4D

Information

Educator Preparation Committee

Update on the Development of the Education Specialist Teaching Performance Assessment

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents an update on the development of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) for Education Specialists and a summary of design team meetings from February to July 2020. Guiding principles for the development of this assessment and proposed pilot study are provided as information for the Commission.

Recommended Action: For Information only

Presenters: Amy Reising, Director, and James Webb, Consultant, Performance Assessment Policy and Development Division

Strategic Plan Goal

II. Program Quality and Accountability
   a) Develop and maintain rigorous, meaningful, and relevant standards that drive program quality and effectiveness for the preparation of the education workforce and are responsive to the needs of California's diverse student population.

Update on the Development of the Education Specialist Teaching Performance Assessment

Introduction

This agenda item presents an update on the development of a Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) for Education Specialist candidates (EdSp CalTPA), as well as a summary of design team meetings from February to July 2020. Guiding principles for the continued design of this assessment and pilot study plans are provided for Commission consideration and discussion.

Background

At its February 2018 meeting, the Commission adopted a revised credential structure for the Education Specialist teaching credentials. The new credential structure includes five preliminary teaching credentials: Mild to Moderate Support Needs (MMSN), Extensive Support Needs (ESN), Visual Impairments (VI), Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH), and Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE). Subsequent to this work, the Commission determined that every teacher candidate should take and pass a TPA prior to earning the preliminary Education Specialist teaching credential. During its June 2018 meeting, the Commission reviewed proposed program standards and teaching performance expectations as well as proposed subject matter requirements for the credential. At the June 2018 Commission meeting, the Commission acted to do the following:

1. Affirm the current subject matter requirements for all Education Specialist credentials (a candidate completes the subject matter requirement as a candidate for a Preliminary Multiple Subject credential or a Preliminary Single Subject credential in one of the following content areas: English, mathematics, social science, science, art, music, or world languages).

2. Adopt Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) for Early Childhood Special Education, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, and Visual Impairments teaching credentials.

3. Affirm that the Early Childhood Special Education teaching credential will authorize teaching and services for birth through kindergarten once the regulatory process has been completed.

At the August 2018 Commission meeting, the Commission adopted program standards and TPEs for the Education Specialist Mild to Moderate and Extensive Support Needs credentials, and in April 2019 adopted authorization statements for these credentials.

Universal TPEs as the "Common Trunk" of Preparation
One of the important outcomes in the Commission's reform work in both special education and general education over the last several years is the development of a common or universal set of TPEs that are met by both general education and special education candidates. These universal TPEs establish a common foundation for all teachers, based on the concept that all teachers are teachers of all students, that all students are general education students first and that all students need intervention at different points in their academic career.

The Commission's goal in establishing universal TPEs was to ensure that all teachers learn the fundamentals of teaching, ideally in common coursework that allows for collaboration across credential types, and then each candidate specializes in the content of their particular credential area – Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Mild to Moderate Support Needs, Extensive Support Needs, Visual Impairment, Deaf and Hard of Hearing and Early Childhood Special Education. The development of the Education Specialist (EdSp) TPA has taken place against the backdrop of these significant changes in the framing of teacher preparation across this range of credentials. How to balance attention between the universal TPEs and the specialized TPEs has been a driving question as staff, stakeholders, and design team members consider the design of the Education Specialist TPA.

Design Team Meetings

The Education Specialist CalTPA Design Team includes twenty-three members representing the full range of teacher preparation programs, teacher induction programs, and the geographic regions of California. In addition to this group of educators, the design team also has a parent liaison and two representatives from the California Department of Education (CDE). One liaison represents the Special Education Division, and the other represents the English Language Development division of the CDE. A list of Education Specialist CalTPA Design Team members is included in Appendix A. The Education Specialist CalTPA Design Team (DT) has engaged in one in-person two-day meeting in February, followed by five online meetings. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the performance assessment team shifted to use online resources in order to continue the work of the design team and to maintain the adopted timeline for the development of the EdSp CalTPA. The design team will continue to meet monthly in whole- and credential specific subgroups through November with staff and the technical contractor, Evaluation Systems. After the November 2020 meeting, the performance assessment team will convene the EdSp DT every other month until the end of the performance assessment development period, in 2021. Brief summaries of each meeting are provided below.

Meeting 1: February 11-12, 2020
At this inaugural meeting, the EdSp CalTPA Design Team members were introduced to their responsibilities and Commission expectations for their participation. The first topic on the agenda covered the history of state policy leading to the TPA requirement in California. Commission staff explained the Commission's recent efforts to (a) strengthen and streamline the accreditation system, (b) develop data dashboards and outcome measures, (c) revise education specialist preliminary preparation program standards, (d) consider the relationship

between general and special education, and (e) update and revise TPEs, TPAs and other performance assessments. The team participated in a small group activity to review and understand the TPA Design Standards and Education Specialist Teaching Performance Expectations. The DT spent time discussing what has been learned from twenty years of implementing TPAs and identified what, from their perspective, was working and what needed to be improved in assessing the performance of Education Specialist preliminary teaching credential candidates. In small groups, Design Team members brainstormed and discussed options for a designed EdSp CalTPA based on their first-hand experiences and research. These potential structures became the foundation for subsequent meetings. The meeting closed with a discussion about recommendations for additional supports for education specialist candidates with a performance assessment.

Meeting 2: March 18, 2020
EdSp CalTPA Design Team members reviewed the 2015 Special Education Task Force Report to examine the recommendations of the report for universal teaching behaviors. In addition, DT members reviewed the challenges for facilitating change in preliminary and professional teacher preparation programs to meet the needs of students with disabilities in California. After rich conversations around the task force recommendations, DT members began to discuss Cycle 1 of the CalTPA for general education teachers, which focuses on learning about students and planning instruction. To expand this context, staff presented information on existing program experiences with the CalTPA. The meeting ended with the DT members brainstorming ways to adapt Cycle 1 for the EdSp CalTPA.

Meeting 3: April 14, 2020
The April meeting began with a summary of their prior discussions of the Special Education Task Force Report and ideas for developing a cycle to address the universal TPEs focused on learning about students and designing learning experiences that would connect across all five credential areas of emphasis. A handful of current EdSp preliminary preparation programs have been using the current CalTPA with their candidates. DT members deconstructed and analyzed a Cycle 1 submission from a current Extensive Support Needs (ESN) candidate for the purpose of identifying the universal TPEs in this CalTPA Cycle and considering what a similarly constructed cycle for the EdSp CalTPA might look like. To assist with this process, the DT also reviewed the draft TPA structures developed during the February meeting. Discussion centered on two questions: 1) What was in the constructed performance assessment in February that is also in the ESN candidate's cycle 1 submission? and 2) What is present in the ESN candidate submission but not in the current cycle that should be included for education specialist candidates? The meeting closed with a discussion of recommendations for assessor criteria for the EdSp CalTPA.

Meeting 4: May 5-6, 2020
Aaron Christensen, consultant at the California Department of Education (CDE), presented information on students with disabilities in California, data that supported the 2015 Special Education Task Force Report, and connections of data to the design of the EdSp CalTPA. Theresa Hawk, CDE consultant with the English Learner Support Division, also shared the CDE's

perspective on supporting language development for students with disabilities. Commission staff provided an overview of the Education Specialist program design standards and the credential-specific TPEs. In small groups DT members continued to brainstorm ideas for an assessment structure that would require evidence of teaching practice and address both the universal and specialist TPEs across all five Education Specialists credential areas. Commission staff also presented information on equity and fairness in performance assessments and how the DT can work to ensure an equitable and fair assessment for education specialist candidates. Upon a review and analysis of the current CalTPA Cycle 1 Performance Assessment Guide, DT members worked in small groups to review requirements for focus students, video and annotation, and reflection/application prompts and consider necessary adaptations for Education Specialists. Recommendations from the DT members were incorporated into a working draft of the EdSp CalTPA Cycle 1 performance assessment guide.

Meeting 5: June 10-11, 2020
Commission staff opened the June meeting with a review of work completed by the DT since March and determined that the development of the EdSp CalTPA is on schedule. DT members worked in small credential-alike groups to review the eight analytic rubrics for CalTPA Cycle 1. Members were asked to consider two questions for this activity: 1) What works for this specific rubric? and 2) What needs to be reconsidered by the design team? Based on recommendations of the DT during the May meeting, attention was brought back to the CalTPA Cycle 1 Performance Assessment Guide for further analysis. Members reviewed each step of Cycle 1, provided information about what candidates would be expected to do in the tasks and also examined how preparation programs can support candidates as they complete cycle 1 of the EdSp CalTPA. Staff from Evaluation Systems presented information about the upcoming pilot study, and then Commission staff provided details on how work would continue for future meetings in which DT members would meet in subgroups to design unique, credential-specific instructional tasks for Cycle 2. The meeting concluded with a discussion of assessor qualifications under the new credential structure for Education Specialists and how the existing seven areas of emphasis will correspond to the new five areas of specialization.

Meeting 6: July 7-8, 2020
In the most recent meeting of the DT, members reviewed the TPEs and isolated teaching behaviors that would support the knowledge, skills, and abilities required for the preliminary Education Specialist credential. DT members then completed an "artifact hunt" with the draft EdSp Cycle 1 to identify specific evidence that an education specialist candidate would submit to demonstrate attainment of select universal and credential-specific TPEs. Commission and ES staff provided additional information on the pilot study and program-specific information to assist with understanding the process. DT members continued their review and analysis of the CalTPA Program Guide to identify appropriate and necessary modifications to include in the EdSp CalTPA, with a focus on how to support programs in implementing the assessment cycles. Upon a deconstruction and analysis of a CalTPA Cycle 2 submission from an education specialist candidate, DT members met in small groups to share ideas on how the credential-specific TPEs could be assessed in a cycle that focuses on assessment-driven instruction to support the five different categories of disabilities.

Commission Bias Review Committee Meeting

The Commission's Bias Review Committee will review the draft EdSp CalTPA Cycle 1: Learning About Students and Planning Instruction, including the assessment guide, rubrics, and supporting materials, in September 2020. The role of the Bias Review Committee is to identify potential bias issues. All committee findings and recommendations, including bias-related and content-related comments, will be reviewed and addressed in revisions to the instructional cycles and rubrics, as appropriate. Additional bias reviews are scheduled to occur throughout the development process prior to operational administration, fall of 2022.

Structure of the Education Specialist CalTPA and Key Components

The Education Specialist CalTPA Design Team, Commission staff, and Evaluation Systems, through their series of discussions have determined an overall structure for the EdSp CalTPA. The DT has come to consensus that the Education Specialist CalTPA will align with key qualities of the general education CalTPA with a task-based structure that is completed at two different times during a candidate's preliminary preparation program. As proposed, a candidate must pass both of the cycles of instruction, following the plan, teach/assess, reflect and apply cycle. This supports an educative quality of the EdSp CalTPA and both builds upon the existing structure of the CalTPA, and assesses the unique TPEs for education specialist candidates.

As proposed, the EdSp CalTPA supports candidates to complete a cycle of instruction during field placement, submit it for scoring, and receive assessment results including a pass or no pass score with analytic feedback about credential-specific TPEs. Programs can support candidates in improving their teaching practice based on their assessment results for the first Cycle of Instruction. The two instructional cycles are being purposefully developed to be completed in order, but the cycles are not dependent on each other. Instructional Cycle 1 could lead to the performance assessment developed and administered in Cycle 2 if the candidate is in the same classroom placement with the same students and it makes sense instructionally for the students and the candidate. Cycle 1, set for pilot study in fall 2020, is to be completed by all five credential area candidates. Given current events related to building closures and district policies regarding online video recording, the pilot study for Cycle 1 may be conducted in the spring of 2021. Cycle 2, currently under development, will be credential area specific. Cycle 2 is scheduled for a pilot study in the spring of 2021.

Key Components of the Education Specialist CalTPA

- Two Cycles of Instruction following Plan, Teach/Assess, Reflect, Apply
    - Instructional Cycle 1: Learning about Students, and Planning Instruction (all five education specialist area candidates)
    - Instructional Cycle 2: Assessment Driven Instruction (credential area specific)
- Focus on three Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP)/Individualized Education Plan (IEP) focus students, including an English learner and/or student with a language-based or expressive language need, a student with an identified disability (physical, cognitive, social) with an IFSP/IEP/504 plan and/or Gifted and Talented Education (GATE)

identified, and a student who has experienced trauma either in or outside of the school setting

- Focus on utilization of instructional support personnel to engage and support all students in learning
- Instructional design based on knowing students' language/communication needs, assets, and their needs for both academic and social/emotional support. Candidates teach every student (all students in the least restrictive environment)
- Educational technology is infused in both cycles of instruction with an emphasis on supporting students to become digital citizens
- Less emphasis on written evidence, instead candidates submit annotated video, audio files, photographs, student work (assessment results), lesson plans and some written responses and reflections about practice
- Video of instruction is directed, specific, and annotated
- Choice in how to present task evidence or reflect on practice (written response, written annotations, video with annotation, audio files, photographs, graphics)
- Subject specific focus on literacy and mathematics, integration of subject matter (as an option)
- Students demonstrate their learning through multiple modalities, e.g. Universal Design for Learning (UDL)
- Candidate reflection on practice is required in each cycle
- Analytic rubrics provide reports to candidates and programs with sufficient detail to guide a learning plan for induction (Universal and Credential Area TPE)
- UDL Theory required for instructional planning and assessment, the what, how, and why of learning
- Aggregated EdSp CalTPA score results designed to be used in accreditation processes as an outcome measure
- Aggregated EdSp CalTPA results to be posted on Commission dashboard

DRAFT EdSp Cycle 1: Learning About Students and Planning Instruction

Step 1: Plan. Gather information about one class or small learning group of students with IFSP and/or IEP, identify content-specific and ELD learning goals as appropriate, and develop a lesson or activity plan based on the applicable California Content Standards and/or Curriculum Frameworks, content-specific pedagogy, knowledge of candidate's students, and IFSP/IEP goals. Candidate may integrate other subjects into the lesson. Describe the assets and learning needs of the class or small learning group and for three focus students.

Step 2: Teach and Assess. Teach the planned lesson or activity to students and video record the lesson. Select and annotate clips from candidate's video that illustrate specific teaching practices and instructional strategies of the lesson or activity. Annotations provided by candidate should describe how they create a positive and safe learning environment; explain connections to prior learning and set expectations for content-specific learning; engage students in age- and developmentally appropriate content-specific higher-order thinking; and monitor for student understanding through assessment. In addition, candidates must also

demonstrate how they are incorporating IFSP/ IEP goals into meeting the diverse learning needs for their students during instruction and assessment.

Step 3: Reflect. Provide information drawn from analysis of student assets and learning needs to plan an appropriate, relevant, and rigorous content-specific lesson or activity for candidate's selected group of students (i.e. whole class, small learning group, or three individuals). Explain how the lesson or activity plan was flexible to incorporate in-the-moment adaptations for specific students. Indicate what the candidate needed to do to support their three focus students.

Step 4: Apply. Candidate explains what they would do differently to advance the learning of the class as a whole, small learning group, or three individuals and, if they were to teach this lesson or activity again, what they would do the same or differently to improve learning for the whole class, small learning group, or three individuals.

DRAFT Analytic Rubric Essential Questions for EdSp CalTPA Cycle 1

Step 1: Plan

1. How does the candidate's proposed learning goal(s) connect with prior knowledge and define specific outcomes for students?
2. How do proposed learning activities and instructional and grouping strategies support, engage, and challenge all students to meet the learning goal(s)?
3. How does the candidate plan instruction using knowledge of Focus Student (FS)1's (English learner) assets and learning needs to support meaningful engagement with the content-specific lesson goal(s)?
4. How does the candidate plan instruction using knowledge of FS2's (student with identified special needs) assets and learning needs to support meaningful engagement with the content-specific lesson goal(s)?
5. How does the candidate plan instruction using knowledge of FS3's assets and learning needs to support meaningful engagement with the content-specific lesson goal(s) and address the student's well-being by creating a safe and positive learning environment during or outside of the lesson?

Step 2: Teach and Assess

6. How does the candidate maintain a positive and safe learning environment that supports all students to access and meet the content-specific learning goal(s), connect to students' prior learning, and establish clear learning expectations?
7. How does the candidate actively engage students in deep learning of content, monitor/assess their understanding, and establish next steps for content-specific learning?

Step 3: Reflect

8. How does the candidate analyze and describe (citing evidence from Steps 1 and/or 2) the impact of their asset- and needs-based lesson planning, teaching, and assessment of student learning and explain how the lesson supports the whole class, small learning group, and three individual focus students?

Step 4: Apply

9. How will the candidate apply what they have learned in Cycle 1 (citing evidence from Steps 1, 2, and/or 3) about students' learning to strengthen and extend students' understanding of content and develop academic language and determine next steps for instruction?

Education Specialist CalTPA Pilot Study Parameters

Cycle 1 of the EdSp CalTPA will be piloted during the fall of 2020, or if necessary due to COVID related school closures, spring of 2021. Results of the pilot will be used to revise the Cycle in preparation for a full field test of the system during the 2020-21 academic years. Pilot study parameters include:

- The CalTPA pilot study will begin in October of 2020 and run through November of 2020
- CalTPA pilot evidence will be submitted online to Evaluation Systems for preliminary review to assist to develop "marker evidence" (high, medium and low levels of performance), inform the scoring process and training, and to assist with determining revisions to tasks and rubrics for the field test to be held in 2021-22
- Pilot results will not be returned to candidates. Programs can determine grades or credit for the evidence submitted as a replacement for a typical coursework assignment
- All evidence submitted will be kept confidential
- Programs gain valuable information about how to design courses and support candidates to prepare for the revised TPEs and EdSp CalTPA
- Target number of participants is 150 across the full range of credentials: Mild/Moderate Support Needs; Extensive Support Needs; Early Childhood Special Education; Deaf and Hard of Hearing; Visual Impairments; and across all types of teacher preparation programs (university student teaching programs, university intern programs, and district intern programs)

EdSp Program and Candidate Supports for Embedded Performance Assessment

Much was learned about how to best support programs and candidates through the redesign of the CalTPA over the last several years. This learning will inform how supports are offered to Education Specialist programs. The preparation community is encouraged to join these supports and over time the plan is to add specific supports and topics to support Education Specialist programs. Education Specialist programs are currently working with Commission staff to revise their programs based on the universal and credential specific TPEs. The goal is to inform programs as the EdSp CalTPA is piloted and field tested regarding how TPEs will be

measured on the EdSp CalTPA so that the expectations for performance are woven into program designs to allow for the embedded performance assessment. Several CalTPA program supports are currently available to Education Specialist programs. These supports include the following:

- Weekly Office hours for program coordinators and faculty
- Virtual Think Tanks (VTT) (online faculty discussions focused on best practices related to TPEs of CalTPA)
- Deep Dive webinars focused on each of the two Instructional MS/SS CalTPA Cycles
- Published candidate mid-range submission responses with videos for MS/SS CalTPA Cycles on the commission's website
- ES supported website for policies, materials, tutorials, and community supports (www.ctcexams.nesinc.com)
- CTC Education Specialist email established for programs, faculty, and candidates
- CTC YouTube Channel Playlist (archived VTTs, online learning webinars) established for programs, faculty, and candidates
- CalTPA Program Guide published (www.ctcexams.nesinc.com)
- Annual TPA Implementation Conference (held July 2020)

To be developed/added:

- Deep Dive webinar about DRAFT EdSp CalTPA Cycle 1 for pilot programs
- Education Specialist Program Guide
- Education Specialist Office Hours
- Addition of Education Specialist topics to VTTs
- Assessor training for pilot study of EdSp CalTPA
- As Education Specialist programs engage with the developing performance assessment work, Commission and ES staff will develop additional supports for this learning community

Next Steps

Commission and ES staff will continue to meet with the Design Team and work with Education Specialist programs to transition programs in aligning with recently-adopted Universal and Education Specialist TPE. Staff plans to provide an EdSp CalTPA development update and share findings from the pilot study analyses during the spring of 2021.

Appendix A

Education Specialist CalTPA Design Team Members

Name	Employer	Role
Amy Andersen	El Dorado County Office of Education	Executive Director, Special Services
Amanda Baird	Orange County Department of Education	Coordinator
Jessica Burrone	Yolo County Office of Education	Director of Special Education
Cathy Creasia	University of Southern California	Director of Accreditation and Credentialing
Vicki Graff	Loyola Marymount University	Technical Advisor, CTC/ES
Megan Gross	Poway Unified School District	Teacher, ESN
Allan Hallis	Riverside County Office of Education	Administrator, Preliminary Teacher Preparation
Cheryl Kamei-Hannan	California State University, Los Angeles	Professor
Elizabeth Jara	Teachers College San Joaquin	Coordinator, Special Education Programs
Gabrielle Jones	University of California, San Diego	Director of MA-ASL Credential Program
Jennifer Kritsch	Point Loma University	Director of Special Education, Associate Professor
Robert Perry	Los Angeles Unified School District	Administrative Coordinator
Elisa Pokorney	William S. Hart Union High School District	Teacher, ESN
Nina Potter	San Diego State University	Director of Assessment & Accreditation
Terrelle Sales	Vanguard University	Assistant Professor of Graduate Education
Julie Sheldon	Walnut Valley Teacher Induction	Induction Coordinator
Cheryl Sjostrom	Brandman University	Director of Clinical Services/Associate Professor
Sarah Steinbach	Santa Clara County Office of Education	Teacher, ESN
Ting Siu	California State University, San Francisco	Assistant Professor and Program Coordinator
Stephanie Stotelmeyer	Santa Ana Unified School District	Teacher, MMSN
Jacquelyn Urbani	Mills College	Director of ECSE/Associate Professor
Janice Myck-Wayne	California State University, Fullerton	Professor, Special Education
Bridget Scott-Weich	Mount Saint Mary's University/John Tracy Center	Director of Graduate Programs and Administration
Robin Zane	California Department of Education	Director, State Special Services Schools Division