approve the request to release an RFP for a validity study of the CA TPA.

Strategic Plan Goal: 1

Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators.

- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators.
- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the performance of credential candidates.

November-December 2006

Presenter: Phyllis Jacobson, Administrator,
Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal: 1

Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators.

- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators.
- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the performance of credential candidates.

November-December 2006

The Teaching Performance Assessment: (I) Overview; (II) The California Teaching Performance Assessment Model; (III) Assessment Quality Standards for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs; and (IV) Request for Proposals for a Validity Study of the California Teaching Performance Assessment

Part I: Overview of the Teaching Performance Assessment

Introduction

This section of the agenda item provides an introduction to the concept of a teaching performance assessment within multiple and single subject professional teacher preparation programs. Information concerning the purpose, design, and implementation of a teaching performance assessment is also provided below as part of the general overview. In Section II, the state-developed teaching performance assessment model, the California Teaching Performance Assessment, is described in detail.

Background

Senate Bill 2042 (Chapter 548, Statutes of 1998) required all candidates for a preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credential to pass an assessment of teaching performance in order to earn a teaching credential. This assessment of teaching performance is designed to measure the candidate's knowledge, skills and ability with relation to California's adopted *Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP)*.

A. What is a Teaching Performance Assessment?

- A teaching performance assessment is an assessment that requires candidates to demonstrate through their performance with K-12 students that they have mastered the knowledge, skills and abilities required of a beginning teacher, as exemplified in California's *Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs)*.

B. What are the Teaching Performance Expectations?

- The *Teaching Performance Expectations* represent the range of knowledge, skills and abilities expected of a beginning teacher. There are thirteen TPEs. A listing of the TPEs is provided in Attachment A.

C. What is the relationship between the *Teaching Performance Expectations* and the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*?

- The CSTP, developed in 1997, were originally validated to be applicable to all teachers, including experienced teachers.
- California's adopted thirteen *Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs)*, are based on and aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession,

but they provide validated expectations applicable specifically to a beginning teacher level.

- The teaching performance assessment used within multiple and single subject teacher preparation programs is designed to cover the knowledge, skills and abilities specified in the TPEs.

D. Who has to Take a Teaching Performance Assessment?

- All multiple and single subject credential candidates in Commission-approved teacher preparation programs must meet the teaching performance assessment requirement starting in July, 2008, as per SB 1209 (Chap. 517, Statutes of 2006).

E. Who Has to Offer a Teaching Performance Assessment?

- All Commission-approved multiple and single subject teacher preparation programs must offer a teaching performance assessment that is embedded within the program for all candidates starting in July, 2008 as per SB 1209 (Chap. 517, Statutes of 2006).

F. Who Administers and Who Scores the Teaching Performance Assessment?

- Teacher preparation programs are responsible for implementing the TPA.
- Scorers are typically:
 - Faculty
 - K-12 teachers, supervisors, support providers, administrators
 - Retired faculty, teachers, and other education professionals

G. How Many Teaching Performance Assessments Are There?

- There are potentially several models of an assessment of teaching performance available to teacher preparation programs.
- The state-developed model is the California TPA (CA TPA). A consortium of universities led by Stanford has developed a TPA known as the “Performance Assessment for California Teachers” (PACT). In addition, at least two other universities have been developing local TPAs.
- Within each current TPA model, there are several tasks that candidates must complete satisfactorily to demonstrate mastery of the Teaching Performance Expectations.
- All TPA models must be approved by the Commission. Programs must implement an approved TPA model.

H. How are the Results of the Teaching Performance Assessment Used?

- As formative information for use by the candidate;
- As one basis for the recommendation of a candidate for a credential;
- As evidence of program effectiveness; and
- As formative information for use in an induction program.

The information in the next section of the agenda item pertains to one specific model of a teaching performance assessment, the “California Teaching Performance Assessment.” This model was developed by the Commission in cooperation with the Educational

Testing Service (ETS) for use with California teacher candidates, and can be used by any professional teacher preparation program approved by the Commission.

II. The California Teaching Performance Assessment Model (CA TPA)

A. What Specifically is the “California Teaching Performance Assessment (CA TPA)”?

- The CA TPA was developed as a series of performance tasks that measure the candidate’s performance on California’s Teaching Performance Expectations.
- These tasks are completed during the teacher preparation program.
- The CA TPA was originally developed in conjunction with Educational Testing Service (ETS) and California educators.

B. What is the Purpose of the CA TPA?

- to assure that all candidates recommended for a preliminary multiple or single subject teaching credential demonstrate a satisfactory level of mastery of the California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs);
- to assure that multiple and single subject teacher preparation programs are preparing teacher candidates to pass the teaching performance assessment; and
- to meet the requirements specified in SB 1209 (Chap. 517, Statutes of 2006) concerning the statewide implementation of a teaching performance assessment.

C. What is the Current Status of the CA TPA?

- The CA TPA has been used on a voluntary basis for the past three years by teacher preparation programs.
- Feedback on the CA TPA continues to be provided to the Commission by those programs that have been using the CA TPA on a voluntary basis.
- Based on the feedback provided by users in the field, the CA TPA continues to evolve in order to meet the needs of the field for a valid, reliable and useful assessment of candidate performance relative to the TPEs.
- As per SB 1209 (Chap. 517, Statutes of 2006), the Governor and the Legislature require all programs to implement a teaching performance assessment as a mandate; this assessment activity will no longer be voluntary on the part of multiple and single subject teacher preparation programs.
- The Commission, in collaboration with the field, continues to look at ways to streamline the teaching performance assessment to maximize the benefit to candidates and to programs while meeting the requirements of SB 1209.

D. What are the Performance Tasks of the CA TPA?

- The tasks of the CA TPA collectively measure the attributes of the Teaching Performance Expectations.
- Each CA TPA task measures a number of TPEs, with most TPEs being measured by more than one task.
- All of the CA TPA tasks are designed so that candidates can practice them repeatedly within the teacher preparation program.

- Task 1 may be completed without candidates basing their responses on the needs of actual K-12 students, while Tasks 2 through 4 require interaction with K-12 California students.
- All tasks require written responses to given prompts, and Task 4 requires a videotape of an actual classroom teaching experience.

Below is a brief description of the four tasks of the CA TPA as originally designed, including the TPEs measured by each task. Discussions are continuing with the field regarding feedback from programs who have been piloting the CA TPA about how each of these tasks is being implemented within the teacher preparation programs and about the overall value of each task for the preparation of candidates for taking and passing the CA TPA. This feedback will be considered before finalizing the CA TPA for full implementation as per SB 1209.

Task 1 presents the candidate with four scenarios, each of which covers content-focused pedagogy, appropriate student assessment activities related to the content, and appropriate adaptations of pedagogy to meet the needs of English learner students and of students with special needs. Each scenario is based on content relevant to the candidate's credential area. For example, Multiple Subject candidates address English/Language Arts in the first scenario, Mathematics in the second, Science in the third, and History/Social Science in the fourth. This written task is not dependent upon working with actual K-12 students.

The following TPEs are measured in Task 1:

- Making subject matter comprehensible to students (TPE 1)
- Assessing student learning (TPE 3)
- Engaging and supporting students in learning (TPE 4, 6, 7)

Task 2 requires the candidate to make appropriate connections between what the teacher knows about the students in the class to his/her instructional planning for those students. This written task contains a five-step set of prompts that focuses the candidate on first identifying and then applying the connections between the students' characteristics and learning needs and the teacher's instructional planning and adaptations for those specific students.

The following TPEs are measured in Task 2:

- Making subject matter comprehensible to students (TPE 1)
- Engaging and supporting students in learning (TPE 4, 6, 7)
- Planning instruction and designing learning experiences for students (TPE 8, 9)
- Developing as a professional educator (TPE 13)

Task 3 requires candidates to demonstrate their ability to design standards-based, appropriate student assessment activities in the context of a small group of students using a specific standards-based lesson of the candidate's choice. In addition, candidates demonstrate their ability to conduct assessment activities appropriately to assess student

learning and to diagnose student instructional needs based on the results of the assessment(s).

The following TPEs are measured in Task 3:

- Assessing student learning (TPE 3)
- Engaging and supporting students in learning (TPE 6, 7)
- Planning instruction and designing learning experiences for students (TPE 8, 9)
- Developing as a professional educator (TPE 13)

Task 4 is the culminating activity of the set of four TPA tasks. In this task, the candidate designs a standards-based lesson for a class of students and teaches that lesson to actual K-12 students within the classroom setting, while making appropriate use of class time and instructional resources, meeting the differing needs of individual students within the class, managing instruction and interactions with and between students, and assessing student learning. Following the lesson, the candidate demonstrates the ability to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson. To ensure equity to all candidates in the scoring of Task 4, a videotape of the lesson is collected and reviewed as evidence during the scoring process.

All TPEs except for TPE 12 (Professional, Legal and Ethical Obligations) are measured in Task 4:

- Making subject matter comprehensible to students (TPE 1)
- Assessing student learning (TPE 2, 3)
- Engaging and supporting students in learning (TPE 4, 5, 6, 7)
- Planning instruction and designing learning experiences for students (TPE 8, 9)
- Creating and maintaining effective environments for student learning (TPE 10, 11)
- Developing as a professional educator (TPE 13)

E. How are the Performance Assessment Tasks Scored?

- Each of the four TPA tasks is scored according to a task-specific rubric that specifies standards of performance on that task and describes characteristics of candidate performance at each of the four score levels.
- The candidate's performance is rated as a 1, 2, 3, or 4 based on the scoring rubric, with 1 being the lowest possible score and 4 being the highest.
- In order to pass the CA TPA, a candidate must have an overall score of 12 on all four tasks taken as a whole, but no individual task may have a score of less than 2.
- Candidates may retake each task until a passing score is earned.

F. What Training is Available for the CA TPA?

- The Commission offers Assessor Training for both Lead Assessors and for program-level assessors.
- During the training, assessors must calibrate their scores on a series of independent score cases for each TPA task in order to be certified as a state assessor and/or Lead Trainer for the CA TPA.
- The Commission also offers orientation training to teacher preparation programs.

- Lead Assessors may offer local training within their programs, institutions and/or regions.

G. What are the Next Steps for CA TPA Users?

- Institutions complete the TPA Implementation Plan Survey on the CTC website (see below, and also Attachment C)
- Institutions begin planning for local implementation (for example, institutions may choose to identify a TPA coordinator, begin identifying who the assessors will be, determine how many assessors will need to be trained, and within what time frame, etc.).
- Institutions participate in orientation and assessor training during 2007-08.

Part III: Assessment Quality Standards for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs

Introduction

In September 2002, the Commission adopted five Assessment Quality Standards to guide the development and implementation of teaching performance assessments (TPA) pursuant to SB 2042 (Chap. 548, Statutes of 1998). In November 2002, the Commission adopted an implementation plan for these standards that addressed timelines and requirements that would enable all sponsors of teacher preparation programs to implement the TPA requirements of SB 2042 beginning in 2003-04. A copy of the five Assessment Quality Standards is provided in Attachment B. In April 2003, the Commission delayed implementation of the five Assessment Quality Standards and the TPA in response to requests received from the Secretary of Education's office and the Legislature due to the state's fiscal crisis at the time. Programs that voluntarily wished to continue using the state model TPA (known as the CA TPA), however, could continue to do so. In place of the five Assessment Quality Standards (i.e., Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standards 19-23), the Commission adopted a *Revised Program Standard 19: Assessment of Candidate Performance* for all professional teacher preparation programs.

In September 2006, the Governor signed new legislation (SB 1209, Chap. 517, Statutes of 2006) that requires the statewide implementation of a teaching performance assessment by all professional multiple and single subject teacher preparation programs as of July 1, 2008. In response to this legislation, staff is returning the Assessment Quality Standards for Commission review, potential modification and reinstatement. In addition, staff is also bringing a revised implementation plan for Commission review and approval.

Background

Description of the Five Assessment Quality Standards As Adopted Previously by the Commission

The five Assessment Quality Standards adopted previously by the Commission require all approved professional teacher preparation programs to include an assessment of teaching performance that fairly and reliably assesses each candidate's performance in relation to the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*. Taken as a whole, these five standards allow for alternative models of a teaching performance assessment to be approved by the Commission; for the validity, fairness and reliability of teaching performance assessment processes; and for the consistent application of performance assessments across the range of professional teacher preparation programs in California.

The five originally adopted Assessment Quality Standards are provided in Attachment A. These standards address two major foci regarding performance assessment of teacher candidates. The first two standards (Standards 19 and 20) apply only to programs that request Commission approval of an alternative teaching performance assessment, and prescribe the quality of the design of the alternative assessment in order to assure the validity, fairness, and reliability of that alternative performance assessment.

The remaining three (Standards 21, 22, and 23) apply to all multiple and single subject professional teacher preparation programs, whether the program is implementing the CA TPA or an alternative performance assessment approved by the Commission. These three standards prescribe the quality of the implementation of the performance assessment within programs in order to assure:

- that the administration of the teaching performance assessment is valid, accurate, and fair to all candidates;
- that the assessors within each professional teacher preparation program are fully qualified and trained for their roles as assessors of candidate performance in relation to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession; and
- that there is sufficient infrastructure within professional teacher preparation programs for the administration of the teaching performance assessment, the reporting of results to candidates and to the state, and the use of the teaching performance assessment results for program improvement.

Proposed Modifications of the Assessment Quality Standards

A. Organization, Use, and Name of the Standards. In the several years since the original five Assessment Quality Standards were adopted and implementation was subsequently delayed by the Commission, the Teaching Performance Assessment to which these standards refer has been evolving. Given the recent legislation that now requires all multiple and single subject teacher preparation programs to implement a teaching performance assessment approved by the Commission as of July 1, 2008, it is appropriate to reexamine and reconsider if the original Assessment Quality Standards as

adopted by the Commission in 2002 might also need to be modified in order to effectively govern the implementation of the TPA within teacher preparation programs as of 2008.

As described above, the first two Assessment Quality Standards, 19 and 20, pertain only to those programs that want to apply to the Commission for approval to implement an alternative TPA. These standards are not truly program level standards that define quality attributes of teacher preparation programs, nor are they applicable to all teacher preparation programs, but represent instead Assessment Quality Standards that would govern the psychometric and technical design properties of an alternative assessment of teaching performance. As such, these original two standards might well be more appropriately used now as (a) official Commission Assessment Standards for the development of alternative model teaching performance assessments; and (b) the framework by which sponsors of an alternative TPA would develop their documentation to submit to the Commission when requesting Commission approval of their alternative TPA model.

Staff recommends, therefore, that the original Assessment Quality Standards 19-20 as previously adopted by the Commission be removed from the set of Multiple and Single Subject Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standards and be repurposed instead to serve as the official Commission Assessment Design Standards establishing (1) the expected quality of the design, development, and organization of an alternative teaching performance assessment and (2) the description of the full range of quality information that would need to be provided by the sponsor of an alternative TPA for submitting that alternative teaching performance assessment for Commission review and approval.

If the Commission approves this proposal, the original Assessment Quality Standards 21-23 would be renumbered, renamed, and implemented as Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standards 19-21. This new Standard 19 would then replace the current *Interim Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standard 19*.

B. Minor Revisions to the Wording of Original Assessment Quality Standards 19, 20 and 22

Since the teaching performance assessment is now to be implemented per SB 1209 (Chap. 517, Statutes of 2006) as an embedded assessment within local programs as one of several overall, or general, program requirements, it would be appropriate to remove the sentence currently contained within Element 19(e) that refers to this assessment as “high-stakes.” Therefore, staff recommends removing from Element 19(e) the words “high stakes” from the following sentence: “The statement demonstrates the sponsor’s clear understanding of the high-stakes implications of assessment for candidates, the public schools, and K-12 students.”

Within the current Assessment Quality Standard 20, Element 20(d), the words “Standard 22” should be replaced with “Standard 20” to refer to the renumbered Standard 20 if the Commission approves the repurposing of this Standard as described above.

Within the Standard Statement of the current Assessment Quality Standard 22, staff recommends that the words “in accordance with Standard 20” be removed from Element 22(c) if the Commission approves the repurposing of this Standard as described above.

C. Use of Standards Statements and Elements Within Standards

The Assessment Quality Standards originally brought to the Commission in 2002 and 2003 contained both standard statements and multiple “required elements” that further explicated the standard statements. The proposed new Assessment Design Standards for alternative teaching performance assessment instruments (formerly Assessment Quality Standards 19-20), if the proposed modification of these two standards is adopted by the Commission, would continue to contain both standard statements and required elements to which sponsors of alternative teaching performance assessments would have to respond. The reason for maintaining the current structure is that these Assessment Design Standards focus on complex issues of assessment design that require a full, detailed institutional response in order for the Commission to be able to judge the quality, reliability and fairness of an alternative performance assessment submitted for approval.

On the other hand, Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standards 19-21, if this modification is adopted by the Commission, would contain only Standard statements, but not required elements. There are several reasons why staff is proposing this structure. In this instance, professional teacher preparation programs would be implementing a teaching performance assessment model that is already well-defined and that has already been approved by the Commission for use by program sponsors. Unlike the Assessment Design Standards for alternative teaching performance assessments being submitted to the Commission for initial review and approval, these three program level standards address how programs embed the teaching performance assessment within their programs in the manner that best fits a local implementation and use model. Thus, since the program sponsor will be implementing a model already approved by the Commission, and since the implementation of the TPA is a program-level responsibility, staff recommends that programs be provided the maximum feasible level of flexibility in addressing the three TPA implementation standards. Allowing programs to respond to the standard statement and then explaining how the teaching performance assessment best fits within the existing approved professional teacher preparation program design would provide that flexibility to program sponsors in implementing the TPA.

Implementation of Teacher Preparation Program Standards 19-21 and of Assessment Design Standards for the Development and Submission of Alternative Teaching Performance Assessments

SB 1209 (Chap. 517, Statutes of 2006) requires each professional teacher preparation program to incorporate a Commission-approved teaching performance assessment beginning July 1, 2008. If the Commission approves the prior recommendations concerning the Assessment Quality Standards proposed above, staff recommends the following implementation schedule for the revised Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standards 19-21 and the Assessment Design Standards for Alternative Teaching Performance Assessments:

Proposed Implementation Schedule

Date	Event	Responsible
Dec. 1, 2006	Reinstatement of the Assessment Quality Standards as new Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standards 19-21, and adoption of Guidelines for sponsors of alternative teaching performance assessment models	Commission
By Dec. 15, 2006	Program sponsors respond to the CTC survey regarding TPA implementation plan and training needs (see Attachment C)	All Program sponsors
February 2007- July 2008	Orientation training and Assessor training for the CA TPA model provided to program sponsors, based on results of the TPA survey	CTC staff and state trainers
Beginning February 2007 and ongoing	Program sponsors notify CTC if they will be submitting an alternative TPA for review and approval	Program sponsors, as applicable
Beginning March 1, 2007 and ongoing	Program sponsors submit alternative TPA models for Commission review and approval	Program sponsors, as applicable
Beginning April 2007 and ongoing	Expert panel reviews alternative TPA models and makes recommendations for approval to the Commission, as per EC 44320.2 (d)(3)	CTC staff and expert panel
By January 2008	Program sponsors respond to Teacher Preparation Program Standards 19-21	All Program sponsors
Beginning January 2008 and ongoing	Responses to Program Standards 19-21 reviewed and programs recommended to COA for approval	CTC staff
July 1, 2008	All approved professional teacher preparation programs implement an approved TPA with all candidates	All Program sponsors

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Commission:

(a) Repurpose the current Assessment Quality Standards 19-20 as “Assessment Design Standards” for the development and submission of alternative teaching performance assessments for Commission approval;

(b) Renumber and rename the current Assessment Quality Standards 21-23 as “Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standards 19-21”;

- (c) Replace *Interim Teacher Preparation Program Standard 19* with the new *Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standard 19*.
- (d) approve the wording changes as described above on page PSC 7A-8; and
- (e) adopt the implementation plan as describe above.

Part IV: Request for Proposals (RFP) for a Validity Study of the California Teaching Performance Assessment

Introduction

This fourth and final section of the agenda item presents a request for the Commission to approve the issuance of a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the initial validation of the CA TPA model described in Part II above.

Background

Senate Bill 2042 (Chapter 548, Statutes of 1998) requires all candidates for a preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credential to pass an assessment of teaching performance in order to earn a teaching credential. In accordance with this provision of SB 2042, the Commission, in cooperation with Educational Testing Service (ETS), designed and developed the prototype California Teaching Performance Assessment (known as the CA TPA) that was described in Section II of this agenda item. The CA TPA measures the attributes of the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) that describe the knowledge and abilities necessary for beginning California teachers that were adopted by the Commission in 2001. The prototype CA TPA has been available for voluntary use by teacher preparation programs since the summer of 2003.

As explained in Section III of this agenda item, although the Commission had adopted Assessment Quality Standards to guide the implementation of both the CA TPA and any alternative teaching performance assessments approved by the Commission, the Commission took action in April 2003 to delay the implementation of the Assessment Quality Standards, and of the teaching performance assessment.

In September 2006, the Governor signed SB 1209 (Chap. 517, Statutes of 2006) which revised Education Code Section 44230 concerning the implementation of the teaching performance assessment requirement. All professional teacher preparation programs must implement a Commission-approved teaching performance assessment with all multiple and single subject teacher candidates as of July 1, 2008. SB 1209 further requires that the Commission “initially and periodically analyze the validity of assessment content and the reliability of assessment scores that are established pursuant to this section.” In compliance with the provisions of SB 1209, staff is requesting approval to issue a Request for Proposals for an initial validity study of the CA TPA.

Scope of Work and Time Frame for the Validity Study of the California Teaching Performance Assessment

In accordance with the provisions of EC 44320.2 (d)(4) and SB 1209, the Commission is required to “initially and periodically analyze the validity of assessment content and the

reliability of assessment scores that are established pursuant to this section” [pertaining to the teaching performance assessment]. The initial validity of the content of the CA TPA model was established at the time of the initial development and the beginning of the pilot study of the CA TPA. However, the study of the initial reliability of the assessment scores needed to wait until sufficient scoring of candidate performance had taken place. Now that three years of pilot implementation scoring data are available, the initial validity of the reliability of assessment scores can proceed. The area of the reliability of assessment scores will form the basis for the scope of work to be contained within the Request for Proposals.

The time frame for the initial score reliability study of the CA TPA will be from February 2007-September 2007, with the final report of the validity study due by September 30, 2007. This time frame has been established in order to use the federal Title II funding allocation from the California Department of Education to the Commission as provided in the State Budget Act. These funds become available for use on January 1, 2007, and expire on September 30, 2007. Because the Commission does not meet in January 2007, the TPA Validity Study contract will not be awarded until the Commission meeting of February 7-8, 2007 and work may not begin until a contract has been awarded.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the release of an RFP for the initial validity of the California Teaching Performance Assessment, as described above, so that this work can move forward in a timely manner within the limited allowable time frame for using the federal Title II funds to support this work.

Attachment A
California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs)

A. MAKING SUBJECT MATTER COMPREHENSIBLE TO STUDENTS

TPE 1: Specific Pedagogical Skills for Subject Matter Instruction

- a. Subject-Specific Pedagogical Skills for Multiple Subject Teaching Assignments
- b. Subject-Specific Pedagogical Skills for Single Subject Teaching Assignments

B. ASSESSING STUDENT LEARNING

TPE 2: Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction

TPE 3: Interpretation and Use of Assessments

C. ENGAGING AND SUPPORTING STUDENTS IN LEARNING

TPE 4: Making Content Accessible

TPE 5: Student Engagement

TPE 6: Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices

- a. Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Grades K-3
- b. Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Grades 4-8
- c. Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Grades 9-12

TPE 7: Teaching English Learners

D. PLANNING INSTRUCTION AND DESIGNING LEARNING EXPERIENCES FOR STUDENTS

TPE 8: Learning about Students

TPE 9: Instructional Planning

E. CREATING AND MAINTAINING EFFECTIVE ENVIRONMENTS FOR STUDENT LEARNING

TPE 10: Instructional Time

TPE 11: Social Environment

F. DEVELOPING AS A PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR

TPE 12: Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations

TPE 13: Professional Growth

Attachment B
**California Teaching Performance Assessment Quality Standards, as
Adopted and Postponed by the Commission in 2002**

Program Standard 19: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness
(Standard 19 Applies to Programs that Request Approval of Alternative Assessments)

The sponsor of the professional teacher preparation program requests approval of a Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) in which complex pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring scales are linked to the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) in Appendix A. The program sponsor clearly states the intended uses of the assessment, anticipates its potential misuses, and ensures that local uses are consistent with the statement of intent. The sponsor maximizes the fairness of assessment design for all groups of candidates in the program, and ensures that the established passing standard on the TPA is equivalent to or more rigorous than the recommended state passing standard.

Required Elements for Standard 19: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness

19(a) The Teaching Performance Assessment includes complex pedagogical assessment tasks to prompt aspects of candidate performance that measure the TPEs. Each task is substantively related to two or more major domains of the TPEs. For use in judging candidate-generated responses to each pedagogical task, the assessment also includes multi-level scoring scales that are clearly related to the same TPEs that the task measures. Each task and its associated scales measure two or more TPEs. Collectively, the tasks and scales in the assessment address key aspects of the six major domains of the TPEs. The sponsor of the professional teacher preparation program documents the relationships between TPEs, tasks and scales.

19(b) To preserve the validity and fairness of the assessment over time, the sponsor may need to develop and field-test new pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring scales to replace or strengthen prior ones. Initially and periodically, the sponsor analyzes the assessment tasks and scoring scales to ensure that they yield important evidence that represents candidate knowledge and skill related to the TPEs, and serves as a basis for determining entry-level pedagogical competence to teach the curriculum and student population of California's K-12 public schools. The sponsor records the basis and results of each analysis, and modifies the tasks and scales as needed.

19(c) Consistent with the language of the TPEs, the sponsor defines scoring scales so different candidates for credentials can earn acceptable scores on the Teaching Performance Assessment with the use of different pedagogical practices that support implementation of the K-12 content standards and curriculum frameworks. The sponsor takes steps to plan and anticipate the appropriate scoring of candidates who use pedagogical practices that are educationally effective but not explicitly anticipated in the scoring scales.

19(d) The sponsor develops scoring scales and assessor training procedures that focus primarily on teaching performance and that minimize the effects of candidate factors that are not clearly related to pedagogical competence, which may include (depending on the circumstances) factors such as personal attire, appearance, demeanor, speech patterns and accents that are not likely to affect student learning.

19(e) The sponsor publishes a clear statement of the intended uses of the assessment. The statement demonstrates the sponsor's clear understanding of the implications of the assessment for candidates, the public schools, and K-12 students. The statement includes appropriate cautions about additional or alternative uses for which the assessment is not valid. Before releasing information about the assessment design to another organization, the sponsor informs the organization that the assessment is valid only for determining the pedagogical competence of candidates for initial teaching credentials in California. All elements of assessment design and development are consistent with the intended use of the assessment for determining the pedagogical competence of candidates for Preliminary Teaching Credentials in California.

19(f) The sponsor completes content review and editing procedures to ensure that pedagogical assessment tasks and directions to candidates are culturally and linguistically sensitive, fair and appropriate for candidates from diverse backgrounds. The sponsor ensures that groups of candidates interpret the pedagogical tasks and the assessment directions as intended by the designers, and that assessment results are consistently reliable for each major group of candidates.

19(g) The sponsor completes basic psychometric analyses to identify pedagogical assessment tasks and/or scoring scales that show differential effects in relation to candidates' race, ethnicity, language, gender or disability. When group pass-rate differences are found, the sponsor investigates to determine whether the differences are attributable to (a) inadequate representation of the TPEs in the pedagogical tasks and/or scoring scales, or (b) overrepresentation of irrelevant skills, knowledge or abilities in the tasks/scales. The sponsor acts promptly to maximize the fairness of the assessment for all groups of candidates and documents the analysis process, findings, and action taken.

19(h) In designing assessment administration procedures, the sponsor includes administrative accommodations that preserve assessment validity while addressing issues of access for candidates with disabilities.

19(i) In the course of developing or adopting a passing standard that is demonstrably equivalent to or more rigorous than the State recommended standard, the sponsor secures and reflects on the considered judgments of teachers, the supervisors of teachers, the support providers of new teachers, and other preparers of teachers regarding necessary and acceptable levels of proficiency on the part of entry-level teachers. The sponsor periodically re-considers the reasonableness of the scoring scales and established passing standard.

Program Standard 20: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness

(Standard 20 Applies to Programs that Request Approval of Alternative Assessments)

The sponsor of the professional teacher preparation program requests approval of an assessment that will yield, in relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the TPEs, enough collective evidence of each candidate's pedagogical performance to serve as an adequate basis to judge the candidate's general pedagogical competence for a Preliminary Teaching Credential. The sponsor carefully monitors assessment development to ensure consistency with the stated purpose of the assessment. The Teaching Performance Assessment includes a comprehensive program to train and re-train assessors. The sponsor periodically evaluates assessment design to ensure equitable treatment of candidates. The assessment design and its implementation contribute to local and statewide consistency in the assessment of teaching competence.

Required Elements for Standard 20: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness

20(a) In relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the TPEs, the pedagogical assessment tasks and the associated directions to candidates are designed to yield enough evidence for an overall judgment of each candidate's pedagogical qualifications for a Preliminary Teaching Credential. The program sponsor will document sufficiency of candidate performance evidence through thorough field-testing of pedagogical tasks, scoring scales, and directions to candidates.

20(b) Pedagogical assessment tasks and scoring scales are extensively field-tested in practice before being used operationally in the Teaching Performance Assessment. The sponsor of the program evaluates the field-test results thoroughly and documents the field-test design, participation, methods, results and interpretation.

20(c) The Teaching Performance Assessment system includes a comprehensive program to train assessors who will score candidate responses to the pedagogical assessment tasks. An assessor training pilot program demonstrates convincingly that prospective and continuing assessors gain a deep understanding of the TPEs, the pedagogical assessment tasks and the multi-level scoring scales. The training program includes task-based scoring trials in which an assessment trainer evaluates and certifies each assessor's scoring accuracy in relation to the scoring scales associated with the task. When new pedagogical tasks and scoring scales are incorporated into the assessment, the sponsor provides additional training to the assessors, as needed.

20(d) In conjunction with the provisions of Standard 22, the sponsor plans and implements periodic evaluations of the assessor training program, which include systematic feedback from assessors and assessment trainers, and which lead to substantive improvements in the training as needed.

20(e) The program sponsor requests approval of a detailed plan for the scoring of selected assessment tasks by two trained assessors for the purpose of evaluating the reliability of scorers during field-testing and operational administration of the assessment. The subsequent assignment of one or two assessors to each assessment task is based on a cautious interpretation of the ongoing evaluation findings.

20(f) The sponsor carefully plans successive administrations of the assessment to ensure consistency in elements that contribute to the reliability of scores and the accurate determination of each candidate's passing status, including consistency in the difficulty of pedagogical assessment tasks, levels of teaching proficiency that are reflected in the multilevel scoring scales, and the overall level of performance required by the Commission's recommended passing standard on the assessment.

20(g) The sponsor ensures equivalent scoring across successive administrations of the assessment and between the Commission's model and local assessments by: using marker performances to facilitate the training of first-time assessors and the further training of continuing assessors; monitoring and recalibrating local scoring through third party reviews of scores that have been assigned to candidate responses; and periodically studying proficiency levels reflected in the adopted passing standard.

20(h) The sponsor investigates and documents the consistency of scores among and across assessors and across successive administrations of the assessment, with particular focus on the reliability of scores at and near the adopted passing standard. To ensure that the overall construct being assessed is cohesive, the sponsor demonstrates that scores on each pedagogical task are sufficiently correlated with overall scores on the remaining tasks in the assessment. The sponsor demonstrates that the assessment procedures, taken as a whole, maximize the accurate determination of each candidate's overall pass-fail status on the assessment.

20(i) The sponsor's assessment design includes an appeal procedure for candidates who do not pass the assessment, including an equitable process for rescoring of evidence already submitted by an appellant candidate in the program.

Program Standard 21: Assessment Administered for Validity, Accuracy and Fairness

The sponsor of the professional teacher preparation program implements the Teaching Performance Assessment according to the assessment design. In the program, candidate responses to pedagogical assessment tasks are scored in a manner that ensures strong consistency of scoring among assessors, particularly in relation to the established passing standard. The program sponsor periodically monitors the administration, scoring and results of the assessment to ensure equitable treatment of candidates. Prior to initial assessment, each candidate receives the *Teaching Performance Expectations* and clear, accurate information about the nature of the assessment and the pedagogical tasks.

Required Elements for Standard 21: Assessment Administered for Validity, Accuracy and Fairness

21(a) The sponsor of the program implements the assessment as designed, administers the pedagogical assessment tasks, uses the scoring scales, secures the scoring services of trained assessors, and oversees the TPE-based scoring of candidate performances to ensure assessment accuracy and equitable treatment of candidates.

21(b) The sponsor plans and implements successive administrations of the assessment to ensure consistency in assessment procedures that contribute to the reliability of scores and the accurate determination of each candidate's passing status.

21(c) The sponsor annually reviews and documents the distribution of scores across administrations and among assessors in an ongoing effort to investigate the reliability of scores at and near the established passing standard. The sponsor accumulates evidence that the assessment procedures, taken as a whole, maximize the accurate classification of each candidate's overall performance.

21(d) The sponsor takes steps to ensure the appropriate scoring of candidates who use pedagogical practices that are educationally effective but not explicitly anticipated in the scoring scales. The sponsor monitors scoring practices to ensure that scorers are focusing on teaching performance and to minimize the effect of candidate factors that are not clearly related to pedagogical competence, which may include (depending on the circumstances) factors such as personal attire, appearance, demeanor, speech patterns and accents that are not likely to affect student learning.

21(e) The program sponsor periodically compiles and examines information regarding the effects of the assessment on groups of candidates in the program. The sponsor monitors and, as needed, promptly adjusts assessment practices and procedures in order to maximize the fairness of the assessment for candidates.

21(f) The sponsor implements administrative accommodations that preserve assessment validity while addressing issues of access for candidates with disabilities. The sponsor reviews these procedures periodically to determine their appropriateness, adequacy and effects.

21(g) The sponsor distributes to each candidate the full text of the *Teaching Performance Expectations* and clear, accurate information about the assessment purpose and use,

including standardized directions related to the pedagogical assessment tasks. In alternate years (or more frequently), the sponsor reviews the descriptive information about the assessment that is provided to candidates. The sponsor revises the information to ensure that each candidate's own performance is based on clear understanding of the assessment and its requirements. In the program, advisors are available for consultations so candidates can fully understand the pedagogical assessment tasks and directions. Over time, the sponsor is consistent in the availability of assessment information, directions and consultations provided to candidates in the program.

21(h) To guard the fairness of the assessment for candidates, the sponsor ensures that each assessed performance is entirely the candidate's own performance. The sponsor periodically reviews the distributed information and assessment-related consultation practices in the program. The sponsor revises these, as needed, to ensure that each candidate's performance is a fair and accurate representation of the candidate's capacity to perform pedagogical tasks independently.

21(i) As specified in the assessment design, the program sponsor makes an appeal process and re-scoring procedure available to candidates who do not pass the assessment. The sponsor closely monitors and thoroughly documents the handling of each appeal and re-scoring to maintain the fairness of the assessment for all candidates.

21(j) The program sponsor scores pedagogical assessment tasks by two trained assessors during pilot and field tests for the purpose of evaluating the reliability of single-scorers during operational administration of the assessment. Periodically, the sponsor uses double scoring, and the analysis of that process, to confirm the reliability of TPA scores.

Program Standard 22: Assessor Qualifications and Training

To foster fairness and consistency in assessing candidate competence in the professional teacher preparation program, qualified assessors accurately assess each candidate's responses to the pedagogical assessment tasks in relation to the *Teaching Performance Expectations* and the multilevel scoring scales. The program sponsor establishes assessor selection criteria that ensure substantial pedagogical expertise on the part of each assessor. The sponsor selects and relies on assessors who meet the established criteria. Each prospective assessor completes a rigorous, comprehensive assessor training program. The program sponsor determines each assessor's continuing service as an assessor in the program primarily based on the assessor's scoring accuracy and documentation. Each continuing assessor is recalibrated annually.

Required Elements for Standard 22: Assessor Qualifications and Training

22(a) The program sponsor establishes specific, clear criteria for selecting qualified assessors from two categories: classroom teachers and other experts in pedagogy. Criteria for selecting teacher assessors include preparation, experience and performance criteria, and ensure that each teacher assessor is a certificated teacher in California. Criteria for selecting other expert assessors ensure that each individual assessor possesses advanced professional education, experience and expertise in pedagogy.

22(b) Prospective assessors satisfactorily complete a comprehensive approved assessor training program in which lead Assessment Trainers provide explanations, exercises and feedback to achieve assessor consistency and accuracy in scoring evidence of candidates' responses to pedagogical assessment tasks. In the Training Program, Assessment Trainers conduct task-based scoring trials and evaluate and certify each assessor's scoring accuracy in relation to the TPE-based scoring scales.

22(c) Consistent with the scoring plan provided by the Commission or approved by the Commission in accordance with Standard 20, the program sponsor assigns qualified assessors to assess candidates' responses to the pedagogical assessment tasks in the Teaching Performance Assessment.

22(d) To ensure accuracy and reliability in assessment scores, each assessor's scores of candidates' responses to pedagogical assessment tasks are reviewed in a monitoring and calibration process during the Training Program and annually thereafter.

22(e) The program sponsor adopts and implements criteria for the retention and non-retention of assessors during and after their participation in the Training Program. Accuracy of assessment judgments and timeliness and completeness of score documentation are the primary criteria for retention and non-retention of assessors in the Teaching Performance Assessment.

Program Standard 23: Assessment Administration, Resources and Reporting

In the professional teacher preparation program, the Teaching Performance Assessment is administered and reported in ways that are consistent with its stated purpose and design. To ensure accuracy in administration of the assessment, the program sponsor annually commits sufficient resources, expertise and effort to its planning, coordination and implementation. Following assessment, candidates receive performance information that is clear and detailed enough to (a) serve as a useful basis for their Individual Induction Plans developed within an approved Induction Programs, or (b) guide them in study and practice as they prepare for reassessment, as needed. While protecting candidate privacy, the sponsor uses individual results of the assessment as one basis for recommending candidates for Preliminary Teaching Credentials. The sponsor uses aggregated assessment results in appropriate ways to improve the program. The sponsor documents the administration, scoring and reporting of the assessment in accordance with state accreditation procedures.

Required Elements for Standard 23: Assessment Administration, Resources and Reporting

23(a) All aspects of assessment administration, scoring and reporting are appropriate for the primary intended purpose and use of the Teaching Performance Assessment: to determine each candidate's pedagogical qualifications for a Preliminary Teaching Credential. The program sponsor refers to the Commission all requests for alternative or additional uses of the Commission-developed assessment.

23(b) During each academic term, the program sponsor allocates sufficient fiscal, personnel and technical resources to support consistency in all aspects of ongoing administration of the Teaching Performance Assessment.

23(c) The program sponsor assumes responsibility for competent administrative coordination of the Teaching Performance Assessment. The sponsor clearly states responsibilities for assessment planning and coordination, assigns these duties to qualified personnel, and monitors assessment coordination each academic term.

23(d) The program sponsor protects the privacy of individual candidates. Access to assessment results is available only to the candidate and to organizational officers who clearly need the information because of their responsibilities in the program, and to CCTC accreditation teams. Prior to participating in the assessment, each candidate is apprised of the intended disposition of assessment findings. Release of assessment findings and/or results to other persons effectively requires prior voluntary consent by the candidate.

23(e) The sponsor's assessment reports to candidates are timely and informative. When a candidate passes the assessment, the candidate's report includes information that contributes to the development of an Individual Induction Plan for use by the beginning teacher in a Professional Induction Program. A candidate who does not pass the assessment receives a detailed performance report from the program sponsor.

23(f) Individual assessment reports to candidates include descriptive information that highlights performance strengths and weaknesses in relation to the *Teaching*

Performance Expectations and the standards for passing the assessment. Reports may also emphasize relationships among TPEs, and may describe the candidate's teaching practice holistically.

23(g) Internal and external reviews of the teacher preparation program include analyses and interpretations of the aggregated results of the assessment. During reviews, program managers and other participants reflect systematically on the aggregated assessment implications and, in conjunction with valid information from other sources, decide on program improvements as needed.

23(h) Pursuant to procedural guidelines established by the Commission, the program sponsor organizes and maintains comprehensive documentation of assessment procedures and instructions to candidates; candidate responses to pedagogical assessment tasks; scorer qualifications, assignments and findings; candidate reports; and uses of and administrative access to candidate results.

Attachment C
Implementation Survey for the
California Teaching Performance Assessment (CA TPA)
Summer 2006

Program Sponsor: _____

Contact Person Name: _____ Title: _____

Phone: _____ Email: _____

Program Sponsor Information

1. My program/institution is currently trying out or piloting the CA TPA
____ No (*Continue to question 1a below*)
____ Yes (*Continue to question 2 below*)
____ Planning to implement the CA TPA in the future (*Continue to question 3 on the next page*)

1a. If No:

- ____ My program/institution is already implementing a TPA other than the CA TPA (specify) _____
____ My program/institution is planning to implement a TPA other than the CA TPA (specify) _____
____ My program/institution is designing its own teaching performance assessment system. It will be ready for implementation by _____(date)

If your program/institution is planning to implement another TPA than the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CA TPA) you do not need to fill out the rest of this survey. Please email or fax your response to Marjorie Suckow by September 30, 2006 (email: msuckow@ctc.ca.gov or Fax 916-327-3165). Thank you for your time!

2. If Yes, my program/institution started the implementation of CA TPA in:

- ____ Fall 2003 ____ Fall 2004 ____ Fall 2005
____ Spring 2004 ____ Spring 2005 ____ Spring 2006
____ Summer 2004 ____ Summer 2005 ____ Summer 2006

2a. Total number of assessors trained in the CA TPA at your institution as of summer 2006 _____

- Number of assessors trained by CCTC staff _____
- Number of assessors trained by non-CCTC trainers _____
- Number of assessors trained by your faculty members _____
(*after they finished the CCTC's "Lead Assessors" trainings*)

2b. Number of assessors who need to be calibrated again in the tasks for which they have

been trained (*assessors need to be calibrated every 6 months, if not currently doing any assessment*) _____

2c. Number of assessors trained in the CA TPA, and when, by TPA Tasks:

	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Task 1			
Task 2			
Task 3			
Task 4			

2d. Number of assessors who have left your program/institution after having been trained in the CA TPA _____

2e. Number of trained assessors who have not left your program/institution but are no longer doing TPA activities _____

2f. Total number of candidates who participated in the CA TPA in 2003-04 _____

2g. Total number of candidates who participated in the CA TPA in 2004-05 _____

2h. Total number of candidates who participated in the CA TPA in 2005-06 _____

2i. Number of candidates who participated in the CA TPA, by credential type:

	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Multiple Subjects			
Single Subjects			

2j. Number of candidates who participated in the CA TPA, by TPA Tasks:

	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Task 1			
Task 2			
Task 3			
Task 4			

2k. Proportion of candidates overall who participated the CA TPA:

(*if exact number is not available, an estimate is OK*)

- ___ All teacher candidates in the program (100%)
- ___ More than three-fourth (approximately 75%)
- ___ More than half (approximately 50%)
- ___ More than one-fifth (approximately 25%)

2l. Need for additional training:

Total number of additional assessors needed by your program/institution to implement the CA TPA for all candidates, starting July 1, 2008 _____

2m. Total number of individuals who would participate in assessor training in **2006-2007:**

(sponsored by the CCTC or other teacher preparation programs or your own trained assessors)

	Summer 2006	Fall 2006	Spring 2007	Summer 2007
Task 1				
Task 2				
Task 3				
Task 4				

2n. Total number of individuals who would participate in assessor training in **2007-2008:**

(sponsored by the CCTC or other teacher preparation programs or your own trained assessors)

	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Summer 2008
Task 1			
Task 2			
Task 3			
Task 4			

Please continue to question 4 on the following page.

3. If your program is **planning to implement the CA TPA in the future, when would you begin implementation?**

_____ in 2006

_____ in 2007

_____ in 2008

3a. Average annual number of teacher candidates prepared by your program _____
(Not including Special Education)

3b. Total number of assessors needed by your program/institution to implement the CA TPA for all candidates, as of July 1, 2008 _____

(as a guideline for programs without prior experience working with the CA TPA, it is suggested that programs/institutions consider having at a minimum one trained and calibrated assessor per 15-20 teacher candidates, but programs may choose to train as many assessors as they want)

3c. Total number of individuals who would participate in assessor training in **2006-2007:**

(sponsored by the CCTC or other teacher preparation programs or your own trained assessors)

	Summer 2006	Fall 2006	Spring 2007	Summer 2007
Task 1				
Task 2				
Task 3				
Task 4				

3d. Total number of individuals who would participate in assessor training in **2007-2008:**
(sponsored by the CCTC or other teacher preparation programs or your own trained assessors)

	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Summer 2008
Task 1			
Task 2			
Task 3			
Task 4			

4. We value your input. Please use the space below to add any additional information you would like us to know or consider about future implementation of the CA TPA.