

---

# 2C

## Information

### *Educator Preparation Committee*

### **Annual Report on the Commission Approved Teaching and Administrator Performance Assessments**

---

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item provides information and candidate pass rate data for each of the Commission-approved performance assessments from 2018 to 2023, including the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA), edTPA, Fresno Assessment for Student Teachers (FAST) and California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA). CalTPA first-year pass rate data is also provided for the Education Specialist Mild to Moderate Support Needs (MMSN) and Extensive Support Needs (ESN) credential candidates. An update on additional CalTPA development for Education Specialist candidates (DHH, VI and ECSE), a formative performance assessment for Early Childhood Education Teacher Permit students (CalFTPA), and the Literacy Performance Assessment (LPA) is also included.

**Recommended Action:** For information only

**Presenters:** Amy Reising, Chief Deputy Director; Zoltan Sarda and Gay Roby, Consultants, Professional Service Division; Heather Klesch and Lori Kroeger, Evaluation Systems group of Pearson; Ricci Ulrich, Coordinator, FAST, and Juliet Wahleithner, Assistant Director of Teacher Education, Cal State Fresno

---

---

# Annual Report on the Commission Approved Teaching and Administrator Performance Assessment

---

---

## Introduction

This agenda item provides information and candidate pass rates for the implementation of Commission-approved performance assessments from 2018 to 2023, including the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA), edTPA, Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST), and California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA). CalTPA and edTPA first-year pass rate data is also provided for the Education Specialist Mild to Moderate Support Needs (MMSN) and Extensive Support Needs (ESN) credential candidates. An update on additional CalTPA development for Education Specialist candidates in low incidence credential areas (DHH, VI and ECSE), a formative performance assessment for Early Childhood Education Teacher Permit students (CalFTPA), and the Literacy performance assessment (LPA) is provided.

## Background

The Commission issues credentials that authorize service as a teacher or administrator in California's public schools. Pursuant to the requirements of applicable state statutes (Chap. 517, Stats. 2006), California uses a series of Commission-approved performance assessments to assess candidates' knowledge, skills, and abilities as defined by Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) and the California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPE).

Pursuant to Education Code (EC) sections 44320.2, and 44259(b)(3), completion of a Teaching Performance Assessment that is fully integrated into teacher preparation programs is required of teacher candidates prior to being recommended by their program for a preliminary credential. TPAs were first required in 2008 and were initially administered and scored locally by preparation program faculty. In 2015, approved teaching performance assessments were updated to align with California's Common Core Standards for students and the revised Performance Assessment Design Standards (PADS). A centralized, online scoring system was established for the CalTPA with the goal of strengthening reliability in scoring within and across preparation programs as called for in EC section 44320.2(e). Centralized online scoring was already in use with the edTPA, and moving CalTPA into this scoring system was intended to improve calibration within the assessor pool while maintaining robust participation from local program faculty and teachers. In 2019, a [study was conducted by HumRRO](#) resulting in the determination that the three adopted teaching performance assessments (i.e., CalTPA, edTPA and FAST) were comparable and measured essential TPEs for Multiple Subjects, Single Subject, and World Language teaching credentials.

In 2015-2017, under Ed Code section [44270.5](#) the Commission received funding and developed a performance assessment for administrative services credential candidates. The CalAPA was first administered as a non-consequential assessment with a requirement that candidates complete each of the three leadership performance assessment cycles. During the 2019-20

academic year, the CalAPA became consequential, and candidates were required to meet a Commission-adopted passing standard for each leadership cycle.

In February 2022, the Commission received its [first annual report on performance assessments](#) in use in California, and in June 2022, held a [study session](#) focused on the role and function of performance assessments in educator preparation and licensure. These two sessions provided important insight and opportunity to better understand how performance assessments are currently functioning in California, as well as the research behind performance assessment<sup>1</sup> and research on the implementation of performance assessment, including the factors that enable or constrain their usefulness<sup>2</sup>.

Part 1 of this agenda item includes a review of statutes that have driven the Commission's work with performance assessments for more than 20 years and provides an overview of each performance assessment that has been approved for use in California by the Commission. Part 2 provides candidate score results and analysis from the last five years of administration (2018-23) and Part 3 provides an update on the development of additional performance assessments focused on literacy, early childhood education, and low incidence areas within the Education Specialist credential. The item closes with Part 4, which identifies ideas for improving the teaching performance assessment system based on the research cited above and lessons learned through the development and implementation of performance assessments. These ideas are provided for Commission discussion and possible consideration at a future meeting.

### **Statutes Framing the Development and Implementation of Teaching Performance Assessments**

The following statutes have been enacted and amended since 1998 to govern the Commission's efforts to develop and implement performance assessments. Education Code section 44259(b) lists the requirements for earning a preliminary teaching credential, and sub paragraph (3)(A) provides for the inclusion of a teaching performance assessment in an accredited program of professional preparation. Section 44320.2, enacted after the Commission undertook a comprehensive review of the requirements for earning and renewing a teaching credential in California, establishes the Legislature's expectations and the Commission's responsibilities with respect to teaching performance assessments.

EC 44259(b)(3)(A)

(b) The minimum requirements for the preliminary multiple subject, single subject, or education specialist teaching credential are all of the following:

(3)(A) Satisfactory completion of a program of professional preparation that has been accredited by the Committee on Accreditation on the basis of standards of program quality

---

<sup>1</sup> (see [Darling Hammond, L. \(2010\). Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness: How Teacher Performance Assessments Can Measure and Improve Teaching](#)). Center for American Progress)

<sup>2</sup> see [Peck, C.A., Yojing, M.G., & Zhang, W. \(2021\). Using teaching performance assessments for program evaluation and improvement in teacher education](#). National Academy of Education Committee on Evaluating and Improving Teacher Preparation Programs. National Academy of Education.

and effectiveness that have been adopted by the commission. In accordance with the commission's assessment and performance standards, a program shall include a teaching performance assessment as set forth in Section 44320.2 that is aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. The commission shall ensure that a candidate recommended for a credential or certificate has demonstrated satisfactory ability to assist pupils to meet or exceed academic content and performance standards for pupils adopted by the state board.

#### EC 44320.2

(a) The Legislature finds and declares that the competence and performance of teachers are among the most important factors in influencing the quality and effectiveness of education in elementary and secondary schools.

(b) Commencing July 1, 2008, for a program of professional preparation to satisfy the requirements of paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) of Section 44259, the program shall include a teaching performance assessment that is aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and that is congruent with state content and performance standards for pupils adopted by the state board. In implementing this requirement, institutions or agencies may do the following:

(1) Voluntarily develop an assessment for approval by the commission. Approval of any locally developed performance assessment shall be based on assessment quality standards adopted by the commission, which shall encourage the use of alternative assessment methods including portfolios of teaching artifacts and practices.

(2) Participate in an assessment training program for assessors and implement the commission developed assessment.

(c) The commission shall implement the performance assessment in a manner that does not increase the number of assessments required for teacher credential candidates prepared in this state. A candidate shall be assessed during the normal term or duration of the preparation program of the candidate.

(d) Subject to the availability of funds in the annual Budget Act, the commission shall perform all of the following duties with respect to the performance assessment:

(1) Assemble and convene an expert panel to advise the commission about performance standards and developmental scales for teaching credential candidates and the design, content, administration, and scoring of the assessment. At least one-third of the panel members shall be classroom teachers in California public schools.

(2) Design, develop, and implement assessment standards and an institutional assessor training program for the sponsors of professional preparation programs to use if they choose to use the commission developed assessment.

(3) Establish a review panel to examine each assessment developed by an institution or agency in relation to the standards set by the commission and advise the commission regarding approval of each assessment system.

(4) Initially and periodically analyze the validity of assessment content and the reliability of assessment scores that are established pursuant to this section.

(5) Establish and implement appropriate standards for satisfactory performance in assessments that are established pursuant to this section.

(6) Analyze possible sources of bias in the performance assessment and act promptly to eliminate any bias that is discovered.

(7) Collect and analyze background information provided by candidates who participate in the performance assessment, and report and interpret the individual and aggregated results of the assessment.

(8) Examine and revise, as necessary, the institutional accreditation system pursuant to Article 10 (commencing with Section 44370), for the purpose of providing a strong assurance to teaching candidates that ongoing opportunities are available in each credential preparation program that is offered pursuant to Section 44320, Article 6 (commencing with Section 44310), Article 7.5 (commencing with Section 44325), or Article 3 (commencing with Section 44450) of Chapter 3 for candidates to acquire the knowledge, skills, and abilities measured by the assessment system.

(9) Ensure that the aggregated results of the assessment for groups of candidates who have completed a credential program are used as one source of information about the quality and effectiveness of that program.

(e) The commission shall ensure that each performance assessment pursuant to subdivision (b) is state approved and aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and is consistently applied to candidates in similar preparation programs. To the maximum feasible extent, each performance assessment shall be ongoing and blended into the preparation program, and shall produce the following benefits for credential candidates, sponsors of preparation programs, and local educational agencies that employ program graduates:

(1) The performance assessment shall be designed to provide formative assessment information during the preparation program for use by the candidate, instructors, and supervisors for the purpose of improving the teaching knowledge, skill, and ability of the candidate.

(2) The performance assessment results shall be reported so that they may serve as one basis for a recommendation by the program sponsor that the commission award a teaching credential to a candidate who has successfully met the performance assessment standards.

(3) The formative assessment information pursuant to paragraph (1) and the performance assessment results pursuant to paragraph (2) shall be reported so that they may serve as one basis for the individual induction plan of the new teacher pursuant to Section 44279.2.

(f) It is the intent of the Legislature that assessments in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2) of subdivision (b), including the administrative costs of the commission, be fully funded.

In addition, all approved model sponsors for performance assessment have met the requirements of the Commission's adopted Performance Assessment Design Standards ([PADS](#)).

### **Availability of California Performance Assessments**

As indicated above, Education Code section 44320.2 authorizes the Commission to recognize and approve multiple performance assessments for teachers, a policy that has also been applied to the development of performance assessments for administrative services candidates. Currently, the Commission has approved three teaching performance assessments and one administrator performance assessment for use in California. The CalTPA series and the CalAPA were developed by appointed design teams of California educators, Commission staff, and the Commission's technical contractor, Evaluation Systems group of Pearson (ES). The assessments are copyrighted and owned by the Commission. The edTPA is owned by Stanford University, which has engaged the Evaluation Systems group of Pearson as its operational partner and technical contractor. Stanford University exclusively owns all the intellectual property rights and trademark for edTPA and is responsible for all edTPA development including candidate handbooks, scoring rubrics and the scorer training design, scorer training curriculum, and materials, as well as support materials for programs, faculty, and candidates. The Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) is a Commission-approved TPA model designed by the faculty of California State University, Fresno. FAST is copyrighted by Cal State Fresno and was approved by the Commission to be administered exclusively by Cal State Fresno for its teacher education candidates.

The Commission's [performance assessment website](#) is hosted and managed by ES and provides detailed performance assessment information for institutions, faculty, and candidates about the CalTPA, CalAPA, and the edTPA. Cal State Fresno provides its candidates with information about FAST on its [website](#).

The CalTPA, CalAPA, and edTPA assessments are provided year-round to candidates through the online platform managed by ES and are scored each month by calibrated assessors. Scores are returned to candidates, programs, and the Commission within three weeks of being scored. FAST candidates complete their submissions in a two-part process, first in their initial student teaching placement, and again in their final student teaching placement. FAST assessments are scored locally by Cal State Fresno faculty.

Commission-approved performance assessments are required to meet the [Teaching Performance Assessment Design Standards](#), and the [Administrator Performance Assessment Design Standards](#) (PADS). PADS require that performance assessments be completed by

candidates through their professional preparation program and as they engage in clinical practice and work with actual students and other educators at the school site. Each performance assessment is a multi-week, inquiry-based experience that measures the appropriate set of teaching performance expectations (TPEs) and for the CalAPA, the administrative expectations (CAPE). Candidates are supported by their program faculty, supervising teachers, and peers as they complete the assessments and submit a range of evidence, including written responses, artifacts of teaching and learning, video recordings, analysis, and reflection of their practice.

### **Institutional Performance Assessment Data Reports**

Institutional data reports are generated by the Commission's performance assessment contractor, Evaluation Systems Group of Pearson, for the CalTPA, CalAPA, and edTPA. The identified performance assessment program coordinator at each authorized score recipient institution who receives the reports is determined by that institution, and each year the Commission's assessment contractor requests updated institutional program coordinator contact information. Institutions may contact ES to update their program coordinator information as necessary.

Candidate score reports are provided within three (3) weeks of the scoring of the submission. Score data reports are provided to programs and the Commission following each scoring session across the year. The institutional score reports can be accessed by the candidate and program from a secure, password-protected web site. Candidates own their scores and their score data.

Summary statistics are provided for the institution based on all candidates who selected that institution when they registered, and may include:

- Number of candidates who submitted performance assessments for scoring
- Number and percentage of candidates passing or not passing
- Performance by rubric level for each submission

Individual candidate information provided for candidates who selected that institution as a score recipient when they registered may include:

- Name and other identifying information
- Scoring date
- Cycles taken (for the CalTPA, CalAPA only)
- Passing status
- Performance by analytic rubric

All Commission approved performance assessments are criterion-referenced and measure the candidates' pedagogical skills and abilities in relation to an established standard (TPEs/CAPEs) rather than in relation to the performance of other candidates. Candidates who submit an assessment are notified if they passed and are provided analytic rubric scores.

At its June 2016 meeting, the Commission acted to extend the period of performance assessment score validity from five years to ten years. As of April 2017, scores for all Commission performance assessments became valid for use toward a California credential for ten years from the date of assessment score date.

### **Resources for Candidates and Educator Preparation Programs**

Using the [performance assessment website](#), linked resources, and the [Commission's YouTube channel](#), CalTPA, CalAPA, edTPA, and FAST candidates can find a wealth of information about the Commission-approved performance assessments that can help them understand what to expect from their educator preparation program and faculty as they engage in completing a performance assessment.

For the CalTPA, CalAPA, and edTPA, candidates can find information about how to register for assessments and, for candidates with documented disabilities, how to request accommodations. Information is also provided about the assessment design and format, the evidence of practice to be submitted, assessment fees, minimum passing scores, and an explanation of the rubric level assessment results report candidates can expect to receive after submitting. Additionally, candidates for the CalTPA and CalAPA are provided with links to preparation materials, including the tasks and rubrics, and examples of mid-range responses. During the pandemic, Commission staff started providing additional support directly to candidates and programs during weekly office hours. This support continues.

Cal State Fresno provides this information to their candidates on their [website](#), and the assessment is embedded into their credential programs with formative assessments included as part of course work and the summative assessments required as part of the field work.

While a few commercial performance assessment preparation options have surfaced, they are unrelated to the Commission, and it is important to note that the Commission does not review or endorse any commercially prepared or published performance assessment preparation materials or supports other than what is provided on the performance assessment website.

### **Performance Assessment Score Bias**

In large-scale performance assessment, differential passing rates by subgroups are not considered a sign of bias in and of themselves. Commission approved performance assessments are designed, in part, to uncover differences in scores according to various subgroups to help understand gaps in preparation and support and provide specific supports to all candidates coming into the teacher and administrative services work force. Analytic rubrics, aligned to TPEs and CAPEs provide programs, candidates, and the Commission with detailed information about which pedagogical knowledge, skills, and/or abilities candidates can demonstrate at different qualitative levels.

The performance assessment design standards require every approved model sponsor to have processes to avoid bias. These processes must be built into the assessment development and administration processes, including a Bias Review Committee, which is required to review all



performance assessment directions, prompts, and rubrics for potential bias, making changes and suggestions if necessary. In addition, all model sponsors must ensure that assessors scoring performance assessments are trained to address and mitigate bias and be calibrated and checked through inter-rater reliability analyses. Assessors who do not meet inter-rater reliability quality measures are not allowed to continue scoring until they demonstrate they have recalibrated. Model sponsors must employ these procedures specifically to reduce measurement error that might be caused by bias so that results by gender, race, and ethnicity can be accurately and appropriately reported. Performance assessment score data is reviewed during the accreditation process as one of many factors that shed light on program quality and effectiveness. Commission and ES staff work to ensure that a diverse group of educators is trained and calibrated to score CalTPA and CalAPA submissions. Assessors include both TK-12 educators and preparation program faculty across the state and different program pathways. Information about the CalTPA and CalAPA assessor race and ethnicity data can be found in [Appendix A](#).

### **Overview of Commission Approved Performance Assessments**

The following section provides brief overviews of CalTPA, edTPA, FAST, and CalAPA. Further detail about the structure and scoring process of these assessments can be viewed in the [Inaugural Annual Report on the Commission Approved Teaching and Administrator Performance Assessments](#), February 2022.

### **CalTPA: Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and World Languages**

In 2000, the CalTPA for Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and World Language (MS/SS/WL) credentials were first administered and scored locally for formative purposes to support candidate development and inform program design. Starting in 2008, passing a TPA became a credential requirement in state statute (Chap. 517, Stats. 2006), and candidates had to meet a passing standard. The CalTPA was revised during 2015-2017 to align with California's new Common Core student standards adopted by the State Board of Education and with the revised PADS. Significant changes for the field included development of an online platform for administration and centralized scoring of submissions facilitated by ES and managed by Commission staff. The current version of the CalTPA for Multiple Subject/Single Subject and World Languages became operational in fall 2018. Data was gathered during the initial operation year and in June 2019, the current passing standards for the two instructional cycles of the CalTPA were [established by the Commission](#).

The CalTPA is based on a two-cycle format with each instructional cycle structured around the four steps of Plan, Teach & Assess, Reflect, and Apply. A candidate must pass both cycles. *Cycle 1, Learning About Students and Planning Instruction* focuses on candidates learning about their students' cultural and linguistic assets and learning needs and planning instruction for one standards-based lesson. Candidates learn about and monitor progress for three focus students (an English learner; a student who has an Individualized Education Plan, 504 plan, or is identified as Gifted; and a student who has experienced trauma either in or out-side of school). *Cycle 2, Assessment Driven Instruction* requires candidates to plan and teach a standards-based learning segment of three to five lessons including three forms of assessment: informal

assessment, student self-assessment, and a formal assessment. Multiple Subject candidates focus on literacy instruction for one cycle and on math instruction for the other cycle. Single Subject and World Language candidates focus their lessons on the specific credential content for both cycles. All candidates reflect on the effectiveness of their instruction and assessments and then apply what they have learned to improve their teaching and provide the next steps to support student learning.

CalTPA MS/SS/WL passing standards:

- Cycle 1: Learning about Students and Planning Instruction (8 analytic rubrics): A score of 19 of 40 points with one rubric score of one (1) allowed.
- Cycle 2: Assessment Driven Instruction (9 analytic rubrics): A score of 21 of 45 points with one rubric score of one (1) allowed.

### **CalTPA: Education Specialist, Mild to Moderate Support Needs (MMSN) and Extensive Support Needs (ESN)**

At the August 2018 Commission meeting, the Commission adopted [program standards and Teaching Performance Expectations \(TPEs\)](#) for the MMSN and ESN credentials, and in April 2019 adopted [authorization statements](#) for these education specialist credentials. In addition, the Commission acted in [December 2020](#) to make the successful demonstration of proficiency on a performance assessment for all five types of education specialist candidates a requirement for the preliminary credential. [Education Code section 44259](#) was amended to include this requirement for earning an education specialist credential. Given the specificity of the pedagogy for each of the low incidence credentials and in the effort to include the participation of faculty and other educators in the design of the cycles, more time was required to develop these assessments. Additional time was granted by the Commission for development (pilot and field testing) and, upon direction from the Commission, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visual Impairment, and Early Childhood Special Education credential candidates are not required to take and pass a TPA until July 1, 2025.

The Commission acted in [June 2022](#) to adopt initial passing standards for the MMSN and ESN assessments. Due to the performance assessment being a new requirement for these candidates, the Commission directed staff to administer the assessment for two additional years and then return with candidate score data to determine if passing standards should be revised.

Passing standards for MMSN

- MMSN Cycle 1: Learning About Students with IEPs and Planning Instruction (8 rubrics): A score of 17 of 40 points with one rubric score of one (1) allowed.
- MMSN Cycle 2: Assessment-Driven Instruction for Students with IEPs (9 rubrics): A score of 19 of 45 points with one rubric score of one (1) allowed.

Passing standards for ESN

- ESN Cycle 1: Learning About Students with IEPs and Planning Instruction (8 rubrics): A score of 15 of 40 points.

- ESN Cycle 2: Assessment Driven Instruction for Students with IEPs (9 rubrics): A score of 17 of 45 points.

### **edTPA: Multiple Subject, Single Subject, World Language, Education Specialist**

The edTPA is a subject-specific performance assessment using a three-task design. edTPA was initially approved by the Commission for use in California as a teaching performance assessment in 2014 and again [in 2018](#). In 2022, the Commission approved the [Special Education Handbook for California](#) for candidates seeing the Education Specialist: Mild-Moderate Support Needs and the Extensive Support Needs credentials. A cycle of teaching, captured by the three tasks that compose an edTPA portfolio, include 1) Planning, 2) Instruction, and 3) Assessment of student learning. In each task, candidates have an opportunity to reflect on and analyze their teaching and propose revisions, considering their knowledge of students and data collected. The edTPA Elementary Education Handbooks assess candidates' performance of both Elementary Literacy and Elementary Mathematics. The Elementary Education Handbooks for Multiple Subject candidates follows the edTPA common architecture with Tasks 1–3 and includes an additional Task 4 assessing candidate performance on Elementary Mathematics or Elementary Literacy. The Special Education Handbook for California, approved for Education Specialist MMSN and ESN credentials, has 15 rubrics and follows the same design and architecture as the other 15-rubric fields. This handbook asks candidates to reflect on the unique learning needs of a single learner, plan and teach lessons to their specific needs, and analyze their teaching effectiveness by assessing learners' progress throughout the learning segment.

edTPA passing standards:

- Multiple Subject Handbook (18 rubrics): A score of 49 of 90 points
- Single Subject Handbook (15 rubrics): A score of 41 of 75 points
- World Language Handbook (13 rubrics): A score of 35 of 65 points
- Education Specialist Handbooks for MMSN/ESN (15 rubrics): A score of 35 of 75 points

### **Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers**

The Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) is a Commission-approved TPA model designed by and used exclusively by Cal State Fresno. FAST was originally reviewed and approved by the Commission in 2007 and has been in use at Cal State Fresno since that time. In 2018, the FAST was revised to align with changes in the performance assessment design standards, and the Teaching Performance Expectations. FAST 2.0 was submitted for review and [approved by the Commission in 2018](#).

FAST 2.0 consists of two parts: the *Site Visitation Project (SVP)*, completed during candidates' initial student teaching, and the *Teaching Sample Project (TSP)*, completed during candidates' final student teaching. The SVP assesses teacher candidates' ability to 1) plan a single lesson, 2) implement that lesson, and 3) evaluate instruction. For Multiple Subject candidates, the content area is mathematics.

Within the TSP, teacher candidates document how they are addressing the needs of all their students in the planning, teaching, and assessing of the content. The TSP assesses candidates' ability to (a) identify the context of the classroom; (b) plan and teach a series of at least five cohesive lessons with a focus on content knowledge and literacy; (c) assess students' learning before, during, and after the unit; (d) document their teaching and their students' learning; and (e) reflect on the effectiveness of their teaching. The TSP is divided into seven components, each of which is scored on a task-specific, four-point rubric. For Multiple Subject candidates, the content area for the TSP is literacy.

FAST passing standard:

- Candidates must receive a minimum score of 2 on the three SVP rubrics: Score of 6 out of 12 points.
- Candidates must receive a minimum score of 2 on the seven TSP rubrics: Score of 14 out of 28 points.

### **California Administrator Performance Assessment**

The California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA) includes three leadership cycles and is structured around the four steps of Investigate, Plan, Act, Reflect. *Leadership Cycle 1: Analyzing Data to Inform School Improvement and Promote Equity* requires candidates to generate and/or analyze multiple sources of school data for the purpose of identifying equity gaps to aid in the development of a plan for equitable improvement in line with the school's vision, mission, and goals, which is then refined after consultation with a school leader. *Leadership Cycle 2: Facilitating Communities of Practice* focuses on facilitating collaborative professional learning within a collegial workgroup for the purpose of improving teaching and student learning or well-being, culminating in the implementation of and reflection on a research-based strategy. *Leadership Cycle 3: Supporting Teacher Growth* follows an educational coaching cycle of a classroom teacher, involving a preconference, observation of a lesson, a post-conference, and reflection upon being an equitable leader.

From 2019-through June 2023, CalAPA passing standards:

- Cycle 1: Analyzing Data to Inform School Improvement and Promote Equity (8 rubrics): A total score of 14 of 40 points
- Cycle 2: Facilitating Communities of Practice (7 rubrics): A total score of 12 of 35 points
- Cycle 3: Supporting Teacher Growth (7 rubrics): A total score of 12 of 35 points

In August of 2022, the Commission approved a [new passing score standard](#), based upon the recommendation of the CalAPA Standard Setting Panel which met in May 2022 to review score data from 2018 through May 2022. The new passing scores, which became effective July 8<sup>th</sup>, 2023, are:

- Cycle 1: Analyzing Data to Inform School Improvement and Promote Equity (8 rubrics): A total score of 15 of 40 points
- Cycle 2: Facilitating Communities of Practice (7 rubrics): A total score of 14 of 35 points
- Cycle 3: Supporting Teacher Growth (7 rubrics): A total score of 14 of 35 points

## Part Two: Candidate Score Results and Analysis

### Caveats about the Data

For all data in this item, if the total number of candidates for a given performance assessment is fewer than 10, pass rate data is not reported. It is also important to note that demographic data is self-reported by candidates.

The data for CalTPA and edTPA have been updated in response to legislative decisions regarding candidates who were unable to complete performance assessments during the COVID pandemic due to school closures. An Executive Order issued by Governor Newsom in 2020 ([N-66-20](#)) authorized the Commission to issue preliminary teaching credentials to candidates who had completed all program requirements except for the teaching performance assessment (and the RICA examination) due to COVID-related school and university closures and related challenges. These candidates were allowed to receive a preliminary credential if they were recommended by their preparation program, with a renewal code that required them to take and pass a TPA (and the RICA exam) as part of the recommendation for a clear credential.

In June 2023, Governor Newsom signed [Senate Bill 114](#) which allows teachers who received a TPA deferral to either complete a Commission approved induction program or have two years of successful experience teaching in place of successfully completing a TPA in order to clear their credentials. Commission staff worked with ES to identify teachers who received a TPA deferral and attempted at least one CalTPA cycle but had not passed from the data set reported in this item. This resulted in 3,831 candidates being removed from the CalTPA data set for MS/SS/WL. In addition, 863 candidates who submitted an edTPA but had not passed were removed from the edTPA data set.

The CalTPA (MS/SS/WL) data presented in February 2022 in the [Inaugural Annual Report on the Commission Approved Teaching and Administrator Performance Assessments](#) for the assessment pass rates included candidates attempting both cycles of the CalTPA assessment in a single program year. If a candidate attempted C1 and C2 in separate program years, they were not included in Table 2 in the 2022 report.

The analysis of CalTPA data in this item includes all candidates attempting both cycles of the assessment and represents their data in the program year within which they submitted and scored the remaining cycle. This data analysis methodology more accurately represents all candidates and their assessment attempts for the CalTPA. Rather than looking exclusively within a single program year of data for individuals, looking across years provides a more accurate representation of when individual candidates may have completed and submitted their cycles for scoring.

The data provided in this item is available to preparation programs for review and used by Commission, ES, edTPA, and FAST staff to regularly monitor candidate assessment results to

ensure reliability and validity as required by the [Teaching Performance Assessment Design Standards](#), and the [Administrator Performance Assessment Design Standards](#) (PADS).

### CalTPA MS/SS/WL Results and Analysis

Data and analysis for CalTPA Multiple Subject/Single Subject/World Language (MS/SS/WL) candidates are provided by overall assessment pass rate, by cycle, and by rubric-specific performance.

- “Best Attempt Pass Rate” refers to percentage of candidates who passed both cycles, which may include multiple attempts.
- “First Attempt Pass Rates” refers to the percentage of candidates who pass on their first attempt.
- “First Attempt Mean Rubric Scores” provides data about mean scores on each rubric calculated based on candidates’ first attempt.

**Table 1: CalTPA Best Attempt Pass Rates for MS/SS/WL Candidates Who Submitted Both Cycles**

Program Year	N of Candidates Submitting Both Cycles	N of Candidates Passed Both Cycles	% Passed
Y1: 2018-19*	4346	4331	100%
Y2: 2019-20	4296	4224	98%
Y3: 2020-21	3054	3008	98%
Y4: 2021-22	5157	5065	98%
Y5: 2022-23	6986	6610	95%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23,839</b>	<b>23,238</b>	<b>97%</b>

\*Lower passing standard established to support candidates and programs in the first year of administration.  
 Note: Candidates who submitted cycles across multiple years are counted in the last year submitted.

Table 1 illustrates the percentages of all Multiple Subject, Single Subject and World Language (MS/SS/WL) candidates who have passed both Cycle 1 and Cycle 2 of the CalTPA for each of the 5 years. 23,239 candidates passed both cycles of the CalTPA through the first 5 program years, which represents a cumulative assessment passing rate of 97%.

The pass rate of 95% for 2022-23 was slightly lower than the four previous years. It is important to underscore that the 3% difference from 2021-22 to 2022-23 is not statistically significant. This percentage difference may be attributed to the higher number of candidates attempting both cycles in 2022-23 or to the fact that candidates who did not pass will be revising and resubmitting during the 2023-24 academic year. An additional factor that may have influenced the pass rate for 2022-23 is that assessment costs were waived for candidates through an appropriation in the state budget. The fee waiver initiative supported candidates and perhaps influenced the increased number of candidates taking and submitting performance assessments. In addition, CalTPA assessors have reported to Commission staff at their bi-monthly meetings that they have seen an increase in candidate submissions that are less comprehensive and/or unorganized. This may be due to candidates seeking rubric-based

feedback as there is no cost to the candidate to submit and or resubmit for scoring. Throughout the fee waiver year Commission staff have notified programs of this emerging issue. Performance assessment fees are waived again for the 2023-24 year. Commission staff and ES will track the data throughout 2023-24 and will monitor this issue.

For transparency, staff reviewed data regarding the 3,831 candidates who were removed from the CalTPA data set because they received a TPA deferral during COVID and were given options by AB 142 that mean they do not need to pass a TPA if they successfully complete an induction program or two years of employment. Of these candidates, 527 submitted both cycles and did not pass, 3,096 did not submit both cycles, and 208 submitted an incomplete cycle or one that could not be scored.

**Table 2: First Time and Best Attempt Pass Rates of MS/SS/WL CalTPA Candidates Who Submitted Both Cycles By Race/Ethnicity**

Race/ Ethnicity	N Passed on First Attempt	% Passed on First Attempt	N Passed on Best Attempt	% Passed on Best Attempt
All	19,091	80%	23,238	97%
N/A	860	77%	1071	98%
Black	431	73%	555	95%
Asian	1009	82%	1208	98%
SE Asian	814	82%	969	97%
Pacific Islander	63	81%	77	99%
Hispanic	6294	78%	7811	97%
Native American	112	77%	141	97%
White	8791	82%	10546	98%
Other	717	81%	860	97%

Table 2 provides the first and best attempt pass rates for candidates who submitted both CalTPA cycles disaggregated by race and ethnicity over the first five program years. On their first attempt, 73% to 82% of candidates reported in these subgroups passed. The differences in pass rates on best attempt narrows to four percentage points (95% - 99%).

A key component of assessor training and calibration focuses on identifying and mitigating the effects of implicit bias in scoring. In the previous two program years, additional training has been developed and implemented to further raise awareness and reflective practice among assessors. These efforts have been extended to raise awareness of the potential for implicit bias across the field through professional learning opportunities for assessment design teams to preliminary program faculty and staff at the Commission. Demographic data are self-reported by candidates.

**CalTPA Mean Rubric Scores (MM/SS/WL)**

The CalTPA has eight analytic rubrics for Cycle 1 and 9 for Cycle 2. Each analytic rubric has five score levels and score judgments are made using multiple sources of candidate evidence. Analytic rubric data provides the opportunity for programs, candidates, and Commission staff

to understand how candidates are demonstrating their capacity to demonstrate specific TPEs that are aligned to planning asset-based instruction, teaching and monitoring for understanding (video of teaching, reflecting on practice and applying what was learned to next instruction).

**Table 3: CalTPA First Attempt Score Means by Rubric\*: Cycle 1 (MS/SS/WL)**

Year	Plan: 1.1	Plan: 1.2	Plan: 1.3	Plan: 1.4	Teach & Assess 1.5	Teach & Assess 1.6	Reflect 1.7	Apply 1.8
2018-19	3.3	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.9	3.0	3.2	3.0
2019-20	3.3	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.6	3.1	2.8
2020-21	3.3	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.5	2.8	2.7
2021-22	3.0	2.8	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.6	2.6
2022-23	3.0	2.8	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.5	2.6	2.6

\*Rubric essential questions are provided in [Appendix B](#)

Mean rubric scores have remained relatively consistent from year to year for five years with scores at or near score level 3. None of the slight mean score differences between years are statistically significant. Commission and ES staff monitor rubric level scores after each scoring window across the academic year. Rubrics 1.6, 1.7 and 1.8 consistently produce the lowest rubric mean scores. Commission staff, assessors, and ES have studied the evidence submitted for these rubrics and made moderate edits to the assessment guide directions, prompts, and score level language.

For example, this year Commission staff have focused on scores for rubric 1.6, which assesses candidates' ability to engage students in higher order thinking and establishing next steps for student learning. Slight revisions were made to the rubric language for the Year 6 version related to next steps for student learning. Support has been provided to programs for rubrics that have lower means by sharing, through online program coordinator meetings, effective strategies to engage students in higher order thinking. Many candidates were providing next steps for instruction as the next activity that the students were asked to do such as "get ready to go outside for recess" and not providing next content specific steps for learning, resulting in lower scores on the rubric. Commission staff added language to the assessment guide and rubric to clearly define next steps as content learning.



**Table 4: CalTPA First Attempt Score Means by Rubric\*: Cycle 2 (MS/SS/WL)**

Year	Plan: 2.1	Plan: 2.2	Teach & Assess 2.3	Teach & Assess 2.4	Teach & Assess 2.5	Teach & Assess 2.6	Teach & Assess 2.7	Reflect 2.8	Apply 2.9
2018-19	3.2	3.1	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.7	3.0	3.0
2019-20	3.1	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.7	2.9	2.9
2020-21	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.7	2.8	3.1	2.8
2021-22	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.6	2.7	2.9	2.7
2022-23	2.6	2.7	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.6	2.7	2.9	2.6

\*Rubric descriptions are provided in [Appendix C](#)

Table 4 illustrates the mean scores for each Cycle 2 rubric. As with Cycle 1, rubric mean scores have remained consistent across five years. For the year 6 versions (2023-24), Commission staff have made minor revisions to Cycle 2 assessment guides to support candidate performance for rubrics 2.1 and 2.2 (Plan) and rubrics 2.6 and 2.7 (Teach and Assess). Through office hours with candidates and programs and a review of candidate submissions, it became clear that some candidates were confused about the differences between an assessment (what the students do for the assessment) and rubrics (the criteria used to assess student learning). Language was added to the guides to clarify the definitions of these two components of student assessment.

For rubric 2.4, which assesses students' use of educational technology, it was determined that candidates would benefit from the addition of a narrative prompt in the sources of evidence for that rubric in order to elaborate more fully on what is seen and heard in the video clips as students use educational technology to learn content.

[Appendix J](#) includes additional data tables that list the number of candidates who have taken both cycles but not yet passed, the number of candidates who submitted one cycle but have not yet submitted the other, and how many attempts it took for candidates to pass Cycle 1 and/or Cycle 2.

### **CalTPA: Education Specialist MMSN and ESN Results and Analysis**

Education Specialist CalTPA performance assessments for Mild to Moderate Support Needs (MMSN) and Extensive Support Needs (ESN) candidates were required for the first-time last year (2022-23).

**Table 5: MMSN and ESN CalTPA Best Attempt Pass Rates for Candidates Who Submitted Both Cycles**

Program Year	N of MMSN	% Passed MMSN	N of ESN	% Passed ESN
2022-23	150	94%	46	100%

Table 5 provides the percentages of all MMSN and ESN candidates who passed the CalTPA. It is important to note that many educational specialist programs are two-year programs, resulting in the low candidate numbers reported in the data tables of this item for MMSN and ESN. Many candidates may be planning to take the CalTPA during the second year of their program. In addition, 72% of Education Specialist candidates are enrolled in Intern programs. Candidates may be on an Intern credential for two years and may be planning to take their CalTPA in 2023-24. Commission staff expect MMSN and ESN numbers to grow significantly next year.

**Table 6: MMSN: Best Attempt Pass Rates by Instructional Cycle for CalTPA**

Academic Year	N Attempted C1	% Passed C1	N Attempted C2	% Passed C2
2022-23	328	92%	150	97%

Table 6 provides the pass rates of MMSN candidates for each of the two instructional cycles. While the pass rates for both cycles are strong, the difference between Cycle 1 with 92% and Cycle 2 with 97% pass rates may be attributed to the different periods in candidates' experience that they complete each cycle. Candidates completing Cycle 1 earlier in their placements have less teaching experience and less familiarity with completing a performance assessment. The formative experiences of completing Cycle 1 and additional teaching experience likely support increased pass rates for Cycle 2. These results mirror what has been observed across the first 5 years of the MS/SS CalTPA.

The overall numbers are low for the first-year administration of the Education Specialist CalTPA. This is because the majority of Education Specialist candidates are enrolled in two-year programs. Programs have advised candidates to take the TPA in the second year of their program once they have completed most of their coursework. In addition, approximately 70% of Education Specialist candidates are enrolled in IHE or district intern programs and it is likely that these candidates are also waiting until their second year to complete the TPA.

**Table 7: ESN: Pass Rates by Instructional Cycle for CalTPA**

Academic Year	N Attempted C1	% Passed C1	N Attempted C2	% Passed C2
2022-23	100	98%	42	95%

Table 7 provides the pass rates of ESN candidates for each of the two instructional cycles. The pass rate for Cycle 1 is three percentage points higher than that of Cycle 2, which is counter to the findings described above. This may be due to the small sample size. Commission staff will continue to monitor overall pass rates across the two cycles as submission numbers increase in the coming program years.

**Table 8: First Attempt Pass Rates of Education Specialist CalTPA Candidates Who Submitted Both Cycles By Race/Ethnicity**

Race/ Ethnicity	N MMSN Passed on First Attempt	MMSN % Passed on First Attempt	N ESN Passed on First Attempt	ESN % Passed on First Attempt
All	134	89%	44	96%
N/A	*	*	*	*
Black	*	*	n/a	n/a
Asian	*	*	*	*
SE Asian	*	*	n/a	n/a
Pac Islander	*	*	n/a	n/a
Hispanic	44	85%	21	91%
Native American	*	*	n/a	n/a
White	65	92%	19	100%
Other	*	*	*	*

\*Results are suppressed for races/ethnicities that had fewer than 10 candidates.

Since 2022-23 was the first year of operation for the Education Specialist version of the CalTPA, there are many groups for which there were not enough candidates to report. When rolling up all of the groups that had less than 10, 29 out of 31 (94%) candidates passed.

**Table 9: MMSN First Attempt Score Means by Rubric: Cycle 1\***

Year	Plan: 1.1	Plan: 1.2	Plan: 1.3	Plan: 1.4	Teach & Assess 1.5	Teach & Assess 1.6	Reflect 1.7	Apply 1.8
2022-23	3.0	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.8

\*Rubric descriptions are provided in [Appendix D](#)

**Table 10: ESN First Attempt Score Means by Rubric: Cycle 1\***

Year	Plan: 1.1	Plan: 1.2	Plan: 1.3	Plan: 1.4	Teach & Assess 1.5	Teach & Assess 1.6	Reflect 1.7	Apply 1.8
2022-23	2.9	3.2	2.8	2.9	3.1	2.7	2.9	2.6

Tables 9 and 10 provide mean scores by rubric for MMSN and ESN Cycle 1. The data indicates that most mean rubric scores are similar to those for recent years of the MM/SS/WL CalTPA.

**Table 11: MMSN First Attempt Score Means by Rubric: Cycle 2\***

Year	Plan: 2.1	Plan: 2.2	Teach & Assess 2.3	Teach & Assess 2.4	Teach & Assess 2.5	Teach & Assess 2.6	Teach & Assess 2.7	Reflect 2.8	Apply 2.9
2022-23	3.0	3.3	3.1	2.8	3.0	2.7	2.8	2.6	3.0

\*Rubric descriptions are provided in [Appendix E](#)

**Table 12: ESN First Attempt Score Means by Rubric: Cycle 2\***

Year	Plan: 2.1	Plan: 2.2	Teach & Assess 2.3	Teach & Assess 2.4	Teach & Assess 2.5	Teach & Assess 2.6	Teach & Assess 2.7	Reflect 2.8	Apply 2.9
2022-23	2.7	3.0	2.9	2.3	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.8

Tables 11 and 12 illustrate mean scores by rubric for MMSN and ESN for Cycle 2. As with Cycle 1, the results for Cycle 2 are similar to the mean scores for the general education (MS/SS/WL) CalTPA. A point of interest is the results for rubrics 2.1 and 2.2, which are the rubrics that assess candidates' ability to plan an asset-based learning segment. The scores for MMSN on rubrics 2.1 and 2.2 are .4 and .6 points respectively higher than those of the current year for MS/SS/WL CalTPA candidates. Mean scores for ESN candidates on rubric 2.2 are .3 points higher. These results may reflect the additional focus for Education Specialist candidates use of Individualized Education Plans and 504 plans to inform instruction. Access to and familiarity with the extensive assessments often available for students with identified learning needs may enhance candidates' ability to plan for student instruction.

### edTPA Results and Analysis

Data and analysis for edTPA is provided in separate tables for Multiple Subject/Single Subject, World Language, and Education Specialist candidates due to the different number of rubrics in the handbooks for each of these credential areas.

- “Best Attempt Pass Rate” refers to percentage of candidates who passed both cycles, which may include multiple attempts.
- “First Attempt Pass Rates” refers to the percentage of candidates who pass on their first attempt.
- “First Attempt Mean Rubric Scores” provides data about mean scores on each rubric calculated based on candidates' first attempt.

*Please note that the total number of candidates (N) listed in the following tables do not always match for program years because the tables look at the data from different angles to try and answer different questions and provide additional context. This is especially true for tables that include candidates who submitted cycles in different program years.*

**Table 13a: edTPA Best Attempt Pass Rates for MS/SS Candidates**

Program Year	# of Candidates	% Passed
2018-19	3878	95%
2019-20	3420	97%
2020-21	2256	97%
2021-22	3548	97%
2022-23	4019	93%

**Table 13b: edTPA Best Attempt Pass Rates for World Language Candidates**

Program Year	# of Candidates	% Passed
2018-19	94	94%
2019-20	107	95%
2020-21	54	98%
2021-22	77	92%
2022-23	124	81%

**Table 13c: edTPA Best Attempt Pass Rates for Education Specialist Candidates**

Program Year	# of Candidates	% Passed
<b>2022-23</b>	163	98%

Tables 13 a-c indicate that the vast majority of candidates who submit an edTPA eventually pass. Education Specialist candidates had a high pass rate for the first year of implementation. It is not surprising that pass rates for the last year to be somewhat lower than previous years because some of the candidates who did not pass will either revise and resubmit their portfolios or redo it. However, the 11 percentage point drop for World Language candidates is unexpected, and Commission staff will work with ES, the model sponsor, and preparation programs to try and understand why and provide support to programs and candidates as appropriate.

For transparency, staff reviewed data regarding the 863 candidates who were removed from the edTPA data set because they received a TPA deferral during COVID and were given options by AB 142 that mean they do not need to pass a TPA if they successfully complete an induction program or two years of employment. Of these candidates, 709 did not pass, and the remaining 154 either submitted a portfolio that could not be scored.

**Table 14a: Number of Attempts Required to Pass edTPA for MS/SS Candidates**

Program Year	Passed on First Attempt	Passed on Second Attempt	Passed on Third Attempt	Have Not Yet Passed
Y1: 2018-19	3378	274	47	193
Y2: 2019-20	2914	236	163	104
Y3: 2020-21	2011	147	37	63
Y4: 2021-22	3110	258	60	153
Y5: 2022-23	3231	333	182	314

**Table 14b: Number of Attempts Required to Pass edTPA for World Language Candidates**

Program Year	Passed on First Attempt	Passed on Second Attempt	Passed on Third Attempt	Have Not Yet Passed
Y1: 2018-19	70	12	6	9
Y2: 2019-20	68	19	15	3
Y3: 2020-21	48	4	1	2
Y4: 2021-22	48	18	5	9
Y5: 2022-23	62	25	13	28

**Table 14c: Number of Attempts Required to Pass edTPA for Education Specialist Candidates**

Program Year	Passed on First Attempt	Passed on Second Attempt	Passed on Third Attempt	Have Not Yet Passed
Y5: 2022-23	145	13	1	4

Tables 14a-c indicate the number of candidates who passed on their first, second, and third attempt based on the year in which they first submitted an edTPA, as well as the number of candidates who have not yet passed. It is expected that the numbers for 2022-23 will decrease as those candidates revise and resubmit their portfolios or redo it. The tables show that a higher percentage of World Language candidates do not pass on their first attempt, so staff will also review this issue with ES, the model sponsor, and preparation programs.

**Table 15: Number of Candidates by Year Who First Submitted edTPA but Not Passed Yet**

Program Year	Multiple/Single Subject	World Language	Education Specialist
Y1: 2018-19	173	5	N/A
Y2: 2019-20	113	7	N/A
Y3: 2020-21	62	1	N/A
Y4: 2021-22	111	6	N/A
Y5: 2022-23	368	32	4

Table 15 provides further context regarding the number of candidates who submitted an edTPA but have never passed, indicating the number of candidates who were not yet able to earn a preliminary credential.

**Table 16a: edTPA Cumulative first time and best attempt pass rates for MS/SS candidates by race/ethnicity**

Race/ Ethnicity	N Passed on First Attempt	% Passed on First Attempt	N Passed on Best Attempt	% Passed on Best Attempt
All	14,524	88%	16,381	96%
Asian/Pacific Island	1803	88%	2033	96%
Black	379	78%	467	91%
Hispanic	3897	86%	4441	95%
Multiracial	1065	88%	1202	96%
Native American	59	86%	71	97%
Other	291	85%	335	95%
Undeclared	417	81%	499	92%
White	6613	90%	7333	97%

**Table 16b: edTPA Cumulative first time and best attempt pass rates for World Language candidates by race/ethnicity**

Race/ Ethnicity	N Passed on First Attempt	% Passed on First Attempt	N Passed on Best Attempt	% Passed on Best Attempt
All	290	67%	414	91%
Asian/Pacific Island	55	89%	63	97%
Black	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	157	61%	243	88%
Multiracial	12	86%	13	93%
Native American	*	*	*	*
Other	*	*	*	*
Undeclared	*	*	12	80%
White	50	72%	69	97%

\*Results are suppressed for races/ethnicities that had fewer than 10 candidates.

**Table 16c: edTPA Cumulative first time and best attempt pass rates for Educational Specialist candidates by race/ethnicity**

Race/ Ethnicity	N Passed on First Attempt	% Passed on First Attempt	N Passed on Best Attempt	% Passed on Best Attempt
All	145	96%	159	98%
Asian/Pacific Island	12	100%	15	100%
Black	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	67	96%	76	97%
Multiracial	12	100%	12	100%
Native American	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	*	*	*	*
Undeclared	*	*	*	*
White	38	97%	39	100%

\*Results are suppressed for races/ethnicities that had fewer than 10 candidates.

Tables 16a-c show that first time pass rates for race/ethnicity groups vary from 61% to 100% on the different versions of the edTPA. There seems to be less variability on the Multiple/Single Subject and Education Specialist handbooks than the World Language handbooks, which have the lowest first time pass rates. This is another indicator that review of the context for World Language handbooks is needed.

**Table 17a: edTPA First Attempt Score Means by Individual Rubric for MS/SS**

Year	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2018-19	382	3.1	3	3.2	3	3	3.1	3	3	3	2.9
2019-20	318	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.1	3	3.1	3	3	3	2.9
2020-21	217	3.1	3	3.2	3.1	3	3	3	3	3	2.8
2021-22	358	3.1	3	3.2	3	2.9	3	3	3	3	2.8
2022-23	378	3.1	2.9	3.2	3	2.9	3	3	2.9	2.9	2.8

**MS/SS (cont.)**

Year	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
2018-19	3.1	3.4	2.9	3	3.1	2.9	3	2.9
2019-20	3.1	3.5	3	3.1	3.1	3	3.1	3
2020-21	3.1	3.6	2.9	3.1	3.1	2.8	3	2.9
2021-22	3.1	3.5	2.9	3	3.1	2.9	3	2.9
2022-23	3.1	3.5	2.9	2.9	3	2.8	2.9	2.8

Planning: Rubrics 1-5

Instruction: Rubrics 6-10

Assessment: Rubrics 11-15

Elementary Specific: Rubrics 16-18

**Table 17b: edTPA First Attempt Score Means by Individual Rubric for World Language Candidates**

Year	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2018-19	100	3	2.9	3.1	3	3.1	2.8	2.5	2.2	2.6	2.7
2019-20	85	3.2	3.1	3.2	3	3.1	3	2.7	2.1	2.5	2.9
2020-21	53	3.3	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.2	2.8	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.9
2021-22	85	2.9	2.9	3	2.8	3.2	2.7	2.3	2	2.4	2.6
2022-23	110	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.7	2.3	2	2.2	2.6

**World Language (cont.)**

Year	11	12	13
2018-19	3	2.5	2.7
2019-20	3.3	2.9	2.8
2020-21	3.3	2.9	2.8
2021-22	3	2.6	2.6
2022-23	3	2.5	2.6

Planning: Rubrics 1-4

Instruction: Rubrics 5-9

Assessment: Rubrics 10-13

**Table 17c: edTPA First Attempt Score Means by Individual Rubric for Education Specialist Candidates**

Year	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2022-23	151	2.7	2.9	2.7	3	2.7	3.1	3	2.9	2.9	2.6

**Education Specialist Data (cont.)**

Year	11	12	13	14	15
2022-23	1.8	3.2	2.3	2.8	2.7

Planning: Rubrics 1-5

Instruction: Rubrics 6-10

Assessment: Rubrics 11-15

\*Rubric essential questions are provided in [Appendix F](#)



Tables 17a-c indicate more variability on the World Language rubrics than the Multiple/Single Subject and Education Specialist handbooks (apart from the latter’s rubric 11). This data will be used with programs to identify ways to strengthen World Language preparation in the rubric areas related to Instruction and Assessment.

### FAST Results and Analysis

Table 18 below provides the total number of candidates who attempted either the FAST 2.0 Site Visitation Project or the Teaching Sample Project in Academic Years 2018-19 through 2022-23 and provides the number and percent who passed on their first attempt and second attempt. The final column provides the number and percentage of candidates who passed either the Site Visitation Project or the Teaching Sample Project within two attempts. Looking across the five years of data demonstrates a slight decline in the percentage of candidates not passing the assessment on their first attempt (94.4% in 2018-19 and 92.1% in 2022-23), though the percentage that ultimately passed has remained constant.

**Table 18: FAST All Attempt Pass Rates (MS/SS)**

Academic Year	Total Attempted	N Passed 1 <sup>st</sup> Attempt	Percentage Passed 1 <sup>st</sup> Attempt	N Passed 2 <sup>nd</sup> Attempt	Percentage Passed 2 <sup>nd</sup> Attempt	N Passed 1 <sup>st</sup> or 2 <sup>nd</sup> attempt	Percentage Passed 1 <sup>st</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> Attempt
2018-19	785	741	94.4%	44	100%	785	100%
2019-20	773	746	96.5%	25	93%	771	99.7%
2020-21	806	784	97.3%	22	100%	806	100%
2021-22	829	772	93.1%	57	100%	827	99.8%
2022-23	889	819	92.1%	62	93.9%	881	99.1%

Tables 19 and 20 provide the mean scores for each program area (Multiple Subject and Single Subject) on each rubric of each task (Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project) in each academic year. As the data indicate, means scores have remained fairly consistent by program across the three years of data. In fact, on the three Site Visitation Project rubrics and the seven Teaching Sample Project rubrics, the mean scores fall between 2.5 and 2.9 for both programs in each of the last three academic years.

**Table 19: FAST First Attempts of Site Visit Performance Score Means by Rubric (MS/SS)\***

Academic Year	Number Submitted	Planning Rubric Mean	Implementation Rubric Mean	Reflection Rubric Mean
2018-19 MS	190	2.7	2.6	2.7
2018-19 SS	171	2.7	2.7	2.8
2019-20 MS	123	2.8	2.8	2.9
2019-20 SS	125	2.7	2.6	2.6
2020-21 MS	269	2.7	2.7	2.7
2020-21 SS	150	2.8	2.9	2.8
2021-22 MS	263	2.6	2.7	2.7
2021-22 SS	165	2.5	2.5	2.6

2022-23 MS	279	2.7	2.7	2.6
2022-23 SS	162	2.6	2.6	2.6

\*Rubric Descriptions Provided in [Appendix G](#)

**Table 20: FAST First Attempts of Teaching Sample Project Rubric Score Means\*\***

Academic Year	N	TSP 1*	TSP 2*	TSP 3*	TSP 4*	TSP 5*	TSP 6*	TSP 7*
2018-19 MS	212	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.5	2.5	2.4
2018-19 SS	181	2.7	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.6
2019-20 MS	229	2.8	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.5
2019-20 SS	165	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.7
2020-21 MS	222	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.6
2020-21 SS	165	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.6	2.7	2.7
2021-22 MS	261	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.5	2.6	2.5
2021-22 SS	140	2.7	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.7	2.6
2022-23 MS	278	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.7	2.5	2.6	2.6
2022-23 SS	148	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.7	2.6

\*TSP 1: Context Rubric

TSP 2: Outcomes Rubric

TSP 3: Assessment Rubric

TSP 4: Instruction Rubric

TSP 5: Decisions Rubric

TSP 6: Analysis Rubric

TSP 7: Reflection Rubric

\*\* Rubric descriptions provided in [Appendix G](#)

Programmatically, Fresno State’s goal is for the mean scores of candidates from both the Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs on each of the rubrics to be closer to 3.0. Currently, program faculty are engaging in an analysis of the data to consider changes they can make in their coursework in an effort to better prepare candidates for the tasks where scores indicate they do have more challenges, including Learning Outcomes, Assessment Plan, Instructional Decision-Making, Analysis of Student Learning, and Reflection and Self-Evaluation in the Multiple Subject Program and Learning Outcomes and Instructional Decision-Making in the Single Subject Program.

**Table 21: FAST Race/Ethnicity Data for First Attempts on Site Visit Project**

Site Visit Perform	2020-21 Number of Submissions	2020-21 Percentage Passed	2021-22 Number of Submissions	2021-22 Percentage Passed	2022-23 Number of Submissions	2022-23 Percentage Passed
All	419	100%	428	97.9%	460	96.7%
Asian	12	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Black	N/A	N/A	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	223	100%	240	97.5%	260	97.7%
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Nat Amer	N/A	N/A	*	*	*	*
Other	17	100%	*	*	10	100%
Pac Island	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SE Asian	23	100%	15	100%	30	90.0%
White	131	100%	105	98.4%	98	98.0%

\* N <10 not reported

**Table 22: FAST Race/Ethnicity Data for First Attempts on Teaching Sample Project**

Teaching Sample Project	2020-21 Number of Submissions	2020-21 Percentage Passed	2021-22 Number of Submissions	2021-22 Percentage Passed	2022-23 Number of Submissions	2022-23 Percentage Passed
All	387	100%	401	87.5%	429	87.2%
Asian	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Black	N/A	N/A	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	202	100%	230	87.8%	238	86.6%
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nat Amer	N/A	N/A	*	*	N/A	N/A
Other	17	100%	*	*	10	100%
Pac Island	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SE Asian	17	100%	18	66.7%	28	89.3%
White	130	100%	105	90.5%	109	86.2%

\* N <10 not reported

Tables 21 (Site Visitation Project) and 22 (Teaching Sample Project) provide the race and ethnicity distribution of teacher candidates who passed each component of the FAST on their first attempt for years 2020-21, 2021-22, and 2022-23. Looking across the years of data shows that, pass rates for all candidates from all ethnicities remained stable from 2021-22 to 2022-23 on the Site Visitation Project. While overall pass rates on first attempts on the Teaching Sample Project have remained stable, pass rates for Southeast Asian candidates increased significantly from 2021-22 (66.7%) to 2022-23 (89.3%).

### CalAPA Results and Analysis

Data and analysis for CalAPA candidates are provided by overall assessment pass rate, by cycle, and by rubric-specific performance.

- “Best Attempt Pass Rate” refers to percentage of candidates who passed both cycles, which may include multiple attempts.
- “First Attempt Pass Rates” refers to the percentage of candidates who pass on their first attempt.
- “First Attempt Mean Rubric Scores” provides data about mean scores on each rubric calculated based on candidates’ first attempt.

**Table 23: CalAPA Cumulative Pass Rates for Candidates who Submitted all Three Cycles**

Year	Number Passing	% Passing
2018-19	871	100%
2019-20	1557	100%
2020-21	1527	100%
2021-22	1465	100%
2022-23	1804	100%

Table 23 illustrates the percentages of CalAPA candidates who have passed all Cycles (1, 2, and 3) of the CaAPA. It also includes the number of candidates who took and passed Cycles 1, 2, and 3. The % Passing reflects the percent of those candidates who passed all cycles (on any attempt) in the program year. The data indicates that over the last five years, 7,036 candidates have completed the assessment with an overall passing rate of 100%.

**Table 24: Cumulative first time and best attempt pass rates for CalAPA candidates by race/ethnicity**

Race/ Ethnicity	N Passed on First Attempt	% Passed on First Attempt	N Passed on Best Attempt	% Passed on Best Attempt
All	7095	98%	7210	100%
N/A	339	98%	344	99%
Black	488	97%	501	100%
Asian	397	99%	401	100%
SE Asian	244	99%	246	100%
Pac Islander	26	100%	26	100%
Hispanic	1952	98%	1994	100%
Native American	44	100%	44	100%
White	3358	98%	3402	100%
Other	247	98%	252	100%

Table 24 shows that different subgroups pass at very similar rates on both first attempt and best attempt.

**Table 25: CalAPA First Attempt Scores by Individual Rubric\***

Cycle 1 & Year	Rubric 1 (I)**	Rubric 2 (I)	Rubric 3 (I)	Rubric 4 (P)	Rubric 5 (P)	Rubric 6 (A)	Rubric 7 (A)	Rubric 8 (R)
C 1 2018-19	3.6	3.0	3.1	3.0	2.5	2.9	2.6	2.5
C 1 2019-20	3.2	2.8	3.0	3.0	2.8	3.0	2.5	2.4
C 1 2020-21	3.2	2.9	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.1	2.6	2.4
C 1 2021-22	3.0	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.7	2.9	2.4	2.4
C 1 2022-23	2.9	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.6	2.8	2.3	2.3

\*\*CalAPA Steps: (I) = Investigate, (P) = Plan, (A) = Act, (R) = Reflect

Cycle 2 & Year	Rubric 1 (I)	Rubric 2 (I)	Rubric 3 (P)	Rubric 4 (P)	Rubric 5 (A)	Rubric 6 (A)	Rubric 7 (R)
C 2 2018-19	2.9	2.5	2.6	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.8
C 2 2019-20	3.0	2.6	2.4	2.7	2.8	2.5	2.6
C 2 2020-21	3.1	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.6	2.2
C 2 2021-22	3.1	2.9	2.3	2.8	3.1	2.7	2.2
C 2 2022-23	3.0	2.8	2.3	2.6	2.8	2.6	2.1

Cycle 3 & Year	Rubric 1 (I)	Rubric 2 (P)	Rubric 3 (A)	Rubric 4 (A)	Rubric 5 (A)	Rubric 6 (R)	Rubric 7 (R)
C 3 2018-19	3.1	2.9	2.9	3.1	2.7	2.8	2.7
C 3 2019-20	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.7
C 3 2020-21	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.9	2.6
C 3 2021-22	2.8	2.7	3.0	2.8	2.4	2.5	2.4
C 3 2022-23	2.6	2.7	3.0	2.6	2.3	2.5	2.5

\*Rubric descriptions are provided in [Appendix H](#).

Table 25 shows candidate score means by individual rubric. Mean rubric scores have remained relatively consistent from year to year for five years with scores at or near score level 3. None of the slight mean score differences between years are statistically significant.

Additional cycle level data tables are provided in [Appendix K](#) to provide additional context for the CalAPA.

### Part 3: Next Steps in the Development and Implementation of Performance Assessments

#### New CalTPA Development

In the past two years, staff have worked with appointed Design Teams and ES to develop additional credential and permit specific CalTPA versions. For the suite of Education Specialist credentials, credential specific experts are assisting staff to develop instructional cycles for DHH, VI, and ECSE. These education specialist performance assessments will be ready for implementation in the fall of 2025.

#### CalFTPA

Under the Preschool Development Grant Renewal (PDG-R) federal grant, staff and early childhood education experts have developed the Early Childhood Educator California Formative Teaching Performance Assessment (ECE CalFTPA). This locally administered and scored formative assessment will be ready for statewide use for the 2024-25 academic year. This fall, Commission staff are offering in-person professional development workshops in Sacramento, Oakland, and Los Angeles to help ECE faculty in both community colleges and four-year institutions become familiar with the assessment and best practices. CalFTPA workshops will continue to be offered this spring and in coming years online. All developed materials to support the CalFTPA will be available on the Commissions website in spring 2024. For information on the development of the ECE CalFTPA, please refer to [Appendix I](#).

## **Literacy Performance Assessment**

Commission staff are working with a Design Team of literacy experts to develop a Literacy Performance Assessment (LPA). Staff are working with the Design Team to revise the current version of the CalTPA, Cycle 2 for the Multiple Subject, Education Specialist (MMSN, ESN, DHH, VI, and ECSE), and the new PK-3 credential candidates, to measure specific literacy pedagogy as directed by Senate Bill (SB) 488, including the ELA/ELD standards and frameworks and the Dyslexia Guidelines. The LPA will be pilot tested in spring 2024, field tested in spring 2025, and will be ready for operational implementation July 1, 2025. The LPA may be used by all candidates regardless of which TPA is being implemented at their institution. For further information about the development of the LPA and the upcoming pilot test, including information regarding the application and selection process for the pilot test of the LPA, please see the [August 2023 Commission item](#).

The LPA Design Team met for the first time in March 2023 to begin development of the Literacy Performance Assessments for the Multiple Subject, Education Specialist, and PK-3 Preliminary Credentials for the Commission's model. Prior state statute did not require Single Subject candidates to take and pass RICA, and per SB 488, Single Subject candidates will not need to take the new Literacy Performance Assessment. Therefore, for all adopted performance assessment models, the Single Subject teaching performance assessment will continue to be administered as developed. A [transition plan for RICA](#) was adopted at the June 2023 Commission Meeting.

## **PK-3 CalTPA**

Candidates pursuing the new PK-3 credential will need to pass a TPA. Commission staff are working with ECE and content experts to develop a version appropriate for PK-3 candidates that is aligned to the newly adopted PK-3 TPEs. These candidates will take a revised version of the CalTPA cycle 1 focused on math and the PK-3 math TPEs, and the revised cycle 2 being developed by the Literacy Design Team.

## **CalTPA Education Specialist for DHH, VI, and ECSE**

A pilot study for the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing (DHH), and Visually Impaired (VI) performance assessments was conducted in the spring of 2022, and they will be field tested in 2025. For further information regarding the development of the ECSE, DHH and VI Education Specialist CalTPA, please see the Commission meeting item [Update on the Development of Education Specialist Teaching Performance Assessments for Lower Incidence Credential Areas](#) from December 2022.

## **Education Specialist TPAs and Literacy TPA (edTPA, FAST)**

SCALE (Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity), developers of the edTPA's education specialist teaching performance assessment was approved by the Commission at its [August 2022](#) meeting. An initial passing standard was approved by the Commission at its [October 2022](#) meeting, and a revised passing standard was adopted at the [June 2023](#) meeting.

Cal State Fresno's education specialist versions of the FAST (MMSN and ESN) were approved by the Commission at its [August 2022](#) meeting. They are completing a second standard setting

study and plan to submit a recommendation for the Commission to consider at its December 2023 meeting.

SCALE and Cal State Fresno are in communication with the Commission's Professional Services Division (PSD) to determine their next steps in regard to the requirements of SB 488 within their models. All TPA models for literacy instruction assessment will need to be adopted and approved by the Commission prior to July 1, 2025.

### **Administrative Services Performance Assessment (CalAPA)**

The Commission is scheduled to convene a study group to examine patterns and trends in candidate scoring and recommend possible program changes to clarify tasks and scoring on specific rubrics. This study group will consider ways to include a focus on inclusive practices and ensure that those who want to provide administrative services to Early Childhood settings are prepared. Additionally, Commission staff will reconvene the Passing Standard Scoring panel for the CalAPA spring of 2024 to make recommendations on future passing scores.

## **Part 4: Ideas for Improving the Performance Assessment System**

### **Performance Assessment Implementation Issues and Options for Discussion**

Five years of performance assessment implementation have provided Commission staff and education partners from edTPA and FAST the opportunity to study the structure and implementation of three comparable but different teaching performance assessments. Commission staff have also studied, learned, and adjusted as needed the administrative services performance assessment, particularly around the impact this assessment has had on program development given its focus on equitable leadership.

Each TPA model sponsor has followed the requirements set forth in the Commission's Performance Assessment Design Standards (PADS) to ensure that their performance assessments are valid and scored reliably. Over the last five years, model sponsors have developed expertise in how to support teacher preparation programs as the programs and faculty have, in turn, supported their teacher candidates. The pandemic years of 2019-20 and 2020-2021 brought new challenges as schools closed and/or moved to online learning for students, and clinical placement experiences were significantly impacted. While these years did provide specific challenges, teacher preparation programs, candidates, and model sponsors together were able to offer quality experiences, meet the TPEs, support candidates as they engaged in the TPA, and prepare candidates for the preliminary credential. The 2022-23 data shows an increase in the number of teachers entering programs and engaging in performance assessments.

Education Code section [44320.2](#) (d) calls on the Commission to examine and revise as necessary the accreditation system in order to provide "a strong assurance to teaching candidates that ongoing opportunities are available in each credential preparation program...for candidates to acquire the knowledge skills and abilities measured by the assessment system." Section (d) goes on to underscore the need for the Commission to ensure that the "aggregated results of the assessment for groups of candidates who have completed a credential program are used as

one source of information about the quality and effectiveness of that program.” (The full text of Education Code section 44320.2 is provided on pages 3-4 above).

Education Code section 44320.2(e) requires the Commission to ensure that all approved performance assessments:

- Align with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession;
- Are consistently applied to candidates in similar preparation programs;
- To the maximum extent feasible are ongoing and blended into the preparation program and produce the following benefits for credential candidates, sponsors of preparation programs and local educational agencies that employ program graduates:
  1. Provide formative assessment information during the preparation program for use by the candidate, instructors, and supervisors for the purpose of improving the teaching knowledge, skill, and ability of the candidate;
  2. Performance assessment results are reported so that they may serve as one basis for a recommendation by the program sponsor that the Commission award a teaching credential to a candidate who has successfully met the performance assessment standards; and
  3. The formative assessment information and the performance assessment results are reported so that they may serve as one basis for the individual induction plan of the new teacher pursuant to Section 44279.2.

In 2015, the Commission received a budget appropriation to update the original CalTPA system, develop the Commission’s first ever Administrator Performance Assessment, and conduct a comparability study focused on the three approved Teaching Performance Assessment models approved for use in California. A key goal of this investment was to increase reliability of scoring within TPAs, and, through the comparability study, determine whether each TPA met the expectations of statute (44320.2(e)) that each aligns with the CSTP and is consistently applied to candidates in similar preparation programs. Over the next three years, design teams were appointed to support development and redevelopment of these performance assessments, which had their launch in 2018-19. To meet the requirements of EC section 44320.2, the design work included the development of an online platform that would support centralized scoring for the CalTPA, mirroring the platform that was in place for the edTPA already. Along with the online platform a structured training system was developed to ensure that CalTPA assessors were prepared and calibrated to score CalTPAs accurately.

Now that teacher and administrator preparation programs are experienced with implementation and candidate level supports for embedded performance assessments, it is timely to take stock and consider the extent to which performance assessment implementation is achieving the goals set forth in statute for this key component of educator preparation. It is also important to take into consideration candidate and program level experiences with performance assessment and to consider needed adjustments or updates that support the goal of performance assessments as educative experiences for both candidates and preparation programs. Commission staff to propose the following ideas for Commission discussion and consideration that could address issues that have surfaced in implementation and strengthen the ways in which TPAs address the priorities established by the legislature for this work.



**Idea 1: Strengthen the use of performance data as one basis for a program to recommend a candidate for a preliminary teaching credential. (EC section 44320.2(e)(2))**

Statute calls for TPA scores to be one source of data that informs the decision to recommend a candidate for a credential. The Commission could allow programs to work closely with candidates who score within -1.0 Standard Error of Measure (SEM) of the established TPA passing standard to address areas of need identified by the rubric level data of the TPA. For these candidates, other measures such as clinical practice observations, information gathered from supervising teachers, course work assessments and assignments, and/or revised or redone TPAs that are rescored by faculty would factor into the program decision to recommend them for a preliminary credential.

If the program determines, based on these multiple measures, that a candidate who scored within -1 SEM should be recommended for a credential, the program would work with the candidate to develop an Individual Development Plan (IDP) that provides detailed performance information gained from the TPA score report and other measures to highlight areas for focus during induction. Programs are already responsible for working with candidates to develop an IDP at the end of their preliminary program to guide their individual induction experience, as called for in EC section 44320.2(e)(3). Induction programs would review the IDP with the new teacher to determine targeted supports to include in their Individual Learning Plan (ILP) supporting the candidate's progress toward earning their Clear Credential. Tying the outcomes of the TPA to ongoing supports during Induction builds a plan for a candidate's connected and continuous improvement from preliminary program experiences (TPEs) to their Induction experiences (CSTP).

If the Commission were to move forward with this idea, the Commission could consider whether and how to open this opportunity to candidates whose TPA submissions were centrally scored in prior years (i.e., 2018-2023) and fell into the -1.0 SEM band of the established passing standard.

Candidates who score below the -1.0 SEM of the established passing standard could receive program remediation as required in Program Standard 5 and be required to revise and/or redo the TPA and resubmit for centralized scoring.

**Idea 2: Strengthen Program Responsibility for Candidate Performance on TPAs**

EC section 44320.2(e) calls for the Commission to ensure, to the maximum feasible extent, that each performance assessment is ongoing and blended into the preparation program. The Commission's accreditation standards include expectations for the embedding of TPAs in programs, but this is an area of the Commission's implementation of statute that could be reviewed and possibly strengthened. EC sections 44320.2(d)(8) and (9) direct the Commission to examine the accreditation system to ensure that candidates have ongoing opportunities to learn, in each program, the knowledge, skills, and abilities (TPEs) measured by the TPA. These sections further require that the aggregated results of the assessments for groups of candidates be used as one source of information about the quality and effectiveness of the program. As the Commission's intense period of TPA development and implementation has unfolded over the last seven years, the accreditation system has taken initial steps to make TPA data available

to accreditation teams for use in program review. [Research](#) indicates that the level of program and faculty participation in TPA implementation and candidate support directly impacts candidate success with TPAs.

While the Commission's accreditation system includes the expectation that performance data is part of an institution's continuous improvement system, the Commission's standards, particularly [Common Standard 4](#) (continuous improvement) and teacher preparation Program [Standard 5](#) (supporting candidates in completing and passing a TPA) could be strengthened and clarified. Commission staff, in consultation with preparation program leaders, could develop a formal process for supporting programs with low TPA pass rates. The process could include building a program improvement plan to address the specific rubric level data that indicates low candidate performance.

### **Idea 3: Convene Performance Assessment Work Group**

Commission staff could convene a work group of education partners (e.g., teachers and administrators, mentor teachers, National Board Certified teachers, preparation program faculty from all segments, and performance assessment experts) to review the TPEs measured, structure (tasks and rubrics) and implementation of California's performance assessments. This group would also review best practices and challenges of implementation along with issues related to reliability in scoring complex sets of evidence of practice, including video evidence. The findings and recommendations of this work group would potentially inform state policy related to the quality and effectiveness of educator preparation in California.

### **Next Steps**

Based on Commission direction, staff will develop a future agenda item to further explore and refine the issues and data included in this item.

## Appendix A

### Information Regarding CalTPA and CalAPA Assessor Ethnicity Data

**Table 1: Number (N) of Assessors for MS, SS and WL CalTPA Cycles**

Program Year	N Multiple Subject Lead Assessors	N Multiple Subject Assessors	N Single Subject Lead Assessors	N Single Subject Assessors
2018-19	8	202	20	170
2019-20	8	145	18	104
2020-21	6	104	16	139
2021-22	6	258	15	265
2022-23	6	233	13	294

**Table 2: Number (N) of Assessors for Education Specialist CalTPA Cycles**

Program Year	N Lead Assessors	N Assessors
2022-23	8	64

**Table 3: CalTPA Assessor Pool Race/Ethnicity Distribution (MS/SS/WL/EdSp)**

Ethnicity - CalTPA	ES %	CA %	Difference
African American	7%	3.0%	4.00%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1%	0.5%	0.50%
Asian/Filipino	7%	7.8%	-0.80%
Hispanic or Latino	15%	23.5%	-8.50%
Pacific Islander	0%	0.3%	-0.30%
Two or More Races	3%	1.1%	1.90%
White	48%	57.7%	-9.70%
<b>Not Reported</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>5.2%</b>	<b>14.80%</b>

Tables 1 and 2 provide the number of assessors and leads for MS/SS/WL and EdSp CalTPA. Table 3 outlines the ethnicity distribution of the assessor pool for the 2022-23 Program Year (ES%). Assessor ethnicity data is self-reported by the educators applying to become assessors. For context, the ethnicity distribution of [CA Full-Time Equivalent Teachers](#) (CA%) is provided. Differences observed between ES% and CA% are 4% or below for all ethnicities, except for Hispanic or Latino (-8.50%) and White (-9.70%). The ethnicity distribution of the assessor pool generally aligns well with the ethnicity distribution of CA Full-Time Equivalent Teachers.

**Table 4: CalAPA Assessor Pool Race/Ethnicity Distribution**

Ethnicity - CalAPA	ES %	CA %	Difference
African American	10%	3.0%	7.00%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1%	0.5%	0.50%
Asian/Filipino	4%	7.8%	-3.80%
Hispanic or Latino	16%	23.5%	-7.50%

<b>Ethnicity - CalAPA</b>	<b>ES %</b>	<b>CA %</b>	<b>Difference</b>
Pacific Islander	0%	0.3%	-0.30%
Two or More Races	3%	1.1%	1.90%
White	50%	57.7%	-7.70%
<b>Not Reported</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>5.2%</b>	<b>10.80%</b>

## Appendix B

### Rubric Essential Questions

**Figure 1: CalTPA Cycle 1 Rubric Essential Questions**

<b>Step 1: Plan</b>	
<b>Rubric 1.1</b>	How does the candidate’s proposed learning goal(s) connect with students’ prior knowledge? How do proposed learning activities, instructional strategies, and grouping strategies support, engage, and challenge all students to meet the learning goal(s)?
<b>Rubric 1.2</b>	How does the candidate plan instruction using knowledge of FS1’s (student with a different language learning need) assets and learning needs to support meaningful engagement with the content-specific learning goal(s)?
<b>Rubric 1.3</b>	How does the candidate plan instruction using knowledge of FS2’s assets, learning needs, and IEP/504/GATE goals/plans to support meaningful engagement with the content-specific learning goal(s)?
<b>Rubric 1.4</b>	How does the candidate plan instruction using knowledge of FS3’s assets and learning needs to support meaningful engagement with the content-specific learning goal(s) and address the student’s well-being by creating a safe and positive learning environment during or outside of the lesson?
<b>Step 2: Teach &amp; Assess</b>	
<b>Rubric 1.5</b>	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)? How does the candidate support students in making connections between prior learning and the current lesson and establish clear learning expectations?
<b>Rubric 1.6</b>	How does the candidate actively engage students in deep learning of content, monitor/informally assess their understanding, and explain to students next steps for learning?
<b>Step 3: Reflect</b>	
<b>Rubric 1.7</b>	How does the candidate reflect on (citing evidence from Steps 1 and/or 2) the impact of their asset- and needs-based lesson planning, teaching, and informal assessment of student learning and analyze how effective the lesson was in supporting the whole class and the 3 focus students in meeting the content-specific learning goal(s)?
<b>Step 4: Apply</b>	
<b>Rubric 1.8</b>	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 academic language development and determine next steps for instruction?

## Appendix C

### Rubric Essential Questions

**Figure 2: CalTPA Cycle 2 Rubric Essential Questions**

<b>Step 1: Plan</b>	
Rubric 2.1	How does the candidate’s learning segment plan provide appropriate content-specific learning goal(s) and, if appropriate, ELD goal(s), assessments, and rubrics that offer multiple ways for all students to demonstrate knowledge and affirm and validate students’ assets, including strengths, experiences, and backgrounds?
Rubric 2.2	How does the candidate plan a learning segment in which assessments and rubrics, instructional strategies, and lessons align and build on one another to provide a progression of learning that develops the students’ concepts and skills to achieve the standards-based learning goal(s)?
<b>Step 2: Teach &amp; Assess</b>	
Rubric 2.3	How does the candidate support student development and demonstration of academic language in relation to the content-specific learning goal(s)?
Rubric 2.4	How does the candidate incorporate educational technology (digital/virtual tools and resources) to provide opportunities for students to use these tools and resources to enhance, improve, and/or demonstrate knowledge, skills, and/or abilities related to the learning goal(s)?
Rubric 2.5	How does the candidate use informal assessment to monitor and support the students’ deep learning of content (age and/or developmentally appropriate higher-order thinking skills) and adjust instruction to meet the needs of learners?
Rubric 2.6	How does the candidate model and engage the students in self-assessment to build their awareness of what they have learned, provide feedback, and support their progress toward meeting content-specific learning goal(s) and ELD goal(s), if appropriate?
Rubric 2.7	How does the candidate use results of informal assessments and/or student self-assessment to provide actionable feedback to students about how to improve or revise their work to continue progress toward and/or beyond the learning goal(s)?
<b>Step 3: Reflect</b>	
Rubric 2.8	How does the candidate analyze the formal assessment results based on the rubric and identify and describe learning patterns and/or trends for the students and determine what was most and least effective in relation to the learning goal(s)?
<b>Step 4: Apply</b>	
Rubric 2.9	How does the candidate use the analysis of results from informal assessment, student self-assessment, and formal assessment to plan and teach a follow-up learning activity and provide a rationale for the activity choice, citing evidence?

## Appendix D

**Figure. 3: Education Specialist CalTPA MMSN/ESN Cycle 1 Essential Questions**

<b>Step 1: Plan</b>	
<b>Rubric 1.1</b>	How does the candidate’s proposed grade-level appropriate content-specific learning goal(s) of the lesson connect with prior knowledge and define specific outcomes for students? Based on UDL principles, how do proposed content-specific learning activities, instructional and grouping strategies, and facilitation of instructional support personnel support, engage, and/or challenge all students to meet the content-specific learning goal(s) of the lesson?
<b>Rubric 1.2</b>	How does the candidate use UDL principles to plan instruction using knowledge of FS1’s assets and learning needs to support meaningful engagement with the content-specific learning goal(s) of the lesson and ELD goal(s)?
<b>Rubric 1.3</b>	How does the candidate use UDL principles to plan instruction using knowledge of FS2’s assets and learning needs to support meaningful engagement with the content-specific learning goal(s) of the lesson and, if appropriate, ELD goal(s)?
<b>Rubric 1.4</b>	How does the candidate plan to use UDL principles in instruction using knowledge of FS3’s assets and learning needs to support meaningful engagement with the content-specific learning goal(s) of the lesson and, if appropriate, ELD goal(s) and address the student’s well-being by creating a safe and positive learning environment during or outside of the lesson?
<b>Step 2: Teach &amp; Assess</b>	
<b>Rubric 1.5</b>	How does the candidate maintain a positive and safe learning environment that supports the student(s) to access and meet the content-specific learning goal(s) of the lesson and ELD goal(s)? How does the candidate support the student(s) in making connections between prior content learning and the current lesson and establish clear learning expectations?
<b>Rubric 1.6</b>	How does the candidate actively engage the student(s) in higher order thinking, monitor/informally assess their understanding, and explain to the student(s) next steps for content learning and/or skills?
<b>Step 3: Reflect</b>	
<b>Rubric 1.7</b>	How does the candidate reflect on (citing evidence from Steps 1 and/or 2) the impact of their asset- and needs-based lesson planning, teaching, and informal assessment of student learning and instructional support personnel to analyze how effective the lesson was in supporting the students and/or the 3 focus students in meeting the grade-level content-specific learning goal(s) and ELD goal(s) and creating a language-rich environment?
<b>Step 4 Apply</b>	

<b>Rubric 1.8</b>	How will the candidate apply what they have learned about UDL principles in Cycle 1 (citing evidence from Steps 1, 2, and/or 3) about students' learning to strengthen and extend students' understanding of content, higher-order thinking, and academic language development to determine next steps for instruction, including collaboration with and/or facilitation of instructional support personnel?
-------------------	--



## Appendix E

**Figure 4: Education Specialist CalTPA MMSN/ESN Cycle 2 Essential Questions**

<b>Step 1: Plan</b>	
Rubric 2.1	How does the candidate’s learning segment plan provide grade-level appropriate content-specific learning goal(s) and ELD goal(s), if appropriate, assessments, rubrics, and facilitation of instructional support personnel that offer multiple ways for all students to demonstrate knowledge and affirm and validate students’ assets, including strengths, experiences, and backgrounds?
Rubric 2.2	How does the candidate plan a learning segment in which assessments and rubrics, instructional strategies, and lessons align and build on one another to provide a progression of learning that develops the students’ concepts and skills to achieve the standards-based learning goal(s)?
<b>Step 2: Teach &amp; Assess</b>	
Rubric 2.3	How does the candidate support student development and demonstration of academic language in relation to the content-specific learning goal(s)?
Rubric 2.4	How does the candidate incorporate educational technology (digital/virtual tools and resources) to provide opportunities for students to use these tools and resources to enhance, improve, and/or demonstrate knowledge, skills, and/or abilities related to the learning goal(s)?
Rubric 2.5	How does the candidate use informal assessment to monitor the students’ deep learning of content (age and/or developmentally appropriate higher-order thinking skills) and adjust instruction to meet the needs of all learners?
Rubric 2.6	How does the candidate model and engage the students in self-assessment to build their awareness of what they have learned, provide feedback, and support their progress toward meeting grade-level content-specific learning goal(s) and ELD goal(s), if appropriate?
Rubric 2.7	How does the candidate use results of informal assessments and/or student self-assessment to provide feedback to the students about how to improve or revise their work to continue progress toward and/or beyond the learning goal(s)? How does the candidate facilitate instructional support personnel to assist students to access content during the lesson and/or engage with informal and/or student self-assessments?
<b>Step 3: Reflect</b>	
Rubric 2.8	How does the candidate analyze the formal assessment results based on the rubric and identify and describe learning patterns and/or trends for the students and determine what was most and least effective about their instructional approach in relation to the grade-level content-specific learning goal(s)? How does the candidate provide feedback to families and/or guardians for the students to support caregivers in understanding the assessment results and the role they will play in supporting student learning beyond the classroom?
<b>Step 4: Apply</b>	
Rubric 2.9	How does the candidate use the analysis of results from informal assessment, student self-assessment, and formal assessment to plan and teach a follow-up learning activity and provide a rationale for the activity choice, citing evidence?

## Appendix F

**Figure 5: edTPA Rubric Essential Questions**

<b>Task 1: Planning</b>	
Rubric 1	How do the candidate's plans build students' understanding of an essential literacy strategy for comprehending OR composing text and the skills that support that strategy?
Rubric 2	How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to target support for students' literacy learning?
Rubric 3	How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to justify instructional plans?
Rubric 4	How does the candidate identify and support language demands associated with a key literacy learning task?
Rubric 5	How are the formal and informal assessments selected or designed to monitor students' use of the essential literacy strategy to comprehend OR compose text and related skills?
<b>Task 2: Instruction</b>	
Rubric 6	How does the candidate demonstrate a positive literacy learning environment that supports students' engagement in learning?
Rubric 7	How does the candidate actively engage students in integrating strategies and skills to comprehend OR compose text?
Rubric 8	How does the candidate elicit student responses to promote thinking and apply the essential literacy strategy AND related skills to comprehend OR compose text?
Rubric 9	How does the candidate support students to learn, practice, and apply the essential literacy strategy for comprehending OR composing text in a meaningful context?
Rubric 10	How does the candidate use evidence to evaluate and change teaching practice to meet students' varied learning needs?
<b>Task 3: Assessment</b>	
Rubric 11	How does the candidate analyze evidence of student learning related to the essential literacy strategy and related skills?
Rubric 12	What type of feedback does the candidate provide to focus students?
Rubric 13	How does the candidate support focus students to understand and use the feedback to guide their further learning?
Rubric 14	How does the candidate analyze students' use of language to develop content understanding?
Rubric 15	How does the candidate use the analysis of what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction?
<b>Task 4: Elementary Education Handbooks Only</b>	
Rubric 16	How does the candidate analyze whole class evidence to identify patterns of student learning?
Rubric 17	How does the candidate use student work to analyze mathematical errors, confusions, and partial understandings?
Rubric 18	How does the candidate examine the re-engagement lesson to further student learning?

## Appendix G

**Figure 6: FAST Site Visitation Performance Rubric Descriptions of Level 2 “Meets Expectations”**

Planning	<p><b>Pedagogy:</b> The lesson plan includes content and related activities or consistent with current subject-specific pedagogy and standards, that support the acquisition or use of academic language.</p> <p><b>Applying Knowledge:</b> Information about students, gathered by the candidate, provides useful information for planning...candidate plans appropriate activities or strategies to promote access to the content.</p> <p><b>Student Engagement:</b> Candidate’s plan for engaging students is appropriate to the grade level.</p>
Implementation	<p><b>Pedagogy:</b> Candidate effectively implements instruction consistent with subject-specific pedagogy to teach the identified academic content standard(s). Instruction supports the acquisition or use of academic language appropriate for students at this grade level.</p> <p><b>Applying Knowledge:</b> Candidate uses knowledge of the learning needs, backgrounds or interests of students to keep them on task.</p> <p><b>Student Engagement:</b> Candidate uses primarily management techniques to promote and monitor participation by students in the learning activities. Candidate expresses and reinforces expectations for social or academic behavior. Candidate models generally positive interactions.</p>
Reflection	<p><b>Pedagogy:</b> Candidate realistically describes strengths and weaknesses of lesson. Provides general justification for how the activity or strategy in the selected video clip represents subject- specific pedagogy. Demonstrates a realistic understanding of the relationship between content knowledge and planning or teaching.</p> <p><b>Applying Knowledge:</b> Candidate realistically describes how the lesson promotes access to the content for the focus student, using evidence of participation. Provides appropriate suggestions to improve access to content for students, in general.</p> <p><b>Student Engagement:</b> Candidate provides general examples of interactions from the lesson. Realistically describes how these interactions promote productive student learning, multiple perspectives, or equitable participation.</p>

**Figure 7: FAST Teaching Sample Project Performance Rubric Descriptions of Level 2 “Meets Expectations”**

Students in Context	<p><b>Implications for Instruction:</b> Descriptions of instructional approaches are generally appropriate for at least two of the following student groups: different levels of English proficiency, identified special needs, and different instructional needs.</p> <p><b>Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments:</b> Expectations for, and responses to, behavior include general examples related to at least two of the following: individual responsibility, intolerance, an inclusive climate. Routines focus on management, with a general description of how they were communicated to students.</p>
---------------------	---

Learning Outcomes	<p><b>Learning Outcomes and Standards:</b> Outcomes primarily address either content or literacy standards. Most outcomes represent the content and level of learning (e.g. DOK level) reflected in the content standards, though they primarily focus on lower levels of learning.</p> <p><b>Appropriateness For Students:</b> Description of unit and rationale provide general justification for development of either content knowledge or literacy skills, and past experiences, pre-requisite knowledge, or future learning, relevance for students at that grade level.</p>
Assessment Plan	<p><b>Congruence with Learning Outcomes and Content:</b> Most assessment methods are congruent with learning outcomes in either content or level of learning. Attention to assessment of content knowledge or literacy skills.</p> <p><b>Variety in Methods of Assessment:</b> The assessment plan assesses student knowledge or performance before, during, and after instruction, with <u>some variety</u> in the assessment methods.</p> <p><b>Clarity of Assessment Methods:</b> Prompts, directions, scoring procedures, and criteria for meeting learning outcomes are given for most assessment methods. Candidate describes how the format of the assessments match the learning outcomes and the purpose of assessing</p>
Design for Instruction	<p><b>Use of Contextual Information and Data to Inform Instruction:</b> Lessons show some attention to pre- assessment results and contextual factors. Lessons provide access to content <u>or</u> develop literacy skills for at least two of the following: identified special needs, different levels of English language proficiency, and different instructional needs.</p> <p><b>Alignment with Learning Outcomes &amp; Standards:</b> Lessons are aligned with unit learning outcomes and are consistent with current subject-specific pedagogy in the content area of instruction or literacy skills.</p> <p><b>Variety in Instruction:</b> A variety of instructional methods and engagement strategies. Appropriate use of technology to engage students or promote access to content, though primarily used by teacher.</p>
Instructional Decision-Making	<p><b>Monitoring Student Learning:</b> Evidence of monitoring students during instruction is implied or general. Focus is primarily on behavior or lesson structure rather than student learning</p> <p><b>Adjustments Based on Knowledge of Student Learning and Providing Access to Curriculum:</b> Some adjustments of the instructional plan are made to address general student needs, with some connections to knowledge of student learning or providing access to curriculum.</p> <p><b>Alignment Between Adjustments and Learning Outcomes:</b> Adjustments to instruction are generally aligned with learning outcomes. Reasons for adjustments address efforts to improve student progress.</p>
Analysis of Student Learning	<p><b>Analysis and Interpretation of Data:</b> Analysis and interpretation of data provides some evidence of the number of students meeting at least one of the learning outcomes, is generally accurate, with some supporting evidence, and describes how the data/scores reflect learning related to at least one of the learning outcomes.</p> <p><b>Progress Report:</b> Progress report for student who struggled that uses some data or examples to describe strengths or areas for growth related to one of</p>

	the unit outcomes and provides general suggestions for improving student learning.
Reflection and Self-Evaluation	<p><b>Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment:</b> Describes effective instructional activities for at least two of these categories: a range of English proficiency, students with identified special learning needs, or students with different learning needs. Identifies the alignment between assessments and learning outcomes. Describes subject matter knowledge related to this unit.</p> <p><b>Implications for Future Teaching:</b> Provides appropriate suggestions for redesigning learning outcomes, instruction, or assessment.</p> <p><b>Implications for Professional Development:</b> Presents a reasonable professional learning goal connected to teaching in general. Appropriate steps described in general terms.</p>

## Appendix H

**Figure 8: CalAPA Leadership Cycle 1 Rubric Essential Questions**

Rubric 1.1	Based on the chosen California state indicator, how does the candidate select and analyze quantitative data sources across the three most recent years, identify patterns and/or trends related to equity, choose one student group, and relate their analysis to the school’s vision, mission, and/or goals?
Rubric 1.2	How does the candidate collect and analyze relevant qualitative data and explain their relation to quantitative data findings and the student group equity issues?
Rubric 1.3	How does the candidate conduct an equity gap analysis based on the chosen California state indicator to inform their understanding of the equity issues for a student group?
Rubric 1.4	How does the candidate determine contributing factors, including institutional and/or structural factors, that created or added to the identified equity gap affecting a student group and cite the research supporting their determination?
Rubric 1.5	How does the candidate use the equity gap analysis and identification of potential contributing factors to develop a feasible problem statement related to student achievement and/or well-being?
Rubric 1.6	Are the strategies proposed for equitable school improvement for the student group well informed by the findings of the equity gap analysis, including contributing factors, and responsive to the problem statement? Are proposed strategies aligned to the school’s vision, mission, and/or goals?
Rubric 1.7	How does the candidate apply the feedback received from a key stakeholder(s) familiar with the school culture and context and describe next steps for creating stakeholder buy-in and potential implications for the adjusted set of strategies?
Rubric 1.8	How does the candidate reflect on and analyze what they have learned about equity-driven leadership in Cycle 1 (citing from Steps 1, 2, and/or 3) and how, based on the school contexts, they might address a single equity gap for a group of students at the school? How does the candidate use this learning to identify strengths and areas for leadership growth?

**Figure 9: CalAPA Leadership Cycle 2 Rubric Essential Questions**

Rubric 2.1	How does the candidate describe and analyze the role of current practices of professional collaboration at the school as the current practices relate to student learning and/or well-being?
Rubric 2.2	How does the candidate select an area of educational focus based on student data and choose a group of educators to participate in a community of practice about student learning and/or well-being that corresponds to the school’s vision, mission, and/or goals?
Rubric 2.3	Based on the agreed-upon area of educational focus, how does the candidate collaboratively work with the group to select a problem of practice (how practitioners may improve instructional practice or the system) related to student learning and/or well-being and build group ownership?
Rubric 2.4	How does the candidate explain the collaborative process used to select the relevant evidence-based strategy and work with the group to learn about and monitor implementation of that strategy to address the selected problem of

	practice? How does the candidate describe the potential impact on student learning and/or well-being?
Rubric 2.5	How does the candidate co-facilitate group learning—including establishing, reviewing, and using norms; documenting decisions; facilitating a collaborative process (group consensus, feedback, and progress); supporting diverse viewpoints; maintaining group focus and energy; and jointly determining next steps?
Rubric 2.6	How does the candidate demonstrate leadership as they co-facilitate group meetings and support members, individually and as a group, in learning to implement the evidence-based strategy and use initial results and feedback from members to help inform the learning process?
Rubric 2.7	How does the candidate use initial implementation results and feedback from the group—citing evidence from any of the four steps—to analyze their leadership skills and practices in order to identify areas for growth and identify next steps for equitably co-facilitating a community of practice?

**Figure 10: CalAPA Leadership Cycle 3 Rubric Essential Questions**

Rubric 3.1	How does the candidate describe and analyze the current role of teacher coaching, observation, and/or instructional feedback practices at the school, and explain the implications for their approach to conducting a coaching cycle?
Rubric 3.2	How does the candidate listen to and talk with the volunteer teacher to understand the learning goals, classroom context, and student assets and learning needs; jointly select with the volunteer teacher one or two CSTP elements, including evidence to be collected; and plan for the observation?
Rubric 3.3	How does the candidate recognize and document qualities of teaching practice related to the selected CSTP element(s) and learning goals of the lesson?
Rubric 3.4	How does the candidate foster a learning conversation in a post-observation meeting using CSTP-focused observation evidence, lesson observation video, and student work with the volunteer teacher regarding strengths and area(s) for growth?
Rubric 3.5	In partnership with the volunteer teacher, how does the candidate co-determine next steps for professional development, including resources and additional coaching support based on the CSTP-related evidence during the post-observation meeting?
Rubric 3.6	How does the candidate analyze their capacity to conduct a CSTP-focused coaching and observation process, based on their experience and feedback from the volunteer teacher, and cite evidence to demonstrate their ability to facilitate and maintain a coaching partnership?
Rubric 3.7	How does the candidate, informed by a continuous improvement mindset and focus on equitable leadership, understand the potential impact of coaching and reflect on benefits to both teachers and students?

## **Appendix I**

### **ECE CalFTP A Overview**

The ECE CalFTP A has been developed as a component of the emerging Child Development Permit system and serves as the means for candidates to demonstrate they have made sufficient progress towards mastering the TPEs for their job role and are ready for state licensure. The CalFTP A was developed under the PDG-R grant with input and advice from the Early Childhood Education Design Team (ECEDT) appointed by the Commission’s Executive Director in February 2021. Commission staff and the ECEDT began development work in March 2021 and will hold its final meeting after the completion of the assessment field test in December 2023. The CalFTP A measures the current, priority ECE CDP teacher level TPEs and is aligned to the California Department of Education’s Preschool Learning Foundations and Early Childhood frameworks.

#### **Three CalFTP A Learning Cycles**

The ECE CalFTP A consists of three, inquiry based, formative assessment learning cycles that allow ECE candidates to demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and abilities (TPEs) in authentic practice with 3-5-year-old children. Each learning cycle moves through a four-step sequence of pedagogical tasks. Together, these learning cycles and the related three-point analytic rubrics provide the opportunity for ECE students to demonstrate their ability to support and teach young learners. The qualitative rubric descriptions provide direction for faculty to guide new teacher development.

#### **Learning Cycle 1: Observing Young Children**

ECE candidates observe one child from a larger class group and move through the sequence of **plan, observe and record, reflect, and apply**. Candidates observe the child in two play-based activities, interpret their recorded notes with consultation from their supervising teacher, reflect on their notes and interpretations, and apply their knowledge of the child to plan an appropriate next learning activity. Learning Cycle 1 is assessed with 5 rubrics.

#### **Learning Cycle 2: Planning Learning Activities**

ECE candidates develop an engaging and asset-based learning activity and move through the sequence of **observe and plan, teach and assess, reflect, and apply**. In collaboration with mentor teachers, candidates plan an activity based on their observations and knowledge of the children in the group. They select one focus child and provide accommodations to support the child’s learning. The focus child can be an English learner, a child with an IEP or other learning need, or a child for whom learning has been impacted by their experiences in or outside of school. Candidates video record themselves teaching and monitoring the play-based activity with children. They reflect on how they monitored children’s understanding and made appropriate in-the-moment adjustments to support learning. Finally, ECE candidates reflect on the children’s experience and their own teaching and apply what they learned to the next activity. Learning Cycle 2 is assessed with 8 rubrics.

#### **Learning Cycle 3: Building Family/Guardian Partnerships**

ECE candidates plan communications and build relationships with families/guardians to support children’s learning outside school by moving through the sequence of **observe and plan, design and connect, reflect, and apply**. Candidates observe a child in an in-school activity and connect



with the child's family/guardian to discuss the child's learning in the activity. They design an out- of-school activity and connect with the family/guardian to explain the activity. Candidates gather information from the family/guardian about how the child experienced the out-of-school activity, reflect on the effectiveness of their family/guardian connections and apply what they learned to determine next steps for further connections and the focus child's learning. Learning Cycle 3 is assessed with 8 rubrics.

## Appendix J

### CalTPA Cycle Level Data

**Table 1: Number of MS/SS/WL Candidates Who Submitted Both Cycles but Have Not Yet Passed By Year First Submitted**

Program Year	N submitted but not yet passed	% of Total N Submitting Both Cycles
Y1: 2018-19	14	.3%
Y2: 2019-20	60	1.4%
Y3: 2020-21	47	1.5%
Y4: 2021-22	97	1.9%
Y5: 2022-23	369	5.3%

Table 1 provides context regarding the number of candidates who submitted both CalTPA cycles but have not yet passed, indicating the number of candidates who were not able to earn a preliminary credential. It is expected that the number of candidates for 2022-23 will decrease as most candidates resubmit revised cycles or submit new cycles that they did not pass.

**Table 2: The Number of MS/SS/WL Candidates by Year Who Submitted One Cycle but Not Yet Submitted the Other Cycle**

Program Year	N of Candidates Submitting C1 but not C2	N of Candidates Submitting C2 but not C1
Y1: 2018-19*	186	39
Y2: 2019-20	271	38
Y3: 2020-21	261	24
Y4: 2021-22	592	32
Y5: 2022-23	1976	81

Table 2 provides further context by identifying the number of candidates who have only submitted one cycle. The higher number of candidates in 2022-23 is likely due at least in part to candidates who are enrolled in preparation programs that last longer than one year, and it is expected that most will submit the other cycle during the current academic year.

**Table 3a: Number of Candidates Who Passed Cycle 1 on First Attempt, Second Attempt, Third Or Higher Attempt, and Have Not Yet Passed**

Program Year	Passed on First Attempt	Passed on Second Attempt	Passed on Third Attempt	Total Passed	Not Yet Passed
Y1: 2018-19*	5679	66	2	5747	19
Y2: 2019-20	3757	482	92	4331	139
Y3: 2020-21	3095	387	51	3533	146
Y4: 2021-22	4769	876	159	5804	333
Y5: 2022-23	5131	981	326	6438	648

\*Lower passing standard established to support candidates and programs in the first year of administration.

**Table 3b: Number of Candidates Who Passed Cycle 2 on First Attempt, Second Attempt, Third Or Higher Attempt, and Have Not Yet Passed**

<b>Program Year</b>	<b>Passed on First Attempt</b>	<b>Passed on Second Attempt</b>	<b>Passed on Third Attempt</b>	<b>Total Passed</b>	<b>Not Yet Passed</b>
Y1: 2018-19*	4334	33	4	4371	12
Y2: 2019-20	4046	208	25	4279	43
Y3: 2020-21	2876	173	28	3077	31
Y4: 2021-22	4661	423	83	5167	92
Y5: 2022-23	5914	601	132	6647	250

\*Lower passing standard established to support candidates and programs in the first year of administration.

Tables 3a and 3b provide information on how many candidates need more than one attempt to pass Cycle 1 and Cycle 2. The ability of candidates to resubmit until they pass is one reason for the high best attempt pass rates reported in the body of this item.

## Appendix K CalAPA Cycle Level Data

**Table 1: Number of Candidates Who Submitted All Three Cycles but Have Not Yet Passed By Year First Submitted**

Program Year	N first submitted but not yet passed
Y1: 2019-20	2
Y2: 2020-21	2
Y3: 2021-22	2
Y4: 2022-23	8

Table 1 shows the number of candidates who submitted all three cycles of the CalAPA but have not yet passed. For the first three years, there were two candidates each year who have not passed. The number is higher for last year, but that may decrease if candidates revise and resubmit one or more cycles.

**Table 2a: The Number of Candidates Who Passed Cycle 1 on First Attempt, Second Attempt, Third or Higher, and Not Yet Passed**

Program Year	Passed on First Attempt	Passed on Second Attempt	Passed on Third Attempt	Not Yet Passed
Y1: 2019-20	1565	n/a	n/a	n/a
Y2: 2020-21	2258	5	n/a	8
Y3: 2021-22	1669	10	1	10
Y4: 2022-23	1667	20	3	21

**Table 2b: The Number of Candidates Who Passed Cycle 2 on First Attempt, Second Attempt, Third or Higher, and Not Yet Passed**

Program Year	Passed on First Attempt	Passed on Second Attempt	Passed on Third Attempt	Not Yet Passed
Y1: 2019-20	1134	n/a	n/a	n/a
Y2: 2020-21	1676	2	n/a	2
Y3: 2021-22	1614	8	n/a	1
Y4: 2022-23	1474	9	n/a	2

**Table 2c: The Number of Candidates Who Passed Cycle 3 on First Attempt, Second Attempt, Third or Higher, and Not Yet Passed**

Program Year	Passed on First Attempt	Passed on Second Attempt	Passed on Third Attempt	Not Yet Passed
Y1: 2019-20	1173	n/a	n/a	n/a
Y2: 2020-21	1700	n/a	n/a	1
Y3: 2021-22	1614	2	n/a	1
Y4: 2022-23	1565	5	n/a	n/a

Tables 2a-c provide additional information on the number of candidates who needed more than one attempt to pass each cycle of the CalAPA.