4F

Information/Action

Educator Preparation Committee

Update on the Teaching Performance Assessment: A Report from the Learning Policy Institute and Further Information Regarding Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment Requirement

Executive Summary: At the April 2024 meeting, while discussing Agenda item 5A, Commissioners posed several questions regarding implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment requirement. This agenda item provides further information in response to these questions for Commissioner consideration and discussion. In addition, the Learning Policy Institute (LPI) recently published a report entitled *How Preparation Predicts Teaching Performance Assessment Results in California,* providing additional information and data concerning TPAs, their implementation and outcomes across the variety of preparation program types and candidate pathways. Subsequent to the Commission meeting further amendments to the proposed SB 1263 legislation were added which would, in addition to eliminating the TPA requirement, also remove the requirement for a reading instruction competence assessment (RICA and Literacy Performance Assessment). This agenda item discusses these issues, includes a presentation by the Learning Policy Institute on their findings, and provides additional available data as requested for the Commission's further information.

Recommended Action: Staff recommends that the Commission discuss this information and provide any direction to staff as it may deem appropriate.

Presenters: Amy Reising, Deputy Director, David DeGuire, Director, Professional Services Division, Tara Kini, Chief of Policy and Programs, and Susan Kemper Patrick, Senior Researcher, Learning Policy Institute.

Strategic Plan Goals

Continuous Improvement
- Goal 7**:** The Commission's work is grounded in research, informed by the voices of practitioners and communities of interests, and supports continuous improvement in educator preparation and licensure.

Update on the Teaching Performance Assessment: A Report from the Learning Policy Institute and Further Information Regarding Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment Requirement

Introduction

At the April 2024 meeting, while discussing Agenda item 5A, Commissioners posed several questions regarding implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment requirement. This agenda item provides further information in response to these questions for Commissioner consideration and discussion. In addition, the Learning Policy Institute (LPI) recently published a report entitled *How Preparation Predicts Teaching Performance Assessment Results in California,* providing additional information and data concerning TPAs, their implementation and outcomes across the variety of preparation program types and candidate pathways. Subsequent to the Commission meeting further amendments to the proposed SB 1263 legislation were added which would, in addition to eliminating the TPA requirement, also remove the requirement for a reading instruction competence assessment (RICA and Literacy Performance Assessment). This agenda item discusses these issues, provides additional available data as requested for the Commission's further information, and includes a presentation by the Learning Policy Institute on their findings.

Background

In December 2023, the Commission took action in Agenda item 2D to create a secondary passing score option[1] for candidates who score just below the Commission adopted passing standard. This option allows candidates to work with their preparation programs to demonstrate mastery of TPEs through other sources of evidence allowing programs to certify that these candidates have met the TPA requirement. Programs may then provide these candidates with a professional development plan during induction to ensure that candidates who fall into this group and who could become effective teachers are not lost from the profession.

Agenda item 5A at the April 2024 Commission meeting discussed proposed legislation, SB 1263 (Newman), which would have eliminated the Teaching Performance Assessment and the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment as requirements for all credentials that presently require passing these assessments. This bill was amended on June 17, 2024 to remove these provisions and instead requires the Commission to establish an expert panel of classroom teachers, teacher education faculty, and performance assessment experts to review current

---

[1] The secondary passing score option applies a negative one Standard Error of Measurement (-1 SEM) to a candidate's score to identify candidates who score just below the passing standard adopted by the Commission for each TPA.

implementation of the TPA requirement and identify areas for improvement by March 1, 2025. The Commission would be required to adopt a set of recommendations by July 1, 2025 and report updates on improvement efforts to the Legislature annually until October 2028. Agenda item 6A in the June 2024 Commission agenda includes an agenda insert with an updated analysis and recommendation for Commission action.

During the April 2024 meeting discussion of this agenda item, Commissioners commented on information provided in the recently released Learning Policy Institute report, *How Preparation Predicts Teaching Performance Assessment Results in California* (Kemper, S. K., 2024) which studied the relationship between preparation experiences and TPA success. The study found differences in candidate success on TPAs across programs and preparation experiences that relate to the level of support provided to candidates to practice their teaching and document skills relative to the TPEs measured by the TPAs and to receive focused feedback on their performance.

Also during the discussion, Commissioners expressed concern about the range of candidate experiences with TPAs as reported in a recent California Teachers Association (CTA) survey of their members, the level of current implementation of statute related to TPAs, and the impact of eliminating teaching performance assessments as a key indicator of candidate readiness to teach as well as of program quality and effectiveness. Commissioners directed staff to provide additional information at the June 2024 meeting regarding the following questions:

1. Are teacher preparation programs sufficiently preparing candidates to be successful on the TPA? Which programs are most successful in preparing candidates and which are least successful?
2. How many candidates pass the TPA within the normal span of their teacher preparation programs, and how many complete the TPA after they have completed their programs?
3. How are programs supporting candidates who did not pass the TPA on their first attempt, and how many are supporting candidates whose score fell within the -1 SEM?
4. How are the levers of accreditation being applied to look at whether preparation programs are serving their candidates sufficiently?

The discussion below presents information responsive to each question based on available Commission data, accreditation findings, and other related sources of information. In addition, Susan Kemper Patrick, a senior researcher with LPI and Tara Kini, LPI's Chief of Policy and Programs, will present the findings from their study and data analyses responsive to Commissioners' questions during the meeting to provide further relevant information and perspectives.

Part I: Commissioner Questions and Staff Responses
1. *Are teacher preparation programs sufficiently preparing candidates to be successful on the TPA? Which programs are most successful in preparing candidates and which are least successful?*
The following discussion provides recent candidate TPA passing rates to illustrate the degree to which candidates are currently being successful on the TPA. On the CalTPA, at least 90% of

current candidates pass the TPA on their best attempt; on the edTPA, approximately 85% of current candidates pass the edTPA. These data indicate that for candidates whose scores fell within or below the -1 SEM, these candidates may not be receiving the level of support they need to be successful on the performance assessment. The LPI report presented as part of this agenda item provides data concerning outcomes by sector and program pathway relating to program preparation to help candidates be successful on the TPA.

Candidate TPA Passing Rates
The following data tables show the passing rates on the CalTPA and on the edTPA for the current year (2023-24), covering the time period of August 1, 2023 to May 16, 2024. These data are presented first for all candidates, and then in Table 4 separately by program pathway. The Learning Policy Institute will provide their analyses regarding candidate pass rates on the CalTPA and the edTPA for the 2021-2023 during their presentation.

Tables 1 and 2 provide current year-to-date (2023-24) passing rates by two TPA models, CalTPA and edTPA, including how many candidates passed the assessment on their best attempt, how many fell within the secondary passing standard, and how many did not pass. As indicated in these tables, the secondary passing standard option for the TPAs allows more candidates to meet the TPA requirement during the 2023-24 academic year. Further discussion and information about the secondary passing standard are provided later in this agenda item.

Table 1: CalTPA Multiple and Single Subject (MS/SS) Candidate Pass Rates, August 1, 2023-May 16, 2024

CalTPA Cycle	Total Submissions Scored	Best Attempt Pass	% Pass	Candidates Within -1 SEM	% Within -1 SEM	Candidates Below -1 SEM	% Below -1 SEM
C1	6,738	5,934	88%	408	6%	396	6%
C2	4,941	4,405	89%	165	3%	371	8%
Mild to Moderate Support Needs							
C1	512	479	94%	4	1%	29	6%
C2	310	291	94%	0	0%	19	6%
Extensive Support Needs							
C1	226	211	93%	1	0%	14	6%
C2	114	108	95%	1	1%	5	4%

For Cycle 1, 6,738 MS/SS candidates submitted responses for scoring. Of these, 5,934, or 88%, passed on their best attempt (candidates may take more than one attempt) at the original passing standard of 19 points. Of these, 408 candidates, or 6%, had scores that fell within the secondary passing standard (-1 SEM) and may work with their preparation programs to identify additional evidence that they meet the TPEs and take the next step towards meeting the TPA requirement (i.e., take the next cycle of the performance assessment if not already passed). Three hundred ninety-six (396) candidates, or 6%, did not meet either the original or the secondary passing standard and will need to retake Cycle 1.

For Cycle 2, 4,941 candidates submitted responses for scoring. Of these, 4,405 candidates, or 89%, passed on their best attempt at the original passing standard of 21 points; 165 candidates, or 3%, had scores that fell within the secondary passing standard; and 371 candidates, or 8%, of the total 4,941, did not meet either the original or the secondary passing standard and will need to retake Cycle 2. Candidates taking the Commission's CalTPA model could have met the TPA requirement for either or both of Cycle 1 and Cycle 2 based on the secondary passing standard option.

Education Specialist candidates were only recently obligated to meet a TPA requirement for their preliminary credential as of the 2022-2023 academic year. Many Education Specialist programs are two years in length, and thus some candidates may be waiting to take the TPA in their second year in the program, or may split their CalTPA cycles over two academic years. A Program Sponsor Alert (PSA) was issued on February 9, 2024 regarding the implementation of the Education Specialist TPA and its passing standard.

A total of 393 Education Specialist Credential (MMSN and ESN) candidates, or approximately 94%, took and passed each Cycle of the CalTPA on their best attempt. Approximate 1% of candidates who took each Cycle of the CalTPA had scores that fell within the -1 SEM and these candidates could potentially use the secondary passing standard option. Approximately 6% of candidates did not meet either the original passing standard or the -1 SEM option. Additional scoring windows for the current academic year are expected to increase these numbers through July 2024. The annual performance assessment update to the Commission in October 2024 will provide updated and final counts for the 2023-2024 academic year.

Table 2 provides information for the edTPA.

Table 2: edTPA Candidate Pass Rates, August 1, 2023-May 16, 2024

	Total Submissions	Best Attempt Pass	% Pass	Candidates Within -1 SEM	% Within -1 SEM	Candidates Below -1 SEM	% Below -1 SEM
Multiple Subject	1750	1462	84%	71	4%	217	12%
Single Subject	1804	1489	83%	93	5%	222	12%
SPED	291	274	94%	3	1%	14	5%
World Languages	133	83	62%	14	11%	36	27%

A total of 1,750 Multiple Subject Credential candidates submitted responses for scoring between August 1, 2023-May 16, 2024. Of these, 1,462, or 84%, passed the edTPA on their best attempt (candidates may take more than one attempt) at the original passing standard of 49 points. Seventy-one (71) candidates (4%) had scores that fell within the -1 SEM and may work with their preparation programs to identify additional evidence that they meet the TPEs and take the next step towards meeting the TPA requirement. Two hundred seventeen (217)

candidates, or 12% of the total 1,750, did not meet either the original or the secondary passing standard and will need to retake the edTPA.

A total of 1,804 Single Subject Credential candidates submitted responses for scoring between August 1, 2023-May 16, 2024. Of these, 1,489, or 83%, passed the edTPA on their best attempt at the original passing standard of 41 points; 93 candidates, or 5%, had scores that fell within the -1 SEM; and 222 candidates, or 12% of the total 1,804, did not meet either the original or the secondary passing standard and will need to retake the edTPA.

A total of 291 Education Specialist Credential candidates submitted responses for scoring between August 1, 2023-May 16, 2024. Of these, 274, or 94%, passed the edTPA on their best attempt; 3 candidates, or 1%, had scores that fell within the -1 SEM; and 14 candidates, or 5% of the total 291, did not meet either the original or the secondary passing standard and will need to retake the edTPA.

For the World Languages Credential, a total of 133 candidates from August 1, 2023-May 16, 2024 submitted responses for scoring. Of these, 83, or 62%, passed the edTPA on their best attempt at the original passing standard of 35 points; 14 candidates, or 11%, had scores that fell within the -1 SEM; and 36 candidates, or 27% of the total 133, did not meet either the original or the secondary passing standard and will need to retake the edTPA.

In summary, during the period of August 1, 2023 and May 16, 2024, a total of 4,358 MS/SS candidates and 393 Education Specialist Candidates passed the CalTPA without using the secondary passing standard option (total of 4,751). A total of 3,252 candidates also passed the edTPA without using the secondary passing standard option during this. There were 760 candidates whose scores fell within the secondary passing standard across the CalTPA and edTPA models who may work with their preparation programs to provide additional evidence that they meet the applicable TPEs and move forward.

2. How many candidates pass the TPA within the normal span of their teacher preparation programs, and how many complete the TPA after they have completed their programs?
All preparation programs are structured to allow candidates to complete a TPA during the course of the program. However, a number of factors may impact whether candidates do in fact complete their program and TPA within the normal time span of the program. For instance, not all candidates attend full time and may complete their program and TPA over multiple semesters or years. The Commission does not currently have a system for tracking time to a credential, which makes this question difficult to answer definitively. The Learning Policy Institute will present data during the June 2024 Commission meeting on the number of attempts candidates made before finally passing a TPA.

Programs have a variety of ways to support candidates after they complete all other program requirements, however, in most cases, if a candidate does not complete the TPA and their score did not fall within the secondary passing standard, they would need to be affiliated with the program to ensure they get the support and supervision they need to complete the TPA in

an appropriate setting. As the secondary passing standard is further implemented by preparation programs and communicated to candidates, the need for retakes of the TPA by candidates who meet the secondary standard should be greatly reduced or eliminated. Candidates who fall outside of the secondary passing standard will still need to retake the TPA.

3. How are programs supporting candidates who did not pass the TPA on their first attempt, and how many are supporting candidates whose score fell within the -1 SEM?

Program standards include several requirements to assist struggling candidates who are not successful on the TPA (see additional information in the response to question 4 below). For example, MS/SS Program Standard 5B requires that the program "provides appropriate remediation support and guidance" as it relates to the TPA. Institutions do this in numerous ways such as providing additional one on one assistance or requiring attendance at additional tutoring or support sessions.

Distribution of Candidates Meeting the Secondary Passing Standard by Preparation Pathway
Tables 3 and 4 provide data on CalTPA (table 3) and edTPA (table 4) candidates scoring within -1 SEM for 2022-23 and for year-to-date 2023-34. The data are organized by preparation pathway. The percent of candidates meeting the secondary passing standard for Cycle 1 ranges from 3%-12% across all pathways, with the highest percentage being small ITEP programs. For Cycle 2, candidates scoring within the secondary passing standard range from 1%-4% across pathways, and for edTPA, between less than 1% and 13%, with the highest percent in the LEA Intern pathway.

Table 3: CalTPA Candidates Scoring within the Secondary Passing standard from 2022-24 by Preparation Pathway

Preparation Pathway	2022-23		2023-24[1]	
	Total Candidates	# within -1 SEM	Total Candidates	# within -1 SEM
CalTPA Cycle 1: Multiple and Single Subject				
LEA Intern	1227	80 (7%)	956	64 (7%)
ITEP			28	3 (12%)
Residency	340	12 (4%)	369	16 (4%)
IHE Intern	1166	34 (3%)	1085	64 (6%)
Student Teaching	4856	217 (4%)	4300	261 (6%)
CalTPA Cycle 2: Multiple and Single Subject				
LEA Intern	1154	23 (1%)	843	24 (3%)
ITEP			26	0
Residency	331	9 (3%)	269	9 (3%)
IHE Intern	1101	16 (1%)	786	26 (3%)
Student Teaching	4609	85 (2%)	3017	106 (4%)

CalTPA Cycle 1: Mild to Moderate Disabilities and Extensive Support Needs				
	2022-23		**2023-24**	
LEA Intern	218	2 (less than 1%)	285	2 (less than 1%)
ITEP	0	0	4	0
Residency	13	0	45	0
IHE Intern	68	3 (4%)	179	1 (less than 1%)
Student Teaching	61	0	225	2 (less than 1%)
CalTPA Cycle 2: Mild to Moderate Disabilities and Extensive Support Needs				
LEA Intern	37	0	197	1 (less than 1%)
ITEP	-	-	1	0
Residency	39	1 (3%)	20	0
IHE Intern	44	0	92	0
Student Teaching	100	0	114	0

[1] Data do not reflect the full year, only candidates submitting and receiving scores through May 16, 2024. Additional scoring windows will increase these numbers.

Table 4: EdTPA Candidates Scoring within the Secondary Passing Standard from 2022-24 by Preparation Pathway

Preparation Pathway	2022-23		2023-24	
	Total Candidates	**# within -1 SEM**	**Total Candidates**	**# within -1 SEM**
edTPA: World Language				
LEA Intern	2	0	4	0
ITEP				
Residency				
IHE Intern	9	1 (1%)	8	0
Student Teaching	113	3 (3%)	121	14 (11%)
Pathway		**-1 SEM**		**-1 SEM**
edTPA: Multiple Subject				
LEA Intern	32	1 (3%)	15	2 (13%)
ITEP				
Residency				
IHE Intern	95	0	129	2 (2%)
Student Teaching	1909	29 (2%)	1606	67 (4%)

	2022-23		2023-24	
edTPA: Single Subject				
LEA Intern	32	2 (6%)	14	0
ITEP				
Residency				
IHE Intern	146	3 (2%)	160	9 (6%)
Student Teaching	1937	43 (2%)	1630	84 (5%)
	2022-23		**2023-24**	
edTPA: Education Specialist				
LEA Intern	12	0	14	0
ITEP				
Residency				
IHE Intern	14	0	3	0
Student Teaching	138	1 (less than 1%)	245	3 (1%)

Program Support Received by Candidates Using the Secondary Passing Standard for the CalTPA from October 2023-June 2024

Commission staff asked teacher preparation colleagues to share how they are implementing the TPA secondary passing standard in their programs. They were asked to share their process, sources of evidence used, and candidate performance. In addition, they were asked to provide feedback on the newly adopted secondary passing standard. Those who responded shared a range of approaches, as illustrated by several brief sample responses below:

Sample 1

UC: "We will use this secondary passing standard for two of our candidates—one multiple subject and one math. We are using the mentor's final evaluation and evidence from the university field supervisor's formal observations. The university field supervisor reviews a lesson plan and completes an observation rubric. We are concerned about a paper submission, as anything mailed into the CTC takes a very long time to process. UCLA TEP's credentials analyst is meeting with the two candidates to review the paperwork and ensure that it is in order prior to submission."

Sample2

UC: "We have 2 students who will take advantage of the secondary passing standard. Here is the criteria that we set:
- 7 or higher on Spring Developmental Continuum on 5 of 6 areas
- 6 or higher on the 6th
- Passing scores B- or Satisfactory in all coursework"

Sample 3
CSU: "We only have a few students who we are in the process of working with to submit the forms. All have attempted the TPA at least twice, and their university supervisors have indicated that they feel they well are prepared. Program faculty are working with the candidates to gather assessment data, most of the students are using student teaching evaluations as the main source of evidence. We will keep copies of the evidence in the students individual files in case CTC requests to see it."

Sample 4
CSU: "Programs are either encouraging or requiring candidates to resubmit a portion of the TPA for rescoring prior to making the secondary passing standard option available, given the significant added workload this presents for program faculty, along with the equivalent amount of work required for candidates for either option. When the secondary passing standard option is used, candidates submit scored course assignments, completed field evaluations by mentor teachers and supervisors, and TPA scores all aligned to TPEs."

Sample 5
CSU: "At our campus candidates have to apply for the secondary passing standard by first emailing the CalTPA coordinator and making a request. At that point they get enrolled into a "free" canvas course where they have to upload various pieces of evidence that demonstrated their ability to address each TPE throughout the credential program. The sources of evidence that they can submit includes either: 1) Scores of 3 or higher on specific CalTPA rubrics; or 2) Formal evaluations that have been conducted by university supervisors (the formal evaluations include criteria that is aligned with each TPE). In addition to these sources of evidence, the candidate must also complete a short write-up for each TPE that unpacks their source of evidence and how/why they believe that piece of evidence addresses the TPE. In addition to this, they must also upload a revised Individual Development Plan (IDP) that is taken with them to induction. The revised IDP must reflect how they plan to improve on the TPEs that they scored low on with respect to the CalTPA."

Sample 6
CSU: "We have met across department to develop a consistent secondary passing standard protocol. In the Department of Special Education, students who do qualify for the secondary passing standard will be required to submit a request to a department committee along with their transcript, signature assignments from certain courses, and student teaching evaluations and observation write-ups. The faculty committee will then meet and discuss the evidence submitted with the student's cooperating teacher and university to make a determination if the student should be retake the TPA or proceed with submitting their materials to CTC for the secondary passing standard."

Sample 7
Private/Independent University:
- "The edTPA Coordinator emails candidates the day after scores are released giving them their options:

- o Independently resubmit
  - o Resubmit with support (will need to take a 1 credit course)
  - o Apply with the secondary passing criteria.
- The edTPA Coordinator then meets with them to discuss the process and go over pros/cons of the options.
- If the candidate decides on option 3, they are sent to the Credential Analyst and the edTPA Coordinator completes the form and gathers evidence"

In addition to how they are implementing the secondary passing standard, programs shared positive thoughts on the application of the -1 SEM and also provided concerns.

Positive feedback:
CSU: "Overall, I think this is an important opportunity and has already made the difference between people remaining in the profession and finding a new career."

CSU: "The positive is that this has dramatically increased the pass rate of our students. It just seems like the extra work is not an appropriate use of time and energy if they should already meet the qualifications by virtue of student teaching."

Private/Independent University: "In talking with our edTPA Coordinator and Credential Analyst, they both felt like the process is going fine and provides an important alternative to some of our candidates."

Concerns:
"Paper application process is lengthy and tedious and an electronic process would be preferred." Several respondents expressed that the criteria provided by the CTC was not clear. Programs offered the following comments:

 CSU: "This change presents a significant workload increase for faculty to assist candidates in assembling materials to be reviewed, and to conduct the review. Clearer guidance from CTC on what materials should be used, and at what level of quality they should be determined to demonstrate mastery of the TPEs, would be helpful. For example, if using the edTPA, what rubrics and at what score can be used for what TPE? Most programs are inclined to not offer the secondary passing standard due to the increased workload and vague criteria."

CSU: "I've heard the reasoning for requiring paper applications, but it is a serious undertaking to process them. Can the commission not come up with some way to track these candidates through online recommendations? We would still be providing all of the specific documentation (for example the CL-911). I understand the commission is also working through these processes. We are very anxious for our first batch to be sent that there will be errors and it will delay the candidate's credentials."

CSU: "Since our staff and faculty are depleted, it would be extremely helpful if Pearson could add a feature to EdReports that would allow us to identify students that qualify for the

secondary passing standard because their total score meets the minimum threshold and have no more than one score 1."

Ongoing Work and Future Opportunities for Implementing the Secondary Passing Standard
For the period of August 1, 2023 to June 1, 2024 there are 760 candidates whose scores fell within the -1 SEM on the CalTPA and the edTPA models combined. Each of these candidates is presently being notified by the Commission's testing contractor, Evaluation systems group of Pearson (ES), as to the opportunity to use the option of the secondary passing standard to move forward in the licensure process, with a copy of the notice also provided to the candidate's preparation program. Information about the secondary passing standard was posted on the Evaluation Systems group of Pearson testing website with a link to the [Secondary Passing Standard PSA](#) starting February 2024. All teacher preparation programs have access to candidate passing data through the test and candidate reporting system (Results Analyzer) on a monthly basis and can immediately reach out to candidates and provide appropriate support and next steps. Passing data are provided simultaneously to candidates, programs, and the Commission.

Note: As of the date of publication of this agenda item, eleven credentials have been granted using the secondary TPA passing standard option, with more expected as the word increasingly gets out about this option. The relatively low number thus far is likely due to a variety of individual candidate circumstances. For example, this option was passed by the Commission in December 2023, which for many was mid-academic year. Another possibility could be that teacher candidates may also have other requirements to fulfill in addition to the TPA and therefore candidates who have not yet completed their program or licensure requirements are not yet eligible to be recommended for a credential by their programs. Until candidates have completed all requirements and are ready to be recommended, the Commission would not know how many candidates may have used the secondary passing standard option. The Commission will have a better idea of the degree to which this option is being used later in the year.

For all candidates who in the future may score within the -1 SEM range, all TPA score reports for both the CalTPA and the edTPA will include information directly on the score report of any candidate who does not pass the assessment about the secondary passing standard option so that these candidates will have immediate information about their options and can reach out to their program faculty for next steps. Programs have been encouraged to reach out to candidates for support purposes for those who do not pass and now they can provide additional information and support regarding the recent secondary passing standard option.

Finally, programs have been encouraged to review their candidate passing data for prior years and reach out to candidates who fell within the secondary TPA passing range. In addition to this outreach effort, Commission staff will work with Evaluation Systems to search the database of candidate scores to identify candidates whose scores may have fallen into the -1 SEM range and who have not completed the assessment. ES will be able to send an email to the address on file and notify those candidates about the secondary passing standard option should they be

interested in pursuing that opportunity. ES will start with 2022-2023, and 2023-2024 candidates for this effort. Candidates notified of this opportunity will need to be affiliated with their program to pursue the application process for a credential.

At the December 2023 meeting, Commissioners indicated that candidates would need to be enrolled in the program to complete the TPA. This language has caused some concerns for the field, and so staff is suggesting that programs be given some latitude in determining how best program affiliation can work for their local context and each individual candidate.

4. How are the levers of accreditation being applied to look at whether preparation programs are serving their candidates sufficiently?

The Commission's [Preparation Program Standards](#) indicate what requirements accredited teacher preparation programs must meet, including implementing and providing candidate support for a TPA approved by the Commission.

- *Program Standard 5: Implementation of a Teaching Performance Assessment* is devoted to Teaching Performance Assessment implementation and candidate preparation processes. This standard prescribes what programs must do to implement the TPA as it was designed and specifies what type of support may and may not be provided to candidates.
- *Program Standard 4: Monitoring, Supporting and Assessing Candidate Progress towards Meeting Credential Requirements* also attends to the program's responsibility for supporting their candidates in mastering the TPEs.
- *Program Standard 3: Clinical Practice* addresses the requirements for clinical practice, candidate placements, supervision by qualified faculty or other supervisory personnel, and feedback to candidates on their performance that all provide needed support for candidates to be successful on the TPA.
- Other standards, such as *Standard 2: Mastery of the TPEs*, and *Standard 1: Program Design and Curriculum,* also contribute to the degree to which a candidate is successful on the performance assessment.

Commission staff note that the orientation of the accreditation system includes helping programs make programmatic improvements to meet Commission adopted standards. As part of the general accreditation processes, approved teacher preparation programs are expected to regularly self-review their candidate outcomes data, including TPA outcomes, to identify if there are areas that need improvement based on these outcomes data. In this way, the accreditation system is designed to be helpful, to foster honest self-appraisals of program strengths and areas for improvement as well as external review and verification of these data, and to provide the technical and other supports necessary for all programs to provide what candidates need to be successful in their chosen profession.

Further, site visit teams review data prior to the site visit and, if warranted, focus attention on the kinds of support candidates are getting, including that related to the TPA. Over the years, accreditation teams have issued findings to programs that are not fully meeting commission standards related to the TPA requirement. Programs with stipulations on their accreditation

status must address issues within one year and return to the Committee on Accreditation having demonstrated actions taken to address these issues. Staff recently reviewed accreditation site visit reports from the last several years to look at how implementation of the TPA was addressed within the review process. Eleven program sponsors have had findings reported to and acted on by the COA related to program standards 4 and 5 which focus on TPA implementation. A sample of recent findings from accreditation teams is provided in Appendix A.

To date, this process has been institution by institution and is most prevalent in preparation for an accreditation site visit. Currently, the Commission's Harvard Data Fellow is researching ways to provide the accreditation system with regular and timely data to inform its work. Additionally, new policies about that data could be considered. For example, the Commission could determine that any institution with a pass rate lower than a certain percentage would have a particular accreditation action in response to these data that could include a required action plan for making curricular changes, changes in clinical practice, or support candidates are receiving in an effort to improve the overall success rate of candidates on the performance assessment.

This process does require a close and ongoing look at what candidate outcomes are indicating in terms of program quality and effectiveness, and this is an area that might also be considered for strengthening with respect to TPA outcomes and the support programs provide for candidates taking this performance assessment.

That said, it might be timely for teacher preparation program standards to be reviewed to determine if modifications may be warranted in order to strengthen them and assure that candidates receive the preparation and support they need to be successful on the selected TPA model(s) used by the candidate's preliminary preparation program. It is also possible that additional processes and procedures might be added to the accreditation system such as focused reviews, technical assistance, or other means of helping programs whose candidates are less successful on the initial attempt at passing the TPA to improve their programs and supports for candidates prior to candidates attempting the TPA. It is also possible that reviewing the standards relating to TPA implementation may merit more emphasis during accreditation activities within the overall accreditation process, including but not limited to the site visits.

Part II: Areas for Timely Improvements to the Statewide TPA Process, 2024-25
Commission staff have been tracking and analyzing the data reviewed by LPI as well as survey results provided by the CTA and have identified several key areas where TPA-related improvements can be more immediately focused to bring about changes and improvements that will help support both programs and candidates within a positive and collaborative technical assistance framework.

One current effort to improve the TPA experience for candidates is that of designing the Literacy Performance Assessment (LPA) to be responsive to candidate and program input,

including through providing candidates with increased flexibility and choice around the number of video clips provided to support their teaching performance, moving to commentary about practice vs. pull down menu labels, requiring one focus student vs. 3 focus students, and the removal of demonstrating educational technology requirements in their teaching. Improvements such as these are expected to provide an immediate improvement to the TPA experience as the new LPA comes on line. Other approaches that the Commission could take to improve the entire TPA process in response to candidate and program feedback are also identified and recommended in the LPI report, as follows:

> " ….TPA data, along with the program completer survey data analyzed here, can help support continuous improvement among programs. Indeed, many California programs already use these data to target support for individual candidates and make programmatic adjustments. However, there are many barriers to integrating this form of data use into practice, including challenges with resources and capacity. Some programs, especially small programs outside of the public university systems, may need better support or systems to be able to learn from their TPA results."

> "….The CTC is particularly well positioned to provide additional support for programs with the lowest TPA passing rates through the accreditation process, especially to ensure that these programs are upholding the program standard related to TPA implementation. The CTC already regularly holds "digging deeper" seminars in which Teacher Preparation Program (TPP) faculty share best practices about support for TPAs; hosts an annual conference for all TPPs focused on the implementation of TPAs; and provides several resources specific to the CalTPA—including office hours with CTC staff, multiple trainings for TPP faculty, and quarterly meetings for CalTPA coordinators. Building on these existing resources, along with connecting struggling programs with those with documented success with TPA implementation, could create more opportunities for programmatic learning and improvement."

The Commission directed staff in December 2023 to establish an expert panel to provide advice and recommendations about the structure and implementation of TPAs. Amendments to SB 1263 made on June 18, 2024 reinforce the need for this action. Commission staff further suggest that this expert panel be constituted as soon as possible to consider several key areas for actionable change for all Commission-approved TPA models:

- Providing input as to where the challenges in the TPA process are for candidates as well as programs, and how these can be mitigated or otherwise addressed;
- Reviewing and updating as needed Program Standards 2, 3, 4 and 5 as these standards pertain to implementation of the TPA;
- Identifying needed technical assistance, including any improvements to technical assistance currently being provided within the accreditation process not only for all programs with respect to how to embed the TPA within the program's coursework and clinical practice experiences, but also particularly and mandatorily for those programs whose TPA outcomes are lower than would otherwise be expected;

- Considering a threshold candidate passing percentage that programs are expected to meet and for which programs falling under the threshold will be required to engage with Commission staff for professional development and technical support; and Considering establishing a certification process for all programs and their implementation of a TPA to document that program supports, feedback, and remedial coaching are provided to candidates.

Next Steps

Consistent with the current updated direction of the SB 1263 proposed legislation, and pending its passage and enactment, staff will begin the process of identifying a performance assessment expert panel to address needed improvements for candidates indicated above. A summary of these steps follows below:

1. Review and update as needed program and accreditation standards and processes to strengthen implementation of EC 44320.2 and the Commission's ability to support institutions, programs, and pathways where candidates may be struggling to pass the TPA and determine what actions should be taken.
2. Implement successful TPA innovations that were pilot tested in the LPA during spring 2024 as described above and work with all Commission approved TPA model sponsors to bring these innovations into all approved TPA models and all of the Commission's other performance assessments.
3. Commit to work collaboratively with educational partners and communities of interest to ensure a workable, accessible, preparatory TPA along with a TPA implementation and support process that adds evidence to document candidate readiness for licensure as well as informs program quality and effectiveness in preparing teacher candidates to effective serve all of California's public school students.

Part III: LPI Report Presentation

Tara Kini, Chief of Policy and Programs, and Susan Kemper Patrick, Senior Researcher, Learning Policy Institute, will present their report and supporting data concerning teacher preparation programs and candidate outcomes on the TPA.

Appendix A
Sample Accreditation Reports Concerning Implementation of the TPA

- Institution A (private/ independent, 2022) was awarded Accreditation with Major Stipulations and required to address all stipulations within one year or risk losing accreditation. Three quarterly reports and a site visit were held and a follow-up site visit verified that all 16 stipulations were addressed. Stipulations related to implementation of the TPA that had to be addressed within one year of the accreditation site visit required the program to provide the following:
    - Evidence that the continuous improvement process includes multiple sources of data including 1) the extent to which candidates are prepared to enter professional practice; and 2) feedback from key stakeholders such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation.
    - Evidence that the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Preliminary Single Subject programs provide assistance throughout the program to support candidates in the TPA including the provision of multiple formative opportunities for candidates to prepare for the TPA tasks/activities.
    - Evidence that the education unit maintains program level TPA data, including but not limited to aggregate results of candidate performance over time.

- Institution B (COE, 2024) The site visit team stated regarding Standard 4: Monitoring, Supporting, and Assessing Candidate Progress toward Meeting the Education Specialist Credential Requirements – Met with Concerns, Candidates and completers indicated that while handbooks were provided, the CalTPA and some other program requirements were not clear at the beginning of their program. In addition, interviewees shared that there is not enough support in taking and passing the CalTPA. While sometimes mentioned during class, coursework did not include an organized, systemic, intentional approach to preparing candidates for success on the RICA or other required exams/assessments.

    Standard 5: Implementation of a Teaching Performance Assessment – Met with Concerns There are inconsistencies on Standard 5: Implementation of a Teaching Performance Assessment for evidence of providing candidates with timely feedback on formative assessments and experiences preparatory to the TPA. Course alignments for the TPA for both the MMSN and ESN programs were provided. Interviews with candidates revealed a lack of communication and connection of the TPA requirement and integration into coursework to receive feedback to prepare for the TPA.

- Institution C (private/independent, 2022): While some faculty and those providing supervisory services to candidates were able to provide evidence or reported this being met, not all were able to do so. Additionally, candidates reported that **their instructors were not knowledgeable about the TPA**. When the MS and SS programs were asked by the site visit team to provide a sample of **TPA data for program improvement** purposes,

they were not able to do so; the program was only able to provide the team with raw student data.

5A – Administration of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA)- While there is a process to obtain individual parent/guardian approval to video record in the classroom, and the program reported that they provide the Supervision Handbook to the mentor teacher which contains information about video recording, it was not provided to the mentor teacher until after the candidate was placed with the mentor teacher. There was no evidence that the program only places candidates in **teaching placements where video recording will be permitted**, as required by the standard.

5B – Candidate Preparation and Support- While the program provided evidence that they introduced the TPA in the Introduction to Assessment and Introduction to Teaching courses, there was **no evidence of formative opportunities for candidates to prepare for the TPA tasks/activities**. There were mixed responses from instructors about incorporating the TPA in coursework even though almost all course syllabi referenced the TPA. Candidates and completers reported that they did not feel that all instructors were knowledgeable of the TPA, nor that they received appropriate on-going support from the program for the TPA and felt that they had to figure it out on their own.

- Institution D (private/independent, 2021): Candidates were not aware of the TPA, its purpose, elements, or how each assignment in each course prepares them for the TPA. Only candidates who participated in the TPA seminar were familiar with the assessment and those who did know felt that the university did not provide sufficient information about the TPA. They sought information from peers or friends enrolled at other IHEs to learn about the TPA. Some remarked that perhaps the faculty did not want to "teach to the test." Candidates included that they learned more about the elements and components of the TPA if they failed their first attempt and met with one-on-one with a coach who provided remediation, coaching, and support.

[within site visit report] - Only candidates who participated in the TPA seminar were familiar with the assessment and those who did know about this assessment felt the university did not provide sufficient information about the TPA. These candidates sought information from peers or friends enrolled at other institutions of higher education to learn about the TPA. Some remarked that perhaps the SOE did not want to "teach to the test." Candidates included that they learned more about the elements and components of the TPA if they failed their first attempt and met with one-on-one with a coach who provided remediation, coaching, and support. Candidates who were interviewed indicated that they were not familiar with the Individualized Development Plan. Program completers were familiar with a checklist form that they completed on their own, but they did not receive any input, guidance, or feedback as they completed the form. There was consistent evidence that candidates are not aware of the alignment between the course assignments and the TPEs. They also were not directly taught the connection between the three evaluative feedback sessions provided by their university

supervisor or the self-reflection papers they write about the TPA and the Individualized Development Plan. Regarding supervisors' knowledge of the TPA, interviews indicate that supervisors were aware of a seminar course on the TPA and that preparation for the TPA was taken care of outside of their role as supervisors. The university supervisors were not aware of the Individualized Development Plan that candidates complete at the end of the program nor did they provide support or guidance in completing this plan.

- Institution E (private/independent, 2019): Standard 5: Implementation of a Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA)– Met with Concerns. The team found inconsistent evidence that adjunct faculty were knowledgeable about the TPA tasks, rubrics, and scoring as well as how the TPA is implemented within the program.