

---

# 4B

## Information/Action

### *Educator Preparation Committee*

#### **Update on the Development of the California Education Specialist Teaching Performance Assessment and Initial Pilot Study**

---

**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 2020 to March 2021. Guiding principles for the continued development of this assessment and fall 2020 pilot study data are presented as information for the Commission. In addition, staff seeks approval from the Commission to provide additional time for a comprehensive field test with the lower incidence credential areas of emphasis (ECSE, DHH, and VI).

**Recommended Action:** Staff recommends that the Commission: 1) confirm its expectation that MMSN and ESN credential programs commence their administration of the Education Specialist CalTPA in fall 2022; 2) approve an additional year for ECSE, DHH, and VI to develop performance assessment guides for Cycle 1 and Cycle 2 with a field test for these credential areas in 2022-2023; and 3) direct staff to include successful demonstration of proficiency on a performance assessment, a requirement for the preliminary credential, in its rulemaking package establishing the new Education Specialist credential and bridge authorizations.

**Presenters:** Amy Reising, Acting Chief Deputy Director and James Webb, Consultant, Performance Assessment Policy and Development

#### **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 California Education Specialist Teaching Performance Assessment and Initial Pilot Study

---

## Introduction

This agenda item presents an update on the development of a Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) for Education Specialists, as well as a summary of design team meetings from February 2020 to March 2021. Guiding principles for the continued design of this assessment and fall 2020 pilot study data are provided for Commission consideration and discussion. In addition, Commission staff seeks approval from the Commission for additional time to allow for a comprehensive field test with the lower incidence credential areas of emphasis (ECSE, DHH, and VI). During the 2022-2023 operational year, low incidence programs would request a waiver for the requirement to take and pass a performance assessment. Low incidence candidates would instead participate in a field test, which would provide the opportunity for further study and development of authentic performance assessment for these areas.

## 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 Teaching Performance Assessment prior to earning the preliminary 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. (i.e., a candidate completes the subject matter requirement 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.

Finally, the Commission took action in [December 2020](#), to make the successful demonstration of proficiency on a performance assessment for education specialist candidates a requirement for the preliminary credential.

### **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 teachers. 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 specialize 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 (See [Appendix A](#)). The development of the Education Specialist (EdSp) TPA has occurred 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 what shape the Education Specialist TPA might take.

### **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 B](#). 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 for the design team and to maintain the adopted timeline for the development of the EdSp CalTPA. The design team continues to meet via Zoom. Short summaries of each meeting are provided in [Appendix C](#).

### **Part I: Fall 2020 Pilot Study Program Information**

The fall Education Specialist CalTPA pilot study began in October of 2020 and ran through December. Education Specialist CalTPA pilot evidence was submitted online to Evaluation Systems group of Pearson (ES) for preliminary review to assist with the identification of marker

evidence, inform the scoring process and assessor training, and to assist with determining revisions to tasks and rubrics of Cycle 1 in preparation for the field test to be held October 2021 to May 2022. All evidence submitted is confidential. Participating programs gained valuable information about how to design courses and support candidates to prepare for the Teaching Performance Expectations and the newly developed Education Specialist CalTPA. The target number of participants for the pilot was 105 across all types of preliminary education specialist preparation programs for scoring purposes. Ultimately, 12 preliminary programs participated, and 148 candidates submitted responses to Cycle 1: Learning About Students and Planning Instruction (See [Appendix D](#)).

At the conclusion of the pilot study, ES collected surveys from candidates and program coordinators. In addition, a focus group session was held online with candidates about the cycle. Calibrated California teachers and faculty who met the assessor criteria ([Appendix E](#) provides Education Specialist CalTPA assessor criteria) scored candidate submissions from January 28-29, 2021, February 10-12, and February 16-17, 2021. At the end of each two-day assessor training and scoring session, assessors debriefed with Commission and ES staff and completed surveys. ES staff analyzed the quantitative and qualitative data. Aggregate scores for each cycle were sent to programs in late March 2021.

#### **Education Specialist CalTPA Assessor Recruitment, Training, and Scoring**

ES recruited assessors for the pilot test scoring process from colleges and universities, preparation programs and active practitioners beginning in the fall 2020 for the pilot test scoring process in the winter of 2021. The table below shows the number of marker assessors and assessors for Cycle 1 in each education specialist credential area that participated.

<b>EdSp Credential Area</b>	<b>Marker Assessors</b>	<b>Assessors</b>	<b>Submissions Scored</b>
MMSN	4	6	32
ESN	4	7	25
ECSE	1	2	4
VI	2	2	6

Assessors were provided “marker papers” that displayed differing levels of quality responses from across the five score levels. Once they demonstrated calibration through reviewing marker papers and discussion, assessors moved into pairs or triads for scoring the candidate submissions. Scoring was conducted online and as score judgments were consensually reached, data was entered into the computer system to track the candidate’s scores. Analytic rubrics were used for each step of the *Plan, Teach and Assess, Reflect, and Apply* sequence, with bulleted lists of tasks and evidence, representing constructs of the Teaching Performance Expectations. Submissions were scored by the assessors and the full range of performance scores were seen.

These scored performances will further direct revisions to the rubrics and to the instructional cycles. Assessors completed a survey at the end of the scoring process and participated in an oral debrief with Commission and ES staff.

### **General Findings of the Cycle 1 Fall Pilot Study**

The pilot test included broad program representation from MMSN and ESN programs that produced enough complete candidate responses and assessor participation to gather data on all parts of the assessment for these two credential areas of emphasis. Initial Pilot test findings were drawn from the performance data (scoring data), surveys completed by candidates, program coordinators, and assessors (including marker assessors), assessor debrief sessions, and candidate and program coordinator online focus groups. Cycle 1 for MMSN and ESN yielded results from candidates, programs, and assessors that positively supported the assessment for these two credential areas of emphasis. Programs and candidates expressed the need for additional guidance in supporting candidates to complete the cycle and provided some concrete feedback on how to do that. Assessors were particularly helpful in making recommendations to sharpen the cycle and rubric language to focus more closely on the measurement of the Teaching Performance Expectations. The following general findings emerged from the pilot data:

- While completing Cycle 1, candidates felt they were able to learn more about the process of teaching.
- Candidates felt prepared by their programs to respond to the prompts for Cycle 1 and were able to capture teaching practice with video.
- Cycle 1 gave candidates the opportunity to consider their students' assets first when planning instruction.
- The pilot test program coordinators appreciated that the assessment process allows for in-depth learning of the teaching performance expectations and agreed they received support as coordinators from CTC/ES.
- The Cycle 1 pilot assessors appreciated the training and the professionalism of CTC/ES staff.
- Going through the analytic rubrics assisted in the Cycle 1 pilot assessor's understanding for scoring.
- Working in teams benefited the Cycle 1 pilot assessor's ability to ask questions and learn from one another.
- Cycle 1 pilot assessors were appreciative to be a part of the process of learning about and being able to assess Cycle 1 candidate submissions.

Survey data was collected from candidates, program coordinators, and assessors based on their pilot participation in the following areas:

- Clarity and Ease of Use;
- Opportunity to Demonstrate Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities of the Teaching Performance Expectations; and
- Fairness and Authenticity.

In addition to survey responses, assessors provided valuable input in their debrief sessions with Commission and ES staff at the conclusion of each scoring session. Candidate focus groups were

held online for each cycle, giving candidates the opportunity to talk directly to Commission and ES staff about their insights and ask questions based on their first-hand experiences. Findings were shared with the Education Specialist CalTPA Design Team at its March 9, 2021 meeting.

As a result of the robust data from the fall pilot study and with the anticipation of further findings from the spring pilot study for MMSN and ESN, staff maintains its development timeline for these two credential areas of emphasis to begin operational administration in 2022-23. Additional fall pilot study data may be found in [Appendix F](#) and [Appendix G](#).

## **Part II: Administration and Scoring of the Education Specialist CalTPA for ECSE, DHH, and VI**

The development and implementation of the Education Specialist CalTPA for Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH), and Visual Impairment (VI) will likely have a significant impact on program design for these areas as varying pedagogical approaches, medical supports, and age considerations widely exist among these credentials. Three areas of challenge have been identified for preliminary education specialist programs for ECSE, DHH, and VI. The first is how to identify and provide sustainable field placements for candidates. To complete the instructional cycles, candidates need to have access to students who are aged three and above. In addition, these three credential areas of emphasis often have itinerant teachers who travel across large SELPA regions in the state, which creates challenges in working with small groups of students or with a whole class. The second challenge is how to address the varying pedagogical philosophies for programs, such as DHH, where there are currently three areas of focus with students who are deaf and hard of hearing: ASL (American Sign Language); LSL (Listening and Spoken Language); and TC (Total Communication). Compounding this challenge is also that none of the five DHH programs in the state participated in the fall pilot study; therefore, staff will not have data to provide to the design team until July 2021. Third, the emerging work of the Early Childhood Education TPE and performance assessment design will have an impact on the design and implementation of a performance assessment for ECSE. Staff would recommend that ECSE align closely to ECE so that students who are identified with an IFSP or IEP would receive support services in the Least Restrictive Environment during their preschool years.

For these reasons, staff is recommending an additional year to prepare the operational administration for the Education Specialist CalTPA for the credential areas of ECSE, DHH, and VI. Commission staff will work with the design team members to accomplish the following:

- Revise cycle performance assessment guides for these credential areas – a version for Cycle 1 in VI has already been developed and is now being piloted by a VI program;
- Review the structure for Cycle 1 of the performance assessment to include supplements and/or chapters to address the unique needs of the ECSE, DHH, and VI programs;
- Work on aligning ECSE cycles with the beginning ECE performance assessment cycles as they develop with the ECE design team;
- Determine how to best support candidates as they prepare for the two instructional cycles;
- Recruit more programs from DHH and ECSE to participate in a pilot study for revised Cycle 1 and for the emerging Cycle 2;

- Determine how to manage the two cycles of the Education Specialist CalTPA as it relates to fieldwork; and,
- Revise MOU with districts and site-based supervisors.

Staff is on track with the 2022-23 operational administration for the Education Specialist CalTPA for MMSN and ESN programs. CTC and ES will convene an additional group of educators for a standard setting study in spring 2022 with staff bringing forward a recommended passing standard for Commission adoption in June 2022. For ECSE, DHH, and VI the operational administration would be 2023-24, thus allowing these programs an additional year for a field study of the Education Specialist CalTPA with all candidates in ECSE, DHH, and VI programs. These programs will participate in a field test for the 2022-2023 year and apply for a waiver. Affected programs will receive both aggregate and individual data for candidates and will be able to use this information to further address and prepare for the following year when passing the Education Specialist CalTPA would be required for all preliminary education specialist candidates in the credential areas of ECSE, DHH, and VI. A proposed timeline for this recommendation is provided in [Appendix H](#).

### **Part III: Dual Credential Considerations**

As a result of the fall pilot study and discussions with design team members, the topic of dual credential candidates (those seeking both an Education Specialist and a general education teaching credential) keeps surfacing. The chart in [Appendix I](#) illustrates the current and proposed clinical hours requirement for those preliminary candidates who pursue the general education and education specialist credentials. The Education Specialist CalTPA is currently in the spring pilot study. Considerations for the performance assessment requirement for the preliminary credential need to be finalized as the operational administration becomes effective with the 2022-23 year. Commission staff continue to consult with the field and the design team on how the CalTPA and the Education Specialist CalTPA can be combined to maintain the integrity of the credentials sought while not burdening the candidate with multiple measures of the knowledge, skills, and abilities required for a dual credential holder. This situation also applies to the education specialist areas of emphasis, such as a MMSN credential candidate who also seeks an ESN credential.

Commission staff is exploring the following possibilities:

- Cycle 1 of the CalTPA serves as the foundational cycle with its emphasis on Learning About Students and Planning Instruction. All credential candidates (general education and education specialist) would complete and pass Cycle 1 of the CalTPA.
- Cycle 2 of the Education Specialist CalTPA with its importance on Assessment Driven Instruction for the Credential Area of Emphasis would serve as the performance assessment measure for candidates within their credential area of specialization to satisfy the preliminary requirement for the education specialist credential.

These proposals are in their earliest draft form currently. Staff will continue to work with the design team, representatives from the Collaboration for Effective Educator Development,

Accountability, and Reform (CEEDAR) Institute, and the field to make recommendations to the Commission at its June 2021 meeting.

### **Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends the following:

1. That the Commission confirm its expectation that MMSN and ESN credential programs commence their administration of the Education Specialist CalTPA in fall 2022.
2. That the Commission approve an additional year for ECSE, DHH, and VI to develop performance assessment guides for Cycle 1 and Cycle 2 with a field test for these credential areas in 2022-2023.
3. That the Commission direct staff to include successful demonstration of proficiency on a performance assessment, a requirement for the preliminary credential, in its rulemaking package establishing the new Education Specialist credential and bridge authorizations.

### **Next Steps**

Based on the data findings and recommendations from the Design Team, Commission and ES staff will revise the Education Specialist CalTPA cycles, rubrics, and program guide. Next steps for development include the following:

- Education Specialist CalTPA Field test recruitment: Spring-Fall 2021;
- Revising MMSN and ESN Education Specialist CalTPA cycles, Rubrics, Support Materials: June-August 2021;
- Field Test Begins: October 2021;
- Continue development/revision to the Cycle 1 performance assessment guides for ECSE, DHH, and VI; and,
- Develop Cycle 2 performance assessment guides for ECSE, DHH, VI.

Commission and ES staff will continue to provide weekly office hours for programs who are participating in the spring pilot study and continue these office hours through the field test. In addition, staff will provide technical assistance through webinars, virtual think tanks, and quarterly coordinator meetings. Staff will continue to update the Education Specialist CalTPA playlist on YouTube.

Staff will continue to bring future updates to the Commission as milestones are reached. In addition, staff will bring further information for consideration with dual credential candidates in June 2021 for action by the Commission.

## Appendix A

### **Education Specialist Credential Structure Recommendation:**

At the December 2017 meeting, staff recommended a revised credential structure, reflecting the consensus of the Commission's special education task force, intended to work in concert with the general education credential to best meet the needs of California's students with disabilities. The proposed structure includes five initial Education Specialist Credentials building off of the same base of preparation (i.e. common trunk) as the general education Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credentials:

1. Early Childhood Special Education (Birth through K)
2. Visual Impairments (Birth to age 22)
3. Deaf and Hard of Hearing (Birth to age 22)
4. Mild/Moderate Support Needs (K to age 22)
5. Significant Support Needs (K to age 22).

## Appendix B

### 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
Sharon Sacks/Ting Siu	California State University, San Francisco	Clinical Supervisor, TVI/Professor
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



## Appendix C

### **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 appropriating change with preliminary and professional learning programs to meet the needs of students with disabilities in California. After rich conversations around these recommendations, DT members began to discuss the CalTPA framework to understand that Cycle 1 centers on learning about students and planning instruction. To expand this context, staff presented information on the task force report, credential-specific group data from fall 2019, Commission guidance, and existing program experiences. The meeting ended with DT members reviewing CalTPA Cycle 1 and brainstorming ways to adapt the steps for the EdSp CalTPA.

### **Meeting 3: April 14, 2020**

The April meeting began with a review of the findings from the March meeting so that DT members could return to the recommendations of the 2015 Special Education Task Force Report and move forward with 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 candidate for the purpose of connecting the universal TPE of the CalTPA and application of those ideas to a similarly constructed cycle for the EdSp CalTPA. To assist with this process, staff presented information from the February meeting in which DT members constructed potential cycle models for the

EdSp CalTPA. Discussion centered on two questions: What was in the constructed performance assessment in February that is also in the ESN candidate's cycle 1 submission? 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 about 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 supports 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 presented the organization and structure of the education specialist program design standards and the credential-specific TPEs. In small groups Design Team members brainstormed ideas for an assessment structure that would require evidence of teaching practice that and addressed 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 would then prompt Commission staff to incorporate items into the working draft of the 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 design team 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 Cycle 1. Members were asked to consider two questions for this activity: What works for this specific rubric? and 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 and 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 Cycle 1 to identify the specific evidence that an education specialist candidate would submit to demonstrate attainment of both the 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.

**Meeting 7: August 12, 18, and 19, 2020**

The design team members met over three days in the five credential-specific areas of MMSN, ESN, ECSE, DHH, and VI. During this subgroup meetings, members from each credential area reviewed the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE) from each credential area of the education specialist credential to map out the corresponding TPE to the cycles of the Education Specialist CalTPA. In addition, each subgroup reviewed the Cycle 2 (Assessment-Driven Instruction) performance assessment guide from the CalTPA to determine what steps and activities could work for education specialist candidates. From these meetings, it was determined that the 2018 education specialist TPE would need some revision for clarity and redundancy.

**Meeting 8: September 22, 2020**

Design team members were presented with the bias review committee’s recommendations for the Cycle 1 performance assessment guide and highlighted revisions to the guide due to the findings of the committee. In addition, each credential area presented the content covered at the August subgroup meetings to the entire design team to provide insight for the direction of the team. Design team members reviewed a draft of a cycle 2 performance assessment guide for the MMSN credential area with questions to the design, structure, and overview of the draft. Upon review, design team members then assembled into their credential-specific subgroups to review the TPE and their alignment to the rubrics; within this activity, team members were specifically charged to examine the following: clarity; demonstrable performance; appropriateness; and possible redundancy. A draft of the program guide to accompany the Education Specialist CalTPA was also presented to design team members for review and consideration.

**Meeting 9: October 14, 21, 22 and 28, 2020**

The design team members met over four days in the five credential-specific areas of MMSN, ESN, ECSE, DHH, and VI. During this subgroup meetings, members from each credential area reviewed a draft of the Cycle 2 (Assessment-Driven Instruction) performance assessment guide

for MMSN to determine the following areas of emphasis: working with instructional support personnel; meeting the needs of students who are English learners; using information from the cycle to inform IEP goals and/or progress monitoring; and, providing assessment information to families and/or guardians. Design team members continued their work to map the TPE with the rubrics in each credential area of emphasis. In addition, design team members worked to review the TPE for clarity, redundancy, demonstrable performance, and required knowledge, skills, and abilities for beginning teachers in each of the credential areas of emphasis.

#### **Meeting 10: November 9 and 10, 2020**

In this two-day meeting, design team members were presented with updates on the fall pilot study for Cycle 1. In addition, members reviewed the winter/spring Cycle 2 pilot study for MMSN and ESN programs. On the first day, MMSN and ESN met in the afternoon to continue their review of the TPE and mapping with rubrics. On the second day, ECSE, DHH, and VI met to continue their review of the TPE and mapping with rubrics.

#### **Meeting 11: January 26, 2021**

The meeting began with a presentation of FERPA and HIPPA considerations with relation to the Education Specialist CalTPA. Design team members from preparation programs provided information on how they handle issues with these considerations. Design team members also began to grapple with the question of dual credential candidates and how the performance assessment would figure into the recommendation for candidates who are attempting to earn two or more credentials. Members were presented with findings from the bias review committed upon review of the Cycle 2 performance assessment guide. Commission staff provided how they took the recommendations and provided revisions to the guide.

#### **Meeting 12: March 9, 2021**

Design team members reviewed the calendar to review the timeline for the work of the development of the Education Specialist CalTPA. Two candidate submissions (ESN and ECSE) were reviewed. Evaluation Systems group of Pearson then presented data from the Fall 2020 Cycle 1 Pilot Study from the following sets: candidate submission scores; candidate/coordinator focus group discussions; and assessor surveys. Members took notes with guiding questions and then divided into groups to analyze and breakdown the data. Updates were provided for the winter/spring Cycle 2 Pilot Study for MMSN and ESN. It was also shared that VI, ECSE, and DHH would be piloting Cycle 1. With the cycle 2 performance assessment guide in pilot study, updates to the program guide were also presented for review.

## Appendix D

### All Submissions: MMSN, ESN, ECSE, and VI

<b>Program</b>	<b>N Submitted</b>
Azusa Pacific University	45
Brandman University	20
California State University, Chico	8
California State University, Los Angeles	6
Concordia University	1
Fortune School of Education	6
High Tech High – District Intern Program	26
National University	3
Point Loma Nazarene University	12
San Jose State University	7
Santa Clara County Office of Education	8
University of Redlands	6
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>148</b>

### Scored Submissions: MMSN and ESN

<b>Program</b>	<b>MMSN</b>	<b>ESN</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
California State University, Chico	1	4	5
San Jose State University	4	1	5
Azusa Pacific University	11	9	20
Brandman University	1	5	6
Concordia University	1		1
National University		2	2
Point Loma Nazarene University	3	2	5
University of Redlands	2		2
Fortune School of Education	1		1
High Tech High – District Intern Program	7		7
Santa Clara County Office of Education	1	2	3
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>57</b>

## Appendix E

### Education Specialist CalTPA Assessor Qualifications

- Must meeting specific criteria:

**Be a current (or retired within 3 years) California education specialist in one (1) or more of the following capacities:**

University/program educator providing instruction to education specialist candidates within a CTC-accredited teacher preparation program

Field supervisor

Mentor or master teacher

Education Specialist

TK–12 administrator (e.g., principal, assistant principal)

**AND**

**Have expertise in the content area assigned to score in one (1) or more of the following ways:**

Hold a current California Clear Education Specialist Teaching Credential, or added authorization

National Board Certified Teacher (NBCT) in Special Education

Have university teaching experience in the specialty content area

Hold a degree in Special Education

## Appendix F

### Demographics of Scored Submissions

<b>Program Type</b>	<b>N</b>
District Intern	24
Residency Program	5
University Intern	11
University Private School Program	3
University Student Teaching Program	14
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>57</b>

<b>Program Length</b>	<b>N</b>
12-month program	11
18-month program	26
24-month or longer program	20
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>57</b>

<b>Placement Setting</b>	<b>N</b>
City	27
Rural	5
Suburban	19
Town	6
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>57</b>

<b>Placement School Type</b>	<b>N</b>
Non-Public School	4
Public	42
Public Charter	11
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>57</b>

	Education Specialist CaTPA: Extensive Support Needs Cycle 1		Education Specialist CaTPA: Mild to Moderate Support Needs Cycle 1	
	N	%	N	%
All	25	100.00	32	100.00
Gender				
Decline to state	1	4.00	3	9.38
Female	19	76.00	23	71.88
Male	5	20.00	6	18.75
Ethnicity				
African American/Black	1	4.00	2	6.25
Choose not to respond	.	.	1	3.13
Filipino American/Filipino	1	4.00	2	6.25
Korean American/Korean	.	.	1	3.13
Latino/Latin American/Puerto Rican/Other Hispanic	1	4.00	2	6.25
Mexican American/Chicano	9	36.00	9	28.13
Other	1	4.00	1	3.13
White (non-Hispanic)	12	48.00	14	43.75

## Appendix G

### Summary of Cycle 1 Candidate Performance: MMSN and ESN

<b>Rubric</b>	<b>N Candidates</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>
Rubric 1	57	3.1	1.01	1	5
Rubric 2	57	2.8	0.94	1	5
Rubric 3	57	3	0.94	1	5
Rubric 4	57	2.8	1.1	1	5
Rubric 5	57	2.5	0.87	1	4
Rubric 6	57	2.5	0.85	1	4
Rubric 7	57	2.6	0.92	1	4
Rubric 8	57	3	0.97	1	5

## Appendix H

### Education Specialist CalTPA Development Timeline: MMSN and ESN

Fall 2016	CTC Forms Preliminary Education Specialist Credential Workgroup
October 2016-August 2017	Workgroup develops Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) for the Preliminary Education Specialist credentials
February 2018	CTC Adopts Revised Education Specialist credential structure
June 2018-April 2019	CTC affirms subject matter requirements, TPEs, program standards, and authorization statements
February 2020-June 2022	Assessment Cycle and Scoring Rubric Development with Design Team
December 2020-March 2021	Pilot Test
December 2021-March 2022	Field Test
May 2022	Standard Setting Study
2022-2023	Operational Administration – Year 1
August 2022	Commission Adopts New Passing Standard

### Education Specialist CalTPA Development Timeline: ECSE, DHH, and VI

Fall 2016	CTC Forms Preliminary Education Specialist Credential Workgroup
October 2016-August 2017	Workgroup develops Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) for the Preliminary Education Specialist credentials
February 2018	CTC Adopts Revised Education Specialist credential structure
June 2018-April 2019	CTC affirms subject matter requirements, TPEs, program standards, and authorization statements
February 2020-June 2022	Assessment Cycle and Scoring Rubric Development with Design Team
October 2020 - May 2021	Pilot Test for Cycle 1
October 2021 - May 2022	Pilot Test for Cycle 2
October 2022 – May 2023	Field Test
May 2023	Standard Setting Study
2023 – 2024	Operational Administration – Year 1
August 2023	Commission Adopts New Passing Standard

## Appendix I

### Dual Credential Questions (Gen Ed and Ed Specialist) Clinical Practice Hours and Requirements

Clinical Practice – Program Standards	<a href="#">Current Preliminary MS/SS Standards</a> (Program Standard 3: Clinical Practice)	<a href="#">Current Preliminary Education Specialist Standards</a> (Program Standard 15: Field Experience)	<a href="#">Future Ed Specialist (effective Fall 2022)</a> (Program Standard 3: Clinical Practice)
<b>Minimum # of hours</b>	600 hours of clinical practice across the arc of the program, including supervised early field experiences, initial student teaching, and final student teaching	N/A  ...candidates must have planned experiences with full range of delivery system, the provider of such services and parents and families, including experiences in general education. The experiences must reflect the full diversity of grades/ages, federal disability category and the continuum of special education services outlined in the specific credential authorization.	600 hours across the arc of the program, which includes 200 hours of early field work in general and special education settings and 400 hours of final student teaching.  Standard also says “Experiences are of sufficient duration for the candidate to demonstrate the teaching performance expectations for Education Specialist teachers.
<b>Final student teaching</b>	Minimum 4 weeks of solo or co-teaching or its equivalent	Required to have an extended culminating placement in which the candidate works toward assuming full responsibility for the provision of services in the specific credential authorization and to demonstrate the TPEs for special educators	400 hours in the desired credential area

<b>Dual (earning a General Education and Education Specialist credential concurrently)</b>	Required to have experiences in general education, inclusive, and special education settings within the 600 hours, and are encouraged to extend clinical practice for an additional 150 hours	No specific language.	Required to have experiences in general education, inclusive, and special education settings within the 600 hours, and encouraged to extend for 150 hours
<b>Candidates working in private schools</b>	Required to complete a substantive clinical experience of at least 150 hours in a diverse school setting where the curriculum aligns with California’s adopted content standards and frameworks	N/A	Required to complete a substantive clinical experience of at least 150 hours in a diverse school setting where the curriculum aligns with California’s adopted content standards and frameworks
<b>Early field experience for interns</b>	Takes place in an experienced mentor’s classroom	Field experience in a broad range of service delivery options may be met by activities embedded in coursework and/or visits/interactions with service providers	Takes place in experienced mentor classrooms in both general and special education settings
<b>Additional Information</b>	<a href="#">Clinical Practice Guidance Document</a> (September 2017)	N/A	<a href="#">Clinical Practice Guidance Document</a> (March 2021)

### Possible Scenarios

When the new Preliminary Education Specialist standards go into effect, what will the clinical practice and/or TPA requirement be for:

1. Candidates in a dual program earning a General and Education Specialist credential concurrently?
2. Candidates earning two Preliminary Education Specialist credentials concurrently, such as the Mild to Moderate and Extensive Support Needs credentials?
3. Candidates earning the General Education, Mild to Moderate, and Extensive Support Needs credentials concurrently?
4. Candidates who previously earned a General Education credential and would like to obtain a new Education Specialist credential?
5. Candidates who previously earned an Education Specialist credential and would like to earn a General Education credential?

<p><b>MS/SS Program Standard Clinical Practice Standard</b>  <b>Standard 3: Clinical Practice (<i>subsection A only</i>)</b>  <b>A. Organization of Clinical Practice Experiences</b></p> <p>The program’s Clinical Practice experiences are designed to provide the candidate with a developmental and sequential set of activities that are integrated with the program’s coursework and extend the candidate’s learning through application of theory to practice with TK-12 students in California public school classrooms. Clinical Practice is a developmental and sequential set of activities integrated with theoretical and pedagogical coursework and must consist of a minimum of 600 hours of clinical practice across the arc of the program. The range of Clinical Practice experiences provided by the program includes supervised early field experiences, initial student teaching (co-planning and co-teaching with both general educators and Education specialists, as appropriate, or guided teaching), and final student teaching. Student teaching includes a minimum of four weeks of solo or co-teaching or its equivalent. For interns, early field experience would take place in an experienced mentor’s classroom.</p> <p>Dual credential programs leading to both a general and a special education credential are required to have substantive experiences in general education, inclusive, and special education settings within the 600 hours, and are encouraged to extend clinical practice for an additional 150 hours.</p> <p>Candidates who are working in private schools and seeking a credential are required to complete a substantive clinical experience of</p>	<p><b>Education Specialist Clinical Practice Standard</b>  <b>Standard 3: Clinical Practice (<i>subsection A only</i>)</b>  <b>A. Organization of Clinical Practice Experiences</b></p> <p>The program ensures that candidates have planned experiences and/or interactions that reflect the full diversity of grades/ages, federal disability categories and the continuum of special education services outlined in the specific credential authorization. The experiences are planned from the beginning of the program to include experiences in general education, experiences with parents and families, and experiences with a broad range of service delivery options leading to an extended culminating placement in which the candidate works toward assuming full responsibility for the provision of services in the specific credential authorization. Experiences are of sufficient duration for the candidate to demonstrate the teaching performance expectations for Education Specialist teachers. The culminating placement may be in any school, agency or program as defined in Education Code Sections 56031, 56360, and 56361 for the purpose of providing special education services. Fieldwork/Clinical experiences are designed to provide candidates with a developmental set of activities integrated with coursework that extend the candidate’s learning through application of theory to practice with students in California’s education settings.</p> <p>Fieldwork provides opportunities for candidates to observe a variety of classrooms and settings and to select focus students for deeper observational study, including students who are dual language learners and who may (a) exhibit typical behavior; (b) exhibit atypical behavior; and</p>
---	---

at least 150 hours in a diverse school setting where the curriculum aligns with California's adopted content standards and frameworks and the school reflects the diversity of California's student population.

The program provides initial orientation for preparation program supervisors and district-employed supervisors of clinical practice experiences to ensure all supervisors understand their role and expectations. The minimal amount of program supervision involving formal evaluation of each candidate must be 4 times per quarter or 6 times per semester. The minimum amount of district-employed supervisors' support and guidance must be 5 hours per week.

Clinical supervision may include an in-person site visit, video capture or synchronous video observation, but it must be archived either by annotated video or scripted observations and evaluated based on the TPEs, that produce data that can be aggregated and disaggregated.

(c) have other types of special learning needs. Fieldwork also provides opportunities for candidates to observe teachers using productive routines and effective transitions for students' academic and socio-emotional growth and development. Candidates are provided with opportunities to review the curriculum and to further develop pedagogical knowledge of high leverage practices in subject matter areas, including early language and literacy for first and second language learners, mathematics, science, technology, engineering, social studies, and arts as appropriate. Candidates can observe the administration of a range of assessments. Candidates are also able to observe how personnel organize and supervise the work of other adults in inclusive and specialized education settings.

Clinical practice is a developmental and sequential set of activities integrated with theoretical and pedagogical coursework and must consist of a minimum of 600 hours of clinical practice across the arc of the program. At least 200 hours of supervised early field work that includes guided observations and initial student teaching (e.g., co-planning and co-teaching, or guided teaching) must be provided to candidates in general education and special education settings prior to final student teaching. Final student teaching shall consist of (400 hours) in the desired credential area. For interns, early field experience would take place in experienced mentor classrooms in both general education and special education settings. Candidates must have a range of experience that reflects the diversity of age and grade levels, the range of federal disability categories, and the continuum of special education services.

	<p>Candidates should have experiences with a range of diverse students and families reflective of the demographics of California.</p> <p>Dual credential programs leading to both a general and a special education credential are required to have substantive experiences in general education, inclusive, and special education settings within the 600 hours, and are encouraged to extend clinical practice for an additional 150 hours.</p> <p>Candidates who are working in private schools and seeking a credential are required to complete a substantive clinical experience of at least 150 hours in a diverse school setting where the curriculum aligns with California’s adopted content standards and frameworks and the school reflects the diversity of California’s student population.</p> <p>The program provides initial orientation for preparation program supervisors and district-employed supervisors of clinical practice experiences to ensure all supervisors understand their role and expectations. The minimal amount of program supervision involving formal evaluation of each candidate must be 4 times per quarter or 6 times per semester. The minimum amount of district-employed supervisors’ support and guidance must be 5 hours per week.</p> <p>Clinical supervision may include an in-person site visit, video capture or synchronous video observation, but it must be archived either by annotated video or scripted observations and evaluated based on the TPEs, that produce data that can be aggregated and disaggregated.</p>
--	--