TPA Stakeholder Forum

A – Increasing Scoring Consistency and Reliability (*Whole Group)*
The Commission has indicated that scoring consistency and reliability must be improved for all models of the TPA. Improving scoring consistency and reliability requires:

- increased oversight of the processes of assessor training and calibration;

- centrally managed scoring on a statewide, regional, and/or local basis; and

- a robust process for reviewing the work of scorers and resolving discrepant scoring between assessors.

Some of the solutions the Commission is considering are:

- Requiring all models to provide a centralized scoring function to programs using that model. The centralized scoring function could include model-supervised and/or externally-supervised scoring on a statewide basis and/or on a regional basis and/or on a local basis

- Requiring all models to provide increased oversight of the work of scorers

- Increasing recalibration requirements for scorers during the scoring process

- Requiring all teacher preparation programs operating the TPA to participate in the model's centralized scoring option

B – Responsibilities of Model Owners *(Whole Group)*
The current Teacher Preparation Program Standards 17-19 relating to TPA implementation, and the Assessment Design Standards 1-2, do not directly address the ongoing relationship between model developers and programs implementing that model. Some TPA model developers have provided support to programs, but this has not been formally required by standards adopted by the Commission. In addition, the Assessment Design Standards do not address the ongoing relationship between model developers and the Commission.

C - Program Standards Requirements vs. What Is Assessed on the TPA *(Whole Group)*
The Commission is currently considering streamlining the accreditation system. As part of that streamlining process, the Commission is interested in reducing redundancy in candidate assessment. The key issue in this regard is to identify what is required to be addressed and assessed by programs within the Commission's adopted program standards and what is required to be addressed and assessed within the TPA. Both sources of information are part of the accreditation process' increased focus on using candidate and program outcomes data as sources of information about candidate and program quality. Part of the overall discussion of this topic is the question of what is more appropriately addressed and assessed within program standards, within the accreditation system, and by the TPA as a key candidate and program outcome assessment.

There are several related topics within the issue of what should be assessed within the program and what should be assessed within the TPA, as follows:

C1- Addressing All Learners within the Assessment *(Small Group Discussion)*
The California preliminary teaching credential carries an authorization to teach English learners, and also requires the candidate to be able to effectively meet the needs of Special Education and other students in the general education classroom. Candidates for the credential should demonstrate that they have the knowledge, skills, and ability to effectively teach all students, including English learners and students with special needs.

OR

C2- Addressing Core Content Areas for Multiple Subject Candidates *(Small Group Discussion)*
Currently some models address all four multiple subject core content areas within the TPA itself, and in these models, candidate scores on the TPA reflect assessing all four of these content areas. Other models, however, use locally-developed assessment activities outside of the actual TPA to address some of the multiple subject core content areas. The results from these activities are not included in the official TPA candidate score, but are part of the program review process in accreditation.

D- Who Should Score the TPA, and Faculty Involvement in the TPA Process *(Whole Group)*
The advent of national TPA models such as the edTPA and the Praxis PreProfessional Assessment of Teachers that are nationally scored has implications for Commission policy regarding who should be scoring California candidates, especially given that the TPA is a consequential assessment for candidates for a California preliminary teaching credential.

Even with California-developed models using only California assessors, the range of types of assessors varies across programs, with some programs requiring faculty to score, other programs using faculty entirely from outside the institution, and some programs using outside assessors connected to the program such as mentor/master/cooperating K-12 teachers and/or administrators. The current Commission TPA-related standards do not address this issue.

Further, programs have consistently found that one of the most effective outcomes of the TPA process is the engagement of faculty with not only scoring, but also working with the candidate outcomes data to understand what the data indicate about program strengths and weaknesses and then using that information for program improvement. The Commission cannot mandate, however, that faculty members must serve as scorers.

E - Moving to "TPA 2.0" *(Small Group Discussion)*
Moving to a next generation of TPA models has implications for what Commission requirements for TPA models should be in the future. There are a number of policy issues to consider.   In small groups select as many of the topics (a-i) or identify additional topics. Please discuss the

topic and provide the group's best advice as to what the Commission should do regarding the topic

Concluding Activity and Final Debrief: Small Group Work
Taking into account the range of the day's discussions, please talk in small groups about what changes you think would be needed to Program Standards 17, 18, and 19, concerning program responsibilities for implementing the TPA in order to move the TPA forward to TPA 2.0.

Staff plans to have an initial DRAFT of updated Assessment Design Standards (currently 2 Standards) and Program Standards 17-19 for you to review and provide feedback