
3G

Information

Educator Preparation Committee

Proposed Revisions to Common and Program Standards Related to Performance Assessment

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents proposed revisions to the Common and Program Standards as part of the implementation of the recommendations of the Workgroup to Review the Design and Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment.

Recommended Action: For information only

Presenters: Erin Sullivan, Director, and Miranda Gutierrez, Administrator, Division of Standards, Accreditation, and Workforce Investment; and Juliet Michelsen Wahleithner, Director, 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
 - B. Develop educator performance assessments that are embedded in clinical preparation to ensure readiness to begin professional practice
 - C. Enact a rigorous accreditation process that ensures programs meet standards and are effective in preparing educators for public schools
- **Goal 4.** Induction programs support the entry of new educators into the profession, strengthen their practice through directed and meaningful mentoring and professional development, and increase the likelihood of their retention in the profession.
 - G. Set and maintain rigorous standards to ensure induction programs effectively support new educators as they move through professional development and mentoring to earn their clear credential
 - H. Strengthen the connection between initial preparation and induction into the profession through individualized mentoring and professional development

Proposed Revisions to Common and Program Standards Related to Performance Assessment

Introduction

Senate Bill 1263 (Chap. 889, Stats. 2024) directed the Commission to review California's teaching performance assessment and broader educator preparation systems. In [June 2025](#), the Commission adopted recommendations from the Workgroup to Review the Design and Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment (RDI-TPA) as the foundation for the next phase of this work. This item presents proposed revisions to the Preliminary Teaching Credential Program Standards (Multiple and Single Subject, Education Specialist, and PK-3 Early Childhood Education Specialist Instruction) and Common Standards as they relate to the various aspects of performance assessments. These revisions include clear expectations that performance assessments be integrated into program curriculum, programs explicitly use performance assessment outcome data to inform continuous improvement efforts, and more concise and clear language related to support be provided to candidates to facilitate their success. The proposed revisions focus on *Project Area 2: Program Implementation* of the workgroup's recommendations ([Agenda Item 3B](#), August 2026).

Background

SB 1263 workgroup

Since 2008, California has required teaching candidates to complete a program that includes a Commission-approved performance assessment for initial licensure, grounding educator preparation in observable teaching aligned to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. The system matured as the state transitioned from a single assessment model to multiple approved options, strengthened alignment to coursework and clinical practice, and began implementation of performance assessment into accreditation and continuous improvement processes.

In 2014, the Commission adopted a five-part accountability framework to support high-quality educator preparation in California. The framework includes: (1) streamlined, outcomes-focused program standards; (2) valid and reliable performance assessments; (3) consistent outcomes measures, including surveys of program completers and employers; (4) accreditation processes that prioritize evidence over narrative; and (5) public transparency through accessible, comparable data. These components are interdependent and designed to work together as a coherent system. Within this structure, the teaching performance assessment was to function as a central mechanism for verifying candidate competence, strengthening program quality, and informing both accreditation and public reporting.

Over time, implementation of the teaching performance assessment (TPA) drifted from the original framework and intent. Candidates increasingly experienced the TPA as a time-intensive requirement that felt separate from their preparation. Faculty reported challenges embedding the assessment effectively in coursework, and programs felt a disconnect with accreditation activities. The added cost and frequency of candidate retakes sustained real concerns about

equity and access. These dynamics diminished the TPA's value as a formative tool and limited its effectiveness as a source of evidence for candidate and program growth.

Senate Bill 1263 (Chap. 889, Stats. 2024) reaffirmed California's use of performance assessment as both a condition of licensure and an accountability tool to ensure educator preparation programs deliver value commensurate with the investment made by candidates. The law directed the Commission to examine and improve the design, implementation, and use of the current system, including convening a workgroup to develop recommendations that support high quality, accessible, and educative preparation.

In August 2024 the Commission appointed the Workgroup to Review the Design and Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment (RDI-TPA Workgroup). The RDI-TPA Workgroup focused on five specific sections of Education Code section 44220.4, which defined the key areas for developing recommendations for the Commission. The five focus areas included:

1. An analysis of any modifications needed to current assessments to ensure they are valid and authentic to the work of teaching, reasonable to implement in the wide range of classroom settings across the state, and appropriate for beginning teachers. [44320.4(c)(1)]
2. Recommendations for how programs might embed the assessments into coursework and clinical work to avoid duplicative work for candidates. [44320.4(c)(2)]
3. Recommendations to strengthen the accreditation system to ensure programs embed the assessment in coursework and clinical work, offer sufficient clinical and pedagogical support, and support candidates to pass the assessment. [44320.4(c)(4)]
4. Recommendations for how programs can engage in local scoring of the assessment to inform program improvement. [44320.4(c)(5)]
5. Suggested questions for program completer surveys to understand candidate experience of programmatic support for assessment completion. [44320.4(c)(3)]

In [June 2025](#), the Commission adopted the recommendations of the RDI-TPA Workgroup and directed staff to return with a phased implementation plan, which was subsequently presented and adopted by the Commission in [August 2025](#).

RDI-TPA Workgroup Recommendations

The recommendations of the RDI-TPA Workgroup were organized by Project Areas with clusters of related recommendations for Commission staff. Project Area 2 focuses on Program Implementation. Table 1 below provides the recommendations for Program Implementation that correspond with updates to standards. The Implementation Plan for addressing Project Area 2 specifically stated that the Division of Standards, Accreditation, and Workforce Investment (DSAWI) and the Division of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (DREA) would collaborate to revise appropriate Program and Common Standards to address the recommendations.

Table 1. Project Area 2 Program Implementation

Project Area 2: Program Implementation
<i>Embedding</i> 3A – Embed PA tasks in coursework and clinical practice 2B – Require orientation for all educational partners on adopted PA model 3B – Require individualized formative feedback throughout PA process 4A – Require local scoring methods that align with improvement needs 3F – Require educator analysis of candidate PA responses 3H – Require program monitoring of PA embedding and local scoring outcomes <i>Program Implementation Oversight</i> 3G – Emphasize use of PA data in Common Standard 4 3D – Include PA as an assessment in each program matrix for accreditation 3C – Require documentation on how programs will support non-passing candidates 3I – Require support tailored for intern pathway candidates 3E – Use PA results to inform IDP and ILP goals

Process for Updating Standards

In following the Implementation Plan, the process for updating the Program and Common Standards was accomplished as a collaborative effort between DSAWI and DREA. Division staff reviewed each of the recommendations in Project Area 2: Program Implementation to identify the specific standards for revision based on each of the recommendations. In particular, staff focused on the recommendations that called for the use of performance assessment data to support candidates and inform program improvement; performance assessment tasks to be embedded in both coursework and clinical practice; and program faculty, staff, and educational partners to be informed and oriented on the adopted TPA model.

Through this process, staff identified two Common Standards and three Program Standards to revise to integrate the recommendations. Note that Common Standards are applied at the institutional level, regardless of the number and type of educator preparation programs offered by the institution, and set requirements for the institution regarding support and oversight of all programs it offers. Program Standards are unique to each individual educator preparation program. The standards being recommended for updates are summarized below. The proposed revisions can be found in Appendix A.

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support

This Common Standard requires that all preparation programs support candidates in each program. Specifically, each program must identify the appropriate personnel to guide each candidate in meeting the program requirements; maintain evidence that candidate progress in meeting competencies or performance expectations is used to guide and support candidates; and have a process in place to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance.

The proposed revisions specify that candidate advising and support are guided by individual candidate progress meeting the competencies or performance expectations and the use of outcome data, including performance assessment data if applicable to the credential.

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement

This Common Standard requires that the education unit implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process at the unit level and within each of its programs. It requires that the collection, analysis, and use of candidate data are regularly and systematically collected and reviewed to improve programs.

The proposed revisions further specify that the unit and programs regularly and systematically assess their effectiveness through a continuous improvement process that includes multiple sources of data. Candidate competency is expanded to include the extent to which candidates demonstrate mastery in meeting competencies or performance expectations and the use of performance assessment data, if applicable to the credential, in the continuous improvement process.

Note: The education unit refers to the college, school, or department in colleges, universities, or local education agencies with the responsibility for managing and coordinating all aspects of Commission-approved educator preparation programs being offered, regardless of where the programs may be administratively housed.

Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject, Education Specialist, and PK-3 Early Childhood Education Specialist Instruction

Program Standard 3: Clinical Practice – B. Criteria for School Placements

This program standard sets the minimum requirements for clinical practice, which varies slightly in each program type but generally includes number of hours of clinical practice; range of experiences; selection, training, support, and expectations of both program- and district-employed supervisors; and school placements. The proposed revisions specify that clinical practice placements must be an appropriate setting for completing the performance assessment.

Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject, Education Specialist, and PK-3 Early Childhood Education Specialist Instruction

Program Standard 5: Teaching Performance Assessment

The current standard for implementing the TPA includes aspects of program compliance more than program quality. The proposed revisions would strengthen the standard by integrating the TPA more fully into ongoing program practices. The proposed revisions require programs to provide candidates with formative experiences aligned with TPA tasks across multiple courses and clinical practice, the use of rubrics to evaluate candidate teaching that aligns with TPA rubrics, candidate remediation support, and ongoing professional development for faculty, staff, and mentor teachers. Consistent with the proposed revisions to Common Standard 4, proposed revisions to Program Standard 5 would support continuous improvement by requiring the use of candidate and program level TPA data to inform the program practices.

Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject and Education Specialist

Program Standard 6: Induction Individual Development Plan

Preliminary PK-3 Early Childhood Education Specialist Instruction

Program Standard 9: Induction Individual Development Plan

This program standard sets the requirement for candidates' individual development plans (IDP), which must be developed through collaboration among the program, the candidate, the district-employed supervisor, and the program supervisor. The IDP is a portable document that candidates who have completed all preliminary credential requirements share with their induction program upon beginning their first year as a credentialed teacher. The IDP includes recommendations for the candidate's continued professional development and growth to be completed during their induction program. These recommendations guide the candidate's individualized learning plan (ILP). The proposed revisions make explicit that a candidate's TPA results inform the development of the candidate's IDP and ILP.

Staff Recommendation

That the Commission review the proposed revisions to the Common and Program Standards and provide feedback to staff.

Next Steps

Staff will incorporate any feedback based on Commission discussion and conduct a field review to gather feedback on the proposed revisions to Common and Program Standards. Staff will return to the Commission with an item for possible adoption of revised Common and Program Standards that include revisions based on feedback received during the field review.

Appendix A

Proposed Common Standards and Program Standards

Common Standards Proposed Revisions

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support

Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success

The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications.

The education unit purposefully recruits and admits candidates to diversify the educator pool in California and provides the support, advice, and assistance to promote their successful entry and retention in the profession.

Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of program and credential requirements.

Evidence regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is consistently used to guide advisement and candidate *support* efforts. Candidate advisement and candidate supports are guided by: (1) individual candidate progress in meeting competencies and performance expectations, and (2) outcomes data including performance assessment if applicable to the credential.

A clearly defined process is in place to identify and support all candidates including those who need additional assistance to meet program requirements and competencies.

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement

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.

The education unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness in relation to: the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice, and support services for candidates.

Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically 1) collect, 2) analyze, and 3) use candidate and program completion data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.

The education unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness in relation to: the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice, and support services for candidates through a continuous improvement process. The continuous improvement process includes multiple sources of data including 1) the extent to which candidates are prepared to enter professional practice; 2) the extent to which candidates have demonstrated mastery

towards meeting performance expectations or candidate competencies, 3) performance assessment data if applicable to the credential, and 4) feedback from key constituencies such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation.

Program Standard Proposed Revisions

Clinical Practice Standard 3 Proposed Changes

Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject

Program Standard 3: Clinical Practice

B. Criteria for School Placements Clinical sites (schools) should be selected that demonstrate commitment to collaborative evidence-based practices and continuous program improvement, have partnerships with appropriate other educational, social, and community entities that support teaching and learning, place students with disabilities in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), provide robust programs and support for English learners, reflect to the extent possible socioeconomic and cultural diversity, and be an appropriate setting for the candidate to complete the TPA and permit video capture for candidate reflection and TPA completion. Clinical sites should also have a fully qualified site administrator.

Preliminary Education Specialist

Program Standard 3: Clinical Practice

C. Criteria for School Placements Sites selected for candidate experiences should demonstrate commitment to developmentally and culturally appropriate practices as well as to collaborative relationships with families. In addition, these sites should also demonstrate placement of students with disabilities in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), provide support for dual language learners with disabilities, and offer the opportunity for candidates to interact with different age groups in both general and special education settings reflecting the continuum of placement options. They should also reflect to the extent possible socioeconomic, linguistic, and cultural diversity, and be an appropriate setting for the candidate to complete the TPA and permit video capture for candidate reflection. Sites selected should have a fully qualified master/mentor teacher with an appropriate credential and a fully qualified site administrator.

Preliminary PK-3 Early Childhood Education Specialist

Program Standard 3: Clinical Practice: Opportunities to Learn and to Practice

B. Criteria for Clinical Practice Placements

Clinical sites should be selected that demonstrate commitment to developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate practices as well as to collaborative relationships with families/guardians. In addition, clinical sites should demonstrate evidence-based practices and continuous program improvement, have partnerships with appropriate other educational, social, and community entities that support teaching and learning, place students with disabilities in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), provide robust programs and support for English learners, reflect to the extent possible socioeconomic and cultural diversity, and be an appropriate setting for the candidate to complete the TPA and permit video capture for

candidate reflection and TPA completion. Clinical sites should also have a fully qualified site administrator.

Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject (MS/SS), Education Specialist, and Preliminary PK-3 Early Childhood Education (ECE) Specialist Instruction Program Standards

MS/SS Standard 5: Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA)

Education Specialist Standard 5: Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA)

PK-3 ECE Specialist Instruction Standard 5: Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA)

[\(current Program Standards for preliminary teaching credential programs\)](#). Note: the language below would replace the language of the current standard.

The program intentionally integrates a Commission-approved TPA in accordance with the requirements of the TPA model sponsor by providing TPA support for candidates across coursework **and** clinical practice using the selected TPA model guidelines.

Prior to clinical practice, candidates are oriented to the TPA structure, materials, logistics (registration, condition codes, and scoring), and institutional policies (remediation and appeals). The program engages candidates in formative experiences aligned with the TPA tasks throughout multiple courses (e.g., assignments analyzing their instruction, developing curriculum units, or assessing student work) and clinical practice (e.g., aligning lesson plan expectations with the TPA lesson requirements; using rubrics to evaluate candidates' teaching that align with the TPA rubrics; using prompts from the TPA to guide candidates' reflections when de-briefing their teaching; requiring candidates to video record their teaching). The program also provides formative feedback to candidates as they prepare their TPA materials, prior to final submission. The program offers remediation support and guidance on resubmitting task components consistent with model sponsor guidelines for candidates who do not pass.

The program provides annual professional development to all program faculty—including full-time, adjunct, supervisory staff, and mentor teachers—on all TPA tasks, rubrics, and scoring processes to effectively prepare candidates.

To drive continuous improvement, the program maintains and documents candidate and program-level TPA data for Commission reporting, accreditation, and mentor teacher and faculty development. The program leverages TPA data to inform program revisions.

MS/SS Standard 6: Induction Individual Development Plan

Education Specialist Standard 6: Induction Individual Development Plan

Before exiting the preliminary program, candidates, district-employed supervisors, and program supervisors collaborate on an individual development plan (IDP) consisting of recommendations for professional development and growth in the candidate's clear program. The candidate's performance assessment results shall be at least one indicator used in developing the recommendations. The plan is a portable document archived by the preliminary program and provided to the candidate for transmission to the clear/induction program.

PK-3 ECE Specialist Instruction Standard 9: Induction Individual Development Plan

Before exiting the preliminary program, candidates, LEA-based supervisors, and program supervisors collaborate on an individual development plan (IDP) consisting of recommendations for professional development and growth in the candidate's clear program. The candidate's performance assessment results shall be at least one indicator used in developing the recommendations. The plan is a portable document archived by the preliminary program and provided to the candidate for transmission to the clear/induction program.