

---

# 2B

## Action

### *Educator Preparation Committee*

#### **Redeveloped CalTPA Pilot – Participant Waiver Requests**

---

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item presents criteria for the selection of institutions to participate in the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA) pilot study. Several institutions have expressed interest in piloting the redeveloped CalTPA and are requesting that the Commission waive the existing Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) requirement for candidates who successfully complete the redeveloped CalTPA during the pilot. This item recommends that the Commission approve the selection criteria for participation; approve the requested waiver for selected institutions that meet proposed criteria; and adopt a performance level for successful completion of the redeveloped CalTPA for use during the pilot.

**Recommended Action:** Staff recommends the Commission:

- (1) Adopt proposed criteria for the selection of institutions to participate in the CalTPA pilot study.
- (2) Approve waiver requests from selected institutions to waive the TPA requirement for their candidates who successfully complete the redeveloped CalTPA and meet the performance level set by the Commission.
- (3) Adopt a compensatory scoring model and require candidates to pass each Instructional Cycle in the redeveloped CalTPA with an expected performance level of 2 across all rubrics and no more than one rubric with a score of 1 on each cycle.

**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.

October 2016

---

---

## **Redeveloped CalTPA Pilot – Participant Waiver Requests**

---

---

### **Introduction**

This agenda item presents criteria for the selection of institutions to participate in the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA) pilot study. Several institutions have expressed interest in participating in the pilot study of the redeveloped CalTPA and are requesting that the Commission waive the existing Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) requirement for candidates who successfully complete the assessment. This item recommends that the Commission approve the selection criteria for participation; approve the requested waiver for selected institutions and candidates that meet proposed criteria, and adopt an expected performance level for successful completion of the redeveloped CalTPA administered during the pilot study.

### **Background**

Education Code §44320.2 requires all candidates for a Preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential to pass an assessment of their teaching performance with TK-12 public school students as part of the requirements for earning a preliminary teaching credential. The teaching performance assessment must be approved by the Commission and meet the Commission's revised and adopted Assessment Design Standards. In addition, the assessment must be aligned to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) as noted below.

Commencing July 1, 2008, for a program of professional preparation to satisfy the requirements of paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) of Section 44259, the program shall include a teaching performance assessment that is aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and that is congruent with state content and performance standards for pupils adopted pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 60605.

Currently there are four Commission-approved TPA models: CalTPA, edTPA, FAST, and PACT. Completion of a Commission-approved TPA is only one of multiple measures that an approved preliminary preparation program is required to use in determining a MS or SS credential recommendation.

The Commission's model, CalTPA, has been approved for use in California since 2008, and is currently being redeveloped and updated. New assessment tasks and scoring rubrics have been developed to assess the revised TPEs and are being finalized in preparation for a pilot study in spring 2017. Sixteen institutions have indicated an interest to participate in the pilot study to date, including thirteen private colleges or universities, two California State University (CSU) campuses, and one local education agency. Commission staff and ES are continuing to recruit additional

programs from the CSU and the University of California in order to achieve a balanced sample across institutions, program and credential types. An updated list of institutions seeking inclusion in the pilot will be presented to the Commission as an in-folder item prior to the October 2016 meeting.

This agenda item is organized into three parts. Part 1 presents an overview of current plans for the pilot study of the redeveloped CalTPA and proposes participation criteria for the selection of institutions. This part of the item also presents a request from institutions for a Commission waiver of the requirement that candidates pass an existing Commission-approved TPA allowing selected candidates to instead, take and meet the performance level of the redeveloped CalTPA administered during the pilot. Part 2 discusses the Commission’s waiver authority and provides an overview of the redeveloped CalTPA, including information about how the revised model addresses the Commission’s Assessment Design Standards. Finally, in Part 3 the item proposes a performance level that would establish a passing score for candidates who complete the redeveloped CalTPA administered during the pilot study (January – April 2017).

**Part 1: Criteria for the Selection of Institutions to Participate in the Pilot Study**

The pilot study will provide an opportunity to collect data about the teaching performance of 320-435 candidates across a sample of institutions that reflect the diversity of program types, sizes, candidates served, institutional affiliations, and service areas in California. The Pilot Plan developed by Evaluation Systems (ES) and approved by Commission staff identifies the following content areas and target number of responses needed for the pilot study:

<b>Target Pilot Test Responses</b>		
<b>Content Area</b>	<b>Target Number of Responses</b>	<b>Recruitment to Ensure Target</b>
Multiple Subject	50	75
English	30	40
English Language Development	15	20
History/Social Science	30	40
Mathematics	30	40
Science	30	40
Art	15	20
Agriculture	15	20
Business	15	20
Health	15	20
Home Economics	15	20
Industrial and Technology Education	15	20
Music	15	20
Physical Education	15	20
World Languages	15	20
<b>Total Target Responses</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>435</b>

To ensure a diverse sample, Commission staff recommends the Commission adopt the following criteria for the selection of institutions to participate in the pilot study:

#### Participation Criteria

1. The institution is in good standing with the Commission and the Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs meet all standards.
2. The institution agrees to fully participate in the pilot study, which requires:
  - a. Working with Evaluation Systems (ES) and Commission staff to select a diverse group of candidates to pilot the redeveloped CalTPA by January 2017.
  - b. Providing the same level of support for pilot participants as is provided to all other MS/SS candidates in preparation for a TPA based on the newly revised TPEs.
  - c. Ensuring that all participating candidates have fair and equitable opportunity to complete both cycles of the redeveloped CalTPA and submit scoreable evidence to ES by April 2017.
  - d. Providing pilot participants who do not meet the expected performance level on both cycles of the redeveloped CalTPA with remedial support and the opportunity to complete the institution's current approved TPA.
3. The institution contributes to an appropriately diverse pool of pilot participants that includes different types of programs and program structures, candidates, geographic regions, and content areas.

#### **Institutions Requesting the Waiver**

ES and Commission staff have been recruiting programs to participate in the pilot, scheduled for spring 2017. As of October 14, 2016, sixteen institutions, listed on the following table, have requested to pilot the redeveloped CalTPA. Several of these institutions (noted in **bold**) have also requested a waiver of the TPA requirement for their candidates who complete the pilot and achieve passing status as determined by the Commission on the redeveloped CalTPA. Most of the institutions that have volunteered to date are private colleges and universities. Commission staff is working to recruit additional CSU and UC campuses to join the effort, and are also seeking additional Agriculture, Home Economics, Business, ELD, Health, and ITE candidates to meet the target number of responses in each content area. An in-folder item will be prepared for the October meeting with an updated list of institutions seeking a waiver for the assessment. If requests come in after the October 2016 Commission meeting, their waiver requests will be placed on the December 2016 Consent Calendar. Commission staff will work with ES and identified institutions to draw a sample of candidates that are diverse and broadly representative of the larger population of teacher candidates to participate in the pilot study.

### Programs Interested in Pilot Candidate Estimates by Content Area

Institution  (Bolded institutions have submitted a waiver request)	Alliant International University	Antioch University Los Angeles	Azusa Pacific University	Biola University	CSU Fresno	CSU San Marcos	Hebrew Union College	La Sierra University	Los Angeles Unified School District	Mount Saint Mary's University	Notre Dame de Namur University	Point Loma Nazarene University	The Master's College	University of Redlands	University of San Diego	Whittier College	Total*
<b>Multiple Subject</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>65</b>		<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>490</b>
SS-Agriculture																	0
SS-Art	4		2	2				2			1	10		3			24
SS-Business			1	1													2
SS-English	10		4	10		3		4	2	5	5	15	1	3	3	2	67
SS-ELD				2										1			3
SS-Health				1				3									4
SS-History/Social Science	10		5	10		3		2		5	5	8	3	8	8	2	69
SS-Home Economics																	0
SS-ITE					10												10
SS-Mathematics	8		4	10				2	2	3	5	15		12	2	1	64
SS-Music	5		2	10				1				10	1	4			33
SS-Physical Education	7		10	5				3			3	8		1			37
SS- Science	10		5	10		3		1	4	3	5	12		10	6	1	70
SS-World Languages	6		1	1				2		3	1				1		15
<b>Institution Total</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>888</b>

## Part 2: Commission Authority to Issue a Waiver

The Commission has the authority to grant waivers that are requested from school districts, county offices of education, private schools and postsecondary institutions through Education Code §44225(m), which states that:

§44225 The commission shall do all of the following:

- (m) Review requests from school districts, county offices of education, private schools, and postsecondary institutions for the waiver of one or more of the provisions of this chapter or other provisions governing the preparation or licensing of educators. The commission may grant a waiver upon its finding that professional preparation equivalent to that prescribed under the provision or provisions to be waived will be, or has been, completed by the credential candidate or candidates affected.

The underlined section of statute sets criteria for the issuance of a waiver that requires some level of equivalence or comparability of requirement to be established. The process of CalTPA redevelopment involves multiple steps, including redesign of tasks and rubrics to measure the revised TPEs; a pilot study where the revised tasks and rubrics are completed; revision of tasks and rubrics based on the pilot; a field test of the revised system and standard setting study; and finally, review and approval by the Commission for use in California. The redeveloped CalTPA has not completed the Commission's review process yet. The redeveloped and approved CalTPA is expected to be fully implemented in 2018-19.

Documentation of progress toward meeting the Assessment Design Standards was conducted by ES and reviewed by Commission staff. The review indicates that the redeveloped CalTPA, as revised in collaboration with the Cal TPA Design Team, satisfies the majority of the Assessment Design Standards adopted by the Commission. On this basis, the redeveloped CalTPA, taken together with the completion of an approved preparation program, can be considered to represent professional preparation comparable to the current requirements for a Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential. Under these conditions, the Commission has the authority to provide waivers to institutions for their candidates that meet the expected performance level on the redeveloped assessment rather than on a Commission-approved teaching performance assessment in order to meet the statutory TPA requirement. The Commission has previously allowed a waiver under similar circumstances for the initial pilot of the edTPA during 2012-13. (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-09/2012-09-2F.pdf>).

Detailed information about the structure of the redeveloped CalTPA and summary information about how it addresses key provisions of the Commission's adopted Assessment Design Standards are presented below to illustrate how the completion of the redeveloped CalTPA can be considered comparable to completion of a full approved TPA. Appendix B provides more detailed information based on the ES analysis and Commission staff documentation of progress toward meeting the Assessment Design Standards.

### *Structure of the Redeveloped CalTPA*

The CalTPA Design Team (see Appendix A for list of members) has been meeting since May 2016 to redevelop the CalTPA to address changes in the recently revised and adopted TPEs and Assessment Design Standards. The Design Team brings a wealth of experience implementing the CalTPA, the PACT and the EdTPA in a variety of teacher preparation programs. Their knowledge and experience have led to the development of a second-generation CalTPA that benefits from lessons learned over a decade of implementation. The draft redeveloped CalTPA is intended by the Design Team to be leaner and more focused than its predecessors, more effective in capturing the complex tasks of teaching, and educative for candidates, programs, and the Commission. Members of the Design Team are listed in Appendix A.

The redeveloped CalTPA reflects a task-based structure with two distinct Instructional Cycles that require candidates to (a) plan a segment of instruction, with attention to the students and the content to be taught, (b) teach a segment of instruction and assessment; (c) assess student learning; (d) reflect on the effectiveness of the planning and instruction; and (e) apply what they have learned from the cycle of instruction by identifying what they would alter and what they will do next instructionally to meet the needs of each student.

Candidates will be asked to complete the two Instructional Cycles at different times during a preparation program, and will have to pass both of the Instructional Cycles in order to be recommended for a preliminary multiple or single subject teaching credential. The Design Team proposes this structure of two cycles completed over time to support an educative quality of the redeveloped CalTPA. This will allow candidates to complete a cycle of instruction during field placement, submit it for scoring, and receive assessment results including a pass or no pass status, a scaled score, and analytic feedback about specific TPEs prior to submitting their response to the second cycle. In this way, programs will be able to provide targeted support for candidates to improve their teaching practice based on their assessment results from Instructional Cycle 1.

The following charts describe the specific steps and expected evidence proposed for each Instructional Cycle.

## Instructional Cycle 1 Tasks and Evidence

Cycle Step	What Candidates need to do	Evidence to be submitted for scoring
<b>Step 1: Plan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gather information about your students, including three focus students.</li> <li>• Use knowledge of your students along with knowledge of the applicable TK–12 student standards and frameworks and of subject-specific pedagogy in your content area to develop one lesson plan.</li> <li>• Explain how the lesson plan addresses classroom norms; applicable student content standards and/or frameworks; educational technology; monitoring student learning; and the academic achievement levels, strengths and needs, and backgrounds of your students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written Narrative: Getting to Know Your Students (Context Information and Description of Focus Students)</li> <li>• Lesson Plan and Related Instructional Materials (up to 5–10 pages)</li> <li>• Written Narrative: Explanation of the Lesson Plan</li> </ul>
<b>Step 2: Teach/ Assess</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teach the planned lesson to your students within the school placement.</li> <li>• Video record the full lesson or segments of the lesson. Select five video clips that show at minimum the opening of the lesson; an activity designed to monitor student learning; and adaptations, accommodations, and/or modifications for each of the three focus students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Video evidence to be submitted in Step 3</li> </ul>



Cycle Step	What Candidates need to do	Evidence to be submitted for scoring
<b>Step 3: Reflect</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide annotations to the five video clips that include brief rationales for practices seen in the video clips. Include the following titles in the annotations:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive learning environment</li> <li>• Engaging instructional strategies and learning activities</li> <li>• Use of educational technology</li> <li>• Social and emotional support</li> <li>• Monitoring student learning</li> <li>• Accommodations and/or modifications</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Five video clips with written annotations (a title and a brief rationale)</li> </ul>
<b>Step 4: Apply</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide responses to questions regarding what you learned from teaching and reflecting on the lesson and what you would do differently.</li> <li>• Cite evidence from your submissions in Steps 1–3.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Narrative (written or video): Application of What You Learned</li> </ul>

### Instructional Cycle 2 Tasks and Evidence

Cycle step	What Candidates need to do	Evidence to be submitted for Scoring
<b>Step 1: Plan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide context information about one class of students within a school placement.</li> <li>• Outline a plan for a lesson/assessment sequence:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Day 1: Lesson and informal assessment</li> <li>• Day 2: Lesson and student self-assessment</li> <li>• Day 3: Review Lessons 1 and 2 and give formal assessment</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written Narrative: Context Information</li> <li>• Lesson/Assessment Sequence Template for one class of students</li> </ul>

Cycle step	What Candidates need to do	Evidence to be submitted for Scoring
<b>Step 2: Teach/ Assess</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teach and assess the lesson/assessment sequence.</li> <li>• Video record the full sequence or segments of the sequence. Select three clips that include informal assessment, student self-assessment, feedback to at least two different students, and formal assessment.</li> <li>• Provide annotations to the video clip that include brief rationales for practices seen in the video clips. Include the following titles in the annotations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Monitoring student learning for critical thinking or problem solving in the subject-specific discipline</li> <li>○ Monitoring for the development of academic language in the subject-specific discipline</li> <li>○ Using student self-assessment</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing feedback to students about assessment results</li> </ul> </li> <li>• From the formal assessment, select products or performances from three students representing high, average, and low performance.</li> <li>• Provide an analysis of student evidence from the formal assessment that the whole class completed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three video clips with written annotations (a title and a brief rationale)</li> <li>• Copy of the formal assessment</li> <li>• Rubric and/or scoring criteria, including definition of proficient student performance</li> <li>• Scored assessments (product or performance) for three students and feedback to these students</li> <li>• Written Narrative: Analysis of Student Evidence from the Formal Assessment</li> </ul>
<b>Step 3: Reflect</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reflect on what you learned about student progress based on your analysis of all assessment results for the whole class and for each of the three student performances: high, average, and low.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written Narrative: Assessment Summary and Analysis of Student Learning</li> </ul>

Cycle step	What Candidates need to do	Evidence to be submitted for Scoring
<b>Step 4: Apply</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Plan a follow-up activity for the next lesson based on your analysis of all the assessment results; either               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A remedial activity for students who did not achieve the learning outcome(s), or</li> <li>○ An activity that builds on what your students demonstrated they learned.</li> </ul> </li>   <li>● Video record the entire follow-up activity or a segment of the activity. Select one video clip that demonstrates how you modified instruction based on your analysis of all assessment results.</li> <li>● Provide annotations to the video clip that include brief rationales for practices seen in the video clip. Include the following titles in the annotations:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Modified instruction (for remedial activity)</li> <li>OR</li> <li>○ Application of new learning (for connecting activity).</li> </ul> </li>   <li>● Explain how what you learned from your analysis of multiple types of student assessment—informal, formal, and student self-assessment—has changed how you will plan instruction for all your students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Remedial or connecting activity description</li>   <li>● One video clip of follow-up activity with written annotations (a title and a brief rationale)</li>   <li>● Narrative (written or video): Assessment Driven Instruction</li> </ul>

### *How the redeveloped CalTPA Addresses the Assessment Design Standards*

A Commission-approved TPA provides assurance to the Commission and the public that each candidate demonstrates the ability to teach the state-adopted content standards to California's public school students. There are many expectations a proposed assessment must satisfy before it is recommended to the Commission for approval. Specific key essential requirements from the Education Code and the Assessment Design Standards are identified below with a staff analysis of the degree to which the redeveloped CalTPA currently addresses each of these essential aspects. (See Appendix B for a full, up to date response to each Assessment Design Standard).

- Assess each candidate on the CSTP

The Education Code specifies that the TPA assess each candidate on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP). The Commission has developed more specific indicators of the level of teaching that needs to be demonstrated through its recently revised *Teaching Performance Expectations* (TPEs), which reflect the CSTP as exemplified at the level of a beginning teacher. Appendix B provides information indicating which TPEs are being assessed in each of the two draft CalTPA Instructional Cycles, and this mapping will be updated after the pilot and used to guide further development of the assessment system. The TPA is only one requirement for earning a teaching credential, and consistent with the Commission's Assessment Design Standards, the TPA is not required to comprehensively assess all TPEs. Candidates must also successfully complete an approved preparation program, and the program is expected to comprehensively prepare candidates on the full scope of TPEs.

- Assess each candidate's ability to teach the state-adopted academic content standards to California students

The TPA must assess each candidate's ability to teach the state-adopted content standards. The redeveloped CalTPA requires candidates to plan their instruction and assessment based on the state adopted academic content standards for students. The TPEs require candidates to demonstrate content specific pedagogy, and the scoring rubrics require a focus on this key set of knowledge and skills. In addition, there is an explicit requirement within the redeveloped CalTPA to address the effective teaching of English learners, special needs students in the general education classroom, and traditionally underserved students. Assessors of the redeveloped CalTPA must hold a California credential or the equivalent in the subject matter area being assessed.

- Validity and Reliability in Scoring

As the tasks within the instructional cycles and the scoring rubrics are completed and made ready for the pilot study, ES, the Design Team, and Commission staff will develop a comprehensive training for scorers. As candidate materials are submitted for scoring, selected scorers will participate in the training, which will include calibration exercises to support reliability in scoring. ES and Commission staff will monitor implementation, program support, and scoring activities to support the validity and reliability of the assessment. Feedback from the pilot will be reviewed and used by the Design Team, ES,

and Commission staff to revise scoring procedures, as needed, for use in the field test. Members of the Design Team, ES and Commission staff have significant experience with performance assessment and scoring performance assessments, including experience with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), edTPA, PACT, and CalTPA.

- Formative assessment information for program use in candidate preparation and program improvement.

Consistent with the Commission's Assessment Design Standards, formative, aggregate pilot data will be provided to programs that participate in the pilot.

In summary, successful completion of the redeveloped CalTPA and an approved teacher preparation program are comparable to completion of a program and passage of a fully approved TPA. Therefore, staff recommends that the Commission utilize its waiver authority to grant waivers to those institutions that meet the criteria and are selected to participate in the pilot study, allowing their candidates who successfully complete the CalTPA pilot to waive the existing TPA requirement.

### **Part 3: Proposed Performance Level to pass the redeveloped CalTPA**

Developers of TPA models typically conduct a standard setting study in order to establish the requirements for successful completion of the assessment. ES will conduct a standard setting study following the field test period, which will conclude in June 2018. The purpose of the pilot is to engage participants to collect additional validity evidence on the design of the assessment, specifically the instructional cycles and rubrics, and use these data to refine the cycles and rubrics for use in a full-scale field test of the entire assessment system.

ES and Commission staff recommend that the Commission establish an expected performance level for use in the scoring of candidates who complete the redeveloped CalTPA during the pilot. The expected performance level should take into account the current passing standard for the CalTPA, (as was determined by the Commission based on a formal standard setting study) and be set to reflect a comparable level of expectation for performance. The expected performance level should also take into account that all preparation programs are expected to be aligned to the new TPEs by September 1, 2017, after the pilot has been completed. While the majority of what is currently assessed on all TPAs is reflected in the revised TPEs, the recently revised and adopted TPEs also include new areas of focus that will be assessed on the redeveloped CalTPA.

#### *Method for determining an expected performance level on the redeveloped CalTPA*

Currently, there are seven rubrics for Instructional Cycle 1 and seven rubrics for Instructional Cycle 2 of the redeveloped CalTPA. The Design Team, ES and Commission staff are working to complete initial design of the scoring rubrics prior to the launch of the pilot.

Consistent with the Commission's Design Standards, each rubric has five score points. The Design Team, ES and Commission staff recommend a compensatory scoring model for each cycle with

an expected performance level of 2 across all rubrics and no more than one rubric with a score of 1 on each cycle. For example:

- For each cycle, given seven, 5-point rubrics, a minimum score of 14 [(2 points x 5 rubrics) + (1 point x 1 rubrics) + (3 points x 1 rubric)] would be required to pass the pilot CalTPA based on all rubrics.

Candidates who do not meet the Commission's expected performance level on both of the Instructional Cycles will not retake the redeveloped CalTPA, instead they will be supported in taking the institution's existing approved TPA.

In summary, the proposed scoring model is comparable to the passing standard for the current CalTPA, will ensure that candidates are prepared and demonstrate an expected level of competence across all standards. Therefore staff recommends that the commission adopt the proposed performance level described above.

### **Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends the Commission:

1. Adopt the proposed criteria for the selection of institutions to participate in the CalTPA pilot study listed on page 3 of this item.
2. Approve waiver requests from selected institutions to waive the TPA requirement for their candidates who successfully complete the redeveloped CalTPA and meet the pilot expected performance level set by the Commission. *Note: a final list of institutions seeking participation in the pilot study will be provided as an agenda insert prior to the October 2016 Commission meeting.*
3. Adopt a compensatory scoring model, and require candidates to pass each Instructional Cycle in the redeveloped CalTPA with an expected performance level of 2 across all rubrics and no more than one rubric with a score of 1 on each cycle.

### **Next Steps**

If the Commission adopts proposed criteria, approves the waiver requests for institutions participating in the pilot study, and adopts the compensatory scoring model and performance level, then ES and staff will work with the institutions to select candidates for the pilot, conduct an orientation with participating programs and candidates, and initiate the pilot in January.

## **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 Verde**, California State University San Bernardino

**Patricia Wick**, University of Phoenix

**Tine Sloan**, Commission Liaison

## Appendix B: Redeveloped CalTPA as aligned to the California Teaching Performance Assessment Design Standards

(Adopted December 2015)

Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by the Revised Draft CalTPA
<b>Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness</b>	
<p>The sponsor* of a teaching performance assessment seeking approval for use in California (model sponsor) designs a Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) in which complex pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring scales are linked to and assess California’s Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). The model sponsor clearly describes the uses for which the assessment has been validated (i.e., to serve as a determination of a candidate’s status with respect to the TPEs and to provide an indication of preparation program quality and effectiveness), anticipates its potential misuses, and identifies appropriate uses consistent with the assessment’s validation process. The model sponsor maximizes the fairness of the assessment design for all groups of candidates in the program. A passing standard is recommended by the model sponsor based on a standard setting study where educators have made a professional judgment about an appropriate performance standard for beginning teachers to meet prior to licensure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the recommendation of the Commission’s TPA Design Team, two, full, subject-specific instructional cycles based on the pedagogical sequence of plan, teach/assess, reflect, and apply that directly address the TPEs</li> <li>• Multiple, 5-point rubrics for each cycle</li> <li>• Analytic performance information provided to candidates, EPPs, and the CTC</li> <li>• Formal review by the Commission’s Bias Review Committee of all assessment materials</li> <li>• Spring 2016 TPE validation study</li> <li>• 2017 pilot and 2017-18 field test with all types of educator preparation programs (EPPs) and candidates</li> <li>• Standard Setting scheduled for spring 2018</li> </ul>
<p>1(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 rubrics that are clearly related to the TPEs that the task measures. Each task and its associated rubrics measure two or more TPEs. Collectively, the tasks and rubrics in the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two, full, subject-specific instructional cycles based on the pedagogical sequence of plan, teach/assess, reflect, and apply that directly address the TPEs               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ <b>Instruction Cycle 1</b>—Learning About Students and Planning Instruction: TPEs 1.1, 1.4, 1.6, 1.8, 2.2, 2.3, 2.6, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6, 4.1, 4.4, 6.1</li> <li>◦ <b>Instruction Cycle 2</b>—Assessment-Driven Instruction: TPEs 1.5, 1.8, 2.1, 2.3, 3.1, 3.3, 3.6, 3.8, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.5, 5.8, 6.1, 6.3</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Each 5-point rubric indicates the TPEs</li> </ul>



Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by the Revised Draft CalTPA
assessment address key aspects of the six major domains of the TPEs. The sponsor of the performance assessment documents the relationships between TPEs, tasks and rubrics.	addressed
1(b) The TPA model sponsor must include a focus on content-specific pedagogy within the design of the TPA tasks and scoring scales to assess the candidate’s ability to effectively teach the content area(s) authorized by the credential.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each instructional cycle completed within the context of the candidate’s subject-specific student teaching assignment</li> <li>• Content Expert Panel reviews of cycles and rubrics before and after pilot (16 panels)</li> </ul>
1(c) Consistent with the language of the TPEs, the model sponsor defines scoring rubrics so candidates for credentials can earn acceptable scores on the Teaching Performance Assessment with the use of different content-specific pedagogical practices that support implementation of the TK-12 content standards and curriculum frameworks. The model sponsor takes steps to plan and anticipate the appropriate scoring of candidates who use a wide range of pedagogical practices that are educationally effective and builds scoring protocols to take these variations into account.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subject-specific pedagogy for inclusion in rubrics identified by each Content Expert Panel</li> <li>• Assessment (cycles, rubrics) and system (e.g., submission and scoring platforms) structured to allow for a variety of response options</li> <li>• Assessor qualifications stipulate that expertise in the content area to be evaluated is required by one or more of the following ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Current Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential or the equivalent in the content area</li> <li>◦ University teaching experience in content area</li> <li>◦ Degree in the content area</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Assessor training, calibration, and scoring designed to address a variety of response options</li> </ul>
1(d) The model sponsor must include within the design of the TPA candidate tasks a focus on addressing the teaching of English learners, all underserved education groups or groups that need to be served differently, and students with special needs in the general education classroom to adequately assess the candidate’s ability to effectively teach all students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In both cycles, an instructional plan that requires classroom context and student characteristics, including numbers of English learners and students with IEPs, 504 Plans, or identified for GATE; description of English language proficiency levels; description of social-emotional learning strengths and needs; and description of funds of knowledge<sup>1</sup>, learning and behavioral characteristics,</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Funds of knowledge are defined as "The historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household or individual functioning and well-being" (Moll et al., 2001).

Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by the Revised Draft CalTPA
	<p>disabilities, dyslexia, intellectual or academic advancement, ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, language, religion, and/or geographic origin, as well as students whose first language is English, English learners, and Standard English learners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each step of Instructional Cycle 1 related to three focus students: English learner, student with identified special need with an IEP/504 Plan or GATE identified, and a student from an underserved education group or a group that needs to be served differently</li> </ul>
<p>1(e) For Multiple Subject candidates, the model sponsor must include assessments of the core content areas of at least Literacy and Mathematics. Programs use local program performance assessments for History/Social Science and Science if not already included as part of the TPA.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Literacy and mathematics addressed by Multiple Subject candidate either as one per cycle (e.g., Cycle 1=literacy, Cycle 2=math) or as integrated lesson for each with another content area (e.g., Cycle 1=math and science, Cycle 2=literacy and social science)</li> </ul>
<p>1(f) The model sponsor must include a focus on classroom teaching performance within the TPA, including a video of the candidate’s classroom teaching performance with candidate commentary describing the lesson plan and rationale for teaching decisions shown and evidence of the effect of that teaching on student learning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For each cycle, evidence required at each step (plan, teach/assess, reflect, and apply) to describe and explain the instructional decisions made and their effectiveness on student learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ <b>Instruction Cycle 1:</b> five annotated video clips</li> <li>◦ <b>Instruction Cycle 2:</b> four annotated video clips</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>1 (g) The TPA model sponsor must provide materials appropriate for use by programs in helping faculty become familiar with the design of the TPA model, the candidate tasks and the scoring rubrics so that faculty can effectively assist candidates to prepare for the assessment. The TPA model sponsor must also provide candidate materials to assist candidates in understanding the nature of the assessment, the specific assessment tasks, the scoring rubrics, submission processes and scoring processes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Face-to-face and online presentations and workshops for EPPs and other stakeholders</li> <li>• Websites: Pilot/field test and operational program sites</li> <li>• CalTPA pilot guides for EPPs and candidates</li> <li>• CalTPA field test guides for EPPs and candidates</li> <li>• CalTPA handbooks for EPPs and candidates</li> </ul>

<b>Assessment Design Standard</b>	<b>How Addressed by the Revised Draft CalTPA</b>
<p>1(h) The model sponsor develops scoring rubrics 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 or any other bias that are not likely to affect job effectiveness and/or student learning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bias prevention addressed in training, calibration, and ongoing scoring during pilot, field test, and operation administration</li> <li>• Candidate personal information protected via encrypted file transmissions</li> <li>• Performance scoring data monitored on an ongoing basis for issues of potential bias</li> <li>• Assessors required to recuse themselves from evaluation of submissions by candidates for whom they are faculty supervisors</li> </ul>
<p>1(i) The model sponsor provides a clear statement acknowledging the intended uses of the assessment. The statement demonstrates the model sponsor’s clear understanding of the implications of the assessment for candidates, preparation programs, the public schools, and TK-12 students. The statement includes appropriate cautions about additional or alternative uses for which the assessment is not valid. All elements of assessment design and development are consistent with the intended uses of the assessment for determining the pedagogical competence of candidates for Preliminary Teaching Credentials in California and as information useful for determining program quality and effectiveness.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intended uses and anticipated, possible misuses reflect the results of the TPE validation study</li> <li>• Validity evidence in support of the program collected at all stages of development and into operational administration</li> </ul>
<p>1(j) The model 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formal review by the Commission’s Bias Review Committee of all assessment materials</li> <li>• Elimination of potential bias responsibility of all review teams and program personnel</li> <li>• Results of pilot and field test target potential equity issues and used to revise the assessment to eliminate potential equity issues</li> </ul>
<p>1(k) The model sponsor completes initial and periodic basic psychometric analyses to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statistical analyses and review of the psychometric qualities of the cycles and rubrics</li> </ul>

<b>Assessment Design Standard</b>	<b>How Addressed by the Revised Draft CalTPA</b>
<p>identify pedagogical assessment tasks and/or scoring rubrics that show differential effects in relation to candidates’ race, ethnicity, language, gender or disability. When group pass-rate differences are found, the model sponsor investigates the potential sources of differential performance and seeks to eliminate construct-irrelevant sources of variance.</p>	<p>during the pilot, field test, and on an ongoing basis through operational administration, including specifically for subgroup performance differences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results of statistical analyses and psychometric reviews used to identify and eliminate issues of potential bias</li> </ul>
<p>1(l) In designing assessment administration procedures, the model sponsor includes administrative accommodations that preserve assessment validity while addressing issues of access for candidates with disabilities or learning needs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (PL 101-336), candidates request accommodations during registration and the alternative arrangements are provided on a case-by-case basis to address the individual need(s) while maintaining the validity of the assessment results.</li> </ul>
<p>1(m) In the course of determining a passing standard, the model sponsor secures and reflects on the considered judgments of teachers, supervisors of teachers, 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 model sponsor periodically reviews the reasonableness of the scoring scales and established passing standard, when and as directed by the Commission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legally defensible standard setting study scheduled for spring 2018, the purpose of which is to provide the Commission with recommended passing standards based on the informed judgments of California educators</li> <li>• Viability of passing standards analyzed throughout ongoing operational administration</li> </ul>
<p>1(n) To preserve the validity and fairness of the assessment over time, the model sponsor may need to develop and field test new pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring rubrics to replace or strengthen prior ones. Initially and periodically, the model sponsor analyzes the assessment tasks and scoring rubrics to ensure that they yield important evidence that represents candidate knowledge and skill related to the TPEs, and serve as a basis for determining entry-level pedagogical competence to teach the curriculum and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statistical analyses and review of the psychometric qualities of the cycles and rubrics on an ongoing basis through operational administration</li> <li>• Results of statistical analyses and psychometric reviews used to identify potential revisions to assessment, as determined with Commission’s TPA Program Director</li> </ul>

Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by the Revised Draft CalTPA
<p>student population of California’s TK-12 public schools. The model sponsor documents the basis and results of each analysis, and modifies the tasks and rubrics as needed.</p>	
<p>1(o) The model sponsor must make all TPA materials available to the Commission upon request for review and approval, including materials that are proprietary to the model sponsor. The Commission will maintain the confidentiality of all materials designated as proprietary by the model sponsor.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the case of the CalTPA, the CTC is the model sponsor and has access to all program-related materials at all times.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Assessment Design Standard 2: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness</b></p>	
<p>The sponsor of the performance assessment 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 a valid basis to judge the candidate’s general pedagogical competence for a Preliminary Teaching Credential. The model sponsor carefully monitors assessment development to ensure consistency with this stated purpose of the assessment. The Teaching Performance Assessment includes a comprehensive program to train, calibrate and maintain assessor calibration over time. The model sponsor periodically evaluates the assessment system to ensure equitable treatment of candidates. The assessment system and its implementation contribute to local and statewide consistency in the assessment of teaching competence.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the recommendation of the Commission’s TPA Design Team, multiple forms of evidence required across the pedagogical sequence of plan, teach/assess, reflect, and apply</li> <li>• Validity evidence in support of the program collected at all stages of development and into operational administration</li> <li>• Centralized, statewide scoring based on standardized scoring materials and procedures and a pool of qualified assessors from across the state who meet CTC requirements for training, calibration, and ongoing operational scoring</li> <li>• Local scoring option available to EPPs based on same standards as used with centralized, statewide scoring</li> </ul>
<p>2(a) In relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the TPEs, the pedagogical assessment tasks, rubrics, and the associated directions to candidates are designed to yield enough valid evidence for an overall judgment of each candidate’s pedagogical qualifications for a Preliminary Teaching</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multiple forms of evidence required across steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ <b>Instruction Cycle 1:</b> written lesson plan context and explanation, annotated video-recorded instruction (5 clips), and written or video-recorded application of candidate reflection</li> <li>◦ <b>Instruction Cycle 2:</b> written lesson plan context, lesson/assessment sequence</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<b>Assessment Design Standard</b>	<b>How Addressed by the Revised Draft CalTPA</b>
<p>Credential as one part of the requirements for the credential.</p>	<p>template, annotated video-recorded instruction (3 clips), copies of assessment and rubrics, three scored student work samples with feedback, written analysis of assessment, written reflective summary, video-recorded follow-up activity, written explanation of follow-up activity</p>
<p>2(b) Pedagogical assessment tasks and scoring rubrics are extensively field tested in practice before being used operationally in the Teaching Performance Assessment. The model sponsor evaluates the field test results thoroughly and documents the field test design, participation, methods, results and interpretation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2017 pilot of cycles and rubrics embedded within requirements of all types of EPPs</li> <li>• 2017-18 field test of entire assessment (cycles, rubrics) and program infrastructure (registration, submission, scoring, score reporting) embedded within requirements of all types of EPPs</li> </ul>
<p>2(c) The Teaching Performance Assessment system includes a comprehensive process to select and train assessors who score candidate responses to the pedagogical assessment tasks. An assessor training program demonstrates convincingly that prospective and continuing assessors gain a deep understanding of the TPEs, the pedagogical assessment tasks and the multi-level scoring rubrics. The training program includes task-based scoring trials in which an assessment trainer evaluates and certifies each assessor's scoring accuracy and calibration in relation to the scoring rubrics associated with the task. The model sponsor establishes selection criteria for assessors of candidate responses to the TPA. The selection criteria include but are not limited to appropriate pedagogical expertise in the content areas assessed within the TPA. The model sponsor selects assessors who meet the established selection criteria and uses only assessors who successfully calibrate during the required TPA model assessor training sequence. When new pedagogical tasks and scoring rubrics are incorporated into the assessment, the model sponsor provides additional training to the assessors, as needed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessor application, screening, and selection based on CTC-approved qualifications</li> <li>• On-line and in-person training of trainers and training of assessors during pilot, field test, and operational administration</li> <li>• Summative assessment based on actual cycles and rubrics passed by each assessor and trainer, confirming knowledge and understanding of the TPEs, cycles, and rubrics prior to operational scoring</li> </ul>

<b>Assessment Design Standard</b>	<b>How Addressed by the Revised Draft CalTPA</b>
<p>2(d) In conjunction with the provisions of the applicable Teacher Preparation Program Standards relating to the Teaching Performance Assessment, the model 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ongoing “read-behinds” by scoring supervisors</li> <li>• Ongoing, timely monitoring of assigned scores, with prompt feedback to assessors based on scoring performance statistics</li> <li>• Full complement of online reliability, frequency distribution, and production reports at the assessment and individual assessor level</li> </ul>
<p>2(e) The model sponsor provides a consistent scoring process for all programs using that model, including programs using a local scoring option provided by the model sponsor. The scoring process conducted by the model sponsor to assure the reliability and validity of candidate outcomes on the assessment may include, for example, regular auditing, selective back reading, and double scoring of candidate responses near the cut score by the qualified, calibrated scorers trained by the model sponsor. All approved models must include a local scoring option in which the assessors of candidate responses are program faculty and/or other individuals identified by the program who meet the model sponsor’s assessor selection criteria. These local assessors are trained and calibrated by the model sponsor, and whose scoring work is facilitated and their scoring results are facilitated and reviewed by the model sponsor. The model sponsor provides a detailed plan for establishing and maintaining scorer accuracy and inter-rater reliability during field testing and operational administration of the assessment. The model 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. The model sponsor must provide an annual audit process that documents that local scoring outcomes are consistent and reliable within the model for candidates across the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CTC-approved assessor and trainer qualifications</li> <li>• Real-time monitoring of inter-rater reliability and scoring processes during pilot, field test, and operational administration</li> <li>• Scorer and trainer summative assessment before scoring and embedded calibration scoring</li> <li>• Automatic and real-time assessor performance statistics</li> <li>• Same standards and processes for centralized, statewide scoring and local scoring</li> <li>• Routine auditing of scoring processes</li> </ul>

<b>Assessment Design Standard</b>	<b>How Addressed by the Revised Draft CalTPA</b>
<p>range of programs using local scoring, and informs the Commission where inconsistencies in local scoring outcomes are identified. If inconsistencies are identified, the sponsor must provide a plan to the CTC for how it will address and resolve the scoring inconsistencies both for the current scoring results and for future scoring of the TPA.</p>	
<p>2(f) The model sponsor’s assessment design includes a clear and easy to implement 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, if the program is using centralized scoring provided by the model sponsor. If the program is implementing a local scoring option, the program must provide an appeal process as described above for candidates who do not pass the assessment. Model sponsors must document that all candidate appeals granted a second scoring are scored by a new assessor unfamiliar with the candidate or the candidate’s response.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appeal process, providing an opportunity for candidates to formally address any concerns or objections arising from established program policies or the implementation of those policies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Rescore based on appeal conducted by assessor unfamiliar with submission</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>2(g) The model sponsor conducting scoring for the program provides results on the TPA to the individual candidate based on performance relative to TPE domains and/or to the specific scoring rubrics within a maximum of three weeks following candidate submission of completed TPA responses. The model sponsor provides results to programs based on both individual and aggregated data relating to candidate performance relative to the rubrics and/or domains of the TPEs. The model sponsor also follows the timelines established with programs using a local scoring option for providing scoring results.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidate score reports designed with Commission’s TPA Design Team</li> <li>• Results reports to candidates, EPPs, and the Commission within three weeks of submission deadline</li> </ul>
<p>2(h) The model sponsor provides program level aggregate results to the Commission, in a manner, format and time frame specified by</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program-level, aggregate results to the Commission (format determined with the Commission’s TPA Program Director)</li> </ul>



Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by the Revised Draft CalTPA
<p>the Commission, as one means of assessing program quality. It is expected that these results will be used within the Commission’s ongoing accreditation system.</p>	
<b>Assessment Design Standard 3: TPA Model Sponsor Support Responsibilities</b>	
<p>The sponsor of the performance assessment provides technical support to teacher preparation programs using that model concerning fidelity of implementation of the model as designed. The model sponsor is responsible for conducting and/or moderating scoring for all programs, as applicable, within a national scorer approach and/or the local scoring option. The model sponsor has ongoing responsibilities to interact with the Commission, to provide candidate and program outcomes data as requested and specified by the Commission, and to maintain the currency of the model over time.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical assistance to EPPs to be defined with Commission’s TPA Design Team</li> <li>• Centralized, statewide scoring and local scoring managed by the CalTPA program</li> <li>• All program data available to the CTC</li> </ul>
<p>3(a) The model sponsor provides technical assistance to programs implementing the model to support fidelity of implementation of the model as designed. Clear implementation procedures and materials such as a candidate and a program handbook are provided by the model sponsor to programs using the model.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical assistance to be defined with Commission’s TPA Design Team, including online handbooks for candidates and EPPs</li> </ul>
<p>3(b) A model sponsor conducting scoring for programs is responsible for providing TPA outcomes data at the candidate and program level to the program within three weeks and to the Commission, as specified by the Commission. The model sponsor supervising/moderating local program scoring oversees data collection, data review with programs, and reporting.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results reports to EPPs within three weeks of submission deadline</li> <li>• Centralized, statewide scoring and local scoring managed by the CalTPA program</li> </ul>
<p>3(c) The model sponsor is responsible for submitting at minimum an annual report to the Commission describing, among other data points, the programs served by the model, the number of candidate submissions scored, the date(s) when responses were received for scoring, the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual report parameters determined in collaboration with the Commission’s TPA Program Director</li> </ul>

<b>Assessment Design Standard</b>	<b>How Addressed by the Revised Draft CalTPA</b>
date(s) when the results of the scoring were provided to the preparation programs, the number of candidate appeals, first time passing rates, candidate completion passing rates, and other operational details as specified by the Commission.	
3(d) The model sponsor is responsible for maintaining the currency of the TPA model, including making appropriate changes to the assessment tasks and/or to the scoring rubrics and associated program, candidate, and scoring materials, as directed by the Commission when necessitated by changes in TK-12 standards and/or in teacher preparation standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of and actions taken to maintain currency of assessment determined with Commission’s TPA Program Director</li> </ul>
3(e) The model sponsor must define the retake policies for candidates who fail one or more parts of the TPA which preserve the reliability and validity of the assessment results. The retake policies must include whether the task(s) on which the candidate was not successful must be retaken in whole or in part, with appropriate guidance for programs and candidates about which task and/or task components must be resubmitted for scoring by a second assessor and what the resubmitted response must include.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retake policies determined in collaboration with Commission’s TPA Design Team and Program Director</li> </ul>

*\* Note: the “model sponsor” refers to the entity that represents the assessment and is responsible to programs using that model and to the Commission. Model sponsors may be a state agency, individual institutions, a consortium of institutions and/or partners, a private entity, and/or combinations of these.*