

---

---

# 4E

## Information/Action

### *Educator Preparation Committee*

### **Proposed Revisions to Performance Assessment Design Standards to Include Attention to Use of Artificial Intelligence**

---

---

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item presents an overview of the one-day Artificial Intelligence in Performance Assessment Forum hosted by the Commission on March 6, 2026, the recommendations of the forum participants, and proposed revisions to the Performance Assessment Design Standards based on the recommendations.

**Recommended Action:** That the Commission provide feedback on the proposed revisions to the Performance Assessment Design Standards and direct staff to revise the standards based on the feedback.

**Presenter:** Juliet Michelsen Wahleithner, Director, Division of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment

### **Strategic Plan Goal**

#### ***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.
  - Q. Use data to inform Commission and staff decision-making and continuous improvement

---

---

# Proposed Revisions to Performance Assessment Design Standards to Include Attention to Use of Artificial Intelligence

---

---

## Introduction

Senate Bill 1263 (Newman, Chap. 889, Stats. 2024) required the formation of a workgroup to review the design and implementation of teaching performance assessments (TPAs) and related systems. The final outcome of the workgroup was the development of recommendations in five focal areas, presented to the Commission in June 2025 ([Agenda Item 3F](#)), to revise existing TPAs and the system of supports surrounding their implementation. Given the increasing prevalence of Artificial Intelligence (AI), the workgroup chose to include an additional recommendation that the Commission assemble an expert group to explore the impact of AI on the TPA. This agenda item presents an overview of a one-day forum held to explore the impact of AI on Performance Assessments, the recommendations developed at the forum, and proposed revisions to the Performance Assessment Design Standards based on the developed recommendations.

## Background

As detailed in Education Code 44320.4, the workgroup to review the design and implementation of the TPA (RDI-TPA) was charged with developing recommendations for the Commission in five main areas: (1) modifications to ensure TPAs are valid and authentic for the work of teaching, reasonable to implement in the range of classroom contexts, and appropriate for beginning teachers; (2) embedding the TPA within candidate preparation; (3) questions to include in completer surveys to better understand candidates' experiences with the TPA; (4) strengthening the accreditation system to ensure candidates receive the support they need; and (5) engaging programs in local scoring to inform program improvement.

As the workgroup grappled with developing recommendations for the five focal areas, the prevalence of AI and candidates' use of AI continued to enter the conversation. In particular, workgroup participants highlighted the lack of any current policy on the use of AI in the performance assessments. Given the increasing prevalence of the use of AI and the lack of a current policy, workgroup participants thought it was critical to include an additional recommendation outside the five focal areas calling for the consideration of the impact of AI on the performance assessments. Specifically, the workgroup's recommendation was:

*"The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that a separate expert group be created to study AI and the impact of AI on the TPA."*

## AI in Performance Assessment Forum

Commission staff partnered with the Californians Dedicated to Education Foundation (CDEF) to hold a one-day forum to explore the use of AI in Performance Assessment on March 6, 2026. The in-person event was attended by 26 individuals. Of those, nine represented educator preparation programs: three from CSU programs; one from an AICCU program; one from a UC program; and four from local education agency-based programs. An additional five participants currently work in PK-12 schools or districts. One individual attended representing the California

Teachers Association and another represented the State Board of Education. The remaining nine individuals were either Commission staff or CDEF staff.

The day included two keynote sessions. In the morning, Dr. Kathleen Rowley, a consulting teacher from William S. Hart Union High School District, provided considerations about the impact of AI on teaching. The afternoon session, led by Dr. Daniel Soodjinda, professor of education and liberal studies at CSU Stanislaus, offered ideas for how to ethically incorporate AI into a performance assessment. Each keynote was followed by the opportunity for participants to engage in a focused conversation on one of four topics: student constructed response, evaluation, assessment development, and formative feedback. After each conversation, participants shared their focused reflections in a Padlet. These reflections, along with notes captured throughout the discussions during the day, became resources for final synthesizing conversations and the development of recommendations.

### **Emerging Themes from Forum Discussions**

As detailed above, participants had multiple opportunities to consider and discuss the impact of AI on performance assessments, currently and in future iterations. Several themes emerged from those discussions.

#### *AI Already Being Utilized*

Participants agreed that candidates already use AI tools to brainstorm ideas for parts of their performance assessments, develop content, and receive feedback on constructed responses. Additionally, participants noted that AI-generated responses have already been shown to receive passing scores. One participant stated, “If educator preparation programs have not begun discussions about incorporating AI into their programs, they should. Candidates are using it, and AI is not going away.”

#### *Current Assessments Privilege Written Commentary*

Participants also highlighted that a shortcoming of the current performance assessments is how much they rely on written commentary for the submission, commentary that can easily be generated by AI. Additionally, the reliance on written commentary potentially puts candidates who struggle with writing or whose first language is not English at a disadvantage. As one participant wrote, “TPA will be valuable only if it feels authentic. Parts of the TPA feel like busy work, and the use of AI is a response to it.” Another participant added, “The assessment tool needs to be redesigned to emphasize and support conversations between candidates and experts.”

#### *Potential of AI to Serve as a Tool*

Still, participants noted that AI can be utilized as a tool to support candidate learning. Candidates might use AI to support their brainstorming of instructional plans or to guide their reflections. As one participant stated, “AI is here, and we should treat it as such. Instead of figuring out how do we prevent AI use, can we shift it to how will teachers use AI—and accept that as the current reality?”

#### *Unequal Access to AI Tools*

Use of AI within the assessments may present issues with equity, as not all candidates have the same access to AI tools. Current expectations for and the policies surrounding AI use vary from

institution to institution, raising concerns about access and candidates' potential ability to use the tools effectively. One participant noted in their reflection, "There needs to be a focus on equity and access for using and understanding AI. If universities/instructors are not using AI or do not want to use it, and others are, this becomes an equity issue for teacher candidates and then the students they teach in the future."

#### *Necessity of Preserving Human Elements of Teaching*

Participants emphasized that, at its core, teaching is a profession that prioritizes interactions with and relationships among people. Teachers must be able to build relationships with students, respond in the moment to student actions, and reflect on their practice. These actions cannot be replaced by AI and must remain central to the performance assessment. One participant offered the hope that, "If AI is used as a tool for greater efficiency, perhaps there is more space and time for authentic relationship development with students in the classroom. We need to elevate personal connection and meeting individual student needs."

#### **Primary Recommendations**

Based on the discussions they had throughout the day, participants were tasked with developing policy recommendations for future performance assessments that would more explicitly impact candidates' use of AI.

#### *Recommendation 1: Shift PA Towards More Authentic Demonstrations of Practice*

Because written commentary can so easily be generated by AI tools, participants recommended that future assessments more heavily focus on videos of instruction or interactions, with requirements that the videos capture evidence of the desired actions, such as adaptations to student needs during instruction and/or reflections on teaching practice. Additionally, participants recommended that safeguards be included to protect against AI-generated videos. Possible safeguards might include required observation by the university supervisor and/or mentor teacher on the day(s) of instruction.

#### *Recommendation 2: Incorporate Recorded Candidate Explanation of Their Work*

To ensure assessment of candidates teaching practices, participants suggested a shift in the format of the performance assessments towards a facilitated discussion with the candidate of their instructional decisions. Suggestions for how this might be incorporated into the assessment included video recording of a supervisor or mentor teacher conducting a structured interview with the candidate utilizing provided prompts to engage the candidate in a reflection on their lesson design and/or implementation.

#### *Recommendation 3: Evaluate Candidates' Ability to Use AI Professionally*

Given the prevalence of the use of AI both in society in general and among candidates, participants recommended instruction in how to use AI effectively to support teaching be incorporated into preparation programs and evaluated as part of the performance assessments. In particular, participants suggested that the assessments could evaluate candidates' ability to use AI tools appropriately, critically analyze AI outputs, adapt AI-generated ideas or lessons for use with their specific students and in their specific contexts, and understand and respond to data privacy concerns.

#### *Recommendation 4: Maintain Human Evaluation*

Participants also acknowledged that AI tools could be implemented for evaluating candidates' submissions. However, they recommended that, even if this occurs, human evaluators must remain central to final decisions made about submissions to ensure fairness, contextual judgements, and attention to the relational aspects of teaching.

#### **Proposed Revisions to Performance Assessment Design Standards**

Incorporating the Forum Participants' recommendations into current TPAs would require the following amendments to the Performance Assessment Design Standards (PADS):

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Suggested PADS Amendment</b>
Recommendation 1: Shift PA Towards More Authentic Demonstration of Practice	Revise PADS 1(a)(1) General Task Specifications statement as follows: "The TPA includes a minimum of one video of the candidate's teaching performance" to read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• For each planned required instructional activity, the TPA includes a minimum of one video of the candidate's teaching performance that captures the candidate's instructional decision-making and ability to adapt to student needs.</li></ul>
Recommendation 2: Incorporate Recorded Candidate Explanation of Their Work	Revise PADS 1(a)(1) General Task Specifications as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Replace the statement "The candidate is required to provide written, audio, or video commentary on the video on instruction that includes description of the lesson plan, rationale for teaching decisions shown, and reflection on the effect of the teaching decisions on student learning" with "For each teaching task, the TPA includes a video submission of a reflective conversation between the candidate and the mentor teacher or university supervisor, facilitated using prompts provided by the model sponsor. At a minimum, prompts must include a description of the lesson plan, rationale for teaching decisions shown, and reflection on the effect of the teaching decisions on student learning."</li></ul>
Recommendation 3: Evaluate Candidates' Ability to Use AI Professionally	Revise PADS 1(a)(1) General Task Specifications to include: Use of AI <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ The TPA allows candidates to ethically use AI tools to support them in their development of instructional resources, including but not limited to initial lesson plan brainstorming, customizing instructional materials, verifying</li></ul>

Recommendation	Suggested PADS Amendment
	<p>accuracy of CA content-strands/standards, and/or assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ When AI Tools are utilized, the TPA requires candidates to document the tools used and the prompts developed to generate the materials. The TPA requires candidates to critically analyze any AI-generated resources and document revisions made.</li> <li>○ It is the responsibility of the candidate to ensure all submitted work reflects authentic professional judgment and follows program and assessment integrity expectations.</li> </ul>
<p>Recommendation 4: Maintain Human Evaluation</p>	<p>Revise PADS 2(d)(1) Development of Scoring Processes to Ensure Validity and Reliability of Scores to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Artificial Intelligence may be used to provide an initial evaluation of a candidate’s submission materials but all final decisions must be made by a calibrated assessor.</li> </ul>

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommend that the Commission consider the recommendations of the participants in the AI in PA Forum and the proposed revisions to the PADS. Based on their considerations and recommendations, staff recommend that the Commission direct staff to make any recommended revisions to the PADS.

**Next Steps**

Based on the direction of the Commission, staff will revise the PADS to align with the recommended revisions. The updated PADS will be shared with all currently approved model sponsors and will be incorporated within the specifications for a new Commission TPA.