3C

Action

Educator Preparation Committee

Performance Level for Candidates Participating in the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA) Field Test

Executive Summary: The Commission previously adopted an expected performance level for the passage of the pilot and field test versions of the redeveloped California Teaching Performance (CalTPA). This agenda item requests that the Commission make a slight adjustment to the expected performance level for candidates participating in the field test of the redeveloped CalTPA this year based on significant changes made to the assessment scoring rubrics following the pilot.

Recommended Action: Staff recommends that given the increase in the number of rubrics proposed between the pilot and the field test that the Commission amend the expected performance level for CalTPA field test candidates as detailed below.

Presenter: Amy Reising, Director of Performance Assessment Development

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.

December 2017

Performance Level for Candidates Participating in the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA) Field Test

Introduction

The Commission is in the process of updating the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA). Redevelopment began in the summer of 2016, in preparation for a pilot test in the winter and spring of 2017. Twenty-four programs and 250 candidates participated in the pilot and were required to meet an expected performance level established by the Commission. Based on the CalTPA pilot test data, the CalTPA was revised in preparation for a final field test of the new assessment in 2017-18. At its June 2017 meeting, the Commission approved the institutions that would be participating in the field test, and reaffirmed the expected performance level for field test participants. During the summer of 2017, Commission staff, Evaluation Systems staff, and the CalTPA Design Team (Appendix A) substantially revised the scoring rubrics used in the pilot. In place of the original eight holistic rubrics developed for Cycle 1 and Cycle 2 of the pilot version of the CalTPA, analytic rubrics were developed for each Instructional Cycle. Revisions resulted in the development of eleven analytic rubrics for Cycle 1: Learning About Students and Planning Instruction and twelve analytic rubrics for Cycle 2: Assessment-Driven Instruction.

Given the increased number of rubrics per Instructional Cycle, Commission and Evaluation Systems Group of Pearson (ES) staff reviewed the performance level set at the June 2017 Commission meeting and determined that it was no longer aligned to the performance level threshold set for the pilot study. Programs and candidates will be using the new analytic rubrics for the first time as part of the field test study. This item recommends an adjusted expected performance level for candidates participating in the field test of the revised CalTPA for the Commission's consideration and action.

Structure of the Field Test CalTPA

The CalTPA offers a task-based structure with two cycles of instruction that follow the steps of Plan, Teach and Assess, Reflect and Apply. Each step of each Cycle has a unique set of analytic rubrics. Cycle 1 requires performance on eleven analytic rubrics; Cycle 2 requires performance on twelve analytic rubrics. The instructional cycles will be completed at two different times during a candidate's preliminary program and they must pass both of the cycles of instruction. This structure supports an educative quality of the performance assessment and both modifies and maintains the original structure of the CalTPA.

Cycle 1: Learning about Students and Planning Instruction

Instructional Cycle 1 represents a complete teaching cycle (*Plan, Teach and Assess, Reflect, and Apply*) for one content-specific lesson that candidates develop and teach within a school placement. Cycle 1 focuses on developing an engaging content-specific lesson for one class and three focus students based on students diverse assets and needs, including their prior knowledge, interests, and developmental considerations. Candidates demonstrate how they select an appropriate learning objective(s), determine what students are to learn and how they

will assess that learning, and develop content-specific activities and instructional strategies to develop students' thorough understanding of the content being taught. This Cycle also focuses on monitoring student understanding during the lesson and making appropriate accommodations to support individual student learning needs. Candidates demonstrate how they establish a positive and safe learning environment, provide social and emotional supports through positive interactions with students, and use resources, materials, and tools, including educational technology and assistive technologies as appropriate, to enhance content-specific learning.

Cycle 2: Assessment-Driven Instruction

Instructional Cycle 2 represents a complete teaching cycle (*Plan, Teach and Assess, Reflect, and Apply*). This cycle emphasizes the interaction between standards, assessment, and instructional decision making. For this Instructional Cycle, candidates develop a learning segment that includes several purposefully connected lessons that occur over multiple days to develop student knowledge and understanding within a particular content area. Candidates use several types of assessment and student results to support and promote deep learning of content, development of academic language, and engagement of students in the use of higher order thinking. Throughout the content-specific learning segment, candidates provide feedback to students about their academic performance(s) based on informal assessment(s), student self-assessment, and formal assessment results, and support students to use assessment feedback to advance their understanding.

Candidates analyze and reflect on the evidence they observed of student learning of content and development of academic language based on learning goal(s) and objective(s) to either (a) create a re-teaching activity because students did not demonstrate the learning goal(s) and/or objective(s) of the instruction or (b) create a connecting activity to build on the instruction provided because students did demonstrate the learning goal(s) and/or objective(s) of the instruction.

CalTPA Field Test

The CalTPA field test began in October 2017 and will conclude in May 2018. Field test evidence will be submitted online to ES, providing a trial run of the online system for uploading and scoring submissions. The field test also provides an opportunity to test the new analytic rubrics and revised assessment guide. Assessor training will be designed based on the revisions to the assessment directions and rubrics resulting from the CalTPA pilot test findings.

Twenty-seven institutions were approved by the Commission in June 2017 for participation in the field test of the redeveloped CalTPA, which will provide an opportunity to collect data about the teaching performance of approximately **900** candidates across a sample of institutions that reflect the diversity of program types, sizes, and candidates served by institutions, and service areas in California. The field test plan developed by ES and approved by Commission staff identifies the following content areas and target number of responses needed for the field test:

Field Test Participants	
Content Area	Projections*
Multiple Subject	453
English	103
English Language Development	1
History/Social Science	59
Mathematics	68
Science	61
Art	19
Agriculture	16
Business	1
Health	0
Home Economics	0
Industrial and Technology Education	1
Music	26
Physical Education	43
World Languages	23
Undeclared (CSUDH)	14
Total Target Field Test Responses	**888**

*as of 11/8/17

To ensure a diverse sample, the Commission adopted the following criteria for the selection of institutions to participate in the 2017-18 field test:

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 field test, which requires:
   a. Working with Evaluation Systems (ES) and Commission staff to select a diverse group of candidates to field test the redeveloped CalTPA.
   b. Providing the same level of support for field test 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 16, 2018.
   d. Providing field test 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 or the operational version of the redeveloped CalTPA, fall of 2018.

3. The institution contributes to an appropriately diverse pool of field test participants that includes different types of programs and program structures, candidates, geographic regions, and content areas.

Commission staff is working to recruit additional Home Economics, Business, English Language Development (ELD), Health, and Industrial and Technology Education (ITE) candidates to meet the target number of responses in each content area.

Proposed Performance Level to Pass the Redeveloped CalTPA
At the June Commission meeting Commission and ES staff recommended a compensatory scoring model identical to the one adopted for the pilot study; candidates would need to complete each cycle with an expected performance level of "2" across all five-point rubrics and no more than one rubric with a score of "1" on each cycle, and a compensating score of "3" or better on another rubric within the same cycle.

Given the increase in the number of rubrics, moving from 8 to 23, Commission and ES staff have re-examined the June 2017 adopted performance level and recommend that the Commission amend the expected performance level for field test candidates. The Commission proposes allowing only one rubric score of "1" per cycle and all other rubric scores at a level "2" or higher for a minimum total score of 21 for Cycle 1 and 23 for Cycle 2. This equates to an average of 1.91 for Cycle 1 and 1.92 for Cycle 2. This would also eliminate the previously adopted requirement that candidate's earn a compensating rubric score of "3" or higher if they score a "1" on a rubric in each cycle.

Commission and ES staff want to ensure that the field test performance level is aligned appropriately to the pilot test performance level adopted by the Commission and want to mitigate any unwarranted misinterpretation of performance due to the newness of the revised analytic rubrics. The revised field test performance level is recommended to support candidates and programs as they implement the redeveloped CalTPA.

Staff Recommendation
Staff recommends that the Commission amend the expected performance level for field test candidates to allow only one rubric score of "1" per cycle and all other rubric scores at a level "2" or higher for a minimum total score of 21 for Cycle 1 and 23 for Cycle 2. This equates to an average of 1.91 for Cycle 1 and 1.92 for Cycle 2. This would also eliminate the previously adopted requirement that candidate's earn a compensating rubric score of "3" or higher if they score a "1" on a rubric in each cycle.

Next Steps
Commission staff is providing technical assistance to programs through webinars, face-to-face workshops, and a website that will unfold over the course of 2017-18. Preparation programs continue to redesign and update their programs and TPA model sponsors will be updating their TPAs to align with the revised Assessment Design Standards and TPEs. All programs are required to ensure that each candidate is taught about, provided the opportunity to practice, and is assessed on the revised TPEs starting September 2017. The Commission's CalTPA Design Team will continue to work with Commission and ES staff to revise the CalTPA based on findings from the field test in preparation for operational administration in 2018-19.

If the Commission approves the proposed revised performance level, then staff will notify the field and support programs and candidates to meet the field test requirement.

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, Cal State TEACH

Annamarie Francois, University of California, Los Angeles

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, Brandman University

Tine Sloan, Commission Liaison