
2D

Information

Professional Services Committee

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

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents a summary of the work to date on the process to collect data on the implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment.

Recommended Action: For information only

Presenter: Michael Taylor, Consultant, and Terry Janicki, 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 and performance of professional educators and for the accreditation of credential programs

January 2011

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

Introduction

This agenda item provides an update on the pilot data collection activities that have taken place for the 2008-2009 academic year administrations of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA).

Background

As of July 2008, California statute (Education Code §44320.2) requires all candidates for a preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credential to pass an assessment of their teaching performance with K-12 public school students as part of the requirements for earning a teaching credential. Prior to this time, several teaching performance assessment models had been developed and were being implemented on a voluntary basis by individual teacher preparation programs.

This assessment of teaching performance is designed to measure the candidate's knowledge, skills and abilities in relation to California's Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs), including demonstrating his/her ability to appropriately instruct all K-12 students in the student academic content standards. To date, the Commission has approved three models of the TPA: the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA), the Formative Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST), and the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). Each of the three approved teaching performance assessment models requires a candidate to complete defined tasks relating to subject-specific pedagogy, designing and implementing instruction and student assessment, and a culminating teaching experience or event. When taken as a whole, teaching performance assessment tasks/activities measure the TPEs multiple times. Candidate performances are scored by trained assessors against one or more rubrics that describe levels of performance relative to each task/activity. Each model must also meet and maintain specified standards of assessment reliability, validity, and fairness to candidates. All candidates who began a Commission-approved multiple and single subject teacher preparation program on or after July 1, 2008 must meet the teaching performance assessment requirement.

Program sponsors may choose to implement either the CalTPA or the PACT. The use of FACT has been restricted by request of the institution for use by CSU Fresno only. TPA implementation takes place at the local teacher preparation program level. Program sponsors must implement the selected model as that model was designed and validated by the model's developer. Programs are responsible for

- the orientation of candidates to the TPA
- advice and assistance to candidates during the TPA process
- identification and training of qualified assessors of candidate performance
- assuring that candidate performance is assessed by trained and calibrated assessors in a manner that is fair and reliable

- providing TPA performance data to candidates
- maintaining candidate, assessor, and outcomes data
- using TPA-related data both for program improvement purposes and as one basis for the recommendation of a candidate for a credential

Commission-Approved Teaching Performance Assessment Models

Each of the three Commission-approved TPA models is based on California's adopted *Teaching Performance Expectations* (see Appendix A). The three models are: (1) the California Teaching Performance Assessment; (2) Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT); and the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST). Additional information about each model follows.

The California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA)

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/TPA.html>

The California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA) is the Commission-developed teaching performance assessment model. The CalTPA consists of four interrelated tasks that increase in complexity: *Subject-Specific Pedagogy*; *Designing Instruction*; *Assessing Learning*; and *Culminating Teaching Experience*. Each of the four tasks measures multiple TPEs within the single task; taken as a whole, the CalTPA measures each TPE several times. Candidates must provide a 20 minute unedited video of their teaching with an actual class of K-12 students as part of the *Culminating Teaching Experience* task.

Each CalTPA task measures the *Teaching Performance Expectations* in multiple ways. In the first task, *Subject-Specific Pedagogy*, the candidate responds to case studies where all the information needed is provided. In the second task, *Designing Instruction*, candidates plan instruction but are not required to actually teach the planned lesson. The third and fourth tasks, *Assessing Learning* and *Culminating Teaching Experience*, require that the candidate be in a field experience setting where he or she is teaching actual K-12 students either as a student teacher or as an intern. Each task contains explicit prompts and/or questions to which the candidate responds. Within each task, the prompts are organized into steps to scaffold the responses. In each task the candidate is required to focus on the class as a whole as well as on two particular students, one an English learner, the other a student with special needs or, depending on the task, a student who presents a different instructional challenge.

The Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST)

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/TPA-files/FAST-flyer.pdf>

The Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) is approved for use only by CSU Fresno, at the request of the university. The FAST system evaluates candidates based on four tasks. The *Comprehensive Lesson Plan Project* and *Site Visitation Project* are completed during candidates' initial student teaching placements. Then, the *Teaching Sample Project* and the *Holistic Proficiency Project* are completed during final student teaching or internship.

The Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT)

<http://www.pacttpa.org>

The Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) was developed by a consortium of institutions including Stanford University and the University of California. The design of the

PACT assessment focuses on two assessment strategies: (1) the formative assessment of prospective teachers through “Embedded Signature Assessments” (ESAs) that occur throughout the teacher preparation sequence, and (2) the formative and summative assessment of prospective teachers through the “Teaching Event” that takes place during student teaching. The PACT scoring system is based on a series of scoring rubrics for the Teaching Event that are specifically developed for each of the content areas, and the scoring system includes formal training, calibration, and recalibration of assessors. The ESAs represent course-embedded assignments that are considered to measure key competencies. Within the PACT system, therefore, before candidates complete the Teaching Event, they have already received a great deal of ongoing support and formative feedback on the teaching competencies that are measured in the Teaching Event and, in some programs, on other dimensions of teaching as well. The Teaching Event is both a formative and summative instrument. It was designed for use in making a summative decision about recommending a candidate for a Preliminary California Teaching Credential as well as to be diagnostic to support candidate growth. The Teaching Event also requires candidates to provide videos of their performance with K-12 students.

Common Characteristics of All Three TPA Models

All three of the Commission-approved teaching performance assessment models share the following characteristics:

- based on California’s *Teaching Performance Expectations* for beginning teachers
- require candidates to perform specified tasks/activities performed by the candidates to demonstrate their ability to provide appropriate, effective instruction for all California K-12 public school students
- include a focus on English learner students and students with special needs
- use a rubric-based score of 1-4 (different models may require different minimum score levels)
- require candidate orientation and practice in the TPA tasks/activities
- embed tasks within the teacher preparation program sequence
- provide assessor training, calibration and recalibration
- scored by trained assessors who must maintain their calibration status
- require double scoring to maintain scoring reliability
- provide feedback to candidates
- provide opportunities for candidates to retake a task if needed
- provide candidate information useful for induction
- provide information for program improvement

Statutory Requirements for TPA Data Collection

Education Code Section 44320.2 requires the following with respect to collection and analysis of candidate scores and background information for teaching performance assessments:

- (d) Subject to the availability of funds in the annual Budget Act, the commission shall perform all of the following duties with respect to the performance assessment:
 - (7) Collect and analyze background information provided by candidates who participate in the performance assessment, and report and interpret the individual and aggregated results of the assessment.

The Commission's Data Collection Process

The Commission's TPA Users Advisory Committee met with Commission staff to determine appropriate data collection elements, and in early 2010 Commission staff began a process for collecting candidate data related to the TPA directly from institutions. Institutions were asked to submit to the Commission scores and demographic information for all candidates who completed some portion of any of the three approved TPA models during the 2008-2009 academic year, which was the first full academic year following statewide implementation of the TPA requirement for teacher candidates.

The data collection effort consisted of three parts:

1. Development and distribution of data templates
2. Completion of data templates by approved programs
3. Submission of data to the Commission via secure, encrypted email

Data Templates

Commission staff developed separate data collection templates for each of the three Commission-approved TPA models, each with specific instructions for completing the template. The templates were posted on the Commission's TPA website. Copies of the appropriate templates and instructions were also emailed to the TPA coordinators for each approved program. Each template required the following information for each candidate:

- candidate name
- candidate SSN or Statewide Educator Identifier (SEID)
- program type (traditional, intern, or blended)
- credential type (MS, SS, dual)
- gender
- ethnicity/race
- native English speaker status (Y or N)
- highest degree held
- scores for each attempt of each task or portion (as appropriate by model)
- dates for each attempt of each task or portion (as appropriate by model)
- overall score (for completers, as appropriate by model)
- overall score date (for completers, as appropriate by model)

Individual identifiers such as candidate names and SSNs or SEID are important to the data collection task because they allow staff to link TPA information collected to additional demographic and other candidate data collected by other means, such as Title II or the Credential Automated System Enterprise (CASE) credentials database, to create a more robust overall data set while minimizing the burden on TPA coordinators or other staff completing the templates. Additionally, because the initial data collection effort included information for only a single academic year, and because many candidates may not complete all portions of the TPA in any given single academic year, individual candidate identification is necessary to link data from one year to the next to get a complete overall picture of the TPA completion process.

Encrypted Email Submissions

Because the completed data templates contained secure and sensitive individual candidate information, institutions were asked to submit their completed data templates to the Commission

using a state-sponsored encrypted email server. Each TPA coordinator was sent an email with a link to the encrypted server. Commission staff worked to combine candidate information submitted by each program into a single data table for each TPA model.

Results

Scores were collected in this manner for 9,742 candidates from 75 different institutions who took some portion of one of the three Commission-approved TPA models during the 2008-2009 academic year. The following table shows demographic information about the data collected.

2008-2009 TPA Data Summary			# of candidates	% of candidates
Statewide			9742	
by model	CalTPA	Total	7305	75%
	FAST	Total	310	3%
	PACT	Total	2127	22%
by program type	Traditional		5881	60%
	Intern		1397	14%
	Blended		442	5%
	Other/blank		2022	21%
by ethnicity	Hispanic		2056	21%
	Asian		641	7%
	Black		315	3%
	American Indian		43	0%
	Pacific Islander		101	1%
	White		4883	50%
	Two or more races		143	1%
	Other/blank		1560	16%
by gender	Female		7292	75%
	Male		2419	25%
	Other/blank		31	0%
by native English speaker	No		520	5%
	Yes		3927	40%
	Other/blank		5295	54%
by highest degree held	None		425	4%
	Associate		3	0%
	Bachelor		7008	72%
	Master		464	5%
	Doctorate		18	0%
	Special		7	0%
	Other/blank		1817	19%

2008-2009 TPA Data Summary		# of candidates	% of candidates
by credential type	Multiple-Subject	4949	51%
	Single-Subject	3548	36%
	Dual	10	0%
	Other/blank	1235	13%

Issues with the Data Collection Method Used

The pilot year for TPA data collection was designed, in part, to identify issues in the process that might either compromise the quality of the data or that posed undue strain on those reporting the data. Had no issues surfaced, Commission staff would have used the data collected to create a comprehensive report of aggregate TPA data for Commission review. Some reporting issues did occur, however, and staff has analyzed them to improve the data collection process for the upcoming year. The issues that Commission staff and program faculty identified included the following:

- There was difficulty obtaining identifying information for all candidates. The University of California system objected to the Commission collecting candidate SSNs as part of the TPA data collection effort. Deadlines for data submission were changed several times to accommodate discussions on this topic. The Commission negotiated a compromise which allowed institutions disputing the SSN requirement to instead submit SEIDs for each candidate. However, many programs submitted data without the required candidate identifying information. Some program's data submission did not include candidate names or demographic information. This was true for many non-UC programs as well, often because the institution's staff members who coordinate TPA activities within programs, or who otherwise have access to the candidate TPA scores requested do not have access to candidate SSNs or requested demographic information.
- Commission staff developed Excel templates for each of the approved models to be completed by the institution providing candidate data. Excel was chosen as a simple and very common format that can be utilized by all programs regardless of the specific and/or proprietary software systems that may be used to collect and store data at the individual campuses. Unfortunately, many of the completed templates submitted to the Commission had been modified by the program sponsor. In many cases entire columns in the template were deleted or left blank, particularly columns asking for demographic information. Also, while the instructions for completing the templates listed specific coding to be used in each field (e.g., "I" for intern and "T" for traditional programs), many templates were returned with other codes, words, or initials in use at the specific program, but not useful to the Commission. As a result, when the data were aggregated for summary purposes there was missing information.
- The encrypted email process did not work with some institution's technology.

In addition to the data collection issues discussed above, determining total score and pass rate information is inconsistent across models. Only CalTPA and FAST have a quantifiable total score. PACT is a pass/fail model overall, with individual scores only for specific components. Additionally, total passing scores for CalTPA in the 08-09 data year included "total scores" for

many candidates who had not yet attempted all four of the required tasks. It was unclear whether those candidates had not had an opportunity to complete all the tasks in the reported academic year or whether they were candidates who had left the program.

The teaching performance assessment is locally implemented by approved programs. In two of the three approved models, there are minor differences across the programs such as the number of times a candidate may retake a task. In addition, for the CalTPA, the passing score at institutions may vary. The state passing score is 12 with no more than one task having been scored as a 2. But some institutions have determined that although the passing score is 12, no task may have been scored a 2. Therefore, individual programs must determine if candidates who have completed all tasks have passed the TPA. The number or percent of candidates who “passed” cannot be accurately determined from individual scores collected at the state level.

Next Steps

The pilot year for collecting TPA data was very helpful in identifying parts of the process that worked well and those that needed to be reformulated. For the 2011 TPA data collection effort–2009-10 school year–Commission staff plans to modify the data submission process significantly in order to simplify the data reporting task for institutions.

- Commission staff will pre-populate a data template for each institution with Title II data previously submitted by the institution. Institutions will then need to simply provide the TPA score information for each of the candidates listed. This process will simplify the work for each of the approved programs since candidates will already be identified and therefore Social Security Numbers (or SEIDs) will not need to be provided by the institutions for the candidates listed in the template.
- Additionally, the data collection templates will be modified to provide restricted choices for the demographic data elements: program type, ethnicity, gender, native English speaker, highest degree held, and credential type.

These modifications should significantly increase the amount of useful demographic information collected by eliminating most of the un-interpretable data entries. The TPA User’s Advisory Committee (UAC) is scheduled to meet January 11, 2011. Though the UAC meeting will have occurred prior to the Commission meeting at which this item will be presented, it has not yet occurred at the time of the preparation of this agenda item. The UAC is composed of TPA users and representatives from all three approved TPA models. The UAC will discuss these data collection issues as well as specific options for modifying future data collection efforts. An oral update will be presented at the January Commission meeting. It is anticipated that the UAC may have specific recommendations for the Commission to consider at a future meeting.