
2G

Information/Action

Educator Preparation Committee

Discussion of Required Reporting for Commission-Approved Teaching Performance Assessment Models

Executive Summary: This agenda item begins the discussion of what data, at what frequency, and for what purposes and uses model developers of Commission-approved teaching performance assessments should be required to submit to the Commission.

Recommended Action: That the Commission discuss the questions posed in the item and provide direction to staff.

Presenters: Mike Taylor, Consultant and Teri Clark, Director, 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

Discussion of Required Reporting for Commission-Approved Teaching Performance Assessment Models

Introduction

This agenda item begins the discussion of what data, at what frequency, and for what purposes and uses model developers of Commission-approved teaching performance assessments should be required to submit to the Commission.

Background

California has nearly two decades of experience implementing educator performance assessments, more than any other state in the nation. The Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA), 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 demonstrated appropriate competence regarding the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) at the level of a beginning teacher and are qualified to begin professional practice. An initial version of the Assessment Design Standards was adopted and used by the Commission to ensure that the original TPA models approved for use by the Commission met the standards of quality for large-scale assessments expected by the Commission and California educators.

This agenda item presents for the Commission's consideration issues relating to data collection and reporting for the three updated TPA models. The revised versions of this assessment, which were updated and reapproved for use with California teaching credential candidates in 2017, are now fully consistent with the updated Assessment Design Standards adopted by the Commission in 2015. Within this statewide implementation context, the Commission now has the unique opportunity to help determine and shape the type and range of TPA outcomes data to be collected, analyzed, reported, and used in a meaningful way to identify the assessments' impacts for candidates, programs, stakeholders, and the public, as well as to inform the ongoing implementation of this assessment.

With this exciting data opportunity, however, also comes some data issues and challenges for the Commission's consideration, and ultimately, for providing guidance to staff as the data collection process moves forward. These issues are identified and discussed below in the context of the applicable Assessment Design Standards that specify the types of data to be collected and suggest additional areas for Commission input for adding to the current list.

Brief Overview of the Three Approved TPA Models

- The California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA) provides for two instructional cycles that are completed and submitted at different times during the preparation program and are scored separately.
- The edTPA consists of a single scored submission.

- The Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) provides for two submissions that are submitted and scored separately.

In addition to the teaching performance assessment work, staff has also been working with the Commission's assessment contractor to develop the *California Administrator Performance Assessment*, or CalAPA, and is beginning work now on a new Commission-owned *Special Education TPA model* appropriate for use with candidates earning an Education Specialist credential.

Specific Focus of this Agenda Item

This agenda item is focused specifically on issues relating to the TPA so that the Commission has the opportunity for an in-depth consideration of these issues and to provide direction to staff in moving forward. At a later time, a related agenda item will consider topics relating to the Commission's other performance assessments, since the Commission's discussion of TPA data within the context of this agenda item will help identify and clarify the future requirements for data submission by model sponsors for the Administrator Performance Assessment.

Requirements Within the Commission's TPA Assessment Design Standards

The introductory narrative of each of the three TPA Assessment Design Standards, not including the complete listing of all of the sub-elements of each standard, is provided below. The full text of the adopted Assessment Design Standards can be found on the [TPA Assessment Design Standards](#) webpage.

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 sub-elements of the Assessment Design Standards specify a number of requirements for teaching performance assessment models and model owners, including:

- All performance assessments must produce valid and reliable outcome data for candidates and for programs, and for use by the Commission;
- Both tasks and rubrics must be subject-specific in orientation, and must include a focus on teaching English learners, students with disabilities in the general education classroom, and students from other traditionally underserved groups;
- The Multiple Subject form of all TPAs must assess both literacy and mathematics;
- Scores provided to candidates and programs must relate to the content domains and/or specific scoring rubrics;
- Candidates must receive their scores within three weeks of submitting their assessment for scoring; and
- Model sponsors must report annually to the Commission on the programs served by the model sponsor, and candidate performance in the aggregate by program and institution.

Data Currently Required to be Collected and Submitted to the Commission

Assessment Design Standard 3(c) specifies a number of data collection points to be submitted annually by model owners, as shown below:

1. Programs or institutions using the model
2. Number of candidate submissions scored
3. Dates when submissions were submitted
4. Dates when the scores were released to programs
5. Number of candidate appeals
6. First time passing rates
7. Candidate completion passing rates

This is the starting point for the Commission’s discussion of what data elements might also be collected that would provide useful, helpful data to inform candidates, programs, accreditation activities, stakeholders, and the public of the outcomes and effects of these assessments.

To that end, staff suggest a number of discussion questions to frame the consideration of what other data elements could, or would, provide useful information to add to the knowledge base about these assessments, their outcomes, and their effects. For example, it is helpful to understand that these assessments consist of multiple activities completed by candidates and submitted for scoring. Within that process, many candidates may not fully complete all of these submissions within a single program year. Thus, a question for consideration is whether data from candidates who take and complete one portion of the TPA in a given program year, but who do not complete all portions in that same year, should be included in the annual data collection for that year. Including or not including candidates such as these would have an effect on a given program’s overall yearly passing rate. For another example, the Commission could consider if data from all of an institution’s Single Subject programs should be combined, or reported separately by content area. This decision would affect the institution’s overall passing rates but may be affected by a small number of candidates in certain programs. It is generally accepted that data from fewer than 10 candidates are not reported in order to protect the confidentiality of individual candidates.

A third example would be whether the Commission would want to add candidate demographics to the list of annual data elements to be reported. Currently, this element is not on the list required by the adopted Assessment Design Standards.

The Commission’s traditional examinations reports include information on both gender and ethnicity, these data are self-reported by the candidates and not all candidates choose to provide this information. Staff believes that the Commission is interested in seeing performance assessment data that includes information on the gender and ethnicity of the candidates. When the Commission collects demographic information, it is required to also collect gender identity and sexual orientation data. It is important to note that when these types of data questions are asked, however, some number of candidates may choose not to respond.

Another potential consideration is whether the Commission might like to further specify the types of data to be reported by Multiple Subject programs, since the Multiple Subject assessment is required by the Assessment Design Standards to assess both literacy and mathematics.

A Framework for Discussion

Performance Assessments are expected to yield important data that support program improvement, accreditation, public reporting and reliability monitoring, as described below. The current Assessment Design Standards may need to be amended to ensure that TPA model sponsors provide sufficient data in support of these four key purposes for data collection, analysis and reporting. Several specific questions are provided below to guide Commission discussion.

1. Program Improvement at the Institution – Institutions receive their own data back from the examination administrator but without a report that includes statewide data, the data is without important contextual information. By providing rubric level reports that allow institutions to compare their mean scores with the state data, this data becomes an important source for program improvement. The data provided to the program would also inform faculty training and the type(s) of support provided to candidates in preparation for the assessment.
2. Accreditation – Consistent with prior Commission direction, data collected from TPA model sponsors will be used to inform accreditation activities for teacher preparation programs. At this time, the plan is to ask accreditation teams to review the performance assessment data, at the rubric level, and in comparison with the statewide data for that model. Review of performance assessment data will allow the team members to develop questions that will be asked during accreditation site visit interviews. The Assessment Design standards do not specify that data is collected at the rubric level.
3. Public Reporting of Passing Rates – The Commission would use data collected from TPA model sponsors to produce TPA passing rate reports for the public and prospective candidates of teacher preparation programs.

Regarding public reporting, the Commission might want to consider the specific information to be collected for reports and how each element will be used in reporting. There already exists a model for this in the form of the Commission’s examination passing rate report. For example, when the Commission reports on passing rates for examinations, information is provided about “first-attempt”- the first time each candidate attempts a given assessment, and “best attempt” – the attempt that resulted in the highest score for each candidate, passing rates, as well as annual and cumulative passing rate information as appropriate. Any specific data that the Commission would like to make available to the public will need to be identified in the Assessment Design Standards.

4. Monitoring Implementation and Reliability of the TPA Models Approved by the Commission – The process for approving TPA models for use in California includes the requirement that model sponsors provide evidence regarding the validity and reliability of their assessment system. The Assessment Design Standards are clear in this regard. There are no provisions, however, for requiring model sponsors monitor and report on the aspects of the system that must be present in order to maintain validity and reliability. The Commission could amend the Design Standards to require model sponsors to report scoring and reliability information for their model such as information about use of condition codes and inter-rater reliability.

Questions for the Commission to Consider:

1. Does the Commission wish to require that candidate demographic data be collected, analyzed, and reported from model sponsors for the TPA? If so, at what level of analysis?

2. How should outcomes data from candidates who complete only portions of the full assessment in a given program year be collected and reported?
3. Does the Commission reaffirm its previous guidance that rubric level data should be collected and used to support both program improvement and accreditation activities?
4. Does the Commission reaffirm the provision of the Assessment Design Standards that model sponsors must collect (and now must also report) scoring and inter-rater reliability data on an ongoing basis?
5. Are the overall purposes for collecting and uses of the data identified by staff sufficient to address Commission interests in the effective use of these data?

Staff Recommendation

That the Commission discuss the issues and questions posed in this agenda item and provide direction to staff.

Next Steps

Based on Commission discussion, staff will clarify and adjust the list of annual required data reporting elements for each TPA model sponsor and will inform the model sponsors of their annual data collection and reporting responsibilities. Staff will also review the language in the current Assessment Design Standards and if modifications are needed, staff will bring the revisions to a future Commission meeting. TPA data analyses and conclusions will be presented to the Commission at a later date following the completion of the annual data collection process.