
4D

Information/Action

Educator Preparation Committee

Performance Assessment Pass Rate Identification Framework Implementation Plan

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents a refined plan for identifying and notifying programs based on performance assessment pass-rate data and for providing a pilot-year Commission System of Support to assist programs with continuous improvement efforts that strengthen candidate preparation and professional readiness. Included within the item is an overview of the Commission's Multiple Measures Report, a new view available within the Accreditation Data Dashboard.

Recommended Action: Staff recommend that the Commission (1) consider and provide feedback on the Performance Assessment Identification Framework Implementation Plan and (2) approve the plan and direct staff to begin pilot-year implementation of the Commission System of Support in Fall 2026.

Presenters: Juliet Michelsen Wahleithner, Director, and Marissa Luna Lopez, Consultant, Division of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment

Strategic Plan Goal

Educator Preparation and Advancement

- **Goal 1.** Educator preparation programs hold candidates to high standards and adequately prepare them to support all students by using culturally and linguistically responsive and sustaining practices in equitable, inclusive, and safe environments.
 - A. Set and uphold rigorous standards for educator preparation programs

Continuous Improvement

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

Performance Assessment Pass Rate Identification Framework Implementation Plan

Introduction

Senate Bill 1263 (Newman, Chap. 889, Stats. 2024) requires the Commission to report the number of teacher preparation programs with low Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) pass rates and to assist those programs in using evidence-based strategies to support candidates in passing the assessment, with such instructional supports provided at no cost to candidates. In February, Commission staff presented an agenda item that outlined a proposed TPA Pass Rate Identification Framework ([Item 4C](#)).

The framework, grounded in continuous improvement, included recommended performance bands based on programs' overall first-time pass rates, along with required actions for programs depending on those pass rates. Specifically, programs with first-time pass rates below 70% would be required to engage in inquiry to better understand their candidates' challenges, using TPA pass-rate data as a starting point. Based on that inquiry, identified programs would develop an Action Plan that would be submitted to the Commission. Following feedback, the programs would implement their Action Plans. Throughout the process, Commission staff would provide ongoing support to programs. The Commission provided feedback on the proposed framework and directed staff to return to the Commission with a refined plan.

This item presents a refined plan for identifying and notifying programs based on performance assessment pass-rate data and for providing a pilot-year Commission System of Support to assist programs with continuous improvement efforts.

Background

Senate Bill 2042 (Alpert), signed into law in 1998, paved the way for the use of TPAs to evaluate candidates' readiness to enter the teaching profession with its proposal that, "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." Part of the intent behind this legislation was that, in addition to evaluating candidates, the TPA would allow preparation programs to gain insights into their practices preparing candidates through their analysis of candidates' performance on the assessment. These insights could then inform changes to program practices, particularly in coursework or through clinical practice support, directly related to areas where scorers observed candidates having difficulty.

Indeed, in the initial years of implementation of the TPA, programs engaged in local scoring of their assessments and had the opportunity to observe their candidates' performance firsthand. However, as use of the TPA continued, concerns began to arise across the state with the reliability of assessment scores when TPAs were scored locally, especially with the ability to compare candidates' scores across programs. These concerns led to the development of new

design policies for Commission-approved TPAs that were proposed to and approved by the Commission in August 2014 (Agenda Item 4D). The revised design policies included the provision that “all models will include centralized and/or local/regional moderated scoring processes to assure reliability and consistency of scoring.” Following the approval of the policies, the Performance Assessment Design Standards were also revised, and specifications were released for a new model of the TPA for the Commission that would include centralized scoring.

One consequence of the move to centralized scoring was that many programs no longer reviewed candidates’ TPAs on a regular basis and no longer used the findings from their reviews to inform program practices. Over time, some programs also became less involved in the preparation of their candidates for the TPA. In short, many programs became disconnected from both their candidates’ completion of the TPA and their candidates’ pass rates, treating the TPA requirement as an add-on for which candidates are responsible and that falls outside the program’s domain.

Impact of Senate Bill 1263

Senate Bill 1263 (Newman, Chap. 889, Stats. 2024) sought to change current practices for TPA implementation, including programs’ involvement in the preparation of their candidates for the assessment. The bill amended Education Code section 44320.2 to explicitly require the Commission to report on programs with low TPA pass rates and to assist those programs in using evidence-based strategies to support candidate success on all administrations of the assessment at no additional cost. In doing so, the Legislature established a clear expectation that the Commission move beyond general monitoring of programs’ TPA outcomes and put in place a more defined, statewide process for identifying low pass rates and ensuring that programs engage in meaningful improvement efforts. The intended effect of this expectation is that programs will no longer treat the TPA as an add-on and will, instead, more purposefully embed preparation for the TPA into program practices and use TPA data to inform continuous improvement efforts.

The continuous improvement requirements of SB 1263 complement Common Standard 4 in the Commission’s existing accreditation system which states:

The education unit develops and implements a comprehensive, continuous improvement process at both the unit level and within each of its programs that identifies program and unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings.

- Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completer data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.
- 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 constituencies such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation

Because candidates typically complete the final part of their TPA near program completion, TPA data may serve as one form of program completer data that programs analyze as part of their

continuous improvement efforts. Multiple Subject and Single Subject Program Standard 5A: Administration of the Teaching Performance Assessment Part 4 links the use of TPA data to the continuous improvement expectation by stating, “The program documents the use of these data for Commission reporting, accreditation and program improvement purposes.” The PA Pass Rate Identification Framework presented to the Commission in February 2026 and further defined here proposes a system that will both notify programs of their candidates’ first-time pass rate on the TPA and support them with the implementation of continuous improvement based on TPA data.

First-Time Pass Rate Identification Framework and Bands

The system proposed in the PA Pass Rate Identification Framework places programs into one of three performance bands depending on a program’s candidates’ first-time pass rates on the TPA the previous academic year: Meeting Standard ($\geq 85\%$), Approaching Standard (70–84%), and Below Standard ($< 70\%$). The framework operates on the idea that low first-time pass rates serve as an indicator that there is an issue in need of further review. Consequently, a program’s placement in a band depends on the first-time pass rate of all program candidates who attempted the TPA in the previous academic year.

The system outlined included recommended required continuous improvement actions for programs depending on their band placement.

Programs with first-time candidate pass rates below 70% that are placed into the Below Standard band would be *required* to, with the support of Commission staff, engage in an inquiry into their program practices that begins with their TPA data. Based on the findings from that inquiry, the programs would create an Action Plan that would be reviewed by Commission staff before being implemented by the program. Commission staff would continue to provide support to the program throughout the implementation of the Action Plan.

Programs with first-time pass rates falling between 70% and 84% would be placed into the Approaching Standard band. These programs would be *encouraged* to engage in an inquiry into their program practices and to use the findings to develop and then implement an Action Plan. The expectation would be that implemented changes would lead to programmatic improvements that would, ultimately, lead to improvements in the programs’ first-time pass rates while also improving candidates’ preparation for teaching.

Finally, programs with first-time pass rates of 85% or higher also would be encouraged to engage in inquiry into their current practices but also encouraged to continue providing high-quality preparation and support for the TPA.

This item builds on the framework presented in February to provide more specific details about how programs will be notified about their first-time pass rates, the actions required of programs, and the Commission System of Support that will guide programs through the inquiry, Action Plan, and implementation process. The identification framework and Commission System of Support are grounded in continuous improvement. Together, they aim to hold programs accountable for providing high-quality preparation while also encouraging an inquiry stance towards program improvement. The goal is to balance the tension between requiring programs to engage in continuous improvement efforts and supporting them in ensuring those

efforts are responsive to their specific contexts and lead to authentic programmatic changes that will, ultimately, lead to better prepared candidates.

Indeed, the continuous improvement processes required of programs by this system mimic the inquiry process embedded within the TPA completed by candidates. Within the TPA, candidates engage in the process of collecting data on their students, using that data to plan responsive instruction that advances their students' learning, assessing their students on their learning, analyzing and reflecting on the assessment results, and using that information to plan future instruction. The Identification Framework system asks programs to take a similar approach to their preparation of their candidates. Programs use the data from the TPA to reflect on their preparation activities—including coursework and clinical practice—and identify areas of strength and areas for improvement. The Action Plans that programs are required to develop align with the next-step planning that candidates complete within the TPA.

Much like programs will be required to engage in continuous improvement efforts, Commission staff will also engage in their own inquiries into the effectiveness of this new system, collecting data from programs on the system's implementation in the first year and using the findings to make revisions for subsequent years.

TPA Pass Rate Identification Framework: Year 1 Implementation Plan

Year 1 of implementation of the TPA Pass Rate Identification Framework, which will run from August 1, 2026, through July 31, 2027, will serve as a pilot year. The pilot year will include notification to programs of their first-time pass rates and PA Band placement; required Direct Support for programs in the Below Standard band; Networked Support available to all programs; and the collection of data to inform revisions to the framework and Commission System of Support for Year 2.

Identification of Programs Through Multiple Measures Report

Beginning in Fall 2026, credential programs will be notified annually by November 15 that the Commission's Multiple Measures Report (MMR) has been updated with the previous year's data. The notification will also include programs' Performance Assessment (PA) Band placement, based on their candidates' first-time TPA pass rates during the 2025-26 academic year. PA Band placements included in Commission dashboards, reports, or related lists will be publicly available to support transparency for candidates, programs, and the public regarding program outcomes. The notification process is intended to ensure that programs are informed of their updated data and band placement when the MMR is updated.

Developed over the course of the 2025-26 academic year as part of the Commission's Accreditation Data Dashboard (ADD), the MMR will provide an annual snapshot of the health of preliminary teaching and administrator credential programs. (See [Appendix B](#) for a full discussion of the MMR development process.) For each credential program, the MMR pulls information from other dashboards in the ADD to highlight data on three metrics of program health: annual first-time and overall TPA pass rates for each of the past five years; the mean ratings from each of the past five years' responses to the Commission-administered completer survey item that asks about overall satisfaction with the preparation received; and the number of candidates who were enrolled in, who were continually enrolled in, and who completed the program the previous year, along with the number of credentials issued by the Commission to

completers of that program. In addition to providing program-specific data, the report provides state-level data for the same period for the purposes of comparison.

The data available in the MMR is purposefully high-level: It is intended to provide a snapshot to programs and to encourage deeper exploration of more specific data within the other dashboards in the ADD. For example, after seeing their first-time TPA pass rates, a program can access its Performance Assessment Dashboard within the ADD. This dashboard provides the ability to disaggregate candidates' scores in multiple ways, including by each rubric of the performance assessment, by attempt, by candidate race/ethnicity, and by subject area.

When a program views its updated PA data in the MMR, a colored symbol that corresponds to its Pass Rate Band appears next to its percentage of candidates who passed the PA on the first attempt: For those programs with an 85% or higher first-time pass rate, a green star appears; for programs whose first-time pass rate falls between 70 and 84%, a yellow circle appears; and for programs with a first-time pass rate lower than 70%, a red exclamation mark appears. The image below provides a screenshot of what a program would see in the MMR.


In addition to being informed that the program's data has been updated in the MMR and of the program's placement in a Pass Rate Band, the program will also receive details about its required next steps, depending on its band placement. Programs in the Below Standard band will be informed that they are required to participate in Direct Support as part of Commission-supported continuous improvement activities and that a Commission staff member will reach out to them with additional details. Programs in the Approaching Standard band will be provided details about Networked Support and encouraged to participate. Programs meeting the 85 percent first-time pass-rate standard will be encouraged to continue their work preparing candidates and supporting them with their PA submissions and to participate in Networked Support, if they choose.


Screenshot of Multiple Measures Report for a sample institution's performance assessment data

























Institution A

This report provides specific candidate outcome measures for the selected institution by type of preparation and/or the specific credential program for the last five academic years. Data include the performance assessment pass rates, program completer survey mean of responses, the number of total enrollment, program completers and credentials issued.




To view additional information, click or mouse hover over the tooltips in the tables.

 : Click the Institution icon on the far right of each table to view [institution data only](#).




 : This icon will appear on the far right of each table when only institution data are displayed. Click the State icon to view state data along with the institution's data.

		INSTITUTION						STATE							
		2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	Last 5-Yea..	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	Last 5-Yea..		
CalITPA	Overall Pass Rate	86.8% 	90.7% 	94.4% 	91.3% 	86.3% 	90.1% 	CalITPA	Overall Pass Rate	90.1% 	94.1% 	94.2% 	94.6% 	89.4% 	92.5% 
CalITPA	First-time Pass Rate	55.9% 	59.7% 	54.9% 	58.8% 	66.6% 	60.3% 	CalITPA	First-time Pass Rate	68.0% 	63.6% 	59.3% 	66.5% 	72.1% 	66.2% 

Color and Shape Legend for Overall Pass Rate

-  95 percent and greater
-  Between 85 percent and 94 percent
-  Less than 85 percent

Color and Shape Legend for First-time Pass Rate

-  85 percent and greater
-  Between 70 percent and 84 percent
-  Less than 70 percent

Commission System of Support

Within the Commission System of Support, programs in the Below Standard band will have required next steps. Programs identified as having a first-time pass rate in the previous academic year that falls below 70 percent will be required to engage in a focused inquiry of their program practices. The focused inquiry will include, first, identifying the rubrics on which candidates had the lowest scores and then reviewing the tasks associated with those rubrics. From there, programs may examine where in coursework and/or clinical practice candidates are prepared with the knowledge and skills to complete these tasks. Programs may consider analyzing additional data that would help with understanding why candidates had difficulty with these tasks. Existing data sources might include course assignments and corresponding rubrics or scoring criteria; samples of student work; and/or clinical practice evaluations. The program might also choose to design and administer surveys to or hold focus group discussions or interviews with candidates, recent program completers, mentor teachers, coaches or university supervisors, employers, and other partners.

Based on the findings from their analyses of the data, programs will then develop Action Plans that include three-to-five clearly identified goals directly aligned to the identified challenge areas. For each goal, the program will be required to identify specific actions to be taken, timelines, benchmarks, and the individual or individuals responsible for leading the work toward meeting the goal. Additionally, programs will be required to identify how they will collect data on their actions to evaluate the effectiveness of those actions. This Action Plan will then be submitted to the Commission by March 15, 2027, for review and feedback. Programs will be expected to begin implementing their Action Plans immediately.

To support programs with conducting their inquiries and developing and implementing their Action Plans, the pilot-year Commission System of Support will include both Direct Support and Networked Support. Direct Support will be required for programs in the Below Standard band and will provide targeted assistance as programs examine their TPA data, identify candidate challenge areas, conduct inquiry into program practices, develop Action Plans, and begin implementation. Networked Support will be available more broadly to programs across performance bands and may include statewide learning sessions, credential-alike exchanges, cross-credential exchanges, topic-area exchanges, and problem-of-practice groups as needed. During the pilot year, the Commission System of Support will be intentionally focused so that the supports provided are feasible for Commission staff and programs in the field while still providing meaningful assistance with inquiry, action planning, implementation, and shared learning.

Direct Support for Programs in the Below Standard Band

Direct Support will be the required component of the Commission System of Support for programs in the Below Standard band. This support will be provided primarily through one-on-one meetings with program leadership that will be held at least quarterly and available more frequently if the program requests. Initial Direct Support meetings will focus on helping the program understand the inquiry process, examine its program practices, develop an Action Plan based on the findings of that inquiry, and begin implementation.

As Direct Support continues, meetings will focus on guided assistance as the program conducts its inquiry. This support may include helping the program analyze rubric-level data to identify where its candidates had the most difficulty. Once challenge areas have been identified, staff will support programs in conducting root cause analysis to better understand the factors contributing to candidate performance in those areas. Staff may also help the program identify additional sources of data to collect or, if they already exist, analyze to better understand why candidates are struggling in this area. Additionally, staff may support the program in identifying strategies to engage program faculty, staff, and partners in the inquiry process, including identifying possible actions to address the challenge areas.

Direct Support will also provide space for programs to talk through the development of their Action Plans. The Action Plan is intended to serve as a point of coordination between programs and the Commission by capturing the program's inquiry, the findings from the inquiry, the actions the program plans to take, and how the program will evaluate progress. The Action Plan is not intended to function primarily as a compliance record, but rather to serve as a tool to support shared understanding, feedback, implementation, and continuous improvement. After the Action Plan has been submitted, staff will be able to provide specific feedback to the program. As the program moves into implementation of the Action Plan, Direct Support meetings will provide space to discuss implementation, review data being collected to evaluate the effectiveness of the identified actions, and problem-solve any challenges that may arise.

The primary goal of Direct Support is to provide targeted, ongoing assistance to programs in the Below Standard band as they use TPA and other data to strengthen program practices. While improvements in pass rates are an important and expected outcome, the focus of the support will be on helping programs better understand candidate performance, identify opportunities to strengthen coursework and clinical practice, and make programmatic changes that support candidates' high-quality preparation.

Networked Support for All Programs

In addition to Direct Support for programs in the Below Standard band, Commission staff will provide Networked Support for programs across performance bands. Networked Support will create opportunities for programs to engage in shared learning, examine data, discuss common challenges, consider promising practices, and strengthen local continuous improvement efforts. Unlike Direct Support, Networked Support will not be limited to programs in the Below Standard band and is intended to provide a broader structure through which programs can learn with and from one another during the pilot year.

Networked Support may include several connected components, including statewide learning sessions, credential-alike exchanges, cross-credential exchanges, topic-area exchanges, and as appropriate, smaller problem-of-practice groups. These components will be organized around the anticipated sequence of inquiry during the pilot year. The sequence will begin with building a shared understanding of the framework and available data; then move into data analysis and Action Plan development; and then shift toward implementation, shared learning, and problem-solving.

Early in the pilot year, statewide learning sessions will focus on building shared understanding among participating programs. These sessions may include updates on the TPA and the PA Pass

Rate Identification Framework, review of data available to programs, and discussion of effective practices in performance assessment implementation and candidate preparation. The intent will be to ensure that programs have a common understanding of the purpose of the identification framework, the data available to support inquiry, and the ways in which TPA data can be used as one source of evidence to examine and strengthen program practices. These sessions may include both Commission staff-led content and practitioner-led discussions so that programs have access to statewide information as well as concrete examples from the field.

As the pilot year progresses, Networked Support may include additional opportunities for collaboration among programs through credential-alike exchanges, cross-credential exchanges, and topic-area exchanges. Credential-alike exchanges would allow programs preparing candidates for similar credentials to discuss shared challenges, compare approaches, and consider how different programs support candidates in developing the knowledge and skills reflected in the TPA. Cross-credential exchanges would allow programs to learn from one another where there are common elements across performance assessments, such as evidence of student learning, formative and summative assessment, planning instruction, academic language development, or reflection on instructional decisions. Topic-area exchanges would allow programs working on similar issues to engage more deeply with one another around shared challenges, questions, or problems of practice. These exchanges are intended to help programs move from understanding the data to considering how other programs have approached similar challenges.

Networked Support may also include activities focused on data analysis and Action Plan development. During this part of the year, Networked Support may help programs analyze rubric-level data, identify areas where candidates struggled, and consider other sources of data they may already have access to or can collect to better understand why candidates may have struggled in the areas they did. These additional data sources might include course assignments, syllabi, student work samples, clinical practice evaluations, surveys, interviews, or focus group discussions with candidates, completers, faculty, staff, mentor teachers, coaches, university supervisors, employers, or other partners.

Building on the discussions of data sources and data collection, Networked Support may also help programs engage in action planning. For programs in the Below Standard band, this support will be connected to the required development of an Action Plan. For programs in the Approaching Standard and Meets Standard bands, similar tools and discussions may support voluntary local continuous improvement planning. Programs developing required Action Plans, and programs using similar tools for voluntary local planning may be supported in identifying outcome goals based on the findings from their inquiries. They may also identify the person or people within the program who will be responsible for overseeing or facilitating the work to meet each goal. Once goals have been identified, programs may develop specific actions, create timelines, identify benchmarks, and consider what types of data they can collect to help evaluate the effectiveness of their actions.

Following the submission of required Action Plans by programs in the Below Standard band, Networked Support may focus on implementation and shared learning. During this part of the year, Below Standard programs may discuss early implementation of their required Action

Plans, while programs in the Approaching Standard and Meets Standard bands may discuss voluntary local improvement efforts. Programs working on similar challenges may also use credential-alike exchanges, cross-credential exchanges, topic-area exchanges, or problem-of-practice groups to examine those challenges in greater depth.

For example, if several programs identify a common challenge related to candidates' development and use of learning outcomes, those programs might examine where in the program and how candidates are prepared to write outcomes that are aligned with standards, instructional goals, and student learning needs. Programs could share course assignments, clinical practice expectations, supervisor or mentor tools, and/or feedback processes that support candidate development in this area. Through Networked Support, programs could together consider possible changes to their program practices and share what they are learning as those changes are implemented.

As Networked Support activities develop, Commission staff may refine the structure based on program feedback, staff capacity, and what is learned during the pilot year. For example, if several programs are working on a similar problem of practice, Commission staff may support a problem-of-practice group that meets over time on that issue. If programs identify credential-specific or regional patterns, staff may also consider whether some exchanges would be more useful if organized by credential area, preparation context, or region.

Taken together, Direct Support and Networked Support are intended to create a focused and flexible Commission System of Support during the pilot year. Direct Support will provide targeted assistance to programs in the Below Standard band as they conduct their inquiries, develop Action Plans, and move into implementation. Networked Support will provide broader opportunities for programs across performance bands to engage in shared learning, examine common challenges, and strengthen program practice. This structure is intended to provide meaningful support to programs with required next steps while also making broader support available to the field in a way that is feasible for Commission staff and programs.

Collection of Data to Inform Year 2 Actions

Throughout Year 1, Commission staff will collect data from programs that receive Direct Support and from programs that participate in Networked Support activities. This data collection will include feedback surveys administered at the end of statewide learning sessions, exchanges, and other Networked Support activities to help inform the planning of future sessions. Based on responses, staff may also plan targeted sessions to support implementation of required Action Plans or voluntary local improvement efforts.

To gather feedback on the Identification Framework and Commission System of Support as a whole, in May of 2027, Commission staff will administer a survey to all programs. The survey will include both closed and open-ended items that will allow staff to learn more about the strengths of the pilot year and areas for improvement. Additionally, Commission staff will invite program leadership to attend listening sessions to create opportunities for individuals to share additional feedback.

The data collected from both the surveys and the listening sessions will be used to inform revisions to the PA Pass Rate Identification Framework and Commission System of Support for Year 2 of implementation.

Pass Rate Identification Framework: Year 2 Implementation Plan

In Year 2, preparation programs will again be notified on November 15 that the MMR has been updated with the previous year's data. Again, this notification will also include programs' PA Band placement, based on their candidates' first-time TPA pass rates during the prior academic year. Both the requirements and Direct Support for programs with first-time pass rates below the standard and the Networked Support available to all programs will be revised based on feedback received in Year 1.

Support for Year 1 Below Standard Programs in Year 2

Because the process of engaging in inquiry, identifying an Action Plan, and implementing that Action Plan takes time, staff anticipate that some programs with first-time pass rates below the standard in Year 1 may remain in the Below Standard band in Year 2 and may continue to require Direct Support from Commission staff. Second-attempt pass rates will be used to inform the support provided to these programs in Year 2.

Second-attempt pass rates would not replace first-time pass rates as the basis for annual band placement; rather, they would help staff determine the appropriate level and focus of continued support for programs that remain in the Below Standard band after Year 1.

The Second-Attempt Pass Rate will be calculated based on the percentage of individuals who did not pass the TPA on their first attempt but who did pass on their second attempt. For example, if a program has 100 candidates and 40 did not pass on the first attempt, a 90 percent second-attempt pass rate means that 36 of those 40 passed on their second attempt. Overall, this means that 96 percent of the program's candidates passed by the second attempt.

Programs with Second-Attempt Pass Rates of 90 percent or higher will be considered as demonstrating sufficient second-attempt candidate success for purposes of determining the level of continued support. The focus of Direct Support for these programs in Year 2 will be continued implementation of the program's Action Plan. These programs will continue one-on-one meetings with Commission staff, with a focus on ongoing support for Action Plan implementation.

Programs with Second-Attempt Pass Rates that fall in the range of 80 to 89 percent will be considered to need continued support. This support will begin in their one-on-one meetings, with Commission staff supporting the programs to review their TPA data to identify areas where candidates continue to struggle. If these areas are not already being addressed in the programs' Action Plans, Commission staff may advise them to revise their inquiry. If the areas are already addressed in the programs' Action Plan, Commission staff will continue to monitor the implementation of their Action Plans and support the programs in the collection and analysis of data on the implementation of their identified actions. When necessary, the programs may be advised to revise the Action Plans based on the findings from the analysis of the collected data.

Programs with Second-Attempt Pass Rates that fall below 80 percent will be considered to need more intensive continued support. While these programs will continue with their required one-on-one meetings, they will also be required to engage in a new inquiry to revise their Action Plan to ensure it addresses the areas identified as problematic for candidates.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommend that the Commission (1) consider and provide feedback on the PA Identification Framework Implementation Plan and (2) approve the plan and direct staff to begin pilot-year implementation of the Commission System of Support in Fall 2026.

Next Steps

If approved by the Commission, staff will begin pilot-year implementation of the PA Pass Rate Identification Framework and Commission System of Support in Fall 2026. Staff will notify programs of their PA Band placement by November 15, 2026, begin required Direct Support for programs in the Below Standard band, and make Networked Support activities available to programs across performance bands. Staff will collect feedback throughout the pilot year and return to the Commission with information about implementation, lessons learned, and any recommended revisions for Year 2.

Appendix A

Pilot-Year Timeline and Commission System of Support Activities

Timeline	System of Support Activity	Engagement by Performance Band
Nov. 15, 2026	PA Band notification	All programs receive notification of band placement.
Dec. 2026	Networked Support launch: framework, data, and inquiry process	<i>Below Standard</i> programs begin required Direct Support and may participate in Networked Support activities; <i>Approaching Standard</i> and Meets Standard programs are encouraged to participate in Networked Support activities.
Jan. 2027	Data analysis and candidate challenge areas	<i>Below Standard</i> programs continue required Direct Support and may participate in Networked Support activities connected to inquiry and data analysis. <i>Approaching Standard</i> and Meets Standard programs may participate in Networked Support to support their own continuous improvement efforts.
Feb. 2027	Inquiry findings, root cause analysis, and Action Plan development	<i>Below Standard</i> programs continue required Direct Support and may use Networked Support to support required Action Plan development. <i>Approaching Standard</i> and Meets Standard programs may participate in relevant Networked Support activities.
Mar. 2027	Action Plan refinement and implementation planning	<i>Below Standard</i> programs continue required Direct Support and prepare to submit required Action Plans. <i>Approaching Standard</i> and Meets Standard programs may participate in Networked Support activities related to program inquiry and continuous improvement.
Mar. 15, 2027	Required Action Plans due	<i>Below Standard</i> programs submit required Action Plans. <i>Approaching Standard</i> and Meets Standard programs are not required to submit Action Plans.
April-June 2027	Implementation, shared learning, and problem-solving	<i>Below Standard</i> programs continue required Direct Support as they begin implementation of required Action Plans. <i>All programs</i> may participate in Networked Support activities focused on shared learning and strengthening program practice.
Summer/Fall 2027	Continued implementation and pilot-year feedback	<i>Below Standard</i> programs continue implementation and receive Direct Support as needed. <i>All programs</i> may provide feedback on the pilot-year Commission System of Support and participate in available Networked Support activities.
Nov. 15, 2027	Updated PA Band notification	<i>All programs</i> receive updated notification of band placement.

Appendix B

Multiple Measures Report

Overview of Multiple Measures Report

Commission staff developed a new view in the Accreditation Data Dashboard (ADD) to support Performance Assessment pass rate reporting as mandated by Senate Bill 1263 (Newman, Chap. 889, Stats. 2024) as well as institutions' continuous improvement efforts. This view is called the Multiple Measures Report (MMR). The ADD has for years provided a wealth of data tables and visualizations for both program staff and accreditation reviewers to reference, including accreditation status, annual candidate enrollments, exams and assessments, completer survey scores, and credentials awarded. Much of the data in the ADD is automatically disaggregated by credential program. The MMR will be a new addition that provides a simple synthesis of key success indicators that are aggregated to the whole institution by default, then with the ability to filter to a specific credential program.

The success indicators of the MMR give five years of data across three categories, providing both the institution's specific results and a side-by-side comparison with the state as whole:

- Performance Assessment (PA) pass rates
 - First-time
 - Overall
- Candidate satisfaction
 - Average score by completer survey respondents
- Enrollment, completion, and credential counts

Each of the three sections, while purposefully succinct in the MMR view, will link to the corresponding tab of the ADD with more detailed data about each category. For instance, while the MMR view provides overall and first-time pass rates in a simple, easy-to-read table, users will be directed to the PA section of the ADD that goes into great depth about PA results by subject area, cycle/task, and even specific rubric averages. Similarly, the aggregated completer satisfaction scores in the MMR will direct users to the Surveys tab of the ADD that includes all survey item score averages disaggregated by specific preparation area.

The MMR will be updated annually by November 15 following the completion of the September 1 – August 31 academic year. The PA tables provide the institution's first-time and overall pass rates going back five years, with indicators to show whether the pass rate falls into the Meets Standard, Approaching Standard, or Does Not Meet Standard band for each year. A notification will go out to programs each year upon the update of the most recent year; thus, the MMR will serve as the mechanism for notifying programs, following the mandates of SB 1263.

The goal of MMR's design is to provide an annual temperature check to institutions on the success and satisfaction of their candidates and to encourage engagement in continuous improvement. Program leaders and accreditation reviewers can start at the MMR to get an overall summary of the institution's results across the most recent five years of data and then dig into the extensive, more granular data points provided throughout the rest of the ADD and other data sources as relevant.

Development of MMR

The Multiple Measures view was designed by staff in 2025 to address the need for a high-level summary of an institution's results in performance assessments, completer satisfaction, and completion rates. Beginning in January 2026, Commission staff partnered with the UC's Center for Teacher Education Research Improvement Network (CTERIN) to hold focus groups to demonstrate the design and use of the MMR and gather feedback.

An invitation to volunteer for the focus groups went out to all programs in January 2026. Participants were categorized into role-alike groups:

- Deans and Directors of Teacher Education
- Program faculty
- Current teacher candidates
- Labor and advocacy representatives

116 people volunteered to participate, and all who volunteered were offered a spot. In total, ten hour-long focus group sessions were held including 66 active participants. Table A below provides a breakdown of sessions by role type and participant counts.

Table A. Focus Group Roles and Participant Counts

Role	Number of Focus Group Sessions Held	Total Number Invited	Total Number Participants
Deans and Directors of Teacher Education	4	44	30
Program faculty	3	49	26
Current teacher candidates	2	17	4
Labor and advocacy representatives	1	6	6
Total	10	116	66

Each focus group session consisted of an introduction to the rationale behind the MMR design; a demonstration of the tables, indicators, and interactive filters; and time for participant questions and feedback. Emphasis was placed on how the MMR can support institutions' continuous improvement efforts.

CTERIN staff synthesized focus group feedback for Commission review in April 2026. Their findings included the following:

- In general, focus group participants thought that Multiple Measures Report was helpful and provided a useful snapshot of program health.
 - *"It's a thermometer. Are we hot or are we cold? Where are we? What can we target?"*
- Focus group participants found the format of the dashboard as intuitive and useful.
 - *"[It] lays the information out in a useful manner and can easily compare to the statewide data."*
- Tool tips and indicators were effective and easy to understand.

- Participants could envision multiple uses for the MMR supporting improvement and advocacy efforts, including:
 - Accreditation and mandated reporting requirements
 - Advisory board and induction presentations
 - Measuring the effect of program changes over time
 - Talent and resource acquisition
- Suggestions to improve clarity and user experience:
 - Make the guidance around interactive tools and filters more obvious in the introduction text
 - Include the date of last update
 - Add data definitions to tool tips (i.e., “first-time pass rate” vs. “overall pass rate”)
 - Ensure data views can be exported (crosstabs, images, PDFs) to share for reporting and presentations

In April-May 2026, Commission staff made edits to the MMR in line with the focus group feedback and are prepared to launch the MMR view in the ADD in the coming weeks up to the 2024-25 academic year with 2025-26 to be added this fall.