2D

Action

Educator Preparation Committee

Approval of Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) Models for Continued Use in California Teacher Preparation Programs

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents three TPA models (CalTPA, edTPA, and FAST) for Commission approval, including information about how each model meets the Commission's Assessment Design Standards and measures the current Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs).

Recommended Action: That the Commission approve the TPA models presented for ongoing use in California teacher preparation programs.

Presenters: Kathryn Polster, Analyst, and Mike Taylor, Consultants, Professional Services Division

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.

Approval of Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) Models for Continued Use in California Teacher Preparation Programs

Introduction
This agenda item presents information about the degree to which the three TPA models proposed for ongoing use in California teacher preparation meet the Commission's Assessment Design Standards and measure the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs), and requests formal approval from the Commission for ongoing administration and use of scores from the TPA models to meet California's TPA requirement for new teachers earning a preliminary multiple subject or single subject teaching credential.

Background
California has nearly two decades of experience implementing teaching performance assessments, more than any other state in the nation. The Teaching Performance Assessment, as specified in Education Code section 44320.2, requires all multiple and single subject credential candidates to demonstrate through actual performance with K-12 students in California public school classrooms that they have mastered the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) at the level of a beginning teacher and are qualified to begin professional practice. The original legislation requiring the passage of a TPA for prospective California teachers dates back to 1998. Although the TPA has been informally administered to candidates since the 2002-03 program year, this assessment became mandatory for all candidates as of July 2008. Leading up to this implementation, earlier versions of the Commission's Assessment Design Standards, TPEs, and three different TPA models had been developed and were approved by the Commission and available for use by programs. The three original TPA models were the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA), the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST), and the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). A fourth model, the EdTPA, was introduced and approved for use in California in August 2014 by the Commission.

The Commission adopted updated Assessment Design Standards and TPEs in December 2015 and June 2016, respectively. This created a need for model sponsors to review and update TPA models, as necessary, to align to these new standards.

Three of the four original models were revised to align with the updated Assessment Design Standards and the TPEs. Both CalTPA and FAST have undergone major revisions including setting a new passing standard. EdTPA required only minor revisions to meet these new California standards.

The Commission's Assessment Design Standards
TPA models adopted for use by the Commission must meet the Commission's Assessment Design Standards. The current Assessment Design Standards were adopted by the Commission at the December 2015 meeting. An overview of each of the three standards is provided below.

Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness
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.

Assessment Design Standard 2: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness
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 General Education 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.

Assessment Design Standard 3: TPA Model Sponsor Support Responsibilities
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.

The updated Assessment Design Standards specified a number of new requirements for TPA models including:

- An expectation that all TPAs will produce valid and reliable outcomes for candidates and for programs, and for use by the Commission;
- An expectation that model sponsors will continue to support programs in implementing a local scoring process that produces valid and reliable outcomes;
- A requirement that candidates receive their scores within three weeks of submitting their assessment for scoring;
- An expectation that both tasks and rubrics have a subject-specific focus as well as a focus on teaching English learners, students with disabilities in the general education classroom, and students from other traditionally underserved education groups;
- A requirement that the multiple subject form of all TPAs assess both literacy and mathematics;
- An expectation that TPA scores provided to candidates and programs relate to the TPE domains and/or specific scoring rubrics; and
- Expectations for reporting annually to the Commission on the programs served by the model sponsor, and candidate performance in the aggregate by program and institution.

The full text of the Assessment Design Standards as well as the specific required elements to be met for each of these standards can be found in Appendix B.

Process for Model Sponsors to Update TPA models

In December 2016 the Executive Director sent a memo to model sponsors outlining the process and timeline for aligning TPA models to revised standards and performance expectations. The memo specified that sponsors of currently-approved Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) models must demonstrate alignment with the Commission's updated TPA Design Standards and TPEs by June 2018 in order to be approved for the continued use of these models in 2018-19.

The memorandum set forth a process and timeline for TPA model sponsors to align currently approved TPA models with the updated Assessment Design Standards and TPEs. The process required model sponsors to:

1. Review their approved TPA model in light of the revised Assessment Design Standards and indicate whether and to what extent the model will need to be updated.
2. Provide a timeline for bringing currently approved models into alignment with the revised Assessment Design Standards and TPEs. In the event that a model will undergo significant changes in order to align with the revised standards and TPEs, validity evidence must be prepared and submitted to the Commission for review prior to the model being approved by the Commission for continued use in 2018-19.
3. Provide a description of the model including where and how it will assess the revised TPEs for the 2018-19 year when standards-aligned models must be in place.

The Assessment Design Standards require model sponsors to ensure that their TPA models assess the revised TPEs. Model sponsors were asked to indicate where in the TPA tasks and rubrics the TPEs are assessed and scored. Model sponsors were expected to provide a description of the design and structure of the model TPA with any modifications made to

address the revised TPEs and Assessment Design Standards. Key revisions in the TPEs that were expected to impact some, if not all, currently approved TPAs include (partial list):

- Increased emphasis on candidate ability to work effectively with special needs students in the general education classroom, including implementing approaches such as Universal Design principles, Multi-Tiered System of Support, and co-teaching;
- Use of technologies to enhance instruction;
- Integration of visual and performing arts within and across content areas to support teaching and learning;
- Use of classroom management strategies that support social and emotional learning;
- Close alignment with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP); and
- Development of K-12 students' critical, creative, and analytic thinking required for students to be college and career ready.

Timeline

Due Date	Required Submission by the Model Sponsor
March 15, 2017	Transition Plan and Timeline identifying anticipated changes to the approved TPA model, supporting material, and administration procedures due to the Commission. Commission staff conducted a follow up call with each of the model sponsors to discuss the transition plan.
March 1, 2018	Description of their updated TPA system, including an explanation of assessment tasks and rubrics, demonstrating where and how the revised TPEs are assessed due to the Commission. Any changes in the way that each model addresses and implements the Assessment Design Standards were also described and documented by this date.
May 31, 2018 (models with significant changes)	Validity data which included the results of field testing, a standard setting study, and a proposed recommended passing standard due to the Commission.

All of the model sponsors complied with the requests and timelines. The edTPA did not undergo major revisions and therefore was not required to conduct new field testing or standard setting. The Commission adopted a passing standard for the edTPA in October 2014 and no change in that passing standard is proposed. The FAST did undergo major revision and submitted all required information and analyses regarding field testing and standard setting to Commission staff. In their report FAST proposed a minimum passing standard of "2" on each of the ten rubrics against which candidate submissions are scored. Commission approval of the FAST model will also be an approval of this recommended passing standard. The CalTPA also underwent major revision and field testing. For purposes of the 2018-19 implementation year, staff recommend that the CalTPA continue using the passing score standard approved by the

Commission in December 2017 for the field test. A final passing score standard for ongoing use of the CalTPA will be presented to the Commission in spring 2019 following on a standard setting study that will be conducted based on the initial administration of the system. This information is summarized in the table below.

TPA Model Revision and Passing Standards

Model	Major Revisions?	Proposed Passing Standard	Passing Standard History	Proposed Passing Standard Future
CalTPA	Yes	Minimum score of 2 across all rubrics and no more than one rubric with a score of 1 on each cycle.	Adopted by the Commission for the pilot in December 2016 and the field test in December 2017	If CalTPA is approved a final passing standard will be recommended to the Commission in spring 2019 following the first year of operational implementation
edTPA	No	MS: Overall score of at least 49 across 18 rubrics SS: Overall score of at least 41 across 15 rubrics	Adopted by the Commission in October 2014	If edTPA is approved the previously adopted minimum passing standard would continue to apply to all submissions
FAST	Yes	Minimum score of 2 on each of the ten rubrics	Recommended by FAST based on faculty standard setting meeting following scoring of field test submissions	If FAST is approved the recommended minimum standard would apply to all candidate submissions for the revised model

Descriptions of the TPA Models Considered for Approval

CalTPA

CalTPA is the Commission-owned model. The current version of the CalTPA is being developed and scored under contract with the Evaluation Systems group of Pearson, Inc by a Design Team comprised of California educators. The CalTPA development contract was awarded in February 2016. Development, piloting, and field testing have been ongoing since 2016. Additional information about the redevelopment of the CalTPA can be found on the Commission's website: https://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/tpa-california

EdTPA

The edTPA was developed by the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity (SCALE). The edTPA was field tested beginning in 2009 and has been used operationally outside of California since September 2013. The edTPA was initially approved for use by the Commission in August 2014, and the Commission adopted a minimum passing standard for edTPA in

California at the October 2014 meeting. More information about edTPA can be found by visiting SCALE's website: https://scale.stanford.edu/teaching/edtpa.

FAST

The FAST was designed by and is used exclusively by California State University, Fresno (Fresno State). The FAST was based on the Renaissance Teacher Work Sample developed through a Title II U.S. Department of Education grant in which Fresno State participated, and was originally approved for use by the Commission in 2007. The FAST is integrated into the preparation programs at Fresno State and does not maintain an information and registration website as the other models do. A general description of the revised assessment can be found in Commission agenda item: https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/commission/agendas/2017-09/2017-09-4d.pdf?sfvrsn=463f54b1_2.

TPA Comparability Study

The TPA models differ in several important ways (e.g., design of candidate tasks, scoring rubrics, teaching performance elements measured). These inter-model differences raise questions regarding the comparability of scores obtained by candidates completing the various TPAs. When funding for the re-design of the CalTPA was provided by the Administration and the Legislature, funds were included to enable the Commission to conduct an external, independent investigation of the comparability of the three TPA models. Consequently, the Commission contracted with the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) to support this inquiry. This contract was approved at the April 2017 Commission meeting.

The Commission's TPA Comparability Study is taking place at the same time as the TPA model update and approval process.

HumRRO's technical approach to the comparability study draws evidence from numerous sources regarding similarity of content, methods of measurement, and similarity of results obtained from each of the three TPA models. The goal of this study is to accumulate as much consistent evidence as possible to investigate the comparability of passing scores obtained across the three TPA models. HumRRO is using a Theory of Action approach to identify several claims that will be investigated to determine the degree to which the Commission-approved TPA models are sufficiently comparable.

HumRRO designed research activities to investigate these claims. A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) composed of model representatives and independent assessment experts has also been convened to provide guidance on the design, implementation, and interpretation of results for the TPA Comparability Study.

There are two major aspects to the work described below: (a) determining the degree to which each model meets the Commission's Assessment Design Standards; and (b) determining the degree to which each model assesses the range of the TPEs (i.e., content validity). These first two activities in HumRRO's project plan for the TPA Comparability Study provide helpful information relating to these two key aspects for informing the Commission regarding approval

of the updated TPA models. For the first activity of the TPA Comparability Study, researchers in educational assessment employed by HumRRO reviewed each of the TPA models to determine the degree to which each meets the Commission's Assessment Design Standards. For the second activity of the Comparability Study a committee of content experts reviewed each model to independently determine the degree to which each model measures the TPEs. The committee of content experts met and reviewed each of these TPA models at a content review workshop that was held in Sacramento in April 2018.

At this meeting, program faculty and experts from the field familiar with the implementation of the TPA models were asked to rate the degree to which each of the TPA models measures each of the TPE elements. Next, HumRRO presented an overview of findings from the evaluation and comparison of evidence across TPA models for adherence to the Assessment Design Standards and to the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (AERA, APA, & NCME, 2014).

The committee found that all three models both sufficiently meet the Assessment Design Standards and sufficiently measure the TPEs to be potentially approved by the Commission for continued use in California.

More detailed information about some of the results of the content validity study can be found in Appendix A.

Staff Recommendation
Based on information and evidence provided by the model sponsors and the Commission's independent contractor, staff recommends that the Commission approve all three proposed TPA models (the CalTPA, the edTPA, and the FAST) and proposed minimum passing standards for continuing use in California educator preparation programs.

Next Steps
If the Commission approves of the TPA models, staff will notify model sponsors of their approval for ongoing use and will also notify preliminary teacher preparation programs about their options for TPA model selection and implementation.

Appendix A

Results of TPA Comparability Study Content Expert Review Workshop

Summary of Coverage of TPEs across TPA Models
0 = No evidence 1 = Weak evidence 2 = Moderate evidence 3 = Strong evidence

The adopted TPEs can be found here

	Sufficiency of Evidence		
	edTPA	CalTPA	FAST
TPE 1.1	2	3	2
TPE 1.2	1	1	2
TPE 1.3	2	2	2
TPE 1.4	2	2	2
TPE 1.5	2	3	2
TPE 1.6	2	2	2
TPE 1.7	0	0	0
TPE 1.8	3	3	3
TPE 2.1	1	2	2
TPE 2.2	2	2	3
TPE 2.3	1	2	2
TPE 2.4	0	1	1
TPE 2.5	2	3	3
TPE 2.6	2	2	2
TPE 3.1	3	3	3
TPE 3.2	3	3	2
TPE 3.3	1	1	1
TPE 3.4	1	1	1
TPE 3.5	3	2	2
TPE 3.6	1	2	2
TPE 3.7	0	0	0
TPE 3.8	0	0	0
TPE 4.1	2	2	3
TPE 4.2	2	2	2
TPE 4.3	0	0	1
TPE 4.4	1	2	2
TPE 4.5	1	1	0
TPE 4.6	0	0	0
TPE 4.7	2	2	3

	Sufficiency of Evidence		
	edTPA	**CalTPA**	**FAST**
TPE 4.8	0	1	1
TPE 5.1	3	3	3
TPE 5.2	2	3	3
TPE 5.3	1	2	0
TPE 5.4	0	1	0
TPE 5.5	1	1	2
TPE 5.6	0	0	0
TPE 5.7	0	1	1
TPE 5.8	2	2	2
TPE 6.1	3	3	3
TPE 6.2	1	1	1
TPE 6.3	0	1	1
TPE 6.4	0	0	1
TPE 6.5	0	0	1
TPE 6.6	0	0	0
TPE 6.7	0	0	0

Appendix B

California Teaching Performance Assessment Design Standards

(Adopted December 2015)

Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness

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.

*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.

Required Elements for Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness

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 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

1(k) The model sponsor completes initial and periodic basic psychometric analyses to 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.

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.

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.

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 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.

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.

Assessment Design Standard 2: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness

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.

Required Elements for Assessment Design Standard 2: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness

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 Credential as one part of the requirements for the credential.

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.

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.

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.

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 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.

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.

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.

2(h) The model sponsor provides program level aggregate results to the Commission, in a manner, format and time frame specified by 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.

Assessment Design Standard 3: TPA Model Sponsor Support Responsibilities

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.

Required Elements for Assessment Design Standard 3: TPA Model Sponsor Support Responsibilities

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.

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.

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 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.

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.