

---

# 3E

## Action

### *Educator Preparation Committee*

## Review and Proposed Adoption of the Revised Assessment Design Standards

---

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item presents revisions to the adopted Assessment Design Standards and requests that the Commission authorize the use of these updated standards in the recently approved regulatory changes with the requirement of a teaching performance assessment for Education Specialist credential candidates.

**Recommended Action:** That the Commission adopt the changes and authorize the use of the new standards to reflect the full continuum of placements for preliminary credential candidates and the full age span from birth to 22.

**Presenter:** James Webb, Consultant, Professional Services 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

---

# Review and Proposed Adoption of the Revised Assessment Design Standards

---

## Introduction

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) adopted new standards and Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) for Education Specialist teaching credentials in 2018. In addition, the Commission adopted minor revisions to the Assessment Design Standards (ADS) at its January 2020 and June 2021 meetings. This item presents further revisions to the ADS for review so they are more inclusive of candidates seeking education specialist credentials and the contexts in which they work to represent the full continuum of placements within the credential authorizations for general education and education specialist candidates.

## Background

At its [February 2018](#) meeting, the Commission adopted a revised credential structure for Preliminary Education Specialist teaching credentials. The new credential structure, going into effect summer/fall 2022, 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). After this work, the Commission determined that every teacher candidate should take and pass a Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) prior to earning the preliminary credential. During its [June 2018](#) meeting, the Commission reviewed proposed program standards and TPEs as well as proposed subject matter requirements for the credential, and 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 TPEs for Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH), and Visual Impairments (VI) 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.

## Design Team Meetings

The Education Specialist CalTPA Design Team (DT) 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 design team has met monthly in whole-group

and credential specific subgroups since February 2020 with staff and the technical contractor, Evaluation Systems group of Pearson.

### **Previous Revisions to the Assessment Design Standards**

At its [January 2020](#) meeting, the Commission revised Assessment Design Standards to include Education Specialist contexts. Staff has determined that the current Assessment Design Standards for the development of the EdSp CalTPA need additional revision to the first Assessment Design Standard - Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness. These revisions are to define the content standards for special education candidates, so they align with adopted credential authorization statements and provide additional flexibility for candidates' settings to represent the full continuum of clinical placements.

An additional set of minor revisions were brought forward at the [June 2021](#) meeting and discussion ensued among members of the Commission on how to include a variety of clinical placements for credential candidates while supporting the Education Specialist TPEs with its emphasis on providing supports to students with disabilities. Recommendations from Commission members were placed into the ADS at this meeting.

As a result of the June 2021 meeting and preliminary information gathered from the Education Specialist CalTPA pilot study, staff recognized the need to provide clarifying language in some of the adopted ADS to better determine what is being measured by the performance assessment. One example of a revision made is to emphasize the education specialist candidate's ability to plan for content-specific pedagogy while also planning for student supports in consultation and collaboration with a variety of instructional support personnel to provide access and inclusion for students with disabilities. Consequently, in [Appendix B](#), additional edits to the Assessment Design Standards are proposed. The changes are meant to include the full range of placements in which candidates may serve and emphasize the full range of authorizations required by the preliminary education specialist credentials.

### **Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the revisions to the Assessment Design Standards.

### **Next Steps**

Staff will update model sponsors for Commission-approved teaching performance assessments and will also use these revised standards for continued development of the Education Specialist CalTPA.

## 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
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 B

### California Teaching Performance Assessment Design Standards

#### **Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness**

The sponsor\* of a teaching performance assessment seeking approval for use in California (model sponsor) designs a Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) in which complex pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring scales are linked to and assess California's Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). The model sponsor clearly describes the uses for which the assessment has been validated (i.e., to serve as a determination of a candidate's status with respect to the TPEs and to provide an indication of preparation program quality and effectiveness), anticipates its potential misuses, and identifies appropriate uses consistent with the assessment's validation process. The model sponsor maximizes the fairness of the assessment design for all groups of candidates in the program. A passing standard is recommended by the model sponsor based on a standard setting study where educators have made a professional judgment about an appropriate performance standard for beginning teachers to meet prior to licensure.

*\* Note: the "model sponsor" refers to the entity that represents the assessment and is responsible to programs using that model and to the Commission. Model sponsors may be a state agency, individual institutions, a consortium of institutions and/or partners, a private entity, and/or combinations of these.*

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

- 1(a) The Teaching Performance Assessment includes complex pedagogical assessment tasks to prompt aspects of candidate performance that measure the TPEs. Each task is substantively related to two or more major domains of the TPEs. For use in judging candidate-generated responses to each pedagogical task, the assessment also includes multi-level scoring rubrics that are clearly related to the TPEs that the task measures. Each task and its associated rubrics measure two or more TPEs. Collectively, the tasks and rubrics in the assessment address key aspects of the six major domains of the TPEs. The sponsor of the performance assessment documents the relationships between TPEs, tasks and rubrics.
- 1(b)
  1. The **general education** TPA model sponsor must include a focus on content-specific pedagogy within the design of the TPA tasks and scoring scales to assess the candidate's ability to effectively teach the content area(s) authorized by the credential.
  2. The **education specialist TPA** model sponsor must include a focus on content-specific pedagogy and provide consultative, collaborative, and coordinating specially designed instruction with students, parents, teachers, and other community and school personnel within the design of the TPA tasks and scoring scales to assess the candidate's ability to effectively teach the content area(s) authorized by the credential.
- 1(c) Consistent with the language of the TPEs, the model sponsor defines scoring rubrics so

candidates for credentials can earn acceptable scores on the Teaching Performance Assessment with the use of different content-specific pedagogical practices that support implementation of the **state-adopted** content standards and curriculum frameworks. The model sponsor takes steps to plan and anticipate the appropriate scoring of candidates who use a wide range of pedagogical practices that are educationally effective and builds scoring protocols to take these variations into account.

- 1(d) 1. **For Multiple Subject and Single Subject candidates**, the model sponsor must include within the design of the TPA candidate tasks a focus on addressing the teaching of English learners, all underserved education groups or groups that need to be served differently, and students with **disabilities** in the general education classroom-to adequately assess the candidate's ability to effectively teach all students.
2. **For Education Specialist candidates, the model sponsor must include within the design of the TPA candidate tasks a focus on addressing teaching students who have an IEP (students aged 3 through 22), who have an IEP and English learners, and who have an IEP who are underserved education groups or groups that need to be served differently to adequately assess the candidate's ability to effectively teach all students with disabilities.**
- 1(e) 1. For Multiple Subject candidates, the model sponsor must include assessments of the core content areas of at least Literacy and Mathematics. Programs use local program performance assessments for History/Social Science and Science if not already included as part of the TPA.
2. For Education Specialist candidates, the model sponsor must include assessments that allow for either Multiple Subject (Literacy and Mathematics) or Single Subject content (as deemed appropriate for special education) and that aligns with the student teaching and/or clinical practice placement.
- 1(f) The model sponsor must include a teaching performance within the TPA **during the required clinical experience**, including a video of the candidate's teaching performance with candidate commentary describing the lesson plan and rationale for teaching decisions shown and evidence of the effect of that teaching on student learning.
- 1 (g) The TPA model sponsor must provide materials appropriate for use by programs in helping faculty become familiar with the design of the TPA model, the candidate tasks and the scoring rubrics so that faculty can effectively assist candidates to prepare for the assessment. The TPA model sponsor must also provide candidate materials to assist candidates in understanding the nature of the assessment, the specific assessment tasks, the scoring rubrics, submission processes and scoring processes.
- 1(h) The model sponsor develops scoring rubrics and assessor training procedures that focus primarily on teaching performance and that minimize the effects of candidate factors that are not clearly related to pedagogical competence, which may include (depending on the circumstances) factors such as personal attire, appearance, demeanor, speech

patterns and accents or any other bias that are not likely to affect job effectiveness and/or student learning.

- 1(i) The model sponsor provides a clear statement acknowledging the intended uses of the assessment. The statement demonstrates the model sponsor's clear understanding of the implications of the assessment for candidates, preparation programs, public schools, and **birth-22** students **within the authorization of the credential**. The statement includes appropriate cautions about additional or alternative uses for which the assessment is not valid. All elements of assessment design and development are consistent with the intended uses of the assessment for determining the pedagogical competence of candidates for Preliminary Teaching Credentials in California and as information useful for determining program quality and effectiveness.
- 1(j) The model sponsor completes content review and editing procedures to ensure that pedagogical assessment tasks and directions to candidates are culturally and linguistically sensitive, fair and appropriate for candidates from diverse backgrounds.
- 1(k) The model sponsor completes initial and periodic basic psychometric analyses to identify pedagogical assessment tasks and/or scoring rubrics that show differential effects in relation to candidates' race, ethnicity, language, gender or disability. When group pass-rate differences are found, the model sponsor investigates the potential sources of differential performance and seeks to eliminate construct-irrelevant sources of variance.
- 1(l) In designing assessment administration procedures, the model sponsor includes administrative accommodations that preserve assessment validity while addressing issues of access for candidates with disabilities or learning needs.
- 1(m) In the course of determining a passing standard, the model sponsor secures and reflects on the considered judgments of teachers, supervisors of teachers, support providers of new teachers, and other preparers of teachers regarding necessary and acceptable levels of proficiency on the part of entry-level teachers. The model sponsor periodically reviews the reasonableness of the scoring scales and established passing standard, when and as directed by the Commission.
- 1(n) To preserve the validity and fairness of the assessment over time, the model sponsor may need to develop and field test new pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring rubrics to replace or strengthen prior ones. Initially and periodically, the model sponsor analyzes the assessment tasks and scoring rubrics to ensure that they yield important evidence that represents candidate knowledge and skill related to the TPEs, and serve as a basis for determining entry-level pedagogical competence to teach the curriculum and student population of California's **birth-22 public schools**. The model sponsor documents the basis and results of each analysis, and modifies the tasks and rubrics as needed.
- 1(o) The model sponsor must make all TPA materials available to the Commission upon

request for review and approval, including materials that are proprietary to the model sponsor. The Commission will maintain the confidentiality of all materials designated as proprietary by the model sponsor.

- 1(p) For concurrent bilingual candidates, no candidate can be required to translate student work or provide English transcriptions for the video component(s) of the TPA if in a language other than English. Model sponsors must ensure that Multiple Subject candidates may demonstrate their knowledge and skills teaching literacy in the language of instruction, including in a language other than English.
- 1(q) All candidates must demonstrate as part of the TPA effective strategies teaching an English learner, in English with the use of the language of instruction as appropriate, within the content area of the intended credential. Each candidate must submit his or her analyses and reflections primarily in English.

### **Assessment Design Standard 2: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness**

The sponsor of the performance assessment requests approval of an assessment that will yield, in relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the TPEs, enough collective evidence of each candidate's pedagogical performance to serve as a valid basis to judge the candidate's general pedagogical competence for a Preliminary Teaching Credential. The model sponsor carefully monitors assessment development to ensure consistency with this stated purpose of the assessment. The Teaching Performance Assessment includes a comprehensive program to train, calibrate and maintain assessor calibration over time. The model sponsor periodically evaluates the assessment system to ensure equitable treatment of candidates. The assessment system and its implementation contribute to local and statewide consistency in the assessment of teaching competence.

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

- 2(a) In relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the TPEs, the pedagogical assessment tasks, rubrics, and the associated directions to candidates are designed to yield enough valid evidence for an overall judgment of each candidate's pedagogical qualifications for a Preliminary Teaching Credential as one part of the requirements for the credential.
- 2(b) Pedagogical assessment tasks and scoring rubrics are extensively field tested in practice before being used operationally in the Teaching Performance Assessment. The model sponsor evaluates the field test results thoroughly and documents the field test design, participation, methods, results and interpretation.
- 2(c) The Teaching Performance Assessment system includes a comprehensive process to select and train assessors who score candidate responses to the pedagogical assessment tasks. An assessor training program demonstrates convincingly that prospective and continuing assessors gain a deep understanding of the TPEs, the pedagogical assessment



tasks and the multi-level scoring rubrics. The training program includes task-based scoring trials in which an assessment trainer evaluates and certifies each assessor's scoring accuracy and calibration in relation to the scoring rubrics associated with the task. The model sponsor establishes selection criteria for assessors of candidate responses to the TPA. The selection criteria include but are not limited to appropriate pedagogical expertise in the content areas assessed within the TPA. The model sponsor selects assessors who meet the established selection criteria and uses only assessors who successfully calibrate during the required TPA model assessor training sequence. When new pedagogical tasks and scoring rubrics are incorporated into the assessment, the model sponsor provides additional training to the assessors, as needed.

- 2(d) In conjunction with the provisions of the applicable Teacher Preparation Program Standards relating to the Teaching Performance Assessment, the model sponsor plans and implements periodic evaluations of the assessor training program, which include systematic feedback from assessors and assessment trainers, and which lead to substantive improvements in the training as needed.
- 2(e) The model sponsor provides a consistent scoring process for all programs using that model, including programs using a local scoring option provided by the model sponsor. The scoring process conducted by the model sponsor to assure the reliability and validity of candidate outcomes on the assessment may include, for example, regular auditing, selective back reading, and double scoring of candidate responses near the cut score by the qualified, calibrated scorers trained by the model sponsor. All approved models must include a local scoring option in which the assessors of candidate responses are program faculty and/or other individuals identified by the program who meet the model sponsor's assessor selection criteria. These local assessors are trained and calibrated by the model sponsor, and whose scoring work is facilitated and their scoring results are facilitated and reviewed by the model sponsor. The model sponsor provides a detailed plan for establishing and maintaining scorer accuracy and inter-rater reliability during field testing and operational administration of the assessment. The model sponsor demonstrates that the assessment procedures, taken as a whole, maximize the accurate determination of each candidate's overall pass-fail status on the assessment. The model sponsor must provide an annual audit process that documents that local scoring outcomes are consistent and reliable within the model for candidates across the range of programs using local scoring, and informs the Commission where inconsistencies in local scoring outcomes are identified. If inconsistencies are identified, the sponsor must provide a plan to the CTC for how it will address and resolve the scoring inconsistencies both for the current scoring results and for future scoring of the TPA.
- 2(f) The model sponsor's assessment design includes a clear and easy to implement appeal procedure for candidates who do not pass the assessment, including an equitable process for rescoring of evidence already submitted by an appellant candidate in the program, if the program is using centralized scoring provided by the model sponsor. If the program is implementing a local scoring option, the program must provide an appeal

process as described above for candidates who do not pass the assessment. Model sponsors must document that all candidate appeals granted a second scoring are scored by a new assessor unfamiliar with the candidate or the candidate's response.

- 2(g) The model sponsor conducting scoring for the program provides results on the TPA to the individual candidate based on performance relative to TPE domains and/or to the specific scoring rubrics within a maximum of three weeks following candidate submission of completed TPA responses. The model sponsor provides results to programs based on both individual and aggregated data relating to candidate performance relative to the rubrics and/or domains of the TPEs. The model sponsor also follows the timelines established with programs using a local scoring option for providing scoring results.
- 2(h) The model sponsor provides program level aggregate results to the Commission, in a manner, format and time frame specified by the Commission, as one means of assessing program quality. It is expected that these results will be used within the Commission's ongoing accreditation system.

### **Assessment Design Standard 3: TPA Model Sponsor Support Responsibilities**

The sponsor of the performance assessment provides technical support to teacher preparation programs using that model concerning fidelity of implementation of the model as designed. The model sponsor is responsible for conducting and/or moderating scoring for all programs, as applicable, within a national scorer approach and/or the local scoring option. The model sponsor has ongoing responsibilities to interact with the Commission, to provide candidate and program outcomes data as requested and specified by the Commission, and to maintain the currency of the model over time.

- 3(a) The model sponsor provides technical assistance to programs implementing the model to support fidelity of implementation of the model as designed. Clear implementation procedures and materials such as a candidate and a program handbook are provided by the model sponsor to programs using the model.
- 3(b) A model sponsor conducting scoring for programs is responsible for providing TPA outcomes data at the candidate and program level to the program within three weeks and to the Commission, as specified by the Commission. The model sponsor supervising/moderating local program scoring oversees data collection, data review with programs, and reporting.
- 3(c) The model sponsor is responsible for submitting at minimum an annual report to the Commission describing, among other data points, the programs served by the model, the number of candidate submissions scored, the date(s) when responses were received for scoring, the date(s) when the results of the scoring were provided to the preparation programs, the number of candidate appeals, first time passing rates, candidate completion passing rates, and other operational details as specified by the Commission.
- 3(d) The model sponsor is responsible for maintaining the currency of the TPA model,

including making appropriate changes to the assessment tasks and/or to the scoring rubrics and associated program, candidate, and scoring materials, as directed by the Commission when necessitated by changes in **state-adopted content** standards and/or in teacher preparation standards.

- 3(e) The model sponsor must define the retake policies for candidates who fail one or more parts of the TPA which preserve the reliability and validity of the assessment results. The retake policies must include whether the task(s) on which the candidate was not successful must be retaken in whole or in part, with appropriate guidance for programs and candidates about which task and/or task components must be resubmitted for scoring by a second assessor and what the resubmitted response must include.