
3F

Information

Educator Preparation Committee

Implementation of Senate Bill 1263: Progress on the RDI-TPA Workgroup Recommendations and Interim Actions

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents an update on the work completed to address both the Interim Actions recommended by the SB 1263-mandated Workgroup to Review the Design and Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment and the workgroup's final recommendations.

Recommended Action: For information only

Presenter: Juliet Michelsen Wahleithner, Director, Division of Research, Evaluation, & 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

Implementation of Senate Bill 1263: Progress on the RDI-TPA Workgroup Recommendations and Interim Actions

Introduction

[Senate Bill 1263](#) (Newman, Chapter 889, Statutes of 2024) directed the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to convene a workgroup to examine the design and implementation of California's teaching performance assessments (TPAs). The legislation required the Commission to adopt recommendations from the workgroup by July 1, 2025, and implement the adopted recommendations by July 1, 2028. Education Code section [44320.4\(d\)](#) also requires annual reports to the Legislature, beginning October 15, 2025, and continuing through October 15, 2028, describing progress on implementation.

The Commission adopted the final recommendations of the RDI-TPA Workgroup in June 2025 ([Agenda Item 3F](#)) and approved an implementation plan in August 2025 ([Agenda Item 3B](#)). Since those actions, the Commission has adopted revised Performance Assessment Design Standards (PADS) ([February 2026 Agenda Item 4B](#)), established design specifications for the Commission's model TPA ([April 2026 Agenda Item 3B](#)), and approved a Performance Assessment Pass Rate Identification Framework and Commission System of Support ([June 2026 Agenda Item 4D](#)). Staff have also developed proposed revisions to Common and Program Standards, presented for information and feedback in a companion item at this October 2026 Commission meeting. These actions address assessment design, scoring, candidate support, integration of assessments into preparation, program improvement, and use of assessment results.

Implementation is assessed through two distinct measures. The first is whether the policy necessary to carry out a recommendation has been established through adopted standards, design requirements, Commission procedures, or other policy actions. The second is whether the recommendation has been operationally implemented through assessment models, preparation programs, accreditation processes, or Commission systems and supports. Distinguishing the two measures allows the Commission to account for policy development while identifying the activities necessary to make those requirements operative.

Table 1: Summary of Implementation Progress

Implementation Measure	Recommendations
Established in adopted policy or existing Commission procedures	16 of 24 (66.7%)
Additional recommendations if proposed standards adopted*	3 of 24 (12.5%)
Not yet addressed by adopted policy or current proposed standards	5 of 24 (20.8%)
Operationally implemented	3 of 24 (12.5%)
Operational implementation pending	21 of 24 (87.5%)

**Three additional recommendations would be addressed through the proposed revisions to the Common Standards and Program Standards presented for the Commission's consideration under Item 3G at this meeting.*

Of the 24 adopted recommendations, including the supplemental recommendation concerning artificial intelligence, 16 have been established in adopted Commission policy or existing procedures. Three additional recommendations would be established through adoption of the proposed Common and Program Standards presented in [Agenda Item 3G](#), bringing the total to 19 of 24, or 79.2 percent. Five recommendations are not yet addressed by adopted policy or the current proposed standards: 1F, concerning financial accessibility; 3D, concerning inclusion of TPA evidence in accreditation program matrices; 3H, concerning monitoring of TPA integration and local scoring outcomes; 3I, concerning support for candidates in intern pathways; and the supplemental recommendation concerning the impact of artificial intelligence on teaching performance assessments.

Three recommendations are currently identified as operationally implemented, while implementation of the remaining 21 is pending. The operational determinations reflect activities documented to date and will continue to be reviewed as assessment models, preparation programs, and Commission processes incorporate the adopted requirements. Some recommendations concern discrete activities that can be completed through publication of a resource or other defined action, while others require changes across multiple assessment models or educator preparation programs.

The report also documents implementation of the seven Interim Actions recommended by the RDI-TPA Workgroup approved by the Commission in February 2025 ([Agenda Item 4A](#)). Five are identified as completed, one as partially implemented, and one as in progress. Those actions have resulted in revisions to condition code procedures, issuance of candidate support guidance, standardization of assessment reporting, changes to secondary passing standard notifications, and development of a statewide process for identifying and supporting preparation programs based on performance assessment outcomes.

Background

California's system of educator preparation includes a TPA requirement intended to establish that candidates can demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary for beginning professional practice ([Education Code 44320.2](#)). The assessments also generate evidence that preparation programs and the Commission can use to examine candidate outcomes and program effectiveness. Commission policies governing and related to TPAs include Teaching Performance Expectations, Performance Assessment Design Standards, Program Standards, and accreditation requirements that establish expectations for preparation, assessment administration, scoring, reporting, and candidate support.

Concerns regarding the design and implementation of TPAs prompted additional examination of the system, including the extent to which assessment activities are authentic to teaching, integrated into preparation, and appropriate for beginning teachers. Other concerns included assessment costs, condition codes, the support candidates receive, and how assessment evidence informs preparation program improvement. Senate Bill 1263 directed the Commission to convene a workgroup representing classroom teachers, teacher educators, and performance

assessment experts to examine these issues and develop recommendations for Commission consideration.

The RDI-TPA Workgroup consisted of 24 members: eight classroom teachers, eight teacher educators, and eight performance assessment experts. The Commission approved the workgroup's charge in August 2024, and the group began meeting in September 2024. Its work addressed five areas identified in [Education Code section 44320.4](#): modifications to ensure assessment validity and authenticity; embedding assessments in coursework and clinical practice; gathering information about the candidate experience; strengthening accreditation and candidate support; and local scoring to inform program improvement.

In February 2025, the workgroup presented initial recommendations and identified seven Interim Actions that could be undertaken before completion of the final recommendations. The Commission approved those actions to address immediate concerns about condition codes, resubmission costs, acceptable candidate support, data reporting, secondary passing standard notifications, and communication with preparation programs. Staff began implementation activities during spring 2025 and continued reporting progress to the workgroup and Commission.

In June 2025, the Commission adopted 23 recommendations across the five focus areas and one supplemental recommendation concerning artificial intelligence. The Commission approved an implementation plan in August 2025 that organized the recommendations into related work involving assessment design, program implementation, and accountability and field support. The plan recognized that fulfilling the recommendations would require both policy development and changes to the practices and systems through which assessments are administered and used.

This report uses “Established in Policy” to identify whether an adopted Commission requirement or existing procedure provides the necessary basis for carrying out a recommendation. Recommendations are identified as “Yes,” “Yes, if proposed standards adopted,” or “No.” “Operationally Implemented” is recorded as “Met” when the activity or process required by the recommendation has been put into effect and “Pending” when additional implementation remains necessary. The seven Interim Actions are evaluated separately according to completion of the activities originally directed by the Commission.

Policy Development

The Commission has taken a series of actions to establish the policy framework for implementing the RDI-TPA Workgroup recommendations. Beginning with adoption of the recommendations in June 2025, these actions have addressed assessment design and administration, preparation program requirements, candidate support, performance assessment reporting, and program improvement. The following summarizes the Commission items that have guided this work.

- **June 2025: Adoption of RDI-TPA Workgroup Recommendations**

At its June 2025 meeting, the Commission adopted 23 recommendations ([Agenda Item 3F](#)) developed by the RDI-TPA Workgroup across the five focus areas identified in Education Code section 44320.4, along with a supplemental recommendation concerning artificial

intelligence. The recommendations address assessment design and authenticity, integration of TPA tasks into coursework and clinical practice, the candidate experience, accreditation and candidate support, and local scoring and analysis of candidate performance. The supplemental recommendation calls for further study of artificial intelligence and its implications for teaching performance assessments. Following adoption, the Commission directed staff to develop an implementation plan assessing feasibility and identifying the policy actions and operational activities necessary to carry out the recommendations.

- **August 2025: RDI-TPA Implementation Plan**

At its August 2025 meeting, the Commission approved an implementation plan ([Agenda Item 3B](#)) for the adopted recommendations. The plan organized activities into three areas: assessment design, preparation program implementation, and accountability and support for the field. It identified revisions to the [Performance Assessment Design Standards](#) (PADS), development of the Commission's model TPA, revisions to Common and Program Standards, and improvements to performance assessment reporting and program support as principal components of implementation. The plan also established a sequence for subsequent policy development and engagement with assessment sponsors, preparation programs, and other educational partners. These activities provided the framework for the Commission actions described below.

- **February 2026: Revised Performance Assessment Design Standards**

At its February 2026 meeting, the Commission adopted revised PADS ([Agenda Item 4B](#)) addressing recommendations concerning assessment design, administration, scoring, candidate support, and reporting. The revisions establish requirements for culturally and linguistically responsive and sustaining teaching, Universal Design for Learning, authentic evidence of classroom practice, and modular assessment tasks that can be embedded in coursework and clinical experiences. They also address multiple forms of candidate evidence, analytic rubrics, scorer qualifications and calibration, and the elimination of content-based condition codes. Additional provisions establish requirements for candidate and program support materials, timely notification and allowances for correction of technical condition codes, local scoring, assessment outcome reporting, and candidate experience surveys. The revised PADS provide a principal policy mechanism for implementing recommendations directed at all Commission-approved assessment models, including the Commission's model TPA.

- **April 2026: Commission Model TPA Design Specifications**

At its April 2026 meeting, the Commission considered and adopted design specifications ([Agenda Item 3B](#)) for the Commission's model TPA. The specifications establish four connected components of teaching practice: knowing learners and identifying learning goals; designing for access, engagement, and evidence; teaching and gathering evidence of learning; and interpreting evidence to inform subsequent instruction. They distinguish between developmental assessment activities, during which candidates can receive feedback and revise their work, and a final submission used to determine readiness for credentialing. Additional provisions address authentic teaching evidence, analytic rubrics and scoring, candidate and program supports, local scoring, reporting, candidate surveys, and technological infrastructure. The specifications also establish expectations for

appropriate use of artificial intelligence while preserving human scoring of candidate performance. Together, these requirements provide the design framework for the Commission's model TPA and guide subsequent assessment development and testing.

- **June 2026: Performance Assessment Pass Rate Identification Framework**

Following consideration of an initial Performance Assessment Pass Rate Identification Framework in February 2026, staff returned to the Commission in June 2026 with a refined framework and implementation plan ([Agenda Item 4D](#)), which the Commission approved. The framework establishes three performance bands based on program first-time TPA pass rates: Meeting Standard, at 85 percent or higher; Approaching Standard, at 70 through 84 percent; and Below Standard, at less than 70 percent. Programs identified as Below Standard are required to examine their assessment results, identify areas for improvement, and develop Action Plans, while programs in other bands are encouraged to engage in corresponding improvement activities. The framework uses the Multiple Measures Report (MMR), developed within the Commission's Accreditation Data Dashboard, to provide programs with performance information and support their analyses. It also establishes a Commission System of Support consisting of Direct Support for identified programs and Networked Support available more broadly. The 2026–27 academic year serves as the initial pilot period for implementing the framework and corresponding support processes.

- **June 2026: Proposed PADS Revisions Concerning Artificial Intelligence**

Also at the June 2026 meeting, the Commission considered proposed revisions ([Agenda Item 4E](#)) to the PADS addressing the use of artificial intelligence in teaching performance assessments. The proposed revisions were developed following an AI in Performance Assessment Forum convened by Commission staff and the Californians Dedicated to Education Foundation on March 6, 2026, in response to the workgroup's supplemental recommendation. The forum brought together 26 participants to examine the implications of AI for assessment validity, authenticity, equity, and candidate preparation. Participants recommended placing greater emphasis on authentic demonstrations of teaching, incorporating opportunities for candidates to explain instructional decisions, and evaluating candidates' ability to use AI appropriately and ethically while preserving human scoring. The proposed PADS revisions were presented for Commission feedback and are being updated based on that feedback.

- **October 2026: Proposed Revisions to Common and Program Standards**

A companion item at this October 2026 Commission meeting, [Agenda Item 3G](#), presents proposed revisions to Common and Program Standards addressing the implementation of performance assessments within educator preparation programs. Proposed revisions to Common Standards 2 and 4 would clarify expectations for candidate support and the use of performance assessment results in continuous improvement. Revisions to Program Standards 3 and 5 would establish additional requirements for clinical placements, integration of TPA tasks into coursework and clinical practice, formative feedback, candidate remediation, professional development, and program analysis of assessment results. Proposed revisions to Program Standards 6 and 9 would also establish expectations for using TPA results to inform Individual Development Plans and subsequent Individual Learning Plans during induction. These proposed revisions address the preparation program

responsibilities associated with several adopted workgroup recommendations. The standards are being presented for information and have not yet been adopted.

Implementation of the RDI-TPA Workgroup Recommendations

The following tables present the policy and operational implementation status of the 24 adopted recommendations. Recommendations are organized by the five focus areas and the supplemental recommendation concerning artificial intelligence. The accompanying discussion identifies the principal policy provisions and implementation activities associated with each recommendation, while the preceding section provides additional detail about the Commission actions establishing those requirements.

Focus Area 1: Assessment Design and Implementation

Table 2: Focus Area 1 Recommendations

Recommendation	Established in Policy	Operationally Implemented
1A: Asset-Based, Inclusive Teaching in TPA Tasks	Yes	Pending
1B: Redesign TPA Structure for Clarity, UDL Alignment, and Smaller Segments	Yes	Pending
1C: Expand Flexibility and Multiple Modalities for Candidate Evidence	Yes	Pending
1D: Require Individualized, Rubric-Specific, Asset-Based Scorer Feedback	Yes	Pending
1E: Require Prompt Candidate Notification for Technical Condition Codes	Yes	Pending
1F: Ensure the TPA Is Free or Financially Accessible	No	Pending

- 1A: Asset-Based, Inclusive Teaching in TPA Tasks.** The workgroup recommended centering culturally responsive and sustaining pedagogy, equitable access, and asset-based instructional practices within TPA tasks. Revised PADS 1(a)(1) establishes corresponding expectations for assessment evidence, including planning for and implementation of instruction that is responsive to diverse learners and applies Universal Design for Learning principles. The Commission's model TPA specifications incorporate these expectations into the instructional-cycle components. Operational implementation remains pending as applicable assessment models incorporate and administer tasks and scoring criteria consistent with these requirements.
- 1B: Redesign TPA Structure for Clarity, UDL Alignment, and Smaller Segments.** The workgroup recommended eliminating duplication, improving assessment instructions and rubrics, and dividing the TPA into smaller tasks embedded throughout preparation. The revised PADS establish modular assessment design requirements, and the Commission model specifications organize candidate work into four connected components with developmental and final submission phases. These adopted requirements establish the policy basis for redesign. Operational implementation requires assessment sponsors to

incorporate the revised structures, instructions, rubrics, and administration procedures into applicable models.

- **1C: Expand Flexibility and Multiple Modalities for Candidate Evidence.** The workgroup recommended greater flexibility in evidence requirements to accommodate different instructional contexts, including permitting choice for written, audio, and/or visual submissions. The revised PADS permit multiple forms of candidate evidence and commentary, while the Commission model specifications address authentic teaching artifacts and options for demonstrating instructional practice. These policies establish requirements for more accessible and context-responsive assessment design. Operational implementation remains pending as sponsors revise assessment tasks and submission procedures to make the permitted options available to candidates.
- **1D: Require Individualized, Rubric-Specific, Asset-Based Scorer Feedback.** The workgroup recommended individualized, actionable feedback explaining the criteria candidates have met and how their evidence relates to the scoring rubrics. Revised PADS 1(b)(1) establishes analytic rubric requirements, while PADS 3(c)(1) requires candidates receiving a score of one on any rubric to receive an explanation of that score. The revised standards also address scorer qualifications and calibration. Operational implementation requires assessment sponsors to incorporate the applicable feedback and calibration requirements into their scoring and reporting processes.
- **1E: Require Prompt Candidate Notification for Technical Condition Codes.** The workgroup recommended that candidates receive notice of technical condition codes within one week and have an opportunity to correct and resubmit their work during the same scoring window without additional cost. Revised PADS 3(c)(1) establishes the notification, correction, and scoring timelines, and staff have undertaken related changes to technical condition code procedures. Full operational implementation remains pending as assessment sponsors revise their scoring processes and notification systems to allow for the seven-day notification period.
- **1F: Ensure the TPA Is Free or Financially Accessible.** The workgroup recommended that candidates have access to TPAs without prohibitive cost through grants, vouchers, stipends, loans, or other financial arrangements. The Commission has undertaken targeted measures, including voucher arrangements for specified candidates and reduction of the CalTPA resubmission fee from \$150 to \$50 beginning in August 2025. Additionally, as revisions were made for new versions of the CalTPA and Education Specialist CalTPA, efforts were made to ensure submissions were scored as submitted to minimize the number of condition codes issued. While these actions address particular assessment expenses and have led to a significant reduction in the number of submissions receiving condition codes, they do not establish a comprehensive policy ensuring that TPAs are free or financially accessible. Additional policy development and funding arrangements are needed to ensure that TPAs are financially accessible to candidates.

Focus Area 2: Embedding Assessments in Preparation

Table 3: Focus Area 2 Recommendations

Recommendation	Established in Policy	Operationally Implemented
2A: Provide Exemplar Materials to Support Program Familiarity with TPA	Yes	Pending
2B: Require Orientation for All Educational Partners on Adopted TPA Model	Yes	Pending
2C: Create Statewide Learning and Feedback Loops for TPA	Yes	Met
2D: Develop a Preservice-to-Induction Continuum of Practice	Yes	Met

- 2A: Provide Exemplar Materials to Support Program Familiarity with TPA.** The workgroup recommended that assessment sponsors provide passing and non-passing examples, common condition code examples, and other materials enabling preparation personnel to understand TPA requirements and scoring. Revised PADS 3(a) establishes requirements for assessment sponsor support materials, including annotated examples and guidance for programs. The Commission model specifications establish corresponding expectations for candidate and program resources. Operational implementation remains pending while the availability of the required materials across applicable assessment models and credential areas is confirmed.
- 2B: Require Orientation for All Educational Partners on Adopted TPA Model.** The workgroup recommended an orientation be provided for preparation faculty, supervisors, mentor teachers, and others supporting candidates. Revised PADS 3(a) requires assessment sponsors to provide orientation materials and ongoing technical assistance, while proposed Program Standard 5 ([October 2026 Agenda Item 3G](#)) would further establish professional development expectations for preparation programs. Commission staff have provided webinars, guidance, and learning opportunities concerning assessment requirements and candidate support. Operational implementation requires programs to establish and carry out orientation practices for relevant educational partners, and that program-level application remains pending.
- 2C: Create Statewide Learning and Feedback Loops for TPA.** The workgroup recommended statewide opportunities for educational partners to exchange information about assessment implementation, share effective practices, and make candidate examples available to preparation programs. Commission staff have supported this work for all program models through the Meredith Fellows Implementation Conference and the Networked Support component of the pass-rate framework. For the Commission's TPA models, specifically, staff have supported programs through Digging Deeper webinars, New Coordinator sessions, and Professional Learning Communities. These activities provide established statewide mechanisms for collaboration and feedback. The recommendation is currently identified as operationally met.

- 2D: Develop a Preservice-to-Induction Continuum of Practice.** The workgroup recommended developing a continuum connecting the Teaching Performance Expectations and California Standards for the Teaching Profession to clarify the progression from preliminary preparation through induction. The Commission published the [2025 Continuum of Teaching Practice](#), aligned with the revised CSTP and grounded in the preservice TPEs. The resource is available to preparation and induction programs for professional reflection, goal setting, and examination of teacher development. Publication of the continuum fulfills the principal activity directed by this recommendation, which is identified as operationally implemented.

Focus Area 3: Accreditation and Candidate Support

Table 4: Focus Area 3 Recommendations

Recommendation	Established in Policy	Operationally Implemented
3A: Embed TPA Tasks in Coursework and Clinical Practice	Yes, if proposed standards adopted	Pending
3B: Require Individualized Formative Feedback Throughout TPA Process	Yes	Pending
3C: Require Documentation on Support for Non-Passing Candidates	Yes, if proposed standards adopted	Pending
3D: Include TPA as an Assessment in Each Program Matrix for Accreditation	No	Pending
3E: Use TPA Results to Inform IDP and ILP Goals	Yes, if proposed standards adopted	Pending
3F: Require Educator Analysis of Candidate TPA Responses	Yes	Pending
3G: Emphasize Use of TPA Data in Common Standard 4	Yes, if proposed standards adopted	Pending
3H: Require Monitoring of TPA Embedding and Local Scoring Outcomes	No	Pending
3I: Require Support Tailored for Intern Pathway Candidates	No	Pending
3J: Establish Criteria for Identifying Lower Performing Programs	Yes	Pending

- 3A: Embed TPA Tasks in Coursework and Clinical Practice.** The workgroup recommended requiring preparation programs to embed TPA activities within coursework and clinical practice rather than treating the assessment as a separate culminating task. The revised PADS establish modular design expectations, and the Commission model specifications provide a structure supporting integration with preparation. Proposed revisions to Program Standards 3 and 5 would establish additional responsibilities for preparation programs, including appropriate clinical placements and formative experiences connected to TPA

tasks. Operational implementation remains pending as these expectations are incorporated into applicable assessment models and program practices.

- **3B: Require Individualized Formative Feedback Throughout TPA Process.** The workgroup recommended that candidates receive timely, individualized feedback on teaching practice and submission expectations before final assessment submission. Revised Program Standard 5, presented in [Agenda Item 3G](#), incorporates specific language that requires programs to provide feedback to candidates on their assessment materials prior to submission. Additionally, the revised PADS and Commission model specifications establish requirements for formative support and developmental assessment activities. [Program Sponsor Alert 25-05](#), issued in April 2025, clarified acceptable feedback and assistance from program faculty, supervisors, and mentor teachers. Operational implementation requires programs to incorporate these forms of support into candidate preparation, including opportunities for reflection and application of feedback.
- **3C: Require Documentation on Support for Non-Passing Candidates.** The workgroup recommended that programs document their support for candidates who do not pass the TPA and that accreditation consider the effectiveness of those supports. Proposed revisions to Common Standard 2 and Program Standard 5 would strengthen expectations for candidate advising, remediation, and use of assessment results to guide support. The program-level policy basis is therefore conditional on adoption of the proposed standards. Operational implementation will require documented support processes and a means of examining their effectiveness through accreditation.
- **3D: Include TPA as an Assessment in Each Program Matrix for Accreditation.** The workgroup recommended including TPA evidence in applicable accreditation program matrices and considering that evidence in Commission on Accreditation decisions. Under existing Program Review procedures, programs identify where each program-specific Teaching Performance Expectation (TPE) is introduced, practiced, and assessed. Commission staff have indicated that programs will be permitted to identify the TPA as an assessment within these matrices and are developing TPA model-specific matrices that link assessment rubrics to the applicable TPEs. These activities support the use of TPA evidence in accreditation but do not yet establish a requirement for its inclusion in each program matrix or consideration in accreditation decisions. Policy establishment and operational implementation therefore remain outstanding.
- **3E: Use TPA Results to Inform IDP and ILP Goals.** The workgroup recommended that TPA results inform Individual Development Plan goals during preliminary preparation and Individual Learning Plan goals during induction. The Commission model specifications establish reporting expectations that can support the use of assessment results for professional development. Proposed revisions to Program Standards 6 and 9 would explicitly require use of TPA information in these planning processes. Policy establishment remains conditional on adoption of the proposed standards, followed by program procedures for incorporating the information into IDPs and ILPs.
- **3F: Require Educator Analysis of Candidate TPA Responses.** The workgroup recommended collaborative analysis of candidate-level TPA responses using rubrics and common sets of work to identify patterns in performance, including disproportionate outcomes, and inform

curriculum and program improvement. The revised PADS establish requirements for candidate and program score reporting, while the approved pass-rate framework provides data and inquiry procedures relevant to performance analysis. Proposed Common Standard 4 and Program Standard 5 would further establish expectations for program use of candidate-level and aggregate assessment evidence. Operational implementation remains pending as programs establish the analysis practices contemplated by the recommendation and use the results to improve preparation.

- **3G: Emphasize Use of TPA Data in Common Standard 4.** The workgroup recommended revising Common Standard 4 to make explicit the use of TPA results in preparation program continuous improvement. Proposed revisions presented in the companion October 2026 item ([Agenda Item 3G](#)) would establish performance assessment information as a defined source of evidence within the standard. Because those revisions have not been adopted, policy establishment remains conditional. Operational implementation will require preparation programs to incorporate the information into their regular continuous improvement processes.
- **3H: Require Monitoring of TPA Embedding and Local Scoring Outcomes.** The workgroup recommended that preparation programs monitor and evaluate the results of embedding TPA activities in coursework and clinical practice and engaging in local scoring or analysis. Proposed revisions to Common Standard 4 and applicable Program Standards would strengthen expectations for using candidate and program-level TPA data to inform continuous improvement, while existing Program Review procedures require programs to document how they meet adopted standards. The Commission's approved Performance Assessment Pass Rate Identification Framework ([June 2026 Agenda Item 4D](#)) also requires programs identified as Below Standard to analyze assessment results, develop Action Plans, and participate in improvement activities. Although these mechanisms support broader analysis of performance assessment outcomes, they do not yet establish the specific requirement to monitor and evaluate the effects of TPA integration and local scoring practices. Policy establishment and operational implementation therefore remain pending.
- **3I: Require Support Tailored for Intern Pathway Candidates.** The workgroup recommended establishing support requirements specific to candidates in intern pathways, including possible arrangements for release time to support TPA completion and submission. Proposed revisions to Program Standard 5 ([Agenda Item 3G](#)) would strengthen expectations for integrating the TPA into coursework, clinical practice, and other program activities but do not establish requirements specifically addressing intern candidates. Commission staff plan to survey intern programs to identify supports needed by intern candidates completing TPA requirements while serving as teachers of record. The survey findings will inform recommendations for additional Program Standards revisions. Policy establishment and operational implementation remain pending until the necessary requirements and corresponding support practices are established.
- **3J: Establish Criteria for Identifying Lower Performing Programs.** The workgroup recommended identifying lower-performing programs through TPA outcomes, including performance patterns among candidate populations, and considering assessment evidence through accountability and accreditation processes. The Commission's approved Performance Assessment Pass Rate Identification Framework ([June 2026 Agenda Item 4D](#))

establishes first-time pass-rate bands, required program inquiry, Action Plans, and a Commission System of Support. These actions establish the program identification and improvement policy framework. Operational implementation remains pending as the first annual notification, support, and improvement planning cycle occurs during 2026–27 and the relationship to accreditation is further addressed.

Focus Area 4: Local Scoring

Table 5: Focus Area 4 Recommendations

Recommendation	Established in Policy	Operationally Implemented
4A: Require Local Scoring Methods That Align with Improvement Needs	Yes	Pending
4B: Prohibit Passing Additional Costs to Candidates for Local Scoring	Yes	Pending

- 4A: Require Local Scoring Methods That Align with Improvement Needs.** The workgroup recommended requiring teacher educators to engage in local scoring methods aligned with candidate support and program improvement, using calibration, common sets of work, reliability requirements, and assessor training. Revised PADS 2(d)(2) establishes an option for local scoring with specified assessor qualifications, calibration, double-scoring, and quality assurance procedures. The Commission model specifications incorporate corresponding scoring capabilities, while proposed Program Standard revisions address program analysis of performance assessment evidence. Operational implementation remains pending as applicable scoring arrangements and program practices are developed and put into use.
- 4B: Prohibit Passing Additional Costs to Candidates for Local Scoring.** The workgroup recommended that assessment revisions and local scoring not result in additional charges to candidates. Revised PADS establish provisions for assessor fees and the distribution of scoring funds to programs electing local scoring, and the Commission model specifications address assessment administration and scoring arrangements. These policies provide a basis for implementing local scoring without imposing new candidate expenses. Operational implementation requires verification that actual assessment and program fee arrangements comply with this expectation.

Focus Area 5: Candidate Experience Surveys

Table 6: Focus Area 5 Recommendation

Recommendation	Established in Policy	Operationally Implemented
5A: Create a Candidate Survey on TPA Experience	Yes	Pending

- 5A: Create a Candidate Survey on TPA Experience.** The workgroup recommended a survey at TPA submission addressing the assessment's formative value, integration with coursework, possible duplication of assignments, and appropriateness for beginning

teachers. Revised PADS 3(d) requires all TPA models to administer a candidate experience survey at submission, and the Commission model specifications provide for survey administration and reporting. Currently, CalTPA candidates complete a survey about their experiences upon submission. These requirements establish the policy basis for collecting comparable information about candidate experiences across approved TPA models.

Operational implementation remains pending as assessment sponsors incorporate revised survey items into submission procedures and provide the resulting information for analysis.

Supplemental Recommendation: Artificial Intelligence

Table 7: Supplemental Recommendation

Recommendation	Established in Policy	Operationally Implemented
Convene Expert Group to Study AI Impact on TPA	No	Pending

- Supplemental Recommendation: Artificial Intelligence.** The workgroup recommended convening a separate expert group to study the implications of artificial intelligence for teaching performance assessments. On March 6, 2026, the Commission and the Californians Dedicated to Education Foundation convened an AI in Performance Assessment Forum attended by 26 participants representing educator preparation, PK–12 education, educational organizations, and Commission-related entities. The forum examined assessment authenticity, equitable access to AI tools, candidate use of AI, and approaches to preserving evidence of independent teaching practice. Staff subsequently presented proposed revisions to the PADS in June 2026 based on the forum's recommendations, but those revisions have not yet been adopted. Policy establishment and operational implementation remain pending.

Implementation of the Interim Actions

In February 2025, the Commission approved seven Interim Actions intended to address immediate concerns raised during the RDI-TPA Workgroup's deliberations. The actions focused on condition code practices, assessment resubmission fees, candidate support, standardized data reporting, secondary passing standard notifications, program pass-rate information, and continued Commission oversight. Unlike the final recommendations, these actions directed specific administrative activities and are assessed according to the extent to which those activities have been completed.

Table 8: Interim Action Implementation Status

Interim Action	Implementation Status
1: Eliminate Content-Based Condition Codes	Completed
2: Free Candidate Resubmissions for Technical Issues	Partially Implemented
3: Clarify Acceptable Support Practices	Completed
4: Standardize Data Collection and Metrics	Completed

5: Improve Secondary Passing Standard Notification	Completed
6: Notify Programs of TPA Pass Rates and Improvement Strategies	In Progress
7: Report on Interim Action Implementation Progress	Completed

- **Interim Action 1: Eliminate Content-Based Condition Codes**

Following approval of the Interim Actions, the Commission's Performance Assessment Team worked with Evaluation Systems (Pearson) to revise condition code procedures for the CalTPA and Education Specialist CalTPA. Changes implemented beginning in March 2025 consolidated condition codes and revised scoring procedures to ensure that deficiencies in candidate evidence were addressed through assessment rubrics rather than content-based condition codes. Additionally, scoring guidelines for the CalTPA, Education Specialist CalTPA, and edTPA were updated immediately to permit video edits without automatically generating a condition code. Rubrics for the 2025–26 assessments were also revised to align with the recommendation. The FAST model does not use condition codes. These changes were subsequently reflected in the revised PADS 1(b)(3), which limit condition codes to technical issues that prevent a submission from being scored. Table 9 compares the number of submissions receiving condition codes during the 2024–25 and 2025–26 academic years. Please note that 2025-26 TPA administrations included a combination of both previous versions, as the prior versions were in the process of being phased out, and revised, updated versions that incorporated changes to instructions and rubric language were being fully administered for the first time.

Table 9: Submissions Receiving Condition Codes by Assessment Model and Component

Assessment Model	Credential Area	Component	2024–25	2025–26
CalTPA	Multiple Subject	Cycle 1/Mathematics	405	129
CalTPA	Multiple Subject	Cycle 2/Literacy	507	147
CalTPA	Single Subject	Cycle 1	139	44
CalTPA	Single Subject	Cycle 2	279	78
CalTPA	World Languages	Cycle 1	30	5
CalTPA	World Languages	Cycle 2	23	3
CalTPA	PK–3	Mathematics	N/A	16
CalTPA	PK–3	Literacy	N/A	1
Education Specialist CalTPA	Mild to Moderate Support Needs	Mathematics	41	23
Education Specialist CalTPA	Mild to Moderate Support Needs	Literacy	72	35
Education Specialist CalTPA	Extensive Support Needs	Mathematics	46	7

Education Specialist CalTPA	Extensive Support Needs	Literacy	28	27
Education Specialist CalTPA	Early Childhood Special Education	Mathematics	N/A	5
Education Specialist CalTPA	Early Childhood Special Education	Literacy	N/A	7
Education Specialist CalTPA	Deaf and Hard of Hearing	Mathematics	N/A	0
Education Specialist CalTPA	Deaf and Hard of Hearing	Literacy	N/A	0
edTPA	Multiple Subject	Assessment	351	415
edTPA	Single Subject	Assessment	231	195
edTPA	Mild to Moderate Support Needs	Assessment	26	32
edTPA	Extensive Support Needs	Assessment	8	3

Note: Counts represent submissions receiving condition codes, not condition code rates. N/A indicates that comparable data were unavailable. No Education Specialist CalTPA Deaf and Hard of Hearing or Visual Impairments assessments received condition codes in 2025–26.

Condition code counts decreased across all CalTPA components with comparable data, including a reduction from 405 to 129 for Multiple Subject Cycle 1 and from 507 to 147 for Cycle 2. Results varied across edTPA assessments, with increases for Multiple Subject and Mild to Moderate Support Needs. Because the figures represent counts rather than rates, differences in submission volume must be considered when interpreting these changes. The revisions to condition code policies and scoring procedures have been implemented, and this Interim Action is identified as completed.

- Interim Action 2: Free Candidate Resubmissions for Technical Issues**
 From February through June 2025, Evaluation Systems issued vouchers to candidates receiving the A2 condition code, which indicates that a submission does not match the registered content or credential area and was the most commonly issued condition code. Commission data identified 155 CalTPA A2 cases between August 2023 and January 2024. Voucher eligibility also extended to certain candidates who had attempted the assessment at least twice and received a failing score or condition code on their most recent attempt. Beginning in August 2025, the CalTPA resubmission fee was reduced from \$150 to \$50 for candidates resubmitting because of a condition code or nonpassing result. Although these measures reduced costs, the available documentation does not establish that all candidates receiving technical condition codes can correct and resubmit their work without additional cost, as directed by the Commission. This Interim Action is therefore identified as partially implemented.
- Interim Action 3: Clarify Acceptable Support Practices**
 In April 2025, the Commission issued Program Sponsor Alert 25-05, clarifying acceptable support practices and providing examples of how faculty, supervisors, and mentor teachers can assist candidates throughout the TPA process. The guidance addressed formative feedback, technical assistance, and integration of assessment preparation into coursework and clinical practice. Staff subsequently provided additional guidance through presentations at the California Council on Teacher Education and Credential Counselors and Analysts of California fall 2025 conferences. The Performance Assessment Team also conducted Digging Deeper webinars in March and September 2025, supported sessions at the 2026 Meredith Fellows Implementation Conference, and developed monthly Professional Learning Communities for each assessment model during 2025–26. The updated guidance has been issued and disseminated, and this Interim Action is identified as completed.
- Interim Action 4: Standardize Data Collection and Metrics**
 The Commission's Division of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment established standardized performance assessment reporting measures, including consistent definitions for pass rates and other indicators of candidate outcomes. These measures are now used in the Accreditation Data System, Performance Assessment Annual Reports, and Multiple Measures Report (MMR). Staff also developed dashboard reporting that provides program faculty, Commission staff, and accreditation review teams with information about first-time pass rates, time and attempts to pass, condition code distributions, and secondary passing standard eligibility, with results available by candidate demographics. The resulting reporting systems support program analysis and the Commission's Performance Assessment Pass Rate Identification Framework. Standardized reporting measures and supporting systems have been established, completing this Interim Action.
- Interim Action 5: Improve Secondary Passing Standard Notification**
 Commission staff worked with Evaluation Systems (Pearson) to revise notifications issued to CalTPA and edTPA candidates whose scores fall within the secondary passing range. The revised notifications, first distributed with the March 13, 2025, score reports, explain the secondary passing standard and provide candidates with information about the steps required to demonstrate readiness through alternate means. Program TPA coordinators

receive a copy of the notification, ensuring that candidates and preparation programs receive the information simultaneously. Staff also developed guidance for the Commission's website clarifying the responsibilities of candidates and programs throughout the secondary passing process. These notification procedures and supporting resources have been implemented, and this Interim Action is identified as completed.

- **Interim Action 6: Notify Programs of TPA Pass Rates and Improvement Strategies**
Standardized first-time pass-rate calculations have been established and were used to prepare the [2026 Performance Assessment Annual Report](#). In June 2026, the Commission approved the [Performance Assessment Pass Rate Identification Framework](#), establishing an annual process for notifying programs of their results and providing support for continuous improvement. Beginning in fall 2026, programs will be notified by November 15 of their first-time TPA pass rates and performance band placement through the MMR. Programs identified as Below Standard will be required to examine their candidate outcomes, develop an Action Plan, and participate in Commission Direct Support, while Networked Support will be available more broadly. Required Action Plans are due March 15, 2027, during the framework's initial implementation year. Because the first annual notifications are scheduled to occur after the October 2026 Commission meeting, this Interim Action remains in progress.
- **Interim Action 7: Report on Interim Action Implementation Progress**
Commission staff reported on implementation of the Interim Actions during the RDI-TPA Workgroup's February, March, and April 2025 meetings. The Commission also received progress reports through [Agenda Item 3C](#) in April 2025 and [Agenda Item 3F](#) in June 2025. Subsequent Commission items addressing revised PADS, assessment design, performance assessment reporting, and program support have documented related implementation activities. This October 2026 item provides an additional update on the status of all seven Interim Actions. The reporting activities directed by the Commission have been carried out, and this Interim Action is identified as completed.

Next Steps

Implementation activities will continue in the areas of policy development, assessment design, preparation program practices, reporting, and statewide support. The immediate policy work includes consideration of the proposed Common and Program Standards presented in the companion October 2026 item, followed by field review and subsequent Commission consideration for possible adoption. Additional policy development remains necessary for Recommendations 1F, 3D, 3H, and 3I, concerning financial accessibility, accreditation program matrices, monitoring of TPA integration and local scoring, and intern-specific candidate support, as well as the supplemental recommendation concerning artificial intelligence. Planned work includes development of TPA model-specific accreditation matrices, a survey of intern programs to inform further standards revisions, and continued consideration of proposed AI-related PADS revisions and any additional work needed to fulfill the supplemental recommendation.

Operational implementation will continue through assessment model revisions, preparation program practices, and Commission accountability and support processes. The revised PADS

and Commission model specifications establish requirements that must be incorporated into applicable assessments, while program-level implementation will depend on the relevant standards, guidance, and accreditation procedures. The initial operational cycle of the Performance Assessment Pass Rate Identification Framework will begin with fall 2026 program notifications, followed by required inquiry, action plans, and support activities during 2026-27.

Development of the Commission's model TPA will also proceed through subsequent design and implementation activities. The planned schedule includes continued Commission consideration of the development approach and contract, assessment and platform development, and subsequent piloting and field testing. Current planning identifies July 1, 2028, for the beginning of pilot administration and July 1, 2029, for the beginning of statewide field testing. These assessment development milestones are distinct from the July 1, 2028, statutory deadline for implementing the adopted workgroup recommendations.

The Commission will continue reporting progress to the Legislature pursuant to Education Code section 44320.4(d). Subsequent reports will identify policy actions taken, changes in operational implementation status, progress on the initial program identification and support cycle, and activities undertaken to address recommendations not yet established in policy.

Appendix A

Adopted Recommendations of the RDI-TPA Workgroup

Focus Area 1: Assessment Design and Implementation

Recommendation 1A

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that culturally responsive/sustaining and equity-focused pedagogy be centered within the TPA tasks by:

- Requiring candidates frame their work through a culturally responsive/sustaining lens.
- Requiring candidates to design and deliver equitable learning opportunities that address systemic/institutional barriers to ensure accessibility for a diverse range of student populations, including multilingual learners, students with exceptional/different abilities, and historically marginalized groups.
- Requiring candidates to demonstrate asset-based pedagogical approaches that value and build upon students' strengths, experiences, and community assets/knowledge as central to their teaching practices.
- Requiring candidates to disaggregate and analyze student data (e.g., by race/ethnicity, language proficiency, and exceptional needs) to inform instructional practice to provide a high-quality educational experience.

Recommendation 1B

Recommendation 1A has been addressed through the revised Performance Assessment Design Standards ([PADS](#)), specifically 1(a)(1), which details the tasks candidates must engage in during an instructional cycle. The standard states that "Each TPA task and its related rubrics:

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that the TPA structure be redesigned to align with Universal Design for Learning principles.

The TPA structure shall be adjusted in at least the following ways:

- Eliminate duplicative activities.
- Incorporate contextualized, real-world teaching scenarios.
- Streamline and redesign rubrics to be asset-based.
- Chunk the assessment submissions into multiple, smaller segments that are embedded throughout the entirety of a credential program (and not treated as a final, summative assessment).
- Require TPA segments to be assigned, evaluated, and submitted during coursework.
- Improve instructions in the TPA tool (not just a separate handbook) to mitigate candidate confusion.
- Embed live links to the rubric within the TPA tool.
- Ensure appropriateness for credential candidates.
- Maintain the secondary passing standard with the revised exam structure to align with current practice adopted by the CTC.

Recommendation 1C

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that the candidate's demonstration of practice in the TPA be redesigned to align with Universal Design for Learning principles.

The TPA exam shall be adjusted to:

- Expand flexibility for candidates to ensure authenticity by accommodating for variability in scope, sequence, and site-based instructional styles.
- Expand and/or ensure opportunities for candidates to submit evidence using multiple modalities (audio, visual, written) and to submit multiple forms of evidence.
- Allow coursework to be utilized as part of the final submission.

Recommendation 1D

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that TPA scorers provide individualized, asset-based, and actionable rubric-specific feedback that highlights the exact criteria met and not met. The group also recommends that feedback be individualized in order to identify for candidates how criteria were met by the provided evidence.

In order to provide such feedback, the RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that scorer calibration include:

- A focus on prioritizing the evaluation of candidate knowledge (what they CAN do), utilizing an asset-based approach rubric.
- Deepening scorer knowledge of the specific competencies and contexts they are assessing, including areas such as culturally responsive teaching and ethnic studies.

Recommendation 1E

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that candidates are notified within a week of submission if they receive a technical condition code. If candidates re-submit within a week of notification, their TPA can be scored within the same scoring window and without incurring additional costs.

Recommendation 1F

The RDI TPA Workgroup recommends the TPA be free or financially accessible to candidates. This may be accomplished through systems such as a loan, grant, stipend, voucher, or other option, without increasing the cost to the candidate.

Focus Area 2: Embedding Assessments in Preparation**Recommendation 2A**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that the following be added to Required Elements for Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness 1(g):

The TPA model sponsor must provide additional materials to programs, including passing examples for each credential area for all sections of the assessment, examples of common condition code issues, and examples of both successful/non successful responses, in order to help all educators involved in the preparation of credential candidates become familiar with the design of the TPA model, the candidate tasks, and the scoring rubrics. Doing so will allow these individuals to effectively assist candidates in preparing for the assessment and score candidate submissions through local scoring.

Recommendation 2B

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that programs provide an orientation for all educational partners working with teacher candidates to become familiar with the adopted TPA model, including its tasks, rubrics, and evidence requirements.

Recommendation 2C

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that the CTC support educator preparation communities to engage in the performance assessment by, at least:

- Convening regular statewide gatherings of the entire preparation community (e.g., teacher preparation program faculty, assessment designers, LEA administrators, mentor teachers, candidates, scorers, etc.) to engage in multi-directional feedback and collaborative learning that informs teacher preparation programs, LEAs, and the assessment itself.
- Collecting exemplary practices for embedding the TPA from preparation programs and regularly sharing these practices with programs.
- Collecting resources such as both passing and non-passing samples for each credential submission-type for program and participant use.

Recommendation 2D

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that the CTC develop a continuum of practice from preservice through in-service that integrates Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) and California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTPs). This continuum should align preservice training, Teaching Performance Assessments (TPAs), and induction expectations to clarify teacher development and support a smooth transition into the profession. This continuum of practice can help guide the appropriateness of performance assessment tasks for credential candidates.

Focus Area 3: Accreditation and Candidate Support

Recommendation 3A

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that Program Standards include the requirement for programs to embed the TPA tasks in coursework and clinical practice.

Recommendation 3B

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends adding to Program Standards the requirement that programs provide candidates individualized and timely feedback throughout the TPA process prior to submission. This includes feedback on both pedagogy and submission criteria in order to ensure the process is formative and educative.

As part of embedding the TPA in fieldwork and coursework, candidates will receive and implement feedback on their teaching and be assessed on the implemented feedback. All candidates must be supported with reflective activities based on the feedback they receive, regardless of whether they pass or fail the TPA.

Therefore, the group also recommends that current guidelines for acceptable support be revised to ensure the entire TPA process is formative and educative.

Recommendation 3C

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends adjusting Program Standards to require institutions to submit documentation on how they will support credential candidates that have not successfully completed the TPA. The effectiveness of support must be addressed through the accreditation process, possibly resulting in findings or stipulations in the accreditation decision.

Recommendation 3D

The RDI TPA Workgroup recommends that the TPA be an included assessment in each program matrix for accreditation. The data must be addressed through the accreditation process through the COA, possibly resulting in findings or stipulations in the accreditation decision.

Recommendation 3E

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that Preliminary Program Standards and Induction Program Standards be revised to require the use of information from the TPA to inform the development of IDP goals at the end of preservice and ILP goals during induction. Induction Program Standard 3 should be revised to include the following: “a candidate’s IDP should be included in the development of the initial ILP and induction goals.”

Recommendation 3F

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that Program Standards include a requirement that a program’s teacher educators who support candidates, including but not limited to teacher preparation program faculty, instructors, supervisors, and school site mentors, engage in analyzing candidate level responses to the TPA as a way to look at student work in the disaggregate in order to better understand and support candidate performance, as a central component of continuous improvement and accreditation. This would include analyzing work to understand disproportionate pass rates. Programs should use the findings to refine their curricula in order to equitably support the development of all candidates, especially candidates who are disproportionately impacted by low pass rates.

The workgroup recommends there be some flexibility in what this analysis looks like as long as it involves (a) analyzing common sets of work, (b) use of the TPA rubrics to examine candidate performance, and (c) collaboration across multiple people involved in supporting candidates.

Some options for analyzing candidate-level responses might include:

- TPPs analyze a percentage of their candidate’s submissions
- TPPs analyze a percentage of their assessment tasks
- TPPs analyze 100% of the assessment for 100% of their candidates
- TPPs analyze their candidates’ TPA re-submissions

Recommendation 3G

The RDI TPA Workgroup recommends that the CTC adopt new language related to Common Standard 4 (continuous improvement) to emphasize the use of TPA data across all programs.

Recommendation 3H

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that programs monitor and evaluate outcomes from embedding the TPA in coursework and clinical practice and engaging in local scoring/analysis.

Programs would then use insights from these processes to inform and improve instructional design and support strategies, as stipulated in Common Standard 4 (Continuous Improvement).

Recommendation 3I

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that Program Standards be updated to include required forms of support (e.g., MOU modification to include release days for TPA completion and submission) specific to the needs of candidates in intern pathways.

Recommendation 3J

The RDI TPA Workgroup recommends that the CTC should establish criteria for identifying lower performing programs (including TPA pass rates and fail rates for specific student populations). These data must be addressed through the accreditation process through the COA, possibly resulting in findings or stipulations in the accreditation decision.

Focus Area 4: Local Scoring

Recommendation 4A

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist Program Standard 5 and PK3 Early Childhood Specialist Standard 6: Implementation of a Teaching Performance Assessment include a requirement that programs' teacher educators who support candidates--including but not limited to teacher preparation program faculty, instructors, supervisors, and school site mentors--engage in a method of local scoring that aligns to program improvement needs and candidate needs for support.

The workgroup recommends programs be allowed some flexibility in what local scoring looks like as long as the adopted model of local scoring includes:

- Collaboration in calibration and scoring
- Scoring common sets of work
- Meeting inter-rater reliability standards set by the CTC, and
- Assessor training

Some options might include:

- Instructors score the tasks that are embedded in their courses
- TPPs score a percentage of their candidate's submissions
- TPPs score a percentage of their assessment tasks
- TPPs score 100% of the assessment for 100% of their candidates
- TPPs double score their candidates' TPA re-submissions"

Recommendation 4B

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that additional costs related to changes to the assessment and/or local scoring not be passed on to the candidates.

Focus Area 5: Candidate Experience Surveys

Recommendation 5A

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that the CTC distribute a survey to be completed upon submission of a teaching performance assessment that includes items regarding:

- The formative nature of the TPA
- If the TPA was embedded in coursework
- If the TPA was duplicative in coursework
- If the TPA is appropriate for beginning teachers
- Other relevant items about the candidate experience

This survey shall include both close-ended and open-ended items and be incorporated within the submission process of each approved TPA model. Ideally, this survey will consolidate any existing surveys about the candidates' performance assessment experience. Candidates will be informed that their survey responses will not impact their TPA scores.

Supplemental Recommendation

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

Appendix B

Commission-Approved Interim Actions

The following Interim Actions were presented in Agenda Item 4A at the February 2025 Commission meeting and subsequently approved by the Commission.

Interim Action 1

Update TPAs as necessary to eliminate the use of content-based condition codes.

Interim Action 2

Redirect candidate submissions with technical condition codes back to the candidates so they can resolve identified technical issue(s) and resubmit at no additional cost.

Interim Action 3

Issue updated Guidelines for Acceptable Support clarifying that direct, ongoing feedback from faculty, supervisors, and mentor teachers aimed at improving candidate responses and addressing technical issues leading to condition codes are important, acceptable and encouraged forms of support.

Interim Action 4

Standardize the Commission's system for collecting and reporting TPA outcome data. Establish clear metrics to inform policy decisions and support improvements in preparation programs.

Interim Action 5

Ensure a system of notification is in place for candidates that fall within the secondary passing standard that includes simultaneous notification to the preparation program and clear information for candidates and programs regarding the process for demonstrating readiness by alternate means.

Interim Action 6

Issue a notification to all programs identifying their TPA first-time pass rates, based on both scorable and non-scorable submissions, and provide evidence-based recommendations for strengthening candidate supports and guidance to reduce/eliminate candidate condition codes.

Interim Action 7

Direct staff to report on implementation progress of these interim actions during future RDI-TPA Workgroup items before the Commission.