3C

Information

Educator Preparation Committee

Update on the Redevelopment of the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA)

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents an update on efforts to redevelop the CalTPA.

Policy Question: Does the redevelopment of the CalTPA align with the Commission's expectations?

Recommended Action: For information only

Presenter: Amy Reising, Director of Performance Assessments

Strategic Plan Goal

I. Educator Quality
  b) Develop, maintain, and promote high quality authentic, consistent educator assessments and examinations that support development and certification of educators who have demonstrated the capacity to be effective practitioners.

September 2016

Update on the Redevelopment of the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA)

Introduction

This agenda item presents an update on efforts to redevelop the CalTPA based on the revised Teaching Performance Assessment Design Standards adopted at the Commission's December 2015 meeting and the revised Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) adopted at the June 2016 meeting. Approval of the TPEs at the June meeting allowed the Commission staff, an appointed Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA) Design Team, and the Commission's technical contractor, Evaluation Systems group of Pearson (Evaluation Systems), to initiate the redevelopment of the Commission's model TPA.

The Commission's teaching performance assessment (TPA) model is called the CalTPA. The CalTPA Design Team includes twenty members representing the full range of teacher preparation programs, teacher induction programs, and the geographic regions of California. A list of CalTPA Design Team members is included in Appendix A. The CalTPA Design Team has met five times at the Commission offices. A sixth two day meeting is planned for September 20-21, 2016. The Design Team will continue to meet every other month through June of 2018 and provide recommendations to support the redevelopment of the CalTPA.

Appendix B provides a graphic showing how the CalTPA Design Team and other teams necessary to inform the redevelopment of the CalTPA will interact with the Commission, Commission staff, and the Commission's technical contractor, Evaluation Systems. Content Expert Panels have been identified and will meet in October to review all CalTPA tasks and rubrics for subject specific appropriateness. Currently Commission staff and Evaluation Systems are recruiting programs to participate in a pilot study of the draft CalTPA assessment tasks. The pilot study will be conducted between January and May of 2017.

Background

At its December 2015 meeting, the Commission adopted revised TPA Design Standards and directed staff to develop an RFP to identify a technical contractor to support Commission staff and an appointed Design Team of California educators, to redevelop the CalTPA (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2015-12/2015-12-2E.pdf). Evaluation Systems group of Pearson was selected in February 2016 to serve as the technical contractor to support the redevelopment project. Subcontractors to Evaluation Systems include the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO,) the California State University and their Deans of Education Assessment Committee, and the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity .

The first task was to conduct a validity study on the revised Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs), which was completed during the spring of 2016. Based on the findings of the validity study, at the June 2016 meeting, the Commission adopted revised TPEs and directed staff to commence with the redevelopment of the CalTPA.

The TPEs play an integral role in determining the design and delivery of teacher preparation program curriculum and fieldwork experiences for teacher candidates. Consistent with statute, Commission-approved Teaching Performance Assessments (TPAs) measure TPEs and are expected to provide critical and detailed feedback that a newly prepared teacher needs to improve and enhance his/her teaching practice. The revised TPEs are organized around the six *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*, and include the following new areas of focus:

- the use of emerging technology to enhance instruction;
- the use of visual and performing arts across content areas to support teaching and learning;
- updated approaches to classroom management that support social and emotional learning;
- developing students' critical, creative, and analytic thinking required to be college and career ready; and
- provide more emphasis on candidates' ability to work effectively with special needs students in the general education classroom, implementing approaches such as Universal Design principles, Multi-Tiered System of Supports, and co-teaching.

All currently approved TPA model sponsors must (a) demonstrate that their model's meet the revised TPA Design Standards and assess the revised TPEs, (b) submit their revised models for review by an expert panel, (c) be approved by the Commission by June 2017, (d) field test their re-approved models in 2017-18, (e) recommend a passing standard by June 1, 2018, and (f) begin full implementation of their revised or updated model in 2018-19.

Design Team Meetings

The CalTPA Design Team includes twenty members representing the full range of teacher preparation programs, teacher induction programs, and the geographic regions of California. A list of CalTPA Design Team members is included in Appendix A. The CalTPA Design Team (DT) has engaged in five, two-day meetings. The first meeting was held in April 2016, and one more two-day meeting is scheduled for later this September. After the September meeting, the CalTPA DT will meet every other month until the end of the performance assessment development period, in 2018. Short summaries of each meeting are provided below.

Meeting 1: April 25-27

At this inaugural meeting, the CalTPA Design Team members were introduced to their responsibilities and Commission expectations for their participation. The first topic on the agenda covered the history of state policy leading to the TPA requirement in California. Commission staff explained the Commission's recent efforts to (a) strengthen and streamline the accreditation system, (b) develop data dashboards and outcome measures, (c) revise preliminary preparation program standards, (d) consider the relationship between general and special education, and (e) update and revise TPEs, TPAs and other performance assessments. The team participated in a small group activity to review and understand the TPA Design Standards and draft Teaching Performance Expectations. The Design Team and Evaluation Systems staff collected and reviewed TPA research articles and reports to support the redevelopment of the CalTPA and Commission staff provided an overview of all currently approved California TPAs (CalTPA, PACT, FAST, and edTPA). The Design Team spent time discussing what has been learned from fifteen years of

implementing TPAs and identified what, from their perspective, was working and what needed to be improved in assessing the performance of preliminary teaching credential candidates. In small groups, Design Team members brainstormed and discussed options for a redeveloped CalTPA based on their first hand experiences and research. These potential TPA structures became the foundation for subsequent meetings. The meeting closed with a discussion about recommendations for assessor criteria for the redeveloped CalTPA.

Meeting 2: May 24-25
The second TPA Design Team meeting focused on a review of the TPE validity study conducted by Evaluation System's subcontractor, HumRRO. The data analysis confirmed that the draft 6 TPEs and 45 elements were in fact important and frequently required of beginning teachers in their beginning teaching practice. Using the findings of the survey and TPE review by the Commission's Bias Review Panel, Design Team members provided a final review of the TPEs and made suggestions for clarifying language and aligning the TPE elements to the TPE narratives.

Elena Fajardo and Gustavo Gonzalez, consultants at the California Department of Education co-presented the recently adopted English Language Arts//English Language Development standards and framework (http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/rl/cf/elaeldfrmwrksbeadopted.asp) providing the opportunity for clarification and discussion of expectations for instructional strategies to support students whose first language is English, English learners, and Standard English learners. Commission staff presented the Special Education Task Force Report findings and discussed the issues related to using the TPEs as a "foundational trunk" of knowledge for education specialists. A third presentation, provided by Design Team member Kim Harrison, focused on how technology can be used to shape the way teachers design and implement instruction and assessment. In small groups Design Team members brainstormed ideas for an assessment structure that would require evidence of teaching practice that focused on supporting English learners, students with disabilities, development of digital literacy, and the use of educational technology.

Meeting 3: June 28-29
Commission staff provided an update on the actions taken by the Commission at its June 2016 meeting to adopt the TPEs. Three Design Team members, Jorge Colmenero, Danial Soodjinda, and Jose Lalas, provided a presentation titled, "Equity and Fairness: How can we assure that the redeveloped CalTPA is equitable and fair to candidates?" Small group work focused on task design following a plan, teach/assess, reflect, and apply cycle. Groups explored key questions including:
- *What performances of practice do we want candidates to demonstrate?*
- *What classroom-based evidence should teachers create or demonstrate?*
- *What classroom based evidence should be created or demonstrated by students?*
- *What prompts should guide candidates' reflective responses?*

The Design Team reflected on their developing work to determine which TPEs the tasks measured, how much guidance would be provided for an instructional cycle, how much time it might take to complete a cycle, and where choice was introduced in the evidence gathered within the cycle of plan, teach/assess, reflect and apply. The Design Team came to consensus around requiring two cycles of instruction for the redeveloped CalTPA. Consistent with the Commission's Assessment Design Standards, Multiple Subject candidates would focus one instructional cycle on literacy and the other cycle on mathematics or both instructional cycles could be integrated

lessons. Single Subject candidates would also complete two cycles of instruction, each focused on a different area of their subject specific content as defined in the California standards and frameworks. Design Team members were invited to join subgroups that would provide additional review and feedback of developing materials between meetings. Design Team members joined one of the following groups:

- Equity
- Cycle/Task Development
- Rubric Development
- Research
- Results Reporting
- Transition to Induction
- Support Materials for Candidates and Programs

Between the June and July meetings, the Cycle/Task subgroup was asked to review draft instructional cycle 1 and provide feedback and recommendations to Commission and Evaluation Systems staff. Revisions were made based on the subgroup's written input and draft instructional cycle 1 was reworked to present at the July Design Team meeting.

Meeting 4: July 26-27
Updated draft instructional cycles 1 and 2 were introduced for review and feedback. Each instructional cycle would require a candidate to create an instructional *plan*, taking into account the particular students and content being taught: *teach* a lesson and *assess* through progress monitoring student learning; *reflect* on the effectiveness of the lesson; and *apply* what they learned by determining what they would teach next to their students. In small groups, Design Team members worked with Commission and Evaluation Systems, SCALE and CSU staff to review and provide feedback on each step of two instructional cycles. Groups were asked to identify design features for Multiple Subject versus Single Subject candidates and to recommend how subject specific pedagogy could be addressed. Groups were asked to revisit which TPEs were being measured and what evidence of practice was being required for submission for the CalTPA. In addition, TPA Assessment Design Standards were revisited along with the timeline for development of the CalTPA. Members provided recommendations for materials development for both candidates and programs. Between the July and August meetings, the Cycle/Task Development subgroup was asked to review and provide feedback and recommendations to Commission and Evaluation Systems staff to assist with developing the next iteration of cycle 1 and cycle 2.

Meeting: 5 August 23-24
Evaluation Systems provided a demonstration of their online submission process and explained the steps involved with uploading evidence for the redeveloped CalTPA. Technology was demonstrated that allows candidates to time-stamp and annotate video recordings and explained what options were available for audio files. Evaluation Systems staff demonstrated the scoring platform and explained how the scoring process will be introduced in the pilot study and field test. Design Team members reviewed and provided feedback and editorial recommendations for the two, draft cycles:

- Cycle 1: Learning about your Students and Planning Instruction
- Cycle 2: Assessment Driven Instruction

They reviewed both cycles and came to agreement on which TPEs are measured by each cycle, and which TPEs would not be measured on the CalTPA but left to programs to assess. Design Team members discussed and provided recommendations about what type of rubric structure should be developed for the CalTPA. In addition, they continued their discussion about the upcoming the pilot study and what materials should be developed (webinars, workshops, presentations) to inform and support candidates and programs.

CalTPA Design Team meetings are scheduled for September 20-21 and November 14-15, 2016. The Design Team will continue to meet and provide recommendations to Commission staff and throughout the pilot study and field test to inform the redevelopment of the CalTPA.

Content Expert Panels
Content expert panels are being identified and will be convened in October to review both instructional cycles, rubrics, and materials as appropriate. Commission and Evaluation Systems staff will lead panels through a structured review process to provide content specific input. Content experts will provide feedback on subject specific pedagogy within tasks and rubrics and make recommendations to inform the next iteration of development in preparation for the pilot study.

Commission Bias Review Committee Meeting
The two cycles of instruction, rubrics, and materials drafted for the pilot study will be reviewed by the Commission's Bias Review Committee in October. The role of the Bias Review Committee is specifically to identify potential bias issues. Commission and Evaluation Systems staff will review all committee findings and recommendations, including bias-related and content-related comments. Evaluation Systems will address all noted issues of potential bias by revising the two instructional cycles and rubrics, as appropriate.

Structure of the Redeveloped CalTPA and Key Components
The CalTPA Design Team, Commission staff, and Evaluation Systems, through their series of discussions have determined an overall structure for the redeveloped CalTPA. The Design Team has come to consensus that the CalTPA will have a task-based structure and will be completed at two different times during a candidate's preliminary program. A candidate must pass both of the cycles of instruction, following the plan, teach/assess, reflect and apply cycle. This supports an educative quality of the CalTPA and both modifies and maintains the original structure of the CalTPA, allowing candidates to complete a cycle of instruction during field placement, submit it for scoring, and receive assessment results including a pass or no pass score with analytic feedback about specific TPEs. Programs can support candidates in improving their teaching practice based on their assessment results for the first Cycle of Instruction. The two Instructional cycles were purposefully developed to be completed in order, but the cycles are not dependent on each other. Instructional Cycle 1 could lead to the performance assessment developed and administered in Cycle 2 if the candidate is in the same classroom placement with the same students and it makes sense instructionally for the students and the candidate.

Key Components of the Redeveloped CalTPA
- 2 Cycles of Instruction following Plan, Teach/Assess, Reflect, Apply
  - Instructional Cycle 1: Learning about Students, and Planning Instruction
  - Instructional Cycle 2: Assessment Driven Instruction
- Focus on at least 2 focus students, an English learner, a student with an identified disability with an IEP/504 plan or GATE identified, or a student with other learning need
- Instructional design based on knowing students language needs, assets, and their needs for both academic and social/emotional support. Candidates teach every student (all students in the least restrictive environment)
- Educational technology is infused in both cycles of instruction with an emphasis on supporting students to become digital citizens
- Less emphasis on written evidence, instead candidates submit annotated video, audio files, photographs, student work (assessment results), and some written responses and reflections about practice
- Video of instruction is directed, specific, and annotated
- Choice in how to present task evidence or reflect on practice (written response, written annotations, video with annotation, audio files, photographs, graphics)
- Subject specific focus, integration of subject matter (as an option)
- Students demonstrate their learning through multiple modalities (arts)
- Candidate reflection on practice is required in each Cycle
- Analytic rubrics (TPE specific) and reports to candidates and programs, report should be detailed enough to guide learning plan for induction
- TPA score results will be used in accreditation processes as an outcome measure
- Aggregated TPA results will be posted on Commission dashboard

CalTPA Pilot Study Parameters

The CalTPA pilot study parameters:
- The CalTPA pilot study begins in January of 2017 and runs through May of 2017.
- CalTPA pilot evidence will be submitted online to Evaluation Systems for preliminary review to assist to develop marker evidence, inform the scoring process and training, and to assist with determining revisions to tasks and rubrics for the field test to be held in 2017-18.
- Pilot results will not be returned to candidates. Programs can determine grades or credit for the evidence submitted as a replacement for a typical course work assignment.
- All evidence submitted will be kept confidential.
- Programs gain valuable information about how to design courses and support candidates to prepare for the revised TPEs and redeveloped CalTPA.
- Target number of participants is 340 across the full range of credentials: multiple subject and the 14 single subjects and across all types of teacher preparation programs (university student teaching programs, university intern programs, and district intern programs).

Issues for Commission Discussion

1. Will candidates who participate in the pilot study and complete both instructional tasks in the spring of 2017 also have to sit for a fully approved TPA? The workload for these candidates would be significant, and the ability of candidates to fully complete two TPAs is questionable. Commission staff and the Design Team have been discussing how to allow candidates who participate in the Pilot Study and complete both instructional cycles to have their performance on the revised CalTPA count toward meeting credential requirements, along with the recommendation of the accredited program. Staff would recommend that only MS/SS programs that are currently meeting all MS/SS program standards and in good standing with the Commission and are committed to be a full participant in the pilot be allowed offer this opportunity to candidates during the pilot study in 2017.

2. All TPA models currently approved by the Commission are expected to undergo revision this year and field testing with standard setting in 2017-18. Should the Commission consider substituting (a) the requirement that all candidates participating in the field test **pass** an approved TPA as one criterion for earning a credential with (b) a requirement that all participating candidates **complete** a revised/updated TPA in 2017-18 and earn a credential based on successful completion and recommendation by their accredited preparation program?

Based on Commission discussion, staff will prepare an agenda item with recommendations for the Commission's consideration and potential action in October.

Next Steps

Commission staff are launching a comprehensive plan for technical assistance that will unfold over the course of 2016-17. Preparation programs will be redesigning and updating their programs and TPA model sponsors will be updating their TPAs. The Commission's CalTPA Design Team will continue work on the revised CalTPA in preparation for a Pilot Study in the first half of 2017. Staff will bring future updates to the Commission as milestones are reached, and will prepare an item for October with recommendations regarding transitioning to new TPAs.

Appendix A

California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA)
Design Team

Rebecca Ambrose, University of California, Davis

Paul Boyd-Batstone, California State University, Long Beach

Jorge Colmenero, RFK UCLA K-12 Community School/Los Angeles/LAUSD

Nedra Crow, National University (San Diego)

Brent Duckor, San Jose State University

Karen Escalante, California State University, San Marcos

Meredith Fellows, CalState TEACH

Fred Freking, University of Southern California

Donna Glassman-Sommer, Tulare County Office of Education

Kim Harrison, Washington Unified School District

Jose Lalas, University of Redlands

Edmundo Litton, Loyola Marymount University

Helene Mandell, University of San Diego

Beth Roybal, Salinas Union High School District

Donna Scarlett, Reach Institute for School Leadership

David Sloan, Brandman University

Daniel Soodjinda, California State University, Stanislaus

Emily Vazirian, Olive Crest Academy

Mick Verdi, California State University, San Bernardino

Patricia Wick, University of Phoenix

Tine Sloan, Commission Liaison

Appendix B
Commission CalTPA Development Process
Roles of the Commission, Staff, Content Experts, Design Team and the Contractor

Activity	California Educators (Design Team, Bias Review Committee, Content Expert Panels, Standard Setting Panel)	CTC Staff/ Contractor	The Commission
Purpose of Assessment & Assessment Design Standards		Plan assessment development → Advertise for CA content experts to serve on **Design Team**	Adopt Assessment Design Standards → Executive Director appoints **Design Team** members
Define what is to be assessed and how	Through multiple meetings, the **Design Team** advises on the content and focus of the assessment ← Through multiple meetings, the **Design Team** provides feedback on draft assessment specifications ← **Design Team** reaches consensus on assessment content and design	Facilitate **Design Team** discussions → Draft assessment specifications → Finalize tasks based on **Design Team** input	Approves the assessment content, focus and design
Developing Tasks and Scoring Rubrics	**Design Team** advises contractor on performance tasks; reviews draft tasks and scoring rubrics; reviews results from pilot and provides feedback on the tasks and the scoring rubrics. Tasks and scoring rubrics reviewed by the **Bias Review Committee;** edits made as necessary to avoid potential bias. **Design Team** reviews results from field test and provides feedback	Develop draft tasks and scoring rubrics → Conduct pilot of tasks and rubrics → Revise candidate and program materials based on **Design Team** input → Conduct field tests of tasks and rubrics → Analyze results, present to **Design Team,** then finalize tasks and rubrics	
Setting Passing Scores and Score Reporting	**Standard Setting Panel** reviews candidate results from the initial performance assessment administration and makes passing standard recommendation to the Commission	Based on field test conduct standard setting study → Analyze and prepare data and recommendations → Report scores for initial test administration	Executive Director appoints **a standard-setting advisory panel** of CA content experts, including membership from the **Design Team**. Commission adopts passing score standard for the new performance assessment
Ongoing Development and Administration		Ongoing analysis to maintain validity and reliability Report to the Commission	Monitor implementation of the assessment