
3D

Information/Action

Educator Preparation Committee

Annual Report on the Commission Approved Teaching and Administrator Performance Assessments

Executive Summary: This agenda item provides information and candidate pass rate data assigned for each of the Commission-approved performance assessments from 2018 to 2024, including the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA), edTPA, Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) and the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA). Information about condition codes assigned and secondary passing standard data are provided for the CalTPA and edTPA. Updates on performance assessment development include how each approved TPA is being revised to measure literacy instruction (SB 488) and the new teaching performance expectations for the ECE PK-3 Education Specialist credential. Information about CalTPA versions for education specialist credentials (DHH, VI, and ECSE) are provided. The item closes with information about the Commission's RDI-TPA (SB 1263) work group.

Recommended Action: That the Commission review this report and provide direction on potential next steps in the development, administration and implementation of performance assessments.

Presenters: Zoltan Sarda and Marissa Luna Lopez, Consultants, Professional Service Division; Lori Kroeger, Evaluation Systems group of Pearson; Ricci Ulrich, Coordinator, FAST, and Juliet Wahleithner, Assistant Director of Teacher Education, Cal State Fresno; Adam Ebrahim, Senior Director of Policy and Continuous Improvement

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.
 - O. Strengthen the Commission's capacity to collect and analyze survey and assessment data related to quality in preparation of the education workforce

Annual Report on the Commission Approved Teaching and Administrator Performance Assessments

Introduction

This agenda item provides information and candidate pass rate data assigned for each of the Commission-approved performance assessments from 2018 to 2024, including the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA), edTPA, Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) and the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA). Information about condition codes assigned and secondary passing standard data are provided for the CalTPA and edTPA. Updates on performance assessment development include how each approved TPA is being revised to measure literacy instruction (SB 488) and the new teaching performance expectations for the ECE PK-3 Education Specialist credential. Information about CalTPA versions for education specialist credentials (DHH, VI, and ECSE) are provided. The item closes with information about the Commission's Workgroup to Review the Design and Implementation of Teaching Performance Assessments (RDI-TPA).

Background

The Commission issues credentials that authorize service as a teacher or administrator in California's public schools. Pursuant to the requirements of applicable state statutes (Chap. 517, Stats. 2006), California uses a series of Commission-approved performance assessments to assess candidates' knowledge, skills, and abilities as defined by Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) and the California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPE). Pursuant to Education Code (EC) sections 44320.2, and 44259(b)(3), completion of a Teaching Performance Assessment that is fully integrated into teacher preparation programs is required of teacher candidates prior to being recommended by their program for a preliminary credential.

TPAs were first required in 2008 and were initially administered and scored locally by preparation program faculty. In 2015, approved teaching performance assessments were updated to align with California's Common Core Standards for students and the Performance Assessment Design Standards (PADS). A centralized, online scoring system was established for the CalTPA with the goal of strengthening reliability in scoring within and across preparation programs as called for in EC section 44320.2(e). Centralized online scoring was already in use with the edTPA, and moving CalTPA into this scoring system was intended to improve calibration within the assessor pool while maintaining robust participation from local program faculty and teachers. FAST was approved in 2008 and is a locally designed and scored assessment that meets the expectations of calibration within Fresno State's assessor pool.

In 2019, [a study was conducted by HumRRO](#) resulting in the determination that the three adopted teaching performance assessments (i.e., CalTPA, edTPA and FAST) were comparable

and measured essential TPEs for Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and World Language teaching credentials.

In 2015-2017, under Ed Code section [44270.5](#), the Commission received funding and developed a performance assessment for administrative services credential candidates. The CalAPA was first administered as a non-consequential assessment with a requirement that candidates complete each of the three leadership performance assessment cycles. During the 2019-20 academic year, passage of the CalAPA became a requirement for earning a preliminary services credential. Further review of statutes that have driven the Commission's work with performance assessments can be found in [Appendix A](#).

This agenda item is organized into the following parts and appendices:

[Part 1: Commission-Approved Performance Assessments](#)

[Part 2: CalTPA Model Information, Candidate Results](#)

[Part 3: edTPA Model Information and Candidate Results](#)

[Part 4: FAST Model Information and Candidate Results](#)

[Part 5: CalAPA Model Information and Candidate Results](#)

[Part 6: RDI-TPA Workgroup](#)

[Appendix A](#): Education Code Related to Performance Assessments

[Appendix B](#): Information Regarding CalTPA and CalAPA Assessor Ethnicity Data

[Appendix C](#): CalTPA (MS/SS/WL) Mean Rubric Scores and Essential Questions

[Appendix D](#): CalTPA (MMSN/ESN) Mean Rubric Scores and Essential Questions

[Appendix E](#): edTPA Mean Rubric Scores and Essential Questions

[Appendix F](#): FAST Mean Rubric Scores and Level 2 Rubric Descriptions

[Appendix G](#): CalAPA Mean Rubric Scores and Essential Questions

[Appendix H](#): Early Childhood Education CalFTPA Overview

Part 1. COMMISSION-APPROVED PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENTS

Commission-approved performance assessments are required to meet [Teaching Performance Assessment Design Standards](#), and the [Administrator Performance Assessment Design Standards \(PADS\)](#). PADS requires model sponsors to meet reliability, validity, and program and candidate support expectations and to engage in ongoing continual improvement through data analysis. PADS, [Program Standard 5](#) (TPA), and [Program Standard 9](#) (CalAPA) require that performance assessments be integrated into candidates' professional preparation programs. These assessments must be embedded as candidates engage in clinical practice, working with actual students and collaborating with other educators at the school site. Each performance assessment includes a multi-week, inquiry-based experience that measures the appropriate set of [Teaching Performance Expectations](#) (TPEs) and for the CalAPA, the [California Administrators Performance Expectations](#) (CAPE). Candidates are to be supported by their program faculty, cooperating teachers, and peers as they complete the assessments and submit a range of evidence, including written responses, artifacts of teaching and learning, video recordings, analysis, and reflection of their practice.

Addressing Performance Assessment Score Bias

The PADS require every approved model sponsor to have processes to avoid bias. These processes must be built into the assessment development and administration processes, including a Bias Review Committee of credential-specific educators, which is required to review all performance assessment directions, prompts, and rubrics for potential bias, and identify necessary changes to avoid and minimize bias.

In addition, all model sponsors must ensure that assessors scoring performance assessments are trained to address and mitigate bias and be calibrated and checked through inter-rater reliability analyses. Assessors who do not meet inter-rater reliability quality measures are not allowed to continue scoring until they demonstrate they have recalibrated. Model sponsors must employ these procedures specifically to reduce measurement error that might be caused by bias so that results by gender, race, and ethnicity can be accurately and appropriately reported. Further information about CalTPA and APA assessors is provided in [Appendix B](#).

Availability of California Performance Assessments

As indicated above, Education Code section 44320.2 authorizes the Commission to recognize and approve multiple performance assessments for teachers, a policy that has also been applied to the development of performance assessments for administrative services candidates. Currently, the Commission has approved three teaching performance assessments and one administrator performance assessment for use in California. The CalTPA series and the CalAPA were developed by appointed design teams of California educators, teacher or administrator preparation faculty, Commission staff, and the Commission's technical contractor, Evaluation Systems group of Pearson (ES). These assessments are owned by the Commission. The edTPA is owned by Stanford University, which has engaged the Evaluation Systems group of Pearson as its operational partner and technical contractor. The Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) is a Commission-approved TPA model designed by the faculty of California State University, Fresno. FAST is copyrighted by Cal State Fresno and was approved by the Commission to be administered exclusively by Cal State Fresno for its teacher education candidates.

The Commission's [performance assessment website](#) is hosted and managed by ES and provides detailed performance assessment information for institutions, faculty, and candidates about the CalTPA, edTPA and CalAPA. Cal State Fresno provides its candidates with information about FAST on its [website](#).

The CalTPA, edTPA and CalAPA assessments are provided year-round to candidates through the online platform managed by ES and are scored each month by calibrated assessors. Scores are returned to candidates, programs, and the Commission within three weeks of being scored. FAST candidates complete their submissions in a two-part process, first in their initial student teaching placement, and again in their final student teaching placement. FAST assessments are scored locally by Cal State Fresno faculty.

Institutional Performance Assessment Data Reports

Institutional data reports are generated by the Commission's performance assessment contractor, Evaluation Systems Group of Pearson (ES), for the CalTPA, edTPA and CalAPA. The

identified performance assessment program coordinator at each authorized score recipient institution who receives the reports is determined by that institution, and each year the Commission's assessment contractor requests updated institutional program coordinator contact information. Institutions may contact ES to update their program coordinator information as necessary.

Candidate score reports are provided within three (3) weeks of the scoring of the submission. Score data reports are provided to programs and the Commission following each scoring session across the year. The institutional score reports can be accessed by the candidate and program from a secure, password-protected web site. Candidates own their scores and their score data.

Summary statistics through Results Analyzer, an online data platform created by ES, are provided for the institution based on all candidates who selected that institution when they registered, and may include:

- Number of candidates who submitted performance assessments for scoring
- Number and percentage of candidates passing or not passing
- Performance by rubric level for each submission
- Condition Codes assigned

Individual candidate information provided for candidates who selected that institution as a score recipient when they registered may include:

- Name and other identifying information
- Scoring date
- Cycles taken (for the CalTPA, CalAPA only)
- Passing status
- Performance by analytic rubric
- Condition Codes assigned

All Commission approved performance assessments are criterion-referenced and measure the candidates' pedagogical skills and abilities in relation to an established standard (TPEs/CAPEs) rather than in relation to the performance of other candidates. Candidates who submit an assessment are notified if they passed and are provided analytic rubric scores. Candidates that submit incomplete evidence receive information about the specific issue and are directed to resubmit with the full set of required evidence at an additional cost.

Secondary Passing Standard Established for CalTPA and edTPA

At its December 2023 meeting, the Commission approved a secondary passing standard for CalTPA and edTPA Multiple Subject, Single Subject and Ed Specialists (MMSN and ESN) that allows programs to use multiple measures of candidate performance for candidates who scored within -1 Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) of the established passing standards for CalTPA and edTPA in their evaluation of candidate readiness for recommendation of a preliminary credential. Further information regarding the Secondary Passing Standard approved by the Commission can be reviewed in Item [2D: Options to Study and Improve California's Teaching Performance Assessments](#) from the December 2023 Commission meeting, and in [PSA 24-02](#). Data regarding the number of candidates qualifying for the secondary passing standard and

credential recommendations for the CalTPA and edTPA are found in Part 2 and 3 of this agenda item.

Part 2. CALTPA MODEL INFORMATION AND CANDIDATE RESULTS

The following section provides an overview of the CalTPA model, including its structure and data on candidate outcomes, non-scorable condition code frequencies, and candidates scoring within the -1.0 SEM range. Candidate mean rubric scores are detailed in [Appendix C](#). Additional information on the structure and scoring process of these assessments can be found in the [Inaugural Annual Report on the Commission Approved Teaching and Administrator Performance Assessments](#) (February 2022).

CalTPA: Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and World Languages (MS/SS/WL)

The CalTPA is based on a two-cycle format with each instructional cycle structured around the four steps of Plan, Teach & Assess, Reflect, and Apply. A candidate must pass both cycles.

Cycle 1, Learning About Students and Planning Instruction focuses on learning about students' cultural and linguistic assets, interests, and learning needs and planning for one standards-based lesson. Candidates learn about and monitor progress for three focus students (an English learner; a student who has an Individualized Education Plan, 504 plan, or is identified as Gifted; and a student who has experienced trauma either in or out-side of school). Candidates reflect on the outcomes of the lesson and describe how they will apply their learning to plan the next lesson for their students.

Cycle 2, Assessment Driven Instruction requires candidates to plan and teach a standards-based learning segment of three to five lessons including three forms of assessment: informal assessment, student self-assessment, and a formal assessment. Candidates reflect on the outcomes of the lessons and assessments and decide to either reteach or extend the learning in the next lesson.

Multiple Subject candidates focus on literacy instruction for one cycle and on math instruction for the other cycle. Single Subject and World Language candidates focus their lessons on the specific credential content for both cycles. Rubric essential questions for CalTPA (MS/SS/WL) can be found in [Appendix C](#).

Commission and ES staff work to ensure that a diverse group of MS/SS/WL educators are trained and calibrated to score CalTPA submissions. Assessors include both TK-12 educators and preparation program faculty across the state and different program pathways. Additional information regarding the CalTPA assessors can be found in [Appendix B](#).

- Cumulative Attempt Pass Rate: Refers to the percentage of candidates who passed both cycles, including those requiring multiple attempts.
- First Attempt Pass Rates: Refers to the percentage of candidates who passed on their first attempt.

Table 1: CalTPA Cumulative Pass Rates for MS/SS/WL Candidates Who Submitted Both Cycles

Program Year	Submitting Both Cycles	Passed Both Cycles	% Passed
Y1: 2018-19*	4346	4331	99.6%
Y2: 2019-20	4296	4224	98%
Y3: 2020-21	3054	3008	98%
Y4: 2021-22	5157	5065	98%
Y5: 2022-23	6986	6610	95%
Y6: 2023-24	7234	6766	94%
Total	31,073	30,004	97%

*Lower passing standard established to support candidates and programs in the first year of administration.

Table 1 illustrates the percentages of all Multiple Subject, Single Subject and World Language (MS/SS/WL) candidates who have passed both Cycle 1 and Cycle 2 of the CalTPA for each of the six years. 30,004 candidates passed both cycles of the CalTPA during the first six program years, which represents a cumulative assessment passing rate of 97%. Table 1 does not include candidates who received a condition code and did not resubmit and those who have not completed both cycles.

The years 5 and 6 pass rates of 95% and 94% respectively were slightly lower than previous years. It is important to underscore that the 3% difference from 2021-22 to 2022-23, and the 1% difference from 2022-23 to 2023-24 are not statistically significant, meaning that a set of data is most likely attributed to chance and not a specific cause. This slight percentage difference may be attributed, for example, to the higher number of candidates attempting both cycles in 2023-24.

An additional factor that may have influenced the pass rates for both 2022-23 and 2023-24 could be the assessment costs being waived for candidates for these years through an appropriation in the state budget. While the fee waiver initiative provided significant support for candidates and likely contributed to the increased number of candidates taking and submitting performance assessments there was a corresponding increase in what appeared to be draft submissions. In bi-monthly lead assessor meetings, an ongoing topic of discussion focused on the nature of these submissions. For example, candidates left notes in their submissions apologizing for incomplete work, some sent in video clips not related to the described lesson plan, and blank and/or off-topic videos were submitted. Increases of draft or incomplete submissions were noted at program completion (end of a semester or quarter). While this information is anecdotal, it suggests one possible source of the increase of lower scores and assignment of condition codes. In a few programs, for example, candidates reported that they were required to comply with program established TPA submission deadlines tied to course grades. Candidates were able to register for the fee waiver until June 30th of 2024 and waivers are valid for 12 months through June 30th of 2025.

Table 2: The Number of MS/SS/WL Candidates by Year Who Submitted One Cycle but Not Yet Submitted the Other Cycle

Program Year	N of Candidates Submitting C1 but not C2	N of Candidates Submitting C2 but not C1
Y1: 2018-19*	186	39
Y2: 2019-20	271	38
Y3: 2020-21	261	24
Y4: 2021-22	592	32
Y5: 2022-23	1976	81
Y6: 2023-24	1980	205

*Lower passing standard established to support candidates and programs in the first year of administration.

Table 2 provides additional details about candidates who submitted only one cycle and are not included in the denominator of cumulative pass rates. The higher number of such candidates in 2022-23 may be due, at least in part, to enrollment in preparation programs lasting more than one year, with the remaining cycle potentially submitted during the current academic year. Tables 3a and 3b present cumulative and first-time pass rates, disaggregated by race and ethnicity.

Table 3a: CalTPA (MS/SS/WL) Candidates Who Completed and Passed Both Cycles by Race/Ethnicity in Cumulative Attempts

Race/Ethnicity	2018-19**	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	Total*
Asian	99% (229)	95% (258)	95% (189)	96% (255)	99% (315)	91% (302)	93% (1,425)
Black	99% (106)	96% (100)	89% (71)	96% (114)	95% (192)	89% (252)	93% (729)
Hispanic	99% (1,199)	94% (1286)	94% (1,062)	96% (1,879)	96% (2,709)	94% (3,196)	95% (10,149)
N/A	100% (218)	96% (249)	95% (167)	98% (217)	96% (266)	93% (280)	96% (1,397)
Nat Amer	100% (17)	97% (32)	95% (22)	100% (33)	95% (42)	97% (35)	99% (1,363)
Other	100% (189)	96% (140)	90% (115)	98% (193)	96% (254)	92% (259)	98% (3,170)
Pac Island	100% (17)	87% (15)	83% (12)	100% (16)	95% (22)	92% (26)	97% (256)
SE Asian	100% (165)	93% (177)	93% (128)	96% (212)	98% (327)	94% (371)	96% (1,444)
White	100% (2,209)	94% (2,180)	94% (1,446)	97% (2,337)	94% (2,739)	94% (2,559)	96% (11,278)

* For this table, only scorable attempts are included in the denominator to determine percentages.

**Lower passing standard established to support candidates and programs in the first year of administration.

Table 3b: CalTPA (MS/SS/WL) First Time Passing Rate for Both Cycles by Race/Ethnicity Requested by the RDI-TPA Workgroup and Reported on October 15, 2024

Race/ Ethnicity	2021-22 Attempts N*	2021-22 Attempts % Passed	2022-23 Attempts N*	2022-23 Attempts % Passed	2023-24 Attempts N*	2023-24 Attempts % Passed
All	5325	73%	6614	73%	6923	78%
Asian	259	76%	301	77%	291	76%
Black	127	62%	185	61%	232	72%
Hispanic	1915	72%	2630	71%	3040	78%
N/A	225	72%	245	71%	266	73%
Nat Amer	32	78%	41	66%	34	71%
Other	195	76%	251	75%	241	75%
Pac Island	15	67%	22	73%	26	88%
SE Asian	209	78%	328	75%	347	80%
White	2348	74%	2611	75%	2,406	79%

* For this table, only scorable attempts are included in the denominator to determine percentages.

Tables 3a and 3b provide data about the cumulative and first-time passing rate for candidates by race/ethnicity who submitted both Cycle 1 and Cycle 2. In a particular year, pass rates range between 87% and a high of 100%. Across the six years of CalTPA, the pass rates range between 93% and a high of 99%. Care needs to be taken in interpreting results where lower Ns (number of candidates) have a disproportionate influence on the pass rate percentage. Overall, 78% of candidates across race/ethnicity pass both cycles on the first attempt and 93% of candidates pass the CalTPA on cumulative attempts. Tables 4a and 4b provide information about the number of attempts candidates take to pass each of the two instructional cycles.

Table 4a: CalTPA (MS/SS/WL) Candidates Who Passed Cycle 1 First, Second, and Three or More Attempts, and Not Yet Passed by Year

Program Year	Cycle 1 N*	First Attempt	Second Attempt	3+ Attempts	Not Yet Passed
Y1: 2018-19**	5766	98% (5679)	1% (66)	0% (2)	0% (19)
Y2: 2019-20	4470	84% (3757)	11% (482)	2% (92)	3% (139)
Y3: 2020-21	3679	84% (3095)	11% (387)	1% (51)	4% (146)
Y4: 2021-22	6137	78% (4769)	14% (876)	3% (159)	5% (333)
Y5: 2022-23	7086	72% (5131)	14% (981)	5% (326)	9% (648)
Y6: 2023-24	8848	68% (6024)	9% (832)	3% (294)	19% (1698)

* For this table, only scorable attempts are included in the total attempt counts.

**Lower passing standard established to support candidates and programs in the first year of administration.

Table 4b: CalTPA (MS/SS/WL) Candidates Who Passed Cycle 2 First, Second, and Three or More Attempts, and Not Yet Passed by Year

Program Year	Cycle 2 N*	First Attempt	Second Attempt	3+ Attempts	Not Yet Passed
Y1: 2018-19**	4383	99% (4334)	1% (33)	0% (4)	0% (12)
Y2: 2019-20	4322	94% (4046)	5% (208)	1% (25)	1% (43)
Y3: 2020-21	3108	93% (2876)	6% (173)	1% (28)	1% (31)
Y4: 2021-22	5259	89% (4661)	9% (423)	2% (83)	2% (92)
Y5: 2022-23	6897	86% (5914)	10% (601)	2% (132)	4% (250)
Y6: 2023-24	7685	84% (6431)	7% (431)	1% (90)	10% (733)

* For this table, only scorable attempts are included in the total attempt counts.

**Lower passing standard established to support candidates and programs in the first year of administration.

Tables 4a and 4b provide information on how many candidates require more than one attempt to pass Cycle 1 and Cycle 2. The higher numbers of candidates who have not yet passed in the most recent years will decline as subsequent attempts are submitted in the current year, 2024-25. It is important to note that some programs are 18 months in length, and intern programs can be up to two years, in some cases resulting in some candidates taking more than one academic year to complete both cycles.

CalTPA Condition Codes (CCs)

Condition codes are assigned after at least two calibrated, credential specific, assessors have determined that a component of a candidate's submission is missing or needs revision to meet submission requirements. Lead assessors provide the final review of each submission and are tasked with assigning condition codes when deemed necessary. Candidates receive a condition code report outlining which condition code(s) were assigned to their submission and which rubric(s) pertain to received condition codes.

There are three broad areas for which candidates may receive a condition code. The first relates to CalTPA submission requirements not being included. For example, candidates are required to identify an ELD learning goal for the lesson they are required to develop for Step 1 in Cycle 1. If an ELD learning goal is not provided, the candidate will receive a condition code and their score report will indicate the condition code(s) assigned. At this point, the candidate will need to revise and resubmit for scoring.

A second type of condition code relates to technical issues with uploaded files. For example, if submitted video clips cannot be opened, audio is missing, or videos are off topic, the candidate receives a condition code and must repair the technical issue prior to resubmission. A third type relates to missing information. For example, if a candidate did not include student work samples as required in response to Step 3 in Cycle 2 they will receive a condition code.

Candidates whose attempt(s) receive a condition code must revise the part associated with the condition code or provide the missing part and resubmit. Each resubmission requires that the candidate pay the assessment fee for resubmission. If a candidate has more than two submissions returned for condition codes, they receive vouchers for subsequent resubmissions. Candidates that receive condition codes and do not reattempt one or both cycles are not included in the denominator of first-time and cumulative pass rates. Condition code descriptions are [provided at this link](#).

Table 5a: CalTPA—Number of Attempts Receiving Non Scorable Condition Codes Requested by the RDI-TPA Workgroup and Reported on October 15, 2024

Program Year	# Attempts* Cycle 1	# Attempts receiving 1+ CC Cycle 1	% Attempts receiving 1+ CC Cycle 1	# Attempts* Cycle 2	# Attempts receiving 1+ CC Cycle 2	% Attempts receiving 1+ CC Cycle 2
2019-20	6194	206	3%	4766	416	9%
2020-21	5114	394	8%	3599	463	13%
2021-22	7347	827	11%	4216	650	15%
2022-23	7305	657	9%	4675	767	16%
2023-24	9565	690	7%	9000	1261	14%

* For this table, condition coded attempts are included in the total attempt counts.

Table 5b: CalTPA Cycle 1—Number of Attempts Receiving Non Scorable Condition Codes by Race/Ethnicity Requested by the RDI-TPA Workgroup and Reported on October 15, 2024

Race/Ethnicity	2021-2022 # Attempts Cycle 1*	2021-2022 % Attempts with 1+ CCs Cycle 1	2022-2023 # Attempts Cycle 1*	2022-2023 % Attempts with 1+ CCs Cycle 1	2023-2024 # Attempts Cycle 1*	2023-2024 % Attempts with 1+ CCs Cycle 1
All	7347	11%	7305	9%	9566	7%
Asian	398	11%	315	7%	377	7%
Black	182	21%	253	12%	383	13%
Hispanic	2768	11%	2952	9%	4243	7%
N/A	290	13%	282	11%	392	5%
Nat Amer	49	8%	46	15%	67	9%
Other	263	11%	251	7%	352	11%
Pac Island	29	14%	20	20%	23	0%
SE Asian	290	12%	367	8%	442	5%
White	3078	11%	2819	9%	3287	7%

* For this table, condition coded attempts are included in the total attempt counts.

Table 5c: CalTPA Cycle 2—Number of Attempts Receiving Non Scorable Condition Codes by Ethnicity Requested by the RDI-TPA Workgroup and Reported on October 15, 2024

Race/ Ethnicity	2021-2022 # Attempts Cycle 2*	2021-2022 % Attempts with 1+ CCs Cycle 2	2022-2023 # Attempts Cycle 2*	2022-2023 % Attempts with 1+ CCs Cycle 2	2023-2024 # Attempts Cycle 2*	2023-2024 % Attempts with 1+ CCs Cycle 2
All	4216	15%	4675	10%	9000	14%
Asian	209	17%	211	11%	364	12%
Black	101	19%	145	25%	357	24%
Hispanic	1397	14%	1688	17%	3933	14%
N/A	195	24%	212	17%	352	14%
Nat Amer	28	25%	25	20%	50	16%
Other	150	19%	160	16%	327	17%
Pac Island	15	13%	22	14%	34	21%
SE Asian	181	15%	217	15%	438	12%
White	1940	15%	1995	16%	3145	13%

*For this table, condition coded attempts are included in the total attempt counts.

Table 5a shows the number of candidate submissions receiving one or more condition codes over the 5 program years. Condition codes likely decreased in 23-24 partly due to revisions made to prompts, directions, and analytic rubrics. Revisions to CalTPA were related to providing additional directions on how to write ELD learning goals and cite ELD standards. Tables 5b and 5c depict condition codes assigned to candidates disaggregated by race and ethnicity showing variability across groups. During the 2022-23 and 2023-24 academic years, Evaluation Systems Group of Pearson fees for performance assessment attempts were paid through a state grant. Candidates receiving condition codes in these years did not pay to resubmit for scoring.

Over the last several years the most frequently assigned condition codes for the CalTPA have been related to planning ELD instruction. In referring to the list of [condition codes](#) provided above, A8 refers to current CA ELD Standards not used, and A9 refers to no ELD Learning Goals included. To address these issues, Commission and ES staff continually made revisions to the CalTPA Candidate Assessment Guide to more fully support candidates in accurately citing ELD standards and creating ELD learning goals. Commission staff has also made a concerted effort to alert programs to the need for more instruction of ELD strategies in coursework and clinical practice. In the last two years, these efforts have contributed to a decrease in these codes.

While the “B,” “D” and “E” condition codes have historically been assigned less frequently, the data has revealed increases in those condition codes over the last three program years. B2 condition codes are related to video clips being edited or technical problems with viewing the recordings. D7 is related to incomplete responses to prompts and D8 is related to 3-5 lessons

not being provided for Cycle 2. E7 is assigned due to candidates not including three student work samples for Step 3 in Cycle 2.

Secondary Passing Standard Data for CalTPA MS/SS/WL

Table 6a: CalTPA (MS/SS/WL) Candidates Who Scored Within the -1 SEM Secondary Passing Standard Cycle 1 and Cycle 2, 2022-23

Program Year 2022-23	N Candidates Within -1 SEM	% Candidates
Cycle 1	313	4%
Cycle 2	120	2%

Table 6b CalTPA (MS/SS/WL) Candidates Who Scored Within the -1 SEM Secondary Passing Standard Cycle 1 and Cycle 2, 2023-24

Program Year 2023-24	N Candidates Within -1 SEM	% Candidates
Cycle 1	438	5%
Cycle 2	245	3%

Tables 6a-b shows the number of CalTPA (MS/SS/WL) candidates who scored within a -1 SEM of the passing standard in the last two program years (2022-23 and 2023-24) and qualified for the Secondary Passing Standard. In 2022-23, 433 candidates scored within the -1 SEM on either their Cycle 1 or Cycle 2 submissions. In 2023-24, 683 candidates scored within the -1 SEM range on either Cycle 1 or Cycle 2. As of November 15, 2024, 402 preliminary credentials (edTPA and CalTPA) have been issued using the secondary passing standard for the TPA requirement.

CalTPA: Education Specialist MMSN and ESN Candidates

Commission and ES staff work to ensure that a diverse group of education specialist educators are trained and calibrated to score CalTPA submissions. Assessors include both TK-12 educators and preparation program faculty across the state and different program pathways. Additional information regarding the CalTPA and CalAPA assessors can be found in [Appendix B](#). Education Specialist CalTPA performance assessments for MMSN and ESN candidates were required for the first time in 2022-23. The Commission acted in [June 2022](#) to adopt initial passing standards for the MMSN and ESN assessments. Due to the performance assessment being a new requirement for these candidates, the Commission directed staff to administer the assessment for two additional years and then return with candidate score data to determine if passing standards should be revised.

The majority of Education Specialist 5th-year preliminary credential programs are two years in duration. Data for 2022-23 reflects this pattern because candidates often complete one or both assessment cycles in the second year of their programs. Most education specialist candidates are enrolled in IHE or LEA Intern programs. These intern credentials are valid for two or more

years, allowing candidates to complete the two cycles of the Education Specialist CalTPA over an extended period.

The first year of operation saw low submission numbers, so data values below 10 are included to provide a more complete understanding of candidate performance. Candidates who submitted cycles across multiple years are counted in the final year of submission. The data presented for each year spans from August 1 to July 31.

Table 7: CalTPA MMSN and ESN Cumulative Pass Rates for Candidates Who Submitted Both Cycles

Program Year	MMSN N	% Passed MMSN	ESN N	% Passed ESN
2022-23	150	94%	46	100%
2023-24	490	98%	178	100%

Table 7 provides the percentages of all MMSN and ESN candidates who passed the CalTPA. Submission numbers increased significantly during 2023-24, due to the fact that many educational specialist programs are two-year programs. Cumulative pass rates for both MMSN and ESN candidates are near or at 100%, which may be attributed to 18 months to two-year Education Specialist preliminary preparation programs, with candidates submitting cycles in the second year of the program.

Table 8: CalTPA MMSN and ESN Candidates Who Completed and Passed Both Cycles by Race/Ethnicity in Cumulative Attempts

	2022-23		2023-24		Total	
Ethnicity	N	% Pass	N	% Pass	N	% Pass
Asian	10	100%	31	100%	41	100%
Black	3	66%	38	97%	41	95%
Hispanic	75	97%	250	96%	325	97%
N/A	6	83%	27	100%	33	100%
Nat Amer	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	1	100%	10	100%	14	100%
Pac Island	1	100%	8	100%	9	100%
SE Asian	3	100%	21	100%	24	100%
White	90	99%	254	98%	344	98%

Table 8 provides data about the passing rate for the number of candidates by race/ethnicity who submitted both Cycle 1 and Cycle 2. In a particular year, pass rates range between 66% and a high of 100%. Across the two years of MMSN and ESN CalTPAs, the pass rates range between

95% and a high of 100%. Care needs to be taken in interpreting these results as lower Ns (number of candidates) have a disproportionate influence on the pass rate percentage. Overall, 95% or higher of candidates across race/ethnicity pass the CalTPA in cumulative attempts. Table 9 and Table 10 provide information about the number of attempts candidates take to pass each of the two instructional cycles.

Table 9: CalTPA MMSN and ESN Candidates Who Passed Cycle 1 First, Second, and Three or More Attempts, and Not Yet Passed by Year

Program Year	Cycle 1 N*	First Attempt	Second Attempt	3+ Attempts	Not Yet Passed
2022-23	420	391	7	0	22
2023-24	873	832	38	0	3

*For this table only scorable attempts are included in the total attempt counts.

Table 10: CalTPA MMSN and ESN Candidates Who Passed Cycle 2 First, Second, and Three or More Attempts, and Not Yet Passed by Year

Program Year	Cycle 2 N*	First Attempt	Second Attempt	3+ Attempts	Not Yet Passed
2022-23	190	182	2	0	6
2023-24	645	632	13	0	0

*For this table only scorable attempts are included in the total attempt counts.

Tables 9 and 10 provide information on how many candidates require more than one attempt to pass Cycle 1 and Cycle 2. No candidates submitted a third attempt. It is important to note that some programs are 18 months, and both IHE and LEA intern programs can be up to two years, in some programs three, resulting in candidates taking more than one program year to complete both cycles. The number of candidates who have not yet passed Cycle 1 and/or Cycle 2 will likely decline in 2024-25 as they submit first submissions or revised evidence.

Table 11: CalTPA MMSN and ESN Candidates Receiving 1 or more Condition Codes for Cycle 1 and Cycle 2 by Year

Program Year	N Cycle 1	# Candidates receiving 1 or more CCs Cycle 1	% Candidates Receiving 1 or more CCs Cycle 1	N Cycle 2	# Candidates receiving 1 or more CCs Cycle 2	% Candidates Receiving 1 or more CCs Cycle 2
2022-23	508	48	9%	239	34	14%
2023-24	1,036	89	8.6%	756	65	8.6%

Table 11 provides the number of CalTPA MMSN and ESN candidates receiving condition codes for Cycle 1 and Cycle 2. The data indicates between 8.6% and 14% of candidates have received condition codes across the two program years. As with MS, SS and WL candidates, the majority of condition codes assigned are due to candidates not including ELD learning goals.

Table 12a: CalTPA (MMSN and ESN) Candidates Who Scored Within the -1 SEM Secondary Passing Standard Cycle 1 and Cycle 2, 2022-23

Program Year 2022-2023	N Candidates Within -1 SEM	% Candidates
Cycle 1	8	2%
Cycle 2	1	<1%

Table 12b: CalTPA (MMSN and ESN) Candidates Who Scored Within the -1 SEM Secondary Passing Standard Cycle 1 and Cycle 2, 2023-24

Program Year 2023-2024	N Candidates Within -1 SEM	% Candidates
Cycle 1	10	1%
Cycle 2	1	<1%

Tables 12a-b shows the number of MMSN and ESN candidates who scored within a -1 SEM of the passing standard in the last two program years (2022-23 and 2023-24) and qualify for the Secondary Passing Standard consideration. In 2022-23, eight candidates scored within the -1 SEM on Cycle 1, and 1 candidate for Cycle 2 submissions. In 2023-24, 10 candidates scored within the -1 SEM on Cycle 1 and one candidate on Cycle 2. As of November 15, 2024, 402 preliminary credentials (MS, SS, WL, MMSN, and ESN) have been issued using the secondary passing standard for the TPA requirement for both the edTPA and the CalTPA. Additional data regarding MMSN and ESN mean rubric scores for Cycle 1 and Cycle 2 can be found in [Appendix D](#).

Resources for Candidates and Educator Preparation Programs

Through the ES [performance assessment website](#), linked resources, and the [Commission's YouTube channel](#), CalTPA candidates are provided an array of information that can help them understand the requirements of the cycle tasks and rubrics and what to expect from their educator preparation program as they engage in completing the performance assessment.

For the CalTPA, the website (www.ctcexams.nesinc.com) provides information about how to register and pay for assessments and request accommodation(s). Information is also provided about the assessment design and format, the evidence of practice to be submitted, assessment fees, minimum passing scores, condition codes and an explanation of the rubric level assessment results report candidates receive after submitting evidence for scoring. Upon registration for the assessment, candidates are provided with links to preparation materials, including the tasks and rubrics. Comprehensive information about video recording, file formats and uploading requirements are also provided on the ES website. Completed example submissions are provided to model mid-range performance for programs and candidates. These submission examples are provided via the Commission's website.

In addition to online resources, Commission staff hold weekly office hours for CalTPA candidates, and bi-weekly office hours for program coordinators and faculty during which information is provided regarding assessment requirements, recommendations to support candidates' review and revision of submissions, and clarification and support regarding registering and submitting CalTPAs. The Commission holds semi-annual program coordinator meetings to present candidate data findings including pass rate data, rubric score data, and emerging trends in condition codes. The intent of these meetings is to share statewide performance and to provide the opportunity for programs to think together and learn about strategies to support candidates. To support new programs planning to implement the CalTPA an annual new program coordinator meeting is offered in the fall. Programs using the Commission's models are invited to contact Commission staff for direct, specific assistance based on their unique needs.

To extend program level discussion about teaching and learning issues highlighted in performance assessment (e.g. how to develop reflective writing skills, how to embed the tasks in course work and field work) quarterly professional development sessions (*Digging Deeper*) are held for preparation programs in which program faculty present best practices. To further promote and support program sharing of practices, the Commission facilitates a two-day, online, annual *Meredith Fellows Implementation Conference*. The conference offers the opportunity for programs to present experiences and practices and interact with other faculty and those who support candidates. The conference invites faculty and others engaged in any of the performance assessment models (edTPA, CalTPA, FAST, CalFPA, CalAPA) to participate.

CalTPA Credential Specific Cycles (Tasks and Rubrics) Under Development

CalTPA Literacy Cycle (SB 488)

Commission staff are working with a Literacy Design Team to integrate literacy instruction, as defined in SB 488, into a cycle of the Multiple Subject, five Education Specialist (MMSN, ESN, DHH, VI and ECSE), and ECE PK-3 Education Specialist versions of the CalTPA. Nineteen teacher preparation programs and 219 candidates participated in the Spring 2024 Pilot Test.

Revisions were made to the pilot test versions based on candidate score data and candidate, program coordinator, cooperating teacher, and assessor surveys and focus group data. Field testing with 30 programs and 320 candidates is currently underway for these revised literacy cycles and cycle development is scheduled to be completed by spring of 2025. Operational assessments, once approved by the Commission, will be available July of 2025. More information on the development of the Literacy Performance Assessment is available in the August 2024 Commission agenda [Item 5B: Update on the Development of the Literacy Performance Assessment and Pilot Study](#).

CalTPA for ECE PK-3 Education Specialist Candidates

The ECE PK-3 CalTPA follows the two-cycle format with four steps of Plan, Teach/Assess, Reflect and Apply. The performance assessment for this new credential type includes a math focused cycle that measures elements of the new [PK-3 Domain 8: Effective Mathematics Instruction in a PK-3 Setting](#), and a literacy focused cycle that measures elements of the new [PK-3 Domain 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for PK-3 Settings](#). The PK-3 ECE Math Cycle was developed by

Commission staff with the assistance of a group of early childhood math pedagogy specialists. The math cycle is being field-tested fall of 2024, and the literacy cycle is being field-tested spring of 2025. This version of the CalTPA is scheduled to be completed spring of 2025 and, upon Commission approval, available July of 2025. For more information about the ECE PK-3 Education Specialist development see [*5D: Participant Waiver Requests for the Literacy Performance Assessment and the CalTPA Mathematics Cycle Field Test.*](#)

CalTPA for DHH, VI, ECSE Education Specialist Candidates

The DHH, VI, and ECSE CalTPA versions follow the two-cycle format with four steps of Plan, Teach/Assess, Reflect and Apply. The performance assessments for these credential types measure elements of the credential specific [TPEs](#). One cycle focuses on math instruction and the other cycle focuses on literacy (SB 488). Commission staff have worked with credential specific pedagogical experts to develop the assessments. The math cycles for each of the three credential areas are being field tested fall of 2024 and the literacy cycles are being field tested spring of 2025. These credential specific assessments are scheduled to be completed and upon Commission approval, available July of 2025.

New CalTPA Development

In the past three years, staff have worked with appointed Design Teams and ES to develop additional credential and permit specific CalTPA versions. For the suite of Education Specialist credentials, credential specific experts are assisting staff to develop instructional cycles for DHH, VI, and ECSE. These education specialist performance assessments will be ready for implementation in the fall of 2025.

CalFTP

Under the Preschool Development Grant Renewal (PDG-R) federal grant, staff and early childhood education experts have developed the Early Childhood Educator California Formative Teaching Performance Assessment (ECE CalFTP). This locally administered and scored formative assessment is ready for statewide use as of the 2024-25 academic year. This fall, Commission staff are offering online professional development workshops to help ECE faculty in both community colleges and four-year institutions become familiar with the assessment and best practices. CalFTP workshops will continue to be offered this spring and in coming years online. All developed materials to support the CalFTP are available on the Commission's website. For information on the development of the ECE CalFTP, please refer to [Appendix H](#).

Part 3. edTPA MODEL INFORMATION AND CANDIDATE RESULTS

The edTPA is a subject-specific performance assessment using a three-task design. edTPA was initially approved by the Commission for use in California as a teaching performance assessment in 2014 and again in 2018. In 2022, the Commission approved the [Special Education Handbook for California](#) for candidates seeing the Education Specialist: Mild-Moderate Support Needs and the Extensive Support Needs credentials. A cycle of teaching, captured by the three tasks that compose an edTPA portfolio, include 1) Planning, 2) Instruction, and 3) Assessment of student learning. In each task, candidates have an opportunity to reflect on and analyze their teaching and propose revisions, considering their knowledge of students and data collected. The edTPA

Elementary Education Handbooks assess candidates’ performance of both Elementary Literacy and Elementary Mathematics. The Elementary Education Handbooks for Multiple Subject candidates follow the edTPA common architecture with Tasks 1–3 and includes an additional Task 4 assessing candidate performance on Elementary Mathematics or Elementary Literacy. The Special Education Handbook for California, approved for Education Specialist MMSN and ESN credentials, has 15 rubrics and follows the same design and architecture as the other 15-rubric fields. This handbook asks candidates to reflect on the unique learning needs of a single learner, plan and teach lessons to their specific needs, and analyze their teaching effectiveness by assessing learners’ progress throughout the learning segment. Rubric Essential Questions for edTPA can be found in [Appendix E](#).

Data and analysis for edTPA are presented in separate tables for Multiple Subject/Single Subject, World Language, and Education Specialist candidates. This separation reflects differences in the number of rubrics included in the handbooks for each credential area.

- Cumulative Attempt Pass Rate: Refers to the percentage of candidates who passed both cycles, including those requiring multiple attempts.
- First Attempt Pass Rates: Refers to the percentage of candidates who passed on their first attempt.
- First Attempt Mean Rubric Scores: Provides mean rubric scores based on candidates’ first attempts (see [Appendix E](#)).

Please note that the total number of candidates (N) listed in the following tables may vary across program years. This is because the tables analyze the data from different perspectives to address distinct questions and provide additional context. This variability is especially notable in tables that include candidates who submitted cycles across different program years.

Table 13a: edTPA Cumulative Attempt Pass Rates for MS/SS Candidates

Program Year	# of Attempts*	% Passed
2018-19	3878	95%
2019-20	3420	97%
2020-21	2256	97%
2021-22	3548	97%
2022-23	4019	93%
2023-24	3827	91%

*For this table, only scorable attempts are included in the total attempt counts.

Table 13b: edTPA Cumulative Attempt Pass Rates for World Language Candidates

Program Year	# of Attempts*	% Passed
2018-19	94	94%
2019-20	107	95%
2020-21	54	98%
2021-22	77	92%
2022-23	124	81%
2023-24	131	77%

*For this table, only scorable attempts are included in the total attempt counts.

Table 13c: edTPA Cumulative Attempt Pass Rates for Education Specialist (MMSN, ESN)

Program Year	# of Attempts*	% Passed
2022-23	163	98%
2023-24	340	98%

*For this table, only scorable attempts are included in the total attempt counts.

Tables 13a-c, provide data on the cumulative attempt pass rates for Multiple Subject, Single Subject, World Language, and Education Specialist (MMSN, ESN) candidates. The data show that the vast majority of candidates who submit an edTPA eventually pass.

Education Specialist candidates achieved high pass rates during these first two years of implementation. Pass rates for the two most recent program years (2022-23 and 2023-24) are somewhat lower for Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and World Language candidates. These are candidates who did not yet pass and are likely revising and resubmitting their portfolios or planning to resubmit them in the future. The drop in the pass rates for World Language candidates is unexpected, prompting Commission staff to collaborate with ES, the model sponsor, and preparation programs to investigate this trend and provide targeted support as needed.

Additionally, for transparency, staff reviewed data for the 863 candidates removed from the edTPA data set. These candidates received a TPA deferral during COVID under AB 142, which allows them to bypass passing a TPA if they successfully complete an induction program or two years of employment. Of these, 709 did not pass, while the remaining 154 submitted portfolios that could not be scored.

Table 14a: edTPA (MS/SS) Candidates Who Passed on First, Second, Third and More Attempts, and Not Yet Passed by Year*

Program Year	First Attempt	Second Attempt	3+ Attempts	Not Yet Passed
Y1: 2018-19	87% (3378)	7% (274)	1% (47)	5% (193)
Y2: 2019-20	85% (2914)	7% (236)	5% (163)	3% (104)
Y3: 2020-21	89% (2011)	7% (147)	2% (37)	3% (63)
Y4: 2021-22	87% (3110)	7% (258)	2% (60)	4% (153)
Y5: 2022-23	80% (3231)	8% (333)	4% (182)	8% (314)
Y6: 2023-24	80% (3224)	5% (213)	1% (52)	14% (560)

*For this table, only scorable attempts are included in the denominator for purposes of determining percentages.

Table 14b: edTPA (WL) Candidates Who Passed on First, Second, Third or More Attempts, and Not Yet Passed*

Program Year	First Attempt	Second Attempt	3+ Attempts	Not Yet Passed
Y1: 2018-19	72% (70)	12% (12)	6% (6)	9% (9)
Y2: 2019-20	65% (68)	18% (19)	14% (15)	3% (3)
Y3: 2020-21	87% (48)	7% (4)	2% (1)	4% (2)
Y4: 2021-22	60% (48)	23% (18)	6% (5)	11% (9)
Y5: 2022-23	48% (62)	20% (25)	10% (13)	22% (28)
Y6: 2023-24	49% (70)	19% (27)	0% (0)	32% (46)

*For this table, only scorable attempts are included in the denominator for purposes of determining percentages.

Table 14c: edTPA (MMSN/ESN) Candidates Who Passed on First, Second, Third or More Attempts, and Not Yet Passed*

Program Year	First Attempt	Second Attempt	3+ Attempts	Not Yet Passed
Y1: 2022-23	89% (145)	8% (13)	<1% (1)	2% (4)
Y2: 2023-24	93% (318)	4% (14)	0% (0)	3% (9)

*For this table, only scorable attempts are included in the denominator for purposes of determining percentages.

Tables 14 a-c indicate the number of candidates who passed on their first, second, and third attempt based on the year in which they first submitted an edTPA, as well as the number of candidates who have not yet passed. It is expected that the numbers of candidates in the “Not Yet Passed” category for the two most recent program years (2022-23 and 2023-24) will decrease as those candidates revise and resubmit their portfolios. The tables show that a higher

percentage of World Language candidates require multiple attempts to pass; staff will also review this issue with ES, the model sponsor, and preparation programs.

Table 15a: edTPA (MS/SS) Candidates Who Completed and Passed by Race/Ethnicity in Cumulative Attempts*

Race/Ethnicity	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Asian	97% (411)	98% (408)	98% (250)	96% (392)	97% (509)	93% (419)
Black	96 % (71)	99% (73)	91% (60)	98% (106)	95% (123)	80% (105)
Hispanic	98% (726)	98% (801)	98% (517)	96% (986)	96% (1246)	90% (1195)
Multiracial	98% (260)	97% (248)	97% (143)	98% (268)	96% (243)	90% (274)
Nat Amer	87% (13)	100% (10)	100% (11)	100% (17)	100% (15)	88% (14)
Other	99% (76)	97% (62)	98% (52)	99% (66)	92% (73)	90% (69)
Undeclared	94% (131)	98% (90)	96% (55)	93% (85)	95% (109)	92% (97)
White	98% (1594)	99% (1478)	98% (1058)	98% (1473)	97% (1403)	93% (1259)

*For this table, only scorable attempts are included in the denominator for purposes of determining percentages.

Table 15b: edTPA (WL) Candidates Who Completed and Passed by Race/Ethnicity in Cumulative Attempts*

Race/Ethnicity	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Asian	85% (11)	100% (16)	100% (11)	100% (6)	100% (21)	100% (6)
Black	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	67% (2)	0% (0)
Hispanic	96% (46)	92% (590)	97% (29)	92% (49)	91% (61)	73% (66)
Multiracial	100% (4)	100% (20)	100% (3)	100% (2)	67% (2)	100% (8)
Nat Amer	100% (1)	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Other	100% (3)	100% (2)	100% (1)	100% (2)	100% (1)	75% (3)
Undeclared	83% (5)	100% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (3)	88% (7)
White	95% (18)	100% (18)	100% (9)	100% (12)	100% (12)	79% (11)

*For this table, only scorable attempts are included in the denominator for purposes of determining percentages.

Table 15c: edTPA (MMSN/ESN) Candidates Who Completed and Passed by Race/Ethnicity in Cumulative Attempts*

Race/Ethnicity	2022-23 #	2022-23 %	2023-24 #	2023-24 %
Asian	15	100%	28	100%
Black	9	100%	32	97%
Hispanic	77	99%	121	98%
Multiracial	12	100%	24	96%
Nat Amer	0	0%	2	100%
Other	2	67%	9	100%
Undeclared	6	86%	10	91%
White	40	100%	105	96%

*For this table, only scorable attempts are included in the denominator for purposes of determining percentages.

Tables 15 a-c provide data on the number and percentage of candidates who passed, disaggregated by race/ethnicity. As indicated by the data, most candidates ultimately pass their edTPA, with many groups seeing a 100% cumulative pass rate. Commission staff will review the lower pass rates by Hispanic, Other, and White World Language candidates with ES, the model sponsor, and preparation programs.

Table 16: Number of Candidates by Year Who First Submitted edTPA but Not Passed Yet

Program Year	Multiple/Single Subject	World Language	Education Specialist*
Y1: 2018-19	173	5	0
Y2: 2019-20	113	7	0
Y3: 2020-21	62	1	0
Y4: 2021-22	111	6	0
Y5: 2022-23	368	32	4
Y6: 2023-24	470	39	8

*Education Specialists were not required to pass a TPA until 2022-23.

Table 16 provides further context regarding the number of candidates who submitted an edTPA but have never passed, indicating the number of candidates who were not yet able to earn a preliminary credential.

Table 17a: edTPA (MS/SS) Candidates Who Completed and Passed by Race/Ethnicity in Cumulative Attempts, 2018-2024*

Race/Ethnicity	N Passed on First Attempt	% Passed on First Attempt	N Passed on Cumulative Attempts	% Passed on Cumulative Attempts
All	17,612	87%	19,869	95%
Asian/Pacific Island	2177	87%	2453	95%
Black	463	77%	573	89%
Hispanic	4958	86%	5648	94%
Multiracial	1327	88%	1482	94%
Nat American	71	86%	86	96%
Other	350	85%	404	94%
Undeclared	495	81%	597	92%
White	7771	89%	8626	96%

*For this table, only scorable attempts are included in the denominator for purposes of determining percentages.

Table 17b: edTPA (WL) Candidates Who Completed and Passed by Race/Ethnicity in Cumulative Attempts, 2018-2024*

Race/Ethnicity	N Passed on First Attempt	% Passed on First Attempt	N Passed on Cumulative Attempts	% Passed on Cumulative Attempts
All	349	64%	515	88%
Asian/Pacific Island	61	90%	69	97%
Black	3	75%	3	60%
Hispanic	197	57%	309	84%
Multiracial	16	84%	21	95%
Nat American	1	100%	2	100%
Other	8	80%	12	92%
Undeclared	6	30%	19	83%
White	57	71%	80	94%

*For this table, only scorable attempts are included in the denominator for purposes of determining percentages.

Table 17c: edTPA (MMSN/ESN) Candidates Who Completed and Passed by Race/Ethnicity in Cumulative Attempts, 2018-2024*

Race/Ethnicity	N Passed on First Attempt	% Passed on First Attempt	N Passed on Cumulative Attempts	% Passed on Cumulative Attempts
All	462	96%	491	98%
Asian/Pacific Island	38	97%	43	100%
Black	38	97%	41	98%
Hispanic	184	96%	197	98%
Multiracial	36	97%	36	97%
Nat American	1	100%	2	100%
Other	11	92%	11	92%
Undeclared	16	89%	17	94%
White	138	95%	144	97%

*For this table, only scorable attempts are included in the denominator for purposes of determining percentages.

Tables 17a-c show that first time pass rates for race/ethnicity groups vary from 57% (Hispanic, World Language, First Attempt) to 100% on the different versions of the edTPA. There appears to be less variability on the Multiple/Single Subject and Education Specialist handbooks than the World Language handbooks, which have the lowest first time pass rates. This is another indicator that review of the context for World Language handbooks is needed.

Table 18a: edTPA Submissions Receiving an Incomplete

Academic Year	N Submissions*	N Submissions with an Incomplete in at Least 1 Task	% Submissions with an Incomplete in at Least 1 Task
2019-20	3886	155	4%
2020-21	2992	233	8%
2021-22	4668	247	5%
2022-23	5330	283	5%
2023-24	5648	404	7%

*For this table condition coded/incomplete attempts are included in the total submissions counts.

Table 18b: edTPA—Submissions Receiving an Incomplete by Ethnicity*

Race/ Ethnicity	2021-2022 N Submissions*	2021-2022 % and N Submissions with an Incomplete in 1+ Task	2022-2023 N Submissions*	2022-2023 % and N Submissions with an Incomplete in 1+ Task	2023-2024 N Submissions *	2023-2024 % and N Submissions with an Incomplete in 1+ Task
Black	180	8% (15)	231	11% (26)	253	(17%) 43
Nat Amer	20	0% (0)	23	13% (3)	36	6% (2)
Asian	591	5% (30)	686	5% (31)	642	7% (43)
Hispanic	1371	6% (86)	191	6% (107)	2066	7% (154)
White	1928	(4%) 85	1910	4% (71)	1917	6% (106)
Multiracial	362	4% (14)	351	7% (23)	427	7% (29)
Other	77	6% (5)	123	8% (10)	136	11% (15)
Undeclared	139	9% (12)	180	7% (12)	171	7% (12)

*For this table condition coded/incomplete attempts are included in the total submissions counts.

Tables 18a and 18b provide data on number and percentage of portfolios that received an Incomplete. Assignment of an Incomplete occurs when two or more condition codes are assigned within a single Task. The data show that only 4-8% of all portfolios receive an Incomplete.

Secondary Passing Standard Data for edTPA MS/SS and WL Candidates

Table 19: edTPA (MS/SS/WL) Secondary Passing Standard Data

Program Year	N Candidates Within -1 SEM	% Candidates
Y5: 2022-23	79	2%
Y6: 2023-24	239	5%

Table 19 shows the number of edTPA (MS/SS/WL) candidates who scored within a -1 SEM of the passing standard in the last two program years (2022-23 and 2023-24) and would then qualify for the Secondary Passing Standard. In program year 5 (2022-23), 79 candidates scored within the -1 SEM representing 2% of the total number of submissions for that year. In program year 6 (2023-24), 239 candidates scored within the -1 SEM range, which represents 5% of the total number of edTPA submissions. As of November 15, 2024, 402 preliminary credentials have been

issued using the secondary passing standard for the TPA (MS/SS/WL, and MMSN/ESN) requirement for both the edTPA and the CalTPA.

Resources for Candidates and Educator Preparation Programs

To provide candidates with just-in-time support, multiple resources for edTPA are made available through the edtpa.com website.

The publicly available [Making Good Choices](#) resource provides candidates with helpful guidance in preparing for and completing their edTPA, including support on video recording and each of the edTPA tasks. A series of [Candidate Support Webinars](#), also available publicly, provide an overview of the assessment, task-by-task guidance for each task, and for those who need to resubmit edTPA, there is a webinar providing guidance on that process. Additional [video tutorials](#) guide candidates through the use of the Pearson ePortfolio system. Candidates seeking [guidance on Condition Codes](#) can locate guidance including full descriptions and next steps on the edtpa.com website. Many other resources are available to candidates on the [edtpa.com website](https://edtpa.com). Should candidates have a specific question and/or wish to speak with a representative, they can contact the [Candidate Support](#) department through chat, email, phone, U.S. mail.

Programs have access to support materials in the Resource Library on edtpa.org, including all assessment materials, webinar recordings, a number of additional resources. Additionally, edTPA is represented annually at the Meredith Fellows Implementation Conference, with presentations by Evaluation Systems staff and EPP faculty/staff who support candidates with edTPA.

edTPA Performance Assessment Under Development

In response to the literacy integration requirements outlined SB 488, three new credential areas are under development: edTPA Multiple Subject Literacy with Mathematics, edTPA Education Specialist, Literacy (MMSN/ESN), and edTPA California ECE PK-3 Education Specialist. The assessments for edTPA Multiple Subject and Education Specialist are to be presented at the December Commission meeting as a request to field test in early 2025. These credential areas have been developed by outside consultants and have been reviewed by California educators with experience in teaching literacy and the SB 488 requirements.

The assessment for the ECE PK-3 Education Specialist credential will be presented at a later Commission meeting in 2025.

Part 4. FAST MODEL INFORMATION AND CANDIDATE RESULTS

The Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) is a Commission-approved TPA model designed by and used exclusively by Cal State Fresno. FAST was originally reviewed and approved by the Commission in 2007 and has been in use at Cal State Fresno since that time. In 2018, the FAST was revised to align with changes in the performance assessment design standards, and the TPEs. FAST 2.0 was submitted for review and [approved by the Commission in 2018](#)

FAST 2.0 consists of two parts: the *Site Visitation Project (SVP)*, completed during candidates' initial student teaching, and the *Teaching Sample Project (TSP)*, completed during candidates' final student teaching. The SVP assesses teacher candidates' ability to 1) plan a single lesson, 2) implement that lesson, and 3) evaluate instruction. For Multiple Subject candidates, the content area is mathematics. Within the TSP, teacher candidates document how they address the needs of all their students in the planning, teaching, and assessing of the content. The TSP assesses candidates' ability to (a) identify the context of the classroom; (b) plan and teach a series of at least five cohesive lessons with a focus on content knowledge and literacy; (c) assess students' learning before, during, and after the unit; (d) document their teaching and their students' learning; and (e) reflect on the effectiveness of their teaching. The TSP is divided into seven components, each of which is scored on a task-specific, four-point rubric. For Multiple Subject candidates, the content area for the TSP is literacy. Rubric Essential Questions for FAST can be found in [Appendix F](#).

Data Results and Analysis

Table 20: FAST Cumulative Attempt Pass Rates (MS/SS/ES)

Academic Year	Total Attempts	N Passed	% Passed
2018-19	785	785	100%
2019-20	773	771	99.7%
2020-21	806	806	100%
2021-22	829	827	99.8%
2022-23	889	881	99.1%
2023-24	860	855	99.4%

Table 19 provides the total number of candidates who attempted either the FAST 2.0 SVP or the TSP in Academic Years 2018-19 through 2023-24. The final column provides the number and percentage of candidates who passed either the SVP or the TSP with passing rates of 99.1%-100%. Please note that, prior to 2023-2024, Education Specialist candidates were not included in the reported scores. They have been included in the 2023-2024 data.

Table 21: FAST Race/Ethnicity Data for First Attempt SVP

Site Visitation Project	2020-21 N Submissions	2020-21 % Passed	2021-22 N Submissions	2021-22 % Passed	2022-23 N Submissions	2022-23 % Passed	2023-24 N Submissions	2023-24 % Passed
All	419	100%	428	97.9%	460	96.7%	422	96.9%
Asian	12	100%	0	0%	0	0%	10	100%
Black	0	0%	4	100%	2	50%	5	100%
Hispanic	223	100%	240	97.5%	260	97.7%	266	98.1%
N/A	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	11	100%
Nat Amer	0	0%	2	100%	6	100%	2	100%
Other	17	100%	8	100%	10	100%	11	100%

Site Visitation Project	2020-21 N Submissions	2020-21 % Passed	2021-22 N Submissions	2021-22 % Passed	2022-23 N Submissions	2022-23 % Passed	2023-24 N Submissions	2023-24 % Passed
Pac Island	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
SE Asian	23	100%	15	100%	30	90.0%	28	92.9%
White	131	100%	105	98.4%	98	98.0%	89	93.3%

Table 22: FAST Race/Ethnicity Data for First Attempt TSP

Teaching Sample Project	2020-21 N Submissions	2020-21 % Passed	2021-22 N Submissions	2021-22 % Passed	2022-23 N Submissions	2022-23 % Passed	2023-24 N Submissions	2023-24 % Passed
All	387	100%	401	87.5%	429	87.2%	438	88.4%
Asian	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	10	100%
Black	0	0%	2	50%	1	100%	6	100%
Hispanic	202	100%	230	87.8%	238	86.6%	276	85.9%
N/A	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	11	90.9%
Nat Amer	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%
Other	17	100%	9	100%	10	100%	13	100%
Pac Island	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%
SE Asian	17	100%	18	66.7%	28	89.3%	20	80.0%
White	130	100%	105	90.5%	109	86.2%	99	92.9%

Tables 21: SVP and 22: TSP provide the race and ethnicity distribution of teacher candidates who passed each component of the FAST on their first attempt for years 2020-21 through 2023-24. Looking across the years of data shows that pass rates for all candidates from all race/ethnicities remained relatively stable on the SVP with the exception of a slight decrease in the number of candidates who identified as white who passed on their first attempt (98.0% to 93.3%). Still, for all ethnicities, the pass rate on the first attempt of the SVP was at least 92.9%.

Similarly, the overall pass rates on first attempts on the TSP have remained relatively stable for most reported race/ethnic groups. The first exception to this is a 6.6% increase in the first attempt pass rates for candidates who identify as white. (86.2% to 92.9%). The second exception to this is the first attempt pass rate for candidates who identify as Southeast Asian. The percentage who passed on their first attempt dropped from 89.3% in 2022-23 to 80.0% in 2023-24. In actual numbers, this meant that 25 of 28 candidates who identified as Southeast Asian passed the TSP on their first attempt in 2022-23, while 16 of 20 passed on their first attempt in 2023-24.

Data Caveat: Prior to 2023-2024, Education Specialist candidates were not included in the reported scores. They have been included in the 2023-2024 data.

Table 23: FAST Cumulative Attempt Pass Rates (SVP and TSP)

Academic Year	Total Attempted	N Passed 1 st Attempt	% Passed 1 st Attempt	N Passed 2nd Attempt	% Passed 2nd Attempt	N Passed 1 st or 2 nd attempt	% Passed 1st & 2nd Attempt
2018-19	785	741	94.4%	44	100%	785	100%
2019-20	773	746	96.5%	25	93%	771	99.7%
2020-21	806	784	97.3%	22	100%	806	100%
2021-22	829	772	93.1%	57	100%	827	99.8%
2022-23	889	819	92.1%	62	93.9%	881	99.1%
2023-24	860	796	92.6%	59	92.2%	855	99.4%

Table 23 provides the total number of candidates who attempted either the FAST 2.0 Site Visitation Project or the Teaching Sample Project in Academic Years 2018-19 through 2023-24 and provides the number and percent who passed on their first attempt and second attempt. The final column provides the number and percentage of candidates who passed either the Site Visitation Project or the Teaching Sample Project within two attempts. Looking across the five years of data demonstrates a slight decline in the percentage of candidates not passing the assessment on their first attempt (94.4% in 2018-19 and 92.6% in 2023-24), though the percentage that ultimately passed has remained constant.

Incomplete FAST Projects

Very rarely does a candidate submit an incomplete project. If this does occur, the coach scores what is submitted and then the FAST Coordinator reviews the project. The coordinator then works with the candidate in the same manner that is done for candidates who did not pass a task which is to meet with the candidate one-on-one to review what was not submitted and what is required to complete that task.

If a candidate is struggling to meet a deadline, typically, the candidate communicates that to their coach, who then works with the FAST Coordinator to revise the deadline so that the candidate can successfully finish and submit the project. In most cases, the candidate submits the completed project within a week of the original deadline. Additional information about FAST mean rubric scores can be found in [Appendix F](#).

Resources for Candidates Completing FAST

Fresno State Teacher Education candidates are provided with a number of resources to support them with the FAST.

Manuals

When first beginning the Teacher Education program, each candidate is provided with an electronic version of the FAST Manual, specific to the credential they are seeking:

- [FAST 2.0 Multiple Subject and Single Subject](#)

- [FAST 3.0 Multiple Subject](#)
- [FAST Ed Specialist: Mild-to-Moderate Support Needs](#)
- [FAST Ed Specialist: Extensive Support Needs](#)

Each manual provides (1) an overview of each project; (2) a breakdown of each specific task within each project; and (3) the task-specific rubrics associated with each project.

Workshops

Throughout each semester, the FAST Coordinator provides multiple workshops to support candidates with their projects. These include a general orientation to the FAST provided at the Teacher Education Induction & Orientation Day, orientations to each overall project at the beginning of each semester, and follow-up presentations about specific tasks within each project. Typically, the orientations are provided within candidates' program-specific seminar classes, while the follow-up presentations are provided over zoom. The slides from all presentations are made available to all candidates through Canvas.

Timelines

To help keep candidates on track, the FAST Coordinator has developed suggested deadlines for each task of each project during the semester. These deadlines are included within candidates Clinical Practice Canvas courses.

Office Hours

Each semester, the FAST Coordinator holds multiple office hour sessions during the final weeks of the semester for candidates who have any questions about their project. These are typically held as drop-in sessions where candidates can come, ask questions, and get support.

Video

The previous FAST Coordinator created videos to breakdown the expectations of each task of each project. These are also available to candidates through Canvas.

Coaches

Coaches who serve as candidates' clinical practice course instructors also provide support throughout each semester. All coaches within Fresno State's Teacher Education program are required to score the FAST, making them very familiar with the specific expectations. They are then able to use this information as they provide feedback to candidates throughout the semester. They are also available to answer questions candidates might have about the projects. Finally, they are able to do regular check-ins with candidates on their progress.

Coursework

Within each program, faculty build assignments into courses to align with the tasks associated with each project.

For example, in the Math Methods course for Multiple Subject and Education Specialist, candidates typically design instructional lessons that integrate mathematics and literacy. Additionally, across the Multiple Subject program, candidates take an Inquiry and Puzzles of

Practice course series that focuses on different types of data they can collect as instructors and how to use that data to inform their instruction.

Within the Single Subject program, candidates create lessons and units that integrate literacy with their content area instruction.

Across all programs, candidates take courses focused on supporting multilingual learners that introduces them to the CA ELD Framework, which they then draw upon when creating their lesson and units for both the SVP and TSP.

Ongoing Support

Throughout each semester, the FAST Coordinator monitors candidate progress to ensure they are submitting the necessary tasks within the suggested timeframe. The coordinator then reaches out to the candidate and the candidate's coach when an element is missing.

Failed Project Support

If a candidate does not pass one or more tasks of a project, they are required to meet with the FAST Coordinator to review the task(s) they did not pass, what the expectations of that task are, and why they may have failed. The FAST Coordinator guides the candidate through thinking about what revisions they need to make before resubmitting their project.

FAST Performance Assessment Under Development

FAST 3.0

In response to the 2023 updates to the Performance Assessment Design Standards, which now require explicit attention to candidates' literacy development as articulated subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (4) of subdivision (b) of Education Code section 44259, in spring 2024, Fresno State engaged in a revision of the FAST 2.0 for Multiple Subject. The goal was to develop FAST 3.0 that would include a revised Site Visitation Project to assess candidates' knowledge of literacy instruction.

Faculty with expertise in literacy instruction and assessment and experience working with the FAST came together to examine the current version of the FAST and plan revisions. In the process, they consulted the updated literacy requirements. Revisions continued through summer 2024.

At its meeting on August 29, 2024, the Commission approved Fresno State to pilot the FAST 3.0 for Multiple Subject in fall 2024 with a cohort of 85 candidates who had taken or who were concurrently taking a TPE 7-aligned Literacy Foundations course. That pilot is currently underway, and data are being collected on its effectiveness. The Standard Setting Study is scheduled for December 3, 2024. For more details on the development of the FAST Literacy TPA, see the August 2024 item [5C: Request for Approval of Field Test for the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers Literacy Performance Assessment](#).

FAST 3.0 for Education Specialists (MMSN/ESN)

Following the process used to revise the FAST 2.0 for Multiple Subjects, a group of Education Specialist faculty, along with the FAST Coordinator and the Director of Educator Preparation and Accreditation, came together in Fall 2024 to revise the FAST for Education Specialist—Mild-to-Moderate Support Needs and FAST for Education Specialist—Extensive Support Needs to align with the requirements articulated in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (4) of subdivision (b) of Education Code sec. 44259.

The group began by reviewing the FAST 3.0 for Multiple Subject, particularly the SVP to look for areas which would need to be modified for instruction in Mild-to-Moderate or Extensive Supports Needs contexts. The group then revised elements of the SVP, particularly the recommended foundational skills assessment to be used and the focal instruction areas for learners in an Extensive Support Needs context. Additionally, the rubrics were revised to align with the appropriate MMSN and ESN Teaching Performance Expectations.

The revised assessments, FAST 3.0 Education Specialist—MMSN and FAST 3.0 Education Specialist—ESN, are in the process of being submitted to the Commission for approval to pilot in spring 2025.

FAST for ECE PK-3 Education Specialist Candidates

Fresno State's proposal to offer a ECE PK-3 Education Specialist credential was approved by the Commission in May 2024. The first cohort of candidates is scheduled to begin the program in May 2025. Fresno intends to develop a version of FAST to align with the requirements of a TPA for the ECE PK-3 context, as identified in the PADS and TPEs.

Currently, a team of early childhood education faculty and coaches has been identified. They will begin meeting in January 2025 to develop the FAST ECE PK-3 version. Their process will be similar to that used to develop the two versions of the FAST 3.0 for Education Specialists (MMSN/ESN). The group will review the FAST 3.0 for MS and then determine what modifications are needed for implementation in an ECE PK-3 context.

Fresno State hopes to submit a draft version of the FAST ECE PK-3 version spring of 2025 to the Commission for approval to pilot in fall 2025.

Part 5. CalAPA MODEL INFORMATION AND CANDIDATE RESULTS

The California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA) includes three leadership cycles and is structured around the four steps of Investigate, Plan, Act, Reflect. *Leadership Cycle 1: Analyzing Data to Inform School Improvement and Promote Equity* requires candidates to generate and/or analyze multiple sources of school data for the purpose of identifying equity gaps to aid in the development of a plan for equitable improvement in line with the school's vision, mission, and goals, which is then refined after consultation with a school leader. *Leadership Cycle 2: Facilitating Communities of Practice* focuses on facilitating collaborative professional learning within a collegial workgroup for the purpose of improving teaching and student learning or well-being, culminating in the implementation of and reflection on a research-based strategy. *Leadership Cycle 3: Supporting Teacher Growth* follows an educational

coaching cycle of a classroom teacher, involving a preconference, observation of a lesson, a post-conference, and reflection upon being an equitable leader. Rubric Essential Questions for CalAPA can be found in [Appendix G](#).

The Commission is planning to convene an Administrative Services study group to focus on inclusive practices and ensure that those who want to provide administrative services in Early Childhood settings are prepared given the new ECE PK-3 Education Specialist credential and expansion of ECE settings in elementary schools. This group may make recommendations to update the CAPE related to these topics which could lead to revisions of the three CalAPA cycle tasks and rubrics.

Commission and ES staff work to ensure that a diverse group of educators are trained and calibrated to score CalAPA submissions. Assessors include both TK-12 educators and preparation program faculty across the state and different program pathways. Additional information regarding the CalTPA and CalAPA assessors can be found in [Appendix B](#).

Table 24: CalAPA Cumulative Pass Rates for Candidates who Submitted all Three Cycles

Program Year	# of Candidates	% Passed
2018-19	871	100%
2019-20	1557	100%
2020-21	1527	100%
2021-22	1465	100%
2022-23	1804	100%
2023-24	1966	97%
Total	9190	99%

Table 24 provides the number and percentages of CalAPA candidates who have passed all cycles (1, 2, and 3) of the CalAPA. The % Passed reflects the percent of those candidates who passed all cycles (on any attempt) in the program year. The data indicates that over the last six years, 9,190 candidates have passed the assessment. The pass rate for 2023-24 decreased slightly, which may be due to the increased number of submissions received.

Table 25: First time and Cumulative Pass Rates for CalAPA Candidates by Race/Ethnicity 2018-2024

Race/Ethnicity	First Attempt	% Passed	Cumulative	% Passed
All	9185	96%	9190	99%
N/A	436	95%	436	98%
Black	630	94%	630	99%
Asian	497	96%	497	99%

Race/Ethnicity	First Attempt	% Passed	Cumulative	% Passed
SE Asian	315	97%	315	99%
Pac Islander	32	94%	32	100%
Hispanic	2600	96%	2601	99%
Native American	57	98%	57	100%
White	4279	97%	4283	99%
Other	339	95%	339	99%

Table 25 provides race/ethnicity first attempt pass rates of 94% to 98% and 98% to 100% cumulative pass rates for all candidates with the exception of the N/A group who had a cumulative pass rate of 98%.

Table 26: CalAPA Candidates Who Passed Cycle 1 First, Second, and Three or More Attempts, and Not Yet Passed by Year

Program Year	First Attempt	Second Attempt	3+ Attempts	Not Yet Passed
Y1: 2019-20	1565	0	0	0
Y2: 2020-21	2258	5	0	8
Y3: 2021-22	1669	10	1	10
Y4: 2022-23	1667	20	3	21
Y5: 2023-24	1994	100	6	137

Table 27: CalAPA Candidates Who Passed Cycle 2 First, Second, and Three or More Attempts, and Not Yet Passed by Year

Program Year	First Attempt	Second Attempt	3+ Attempts	Not Yet Passed
Y1: 2019-20	1134	0	0	0
Y2: 2020-21	1676	2	0	2
Y3: 2021-22	1614	8	0	1
Y4: 2022-23	1474	9	0	2
Y5: 2023-24	1858	64	4	138

Table 28: CalAPA Candidates Who Passed Cycle 3 First, Second, and Three or More Attempts, and Not Yet Passed by Year

Program Year	First Attempt	Second Attempt	3+ Attempts	Not Yet Passed
Y1: 2019-20	1173	0	0	0
Y2: 2020-21	1700	0	0	1
Y3: 2021-22	1614	2	0	1
Y4: 2022-23	1565	5	0	0
Y5: 2023-24	1991	51	4	105

Tables 26-28 provide additional data on the number of candidates who needed more than one attempt to pass each cycle of the CalAPA. The numbers of candidates who have not yet passed in Year 6 will be reduced through the coming year as they submit revised CalAPA cycles.

Table 29: CalAPA Candidates Receiving 1 or more Condition Codes for Cycle 1, Cycle 2 and Cycle 3 by Year

Academic Year	N Cycle 1	# 1+ CCs Cycle 1	% Cycle 1	N Cycle 2	# 1+ CCs Cycle 2	% Cycle 2	N Cycle 3	# 1+ CCs Cycle 3	% Cycle 3
2019-20	2296	17	<1%	1946	261	13%	1871	170	9%
2020-21	1711	6	<1%	1964	334	17%	1810	190	10%
2021-22	1765	13	<1%	1701	210	12%	1676	101	6%
2022-23	2257	13	<1%	2142	311	15%	2142	186	9%
2023-24	2249	12	<1%	2638	574	22%	2409	258	11%

Table 29 shows the number of CalAPA candidate submissions receiving one or more condition codes for each of the six program years. Condition codes have led to revisions made to prompts, directions, and analytic rubrics as needed for each of the three cycles. Cycle 2 has been a focus with the most prevalent code being A1 and D8. A1 is “requirements not met” and D8 is “at least three implementation meeting agendas and/or minutes were not provided”. In 2022-23 and 2023-24 candidates did not pay to take performance assessments due to a state grant. Therefore, candidates receiving a [condition code](#) in these years did not pay to resubmit for scoring.

Additional information about CalAPA mean rubric scores can be found in [Appendix G](#).

Resources for Candidates and Educator Preparation Programs

Through the ES [performance assessment website](#), linked resources, and the [Commission's YouTube channel](#), CalAPA candidates are provided an array of information that can help them understand the requirements and what to expect from their educator preparation program as they engage in completing the performance assessment cycles.

For the CalAPA, the website (www.ctcexams.nesinc.com) provides information about how to register and pay for assessments and request accommodation(s). Information is also provided about the assessment design and format, the evidence of practice to be submitted, assessment fees, minimum passing scores, condition codes and an explanation of the rubric level assessment results report candidates receive after submitting evidence for scoring. Upon registration for the assessment, candidates are provided with links to preparation materials, including the tasks and rubrics. Comprehensive information about video recording, file formats and uploading requirements are also provided on the ES website. Completed example submissions are provided to model mid-range performance for programs and candidates. These submission examples are provided via the Commission's website.

In addition to online resources, Commission staff hold office hours twice a month for program coordinators and faculty during which information is provided regarding assessment requirements, recommendations to support candidates' review and revision of submissions, and clarification and support regarding registering and submitting CalAPA cycles. The Commission holds semi-annual program coordinator meetings to present candidate data findings including pass rate data, rubric score data, and emerging trends in condition codes. The intent of these meetings is to share state-wide performance and to provide the opportunity for programs to think together and learn about strategies to support candidates. To support new programs planning to implement the CalAPA an annual new program coordinator meeting is offered in the fall. CalAPA programs are invited to contact Commission staff for direct, specific assistance based on their unique needs.

To extend program level discussion about teaching and learning issues highlighted in performance assessment, (e.g. how to develop reflective writing skills, how to embed the tasks in course work and field work) quarterly professional development sessions (*Digging Deeper*) are held for preparation programs in which program faculty present best practices. To further promote and support program sharing of practices, the Commission facilitates a two-day, online, annual *Meredith Fellows Implementation Conference*. The conference offers the opportunity for programs to present experiences and practices and interact with other faculty and those who support candidates. The conference invites faculty and others engaged in any of the performance assessment models (3 TPA models, CalFTPA, CalAPA) to participate.

Part 6. RDI-TPA WORKGROUP

The Workgroup to Review the Design and Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessments (RDI-TPA) was established at the direction of the Commission and in response to [Senate Bill 1263](#). This legislation includes Education Code section 44320.4 ([Appendix A](#)), which provides guidelines for the workgroup's composition, scope of review, and timelines for reporting recommendations to the Commission and progress updates to the Legislature.

To ensure alignment with both the legislative requirements and the Commission's past direction on this topic, a comprehensive workgroup charge was developed. This charge, outlining the workgroup's objectives and deliverables, was presented to and adopted by the Commission during its August 2024 meeting. Additional information about the RDI-TPA Workgroup, including membership details, is available in [Item 5E](#) from the August 2024 Commission meeting.

Adopted RDI-TPA Workgroup Charge
<p>I. Purpose: The Commission directs staff to convene an expert panel/workgroup (hereafter referred to as the "workgroup") to evaluate the design and implementation of the state's current teaching performance assessments. The objective is to ensure that these assessments are valid, authentic, formative in nature, embedded in preparation, suitable for beginning teachers, and contribute to program improvement through the accreditation system.</p> <p>II. Composition: The workgroup shall include classroom teachers, teacher educators, and</p>

performance assessment experts. Staff shall consult with statewide labor organizations and other representative organizations for recommendations for workgroup members. At least one-third of the workgroup members must be classroom teachers in California public schools.

III. Topics for Consideration: The workgroup shall, at a minimum, consider the following topics and develop aligned recommendations to advise the Commission:

1. Any modifications needed for current teaching performance assessments to ensure validity, authenticity and feasibility for candidates and programs
2. Embedding performance assessments into coursework and clinical practice to avoid duplicative work
3. Strengthening the accreditation system to ensure programs embed performance assessments in a manner consistent with statute and support candidates in passing the performance assessment
4. Using local scoring to inform educator preparation program improvement
5. Developing questions for program completer surveys to understand candidates' experiences of program support for assessment completion

IV. Timelines: The workgroup shall present initial recommendations to the Commission for feedback during the February 2025 meeting and submit final recommendations for action during the June 2025 meeting.

Note: The “Topics for Consideration” from the charge are also referred to as “Focus Areas” by the RDI-TPA workgroup and staff.

Summary of Activities

By the December 2024 Commission meeting, the RDI-TPA Workgroup will have convened four times, for a total of eight days. During this time, members will have participated in an organizational meeting, conducted inquiry into key Commission documents and data, and addressed the first three topics outlined in the workgroup charge.

Meeting 1: September 19-20, 2024

The initial meeting began with a welcome and introductions, followed by [a training session](#) conducted by RDI-TPA Workgroup staff on the workgroup charge, the requirements of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, and Robert’s Rules of Order. Members developed and adopted norms, reviewed relevant sections of the Education Code, and started analyzing five focus areas aligned with the workgroup charge using key resources curated by staff.

Meeting 2: October 14-15, 2024

The second meeting concentrated on Focus Area 1, exploring potential modifications to current teaching performance assessments. Members defined key statutory concepts, such as “formative in nature,” to establish a foundation for recommendations. They reviewed and discussed recent [candidate outcomes data](#) from Commission-approved models, which informed model sponsor presentations on day two. The meeting concluded with an [initial brainstorming](#)

[session](#) to address concerns regarding disproportionate outcomes and an increase in condition codes/incompletes assigned to candidates, among other topics.

Meeting 3: November 5-6, 2024

The third meeting continued deliberations on Focus Area 1, concentrating on potential modifications to teaching performance assessments. Members refined [definitions for focus area concepts](#), examined additional condition code data, and reviewed the prioritized results of the brainstorm from the previous session. Using a scoring system (+2 for strong support, +1 for support, 0 for neutral, -1 for oppose, and -2 for strong oppose), members ranked the top five possible recommendations for Focus Area 1. These recommendations, in their unrefined form, are included with permission from the Co-Chairs of the RDI-TPA Workgroup.

Score (2 to -2)	Possible Recommendations for Focus Area 1*
1.8	Eliminate additional costs for candidates that receive non-scorable condition codes.
1.75	Tests privilege a pedagogical approach that is asset-based and community/culturally responsive.
1.65	Implement a system of preparation program accountability for disproportionate success rates, particularly by race and ethnicity.
1.65	Ensure candidates receive feedback in a timely manner that allows for growth in their ongoing development.
1.6	Build an aligned continuum that connects the TPA, the ILP, and the induction plan to the skills and behaviors that lead to successful teaching careers.

*Possible recommendations will undergo additional workshoping and modification by members before being shared as “Initial Recommendations” with the Commission during the February 2025 Commission Meeting.

Meeting 4: December 4-5, 2024

During the fourth meeting, RDI-TPA Workgroup members will further develop the initial recommendations for Focus Area 1 and generate and prioritize recommendations for Focus Area 2, which addresses embedding performance assessments into coursework and clinical practice. On the second day, workgroup members will participate in an interactive presentation with staff from the Professional Services Division to gain a deeper understanding of accreditation within the contexts of preliminary and clear preparation programs as the basis for recommendations to strengthen accreditation in alignment with Focus Area 3.

Additional information from this meeting relevant to the Annual Teaching Performance Assessment Item may be posted closer to the December meeting as an agenda insert.

The RDI-TPA Workgroup will continue meeting throughout spring 2025 to develop and refine recommendations for the Commission's consideration. Initial recommendations will be presented at the February 2025 Commission meeting, allowing for feedback before the development of the full draft recommendations. The draft recommendations will be shared during the April 2025 Commission meeting, providing another opportunity for input before the workgroup finalizes its recommendations for the June 2025 Commission meeting.

All RDI-TPA Workgroup resources and meeting information are available on the [Commission on Teacher Credentialing website](#).

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission review this report and provide direction on potential next steps in the development, administration and implementation of performance assessments.

Appendix A

Education Code Related to Performance Assessments

Appendix A contains an overview of statutes that have been enacted and amended since 1998 to govern the Commission's efforts to develop and implement performance assessments. Education Code section 44259(b) lists the requirements for earning a preliminary teaching credential, and sub paragraph (3)(A) provides for the inclusion of a teaching performance assessment in an accredited program of professional preparation. Section 44320.2, enacted after the Commission undertook a comprehensive review of the requirements for earning and renewing a teaching credential in California, establishes the Legislature's expectations and the Commission's responsibilities with respect to teaching performance assessments.

EC 44259(b)(3)(A)

(b) The minimum requirements for the preliminary multiple subject, single subject, or education specialist teaching credential are all of the following:

(3) (A) Satisfactory completion of a program of professional preparation that has been accredited by the Committee on Accreditation on the basis of standards of program quality and effectiveness that have been adopted by the commission. In accordance with the commission's assessment and performance standards, a program shall include a teaching performance assessment as set forth in Section 44320.2 that is aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. The commission shall ensure that a candidate recommended for a credential or certificate has demonstrated satisfactory ability to assist pupils to meet or exceed academic content and performance standards for pupils adopted by the state board. Programs that meet this requirement for professional preparation shall include any of the following:

EC 44320.2

44320.2. (a) The Legislature finds and declares that the competence and performance of teachers are among the most important factors in influencing the quality and effectiveness of education in elementary and secondary schools.

(b) Commencing July 1, 2008, for a program of professional preparation to satisfy the requirements of paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) of Section 44259, the program shall include a teaching performance assessment that is aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and that is congruent with state content and performance standards for pupils adopted by the state board. In implementing this requirement, institutions or agencies may do the following:

(1) Voluntarily develop an assessment for approval by the commission. Approval of any locally developed performance assessment shall be based on assessment quality standards adopted by the commission, which shall encourage the use of alternative assessment methods including portfolios of teaching artifacts and practices.

(2) Participate in an assessment training program for assessors and implement the commission developed assessment.

(c) The commission shall implement the performance assessment in a manner that does not increase the number of assessments required for teacher credential candidates prepared in this state. A candidate shall be assessed during the normal term or duration of the preparation program of the candidate.

(d) Subject to the availability of funds in the annual Budget Act, the commission shall perform all of the following duties with respect to the performance assessment:

(1) Assemble and convene an expert panel to advise the commission about performance standards and developmental scales for teaching credential candidates and the design, content, administration, and scoring of the assessment. At least one-third of the panel members shall be classroom teachers in California public schools.

(2) Design, develop, and implement assessment standards and an institutional assessor training program for the sponsors of professional preparation programs to use if they choose to use the commission developed assessment.

(3) Establish a review panel to examine each assessment developed by an institution or agency in relation to the standards set by the commission and advise the commission regarding approval of each assessment system.

(4) Initially and periodically analyze the validity of assessment content and the reliability of assessment scores that are established pursuant to this section.

(5) Establish and implement appropriate standards for satisfactory performance in assessments that are established pursuant to this section.

(6) Analyze possible sources of bias in the performance assessment and act promptly to eliminate any bias that is discovered.

(7) Collect and analyze background information provided by candidates who participate in the performance assessment, and report and interpret the individual and aggregated results of the assessment.

(8) Examine and revise, as necessary, the institutional accreditation system pursuant to Article 10 (commencing with Section 44370), for the purpose of providing a strong assurance to teaching candidates that ongoing opportunities are available in each credential preparation program that is offered pursuant to Section 44320, Article 6 (commencing with Section 44310), Article 7.5 (commencing with Section 44325), or Article 3 (commencing with Section 44450) of Chapter 3 for candidates to acquire the knowledge, skills, and abilities measured by the assessment system.

(9) Ensure that the aggregated results of the assessment for groups of candidates who have completed a credential program are used as one source of information about the quality and effectiveness of that program. The commission shall report the number of programs with low pass rates and assist these programs to use evidence-based strategies to support candidates to pass the assessment for all administrations of the assessment. There shall be no fees to candidates for these instructional supports.

(e) The commission shall ensure that each performance assessment pursuant to subdivision (b) is state approved and aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and is consistently applied to candidates in similar preparation programs. The commission shall ensure that any approved performance assessment is compliant with this section and meets the commission standards for administration. To the maximum feasible extent, each performance assessment shall be ongoing and blended into the preparation program, and shall produce the following benefits for credential candidates, sponsors of preparation programs, and local educational agencies that employ program graduates:

(1) The performance assessment shall be designed to provide formative assessment information during the preparation program for use by the candidate, instructors, and supervisors for the purpose of improving the teaching knowledge, skill, and ability of the candidate.

(2) The performance assessment results shall be reported so that they may serve as one basis for a recommendation by the program sponsor that the commission award a teaching credential to a candidate who has successfully met the performance assessment standards. The commission shall maintain a secondary passing standard for the teaching performance assessment that may be used, with consideration of other evidence of the candidate's performance related to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession, for a program sponsor's recommendation of a candidate to the commission for a teaching credential.

(3) The formative assessment information pursuant to paragraph (1) and the performance assessment results pursuant to paragraph (2) shall be reported so that they may serve as one basis for the individual induction plan of the new teacher pursuant to Section 44279.2.

(f) It is the intent of the Legislature that assessments in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2) of subdivision (b), including the administrative costs of the commission, be fully funded.

EC 44320.3

(a) By July 1, 2025, the commission shall ensure that an approved teaching performance assessment for a preliminary multiple subject credential, as required by Section 44320.2, and for a preliminary education specialist credential assesses all candidates for competence in instruction in literacy, including, but not limited to, evidence-based methods of teaching foundational reading skills, as described in paragraph (4) of subdivision (b) of Section 44259. The commission shall ensure that any competencies assessed pursuant to this section are assessed in a manner aligned to the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (4) of subdivision (b) of Section 44259, the commission's standards of program quality and effectiveness and current teaching performance expectations, and the current English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework adopted by the state board. The commission shall ensure that the assessment meets the commission's adopted teaching performance assessment design standards for validity, reliability, and sponsor support responsibilities.

(b) Before requiring successful passage of the teaching performance assessment for the preliminary multiple subject teaching credential and the preliminary education specialist credential pursuant to subdivision (a), the commission shall certify that all of the teacher education programs approved by the commission pursuant to Section 44227 provide instruction

in the knowledge, skills, and abilities required in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (4) of subdivision (b) of Section 44259.

(c) Commencing on July 1, 2022, and annually thereafter, until the requirements of this section are met, the commission shall report to the appropriate fiscal and policy committees of the Legislature on its progress in meeting the requirements of this section and Sections 44259.6 and 44259.7, including how stakeholders were engaged in the process of meeting the requirements of this section and Sections 44259.6 and 44259.7.

EC 44320.4

44320.4. (a) To ensure the teaching performance assessments described in Sections 44320.2 and 44320.3 are valid and authentic, formative in nature, embedded in preparation, and inform program improvement through the accreditation system, the commission shall convene a workgroup to assess current design and implementation of the state's current teaching performance assessments.

(b) The commission shall select classroom teachers, teacher educators, and performance assessment experts to form the workgroup described in subdivision (a). At least one-third of the workgroup members shall be classroom teachers in California public schools. The commission shall not appoint any person to the workgroup with a financial interest in any teacher licensure assessment. The commission shall consult with statewide labor organizations and other representative organizations for recommendations of workgroup members.

(c) The workgroup shall develop recommendations to be presented to the commission by March 1, 2025, and the commission shall vote to adopt a set of recommendations by July 1, 2025. Adopted recommendations shall be implemented by July 1, 2028. At a minimum, the recommendations from the workgroup shall include:

- (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.
- (2) Recommendations for how programs might embed the assessments into coursework and clinical work to avoid duplicative work for candidates.
- (3) Suggested questions for program completer surveys to understand candidate experience of programmatic support for assessment completion.
- (4) 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.
- (5) Recommendations for how programs can engage in local scoring of the assessment to inform program improvement.

(d) Notwithstanding Section 10231.5 of the Government Code, the commission shall report to the Legislature annually, beginning on October 15, 2025, and through October 15, 2028, and in compliance with Section 9795 of the Government Code, on the progress of the workgroup in

making its recommendations and actions taken by the commission to implement the recommendations it adopts.

(e) Meetings of the workgroup are subject to the requirements of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act (Article 9 (commencing with Section 11120) of Chapter 1 of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code).

Appendix B

Information Regarding CalTPA and CalAPA Assessor Ethnicity Data

Table 1: Number (N) of Assessors for MS, SS and WL CalTPA Cycles

Program Year	N Multiple Subject Lead Assessors	N Multiple Subject Assessors	N Single Subject Lead Assessors	N Single Subject Assessors
2018-19	8	202	20	170
2019-20	8	145	18	104
2020-21	6	104	16	139
2021-22	6	258	15	265
2022-23	6	233	13	294
2023-24	6	146	12	234

Table 2: Number (N) of Assessors for Education Specialist CalTPA Cycles

Program Year	N Lead Assessors	N Assessors
2022-23	8	64
2023-24	8	66

Table 3: CalTPA Assessor Pool Race/Ethnicity Distribution (MS/SS/WL/EdSp) 2023-2024

Ethnicity - CalTPA	ES %	CA %	Difference
African American	6.3%	3.8%	2.5%
American Indian or Alaska Native	.9%	0.5%	0.4%
Asian/Filipino	8.5%	7.8%	0.7%
Hispanic or Latino	23.8%	24.9%	-1.1%
Pacific Islander	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%
Two or More Races	1.2%	1.1%	0.1%
White	40.6%	55.5%	-14.9%
Not Reported	18.2%	5.9%	12.3%

Tables 1 and 2 provide the number of assessors and leads for MS/SS/WL and EdSp CalTPA. Table 3 outlines the ethnicity distribution of the assessor pool for the 2023-24 Program Year (ES%). Assessor ethnicity data is self-reported by the educators applying to become assessors. For

context, the ethnicity distribution of [CA Full-Time Equivalent Teachers](#) (CA%) is provided. Differences observed between ES% and CA% are 4% or below for all ethnicities, except for Hispanic or Latino (-8.50%) and White (-9.70%).

Table 4: CalAPA Assessors for 2022-24

Program Year	N Lead Assessors	N Assessors
2022-2023	9	87
2023-2024	9	92

Table 5: CalAPA Assessor Pool Race/Ethnicity Distribution

Ethnicity - CalAPA	ES %	CA %	Difference
African American	10.5%	3.8%	6.7%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%	0.5%	-0.5%
Asian/Filipino	4.2%	7.8%	-3.6%
Hispanic or Latino	16.1%	24.9%	-8.8%
Pacific Islander	0%	0.3%	-0.3%
Two or More Races	2.1%	1.1%	1.0%
White	44.8%	55.5%	-10.7%
Not Reported	22.4%	5.9%	16.5%

Tables 3 and 4 provide the number of assessors and leads for CalAPA. Table 3 outlines the ethnicity distribution of the assessor pool for the 2023-24 Program Year (ES%). Assessor ethnicity data is self-reported by the educators applying to become assessors. For context, the ethnicity distribution of [CA Full-Time Equivalent Teachers](#) (CA%) is provided. Differences observed between ES% and CA% are 6.7% or below for all ethnicities except “Not Reported” at 16.5%.

Appendix C

CalTPA (MS/SS/WL) Mean Rubric Scores and Essential Questions

CalTPA MS/SS/WL Passing Standards:

- Cycle 1: Learning about Students and Planning Instruction (8 analytic rubrics): A score of 19 of 40 points with one rubric score of one (1) allowed. Secondary passing standard is 16 points.
- Cycle 2: Assessment Driven Instruction (9 analytic rubrics): A score of 21 of 45 points with one rubric score of one (1) allowed. Secondary passing standard is 18 points.

CalTPA Mean Rubric Scores (MS/SS/WL)

Table 1: CalTPA First Attempt Score Means by Rubric: Cycle 1 (MS/SS/WL)

Year	Plan: 1.1	Plan: 1.2	Plan: 1.3	Plan: 1.4	Teach & Assess 1.5	Teach & Assess 1.6	Reflect 1.7	Apply 1.8
2018-19	3.3	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.9	3.0	3.2	3.0
2019-20	3.3	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.6	3.1	2.8
2020-21	3.3	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.5	2.8	2.7
2021-22	3.0	2.8	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.6	2.6
2022-23	3.0	2.8	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.5	2.6	2.6
2023-24	3.0	2.8	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.6	2.5

Mean rubric scores have remained relatively consistent from year to year for six years with scores at or near score level 3. None of the slight mean score differences between years are statistically significant. Commission and ES staff monitor rubric level scores after each scoring window across the academic year. Rubric 1.5 and 1.6 have been of particular focus for Commission staff, assessors, and ES, and changes have been made to the instructions and rubrics related to those rubrics for the 2024-25 year. Specifically, Rubrics 1.5 and 1.6 contain constructs assessing candidates' ability to connect the content of the lesson to prior learning (Rubric 1.5) and next steps for learning (Rubric 1.6). It was determined that this knowledge and ability would be more appropriately assessed in Step 1, Plan for connecting to prior content learning. Upon review, it was also determined that the next steps for learning requirement in Rubric 1.6 was duplicative of what candidates are already required to demonstrate in Step 4, Apply (Rubric 1.8). Commission staff and ES will monitor submission results through the year to evaluate the outcomes of these changes.

Figure 1: CalTPA Cycle 1 Rubric Essential Questions

Step 1: Plan	
Rubric 1.1	How does the candidate's proposed grade-level appropriate content-specific learning goal(s) of the lesson connect with students' prior knowledge? How do proposed learning activities, instructional strategies, and grouping strategies

	support, engage, and/or challenge all students to meet the content-specific learning goal(s) of the lesson?
Rubric 1.2	How does the candidate plan instruction using knowledge of FS1's (English learner) assets and learning needs to support meaningful engagement with the content-specific learning goal(s) of the lesson and ELD goal(s)?
Rubric 1.3	How does the candidate plan instruction using knowledge of FS2's assets, learning needs, and IEP/504/GATE goals/plans to support meaningful engagement with the content-specific learning goal(s)?
Rubric 1.4	How does the candidate plan instruction using knowledge of FS3's assets and learning needs to support meaningful engagement with the content-specific learning goal(s) and address the student's well-being by creating a safe and positive learning environment during or outside of the lesson?
Step 2: Teach & Assess	
Rubric 1.5	How does the candidate maintain a positive and safe learning environment that supports all students to access and meet the content-specific learning goal(s) and ELD goal(s)? How does the candidate establish expectations for learning?
Rubric 1.6	How does the candidate actively engage students in deep learning of content and monitor/informally assess their understanding?
Step 3: Reflect	
Rubric 1.7	How does the candidate reflect on (referring to evidence from Steps 1 and/or 2) the impact of their asset- and needs-based lesson planning, teaching, and informal assessment of student learning and analyze how effective the lesson was in supporting the whole class and the 3 focus students in meeting the content-specific learning goal(s) and ELD goal(s)?
Step 4: Apply	
Rubric 1.8	How will the candidate apply what they have learned in Cycle 1 (referring to evidence from Steps 1, 2, and/or 3) about students' learning to strengthen and extend students' understanding of content, higher-order thinking, and academic language development and determine next steps for instruction?

Figure 2: CalTPA Cycle 2 Rubric Essential Questions

Step 1: Plan	
Rubric 2.1	How does the candidate's learning segment plan provide appropriate content-specific learning goal(s) and, if appropriate, ELD goal(s), assessments, and rubrics that offer multiple ways for all students to demonstrate knowledge and affirm and validate students' assets, including strengths, experiences, and backgrounds?

Rubric 2.2	How does the candidate plan a learning segment in which assessments and rubrics, instructional strategies, and lessons align and build on one another to provide a progression of learning that develops the students' concepts and skills to achieve the learning goal(s)?
Step 2: Teach & Assess	
Rubric 2.3	How does the candidate support student development and demonstration of academic language in relation to the content-specific learning goal(s)?
Rubric 2.4	How does the candidate incorporate educational technology (digital/virtual tools and resources) to provide opportunities for students to use these tools and resources to enhance, improve, and/or demonstrate knowledge, skills, and/or abilities related to the learning goal(s)?
Rubric 2.5	How does the candidate use informal assessment to monitor and support the students' deep learning of content (age and/or developmentally appropriate higher-order thinking skills) and adjust instruction to meet the needs of learners?
Rubric 2.6	How does the candidate model and engage the students in self-assessment to build their awareness of what they have learned, provide feedback, and support their progress toward meeting content-specific learning goal(s) and ELD goal(s), if appropriate?
Rubric 2.7	How does the candidate use results of informal assessments and/or student self-assessment to provide actionable feedback to students about how to improve or revise their work to continue progress toward and/or beyond the learning goal(s)?
Step 3: Reflect	
Rubric 2.8	How does the candidate analyze the formal assessment results based on the rubric and identify and describe learning patterns and/or trends for the students and determine what was most and least effective in relation to the learning goal(s)?
Step 4: Apply	
Rubric 2.9	How does the candidate use the analysis of results from informal assessment(s), student self-assessment(s), and formal assessment(s) to plan and teach a follow-up learning activity and provide a rationale for the activity choice, referring to evidence from student responses and assessment results?

Appendix D

Education Specialist CalTPA (MMSN/ESN) Mean Rubric Scores and Essential Questions

Passing standards for MMSN

- MMSN Cycle 1: *Learning About Students with IEPs and Planning Instruction* (8 rubrics): A score of 17 of 40 points with one rubric score of one (1) allowed. Secondary passing standard is 15.
- MMSN Cycle 2: *Assessment-Driven Instruction for Students with IEPs* (9 rubrics): A score of 19 of 45 points with one rubric score of one (1) allowed. Secondary passing standard is 17.

Passing standards for ESN

- ESN Cycle 1: *Learning About Students with IEPs and Planning Instruction* (8 rubrics): A score of 15 of 40 points. Secondary passing standard is 12.
- ESN Cycle 2: *Assessment Driven Instruction for Students with IEPs* (9 rubrics): A score of 17 of 45 points. Secondary passing standard is 15.

Table 1: MMSN First Attempt Score Means by Rubric: Cycle 1

Year	Plan: 1.1	Plan: 1.2	Plan: 1.3	Plan: 1.4	Teach & Assess 1.5	Teach & Assess 1.6	Reflect 1.7	Apply 1.8
2022-23	3.0	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.8
2023-24	3.0	3.1	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.8

Table 2: ESN First Attempt Score Means by Rubric: Cycle 1

Year	Plan: 1.1	Plan: 1.2	Plan: 1.3	Plan: 1.4	Teach & Assess 1.5	Teach & Assess 1.6	Reflect 1.7	Apply 1.8
2022-23	2.9	3.2	2.8	2.9	3.1	2.7	2.9	2.6
2023-24	2.9	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.5	2.9	2.9

Tables 1 and 2 provide mean scores by rubric for MMSN and ESN Cycle 1. The data indicates that most mean rubric scores are similar to those for recent years of the MM/SS/WL CalTPA, and are reflective of the high first attempt pass rates for each assessment.

Table 3: MMSN First Attempt Score Means by Rubric: Cycle 2

Year	Plan: 2.1	Plan: 2.2	Teach & Assess 2.3	Teach & Assess 2.4	Teach & Assess 2.5	Teach & Assess 2.6	Teach & Assess 2.7	Reflect 2.8	Apply 2.9
2022-23	3.0	3.3	3.1	2.8	3.0	2.7	2.8	2.6	3.0
2023-24	2.8	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.9	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.9

Table 4: ESN First Attempt Score Means by Rubric: Cycle 2

Year	Plan: 2.1	Plan: 2.2	Teach & Assess 2.3	Teach & Assess 2.4	Teach & Assess 2.5	Teach & Assess 2.6	Teach & Assess 2.7	Reflect 2.8	Apply 2.9
2022-23	2.7	3.0	2.9	2.3	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.8
2023-24	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.9	2.6	2.8	2.7	3.0

Tables 3 and 4 illustrate mean scores by rubric for MMSN and ESN for Cycle 2. As with Cycle 1, the results for Cycle 2 are similar to the mean scores for the general education (MS/SS/WL) CalTPA. A point of interest that has continued into the second program year is the results for rubrics 2.1 and 2.2, which are the rubrics that assess candidates' ability to plan an asset-based learning segment. Scores for these rubrics are .3 and .4 points higher for MMSN than MS/SS scores, and .5 and .4 points respectively for ESN. Commission and ES staff surmised last year that these results may reflect the additional focus for Education Specialist candidates use of Individualized Education Plans and 504 plans to inform instruction, and the data continues to support that analysis.

Figure 1: Education Specialist CalTPA MMSN/ESN Cycle 1 Essential Questions

Step 1: Plan	
Rubric 1.1	How does the candidate's proposed grade-level appropriate content-specific learning goal(s) of the lesson connect with prior knowledge and define specific outcomes for students? Based on UDL principles, how do proposed content-specific learning activities, instructional and grouping strategies, and facilitation of instructional support personnel support, engage, and/or challenge all students to meet the content-specific learning goal(s) of the lesson?
Rubric 1.2	How does the candidate use UDL principles to plan instruction using knowledge of FS1's assets and learning needs to support meaningful engagement with the content-specific learning goal(s) of the lesson and ELD goal(s)?
Rubric 1.3	How does the candidate use UDL principles to plan instruction using knowledge of FS2's assets and learning needs to support meaningful engagement with the content-specific learning goal(s) of the lesson?
Rubric 1.4	How does the candidate plan to use UDL principles in instruction using knowledge of FS3's assets and learning needs to support meaningful engagement with the content-specific learning goal(s) of the lesson and address the student's well-being by creating a safe and positive learning environment during or outside of the lesson?

Step 2: Teach & Assess	
Rubric 1.5	How does the candidate maintain a positive and safe learning environment that supports all students to access and meet the content-specific learning goal(s) and ELD goal(s)? How does the candidate establish clear expectations for content-specific learning?
Rubric 1.6	How does the candidate actively engage the student(s) in deep learning of content and monitor/informally assess their learning?
Step 3: Reflect	
Rubric 1.7	How does the candidate reflect on (referring to evidence from Steps 1 and/or 2) the impact of their asset- and needs-based lesson planning, teaching, and informal assessment of student learning and instructional support personnel to analyze how effective the lesson was in supporting the whole class/small group and the 3 focus students in meeting the grade-level content-specific learning goal(s) and ELD goal(s) and creating a language-rich environment?
Step 4 Apply	
Rubric 1.8	How will the candidate apply what they have learned about UDL principles in Cycle 1 (referring to evidence from Steps 1, 2, and/or 3) about students' learning to strengthen and extend students' understanding of content, higher-order thinking, and academic language development to determine next steps for instruction, including collaboration with and/or facilitation of instructional support personnel?

Figure 2: Education Specialist CalTPA MMSN/ESN Cycle 2 Essential Questions

Step 1: Plan	
Rubric 2.1	How does the candidate's learning segment plan provide grade-level appropriate content-specific learning goal(s) and ELD goal(s), if appropriate, assessments, rubrics, and facilitation of instructional support personnel that offer multiple ways for all students to demonstrate knowledge and affirm and validate students' assets, including strengths, experiences, and backgrounds?
Rubric 2.2	How does the candidate plan a learning segment in which assessments and rubrics, instructional strategies, and lessons align and build on one another to provide a progression of learning that develops the students' concepts and skills to achieve the learning goal(s)?

Step 2: Teach & Assess	
Rubric 2.3	How does the candidate support student development and demonstration of academic language in relation to the grade-level content-specific learning goal(s)?
Rubric 2.4	How does the candidate incorporate educational technology (digital/virtual tools and resources) to provide opportunities for students to use these tools and resources to enhance, improve, and/or demonstrate knowledge, skills, and/or abilities related to the learning goal(s)?
Rubric 2.5	How does the candidate use informal assessment to monitor the students' deep learning of content (age and/or developmentally appropriate higher-order thinking skills) and adjust instruction to meet the needs of all learners?
Rubric 2.6	How does the candidate model and engage the students in self-assessment to build their awareness of what they have learned, provide feedback, and support their progress toward meeting grade-level content-specific learning goal(s) and ELD goal(s), if appropriate?
Rubric 2.7	How does the candidate use results of informal assessment(s) and/or student self-assessment to provide actionable feedback to the students about how to improve or revise their work to continue progress toward and/or beyond the learning goal(s)? How does the candidate facilitate instructional support personnel to assist students to access content during the lesson and/or engage with informal and/or student self-assessments?
Step 3: Reflect	
Rubric 2.8	How does the candidate analyze the formal assessment results based on the rubric and identify and describe learning pattern(s) and/or trend(s) for the students and determine what was most and least effective about the candidate's instructional approach in relation to the grade-level content-specific learning goal(s)? How does the candidate provide feedback to families and/or guardians for the students to support caregivers in understanding the assessment results and the role they will play in supporting student learning beyond the classroom?
Step 4: Apply	
Rubric 2.9	How does the candidate use the analysis of results from the informal assessment(s), student self-assessment(s), and formal assessment(s) to plan and teach a follow-up learning activity and provide a rationale for the activity choice, referring to evidence from student responses and assessment results?

Figure 3: Education Specialist CalTPA MMSN/ESN Cycle 2 Essential Questions

Step 1: Plan	
Rubric 2.1	How does the candidate’s learning segment plan provide grade-level appropriate content-specific learning goal(s) and ELD goal(s), if appropriate, assessments, rubrics, and facilitation of instructional support personnel that offer multiple ways for all students to demonstrate knowledge and affirm and validate students’ assets, including strengths, experiences, and backgrounds?
Rubric 2.2	How does the candidate plan a learning segment in which assessments and rubrics, instructional strategies, and lessons align and build on one another to provide a progression of learning that develops the students’ concepts and skills to achieve the learning goal(s)?
Step 2: Teach & Assess	
Rubric 2.3	How does the candidate support student development and demonstration of academic language in relation to the grade-level content-specific learning goal(s)?
Rubric 2.4	How does the candidate incorporate educational technology (digital/virtual tools and resources) to provide opportunities for students to use these tools and resources to enhance, improve, and/or demonstrate knowledge, skills, and/or abilities related to the learning goal(s)?
Rubric 2.5	How does the candidate use informal assessment to monitor the students’ deep learning of content (age and/or developmentally appropriate higher-order thinking skills) and adjust instruction to meet the needs of all learners?
Rubric 2.6	How does the candidate model and engage the students in self-assessment to build their awareness of what they have learned, provide feedback, and support their progress toward meeting grade-level content-specific learning goal(s) and ELD goal(s), if appropriate?
Rubric 2.7	How does the candidate use results of informal assessment(s) and/or student self-assessment to provide actionable feedback to the students about how to improve or revise their work to continue progress toward and/or beyond the learning goal(s)? How does the candidate facilitate instructional support personnel to assist students to access content during the lesson and/or engage with informal and/or student self-assessments?
Step 3: Reflect	
Rubric 2.8	How does the candidate analyze the formal assessment results based on the rubric and identify and describe learning pattern(s) and/or trend(s) for the students and determine what was most and least effective about the candidate’s instructional approach in relation to the grade-level content-specific learning goal(s)? How does the candidate provide feedback to

	families and/or guardians for the students to support caregivers in understanding the assessment results and the role they will play in supporting student learning beyond the classroom?
Step 4: Apply	
Rubric 2.9	How does the candidate use the analysis of results from the informal assessment(s), student self-assessment(s), and formal assessment(s) to plan and teach a follow-up learning activity and provide a rationale for the activity choice, referring to evidence from student responses and assessment results?

Appendix E

edTPA Mean Rubric Scores and Essential Questions

edTPA passing standards:

- Multiple Subject Handbook (18 rubrics): A score of 49 of 90 points
- Single Subject Handbook (15 rubrics): A score of 41 of 75 points
- World Language Handbook (13 rubrics): A score of 35 of 65 points
- Education Specialist Handbooks for MMSN/ESN (15 rubrics): A score of 35 of 75 point

Table 1: edTPA First Attempt Score Means by Individual Rubric for MS/SS

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
2018-19	3.1	3	3.2	3	3	3.1	3	3	3	2.9	3.1	3.4	2.9	3	3.1	2.9	3	2.9
2019-20	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.1	3	3.1	3	3	3	2.9	3.1	3.5	3	3.1	3.1	3	3.1	3
2020-21	3.1	3	3.2	3.1	3	3	3	3	3	2.8	3.1	3.6	2.9	3.1	3.1	2.8	3	2.9
2021-22	3.1	3	3.2	3	2.9	3	3	3	3	2.8	3.1	3.5	2.9	3	3.1	2.9	3	2.9
2022-23	3.1	2.9	3.2	3	2.9	3	3	2.9	2.9	2.8	3.1	3.5	2.9	2.9	3	2.8	2.9	2.8
2023-24	3.0	2.9	3.1	2.9	2.9	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	3.0	3.5	2.8	2.9	3.0	2.7	2.9	2.7

Planning: Rubrics 1-5

Instruction: Rubrics 6-10

Assessment: Rubrics 11-15

Elementary Specific: Rubrics 16-18

Table 2: edTPA First Attempt Score Means by Individual Rubric for World Language Candidates

Year	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
2018-19	100	3	2.9	3.1	3	3.1	2.8	2.5	2.2	2.6	2.7	3	2.5	2.7
2019-20	85	3.2	3.1	3.2	3	3.1	3	2.7	2.1	2.5	2.9	3.3	2.9	2.8
2020-21	53	3.3	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.2	2.8	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.9	3.3	2.9	2.8
2021-22	85	2.9	2.9	3	2.8	3.2	2.7	2.3	2	2.4	2.6	3	2.6	2.6
2022-23	110	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.7	2.3	2	2.2	2.6	3	2.5	2.6
2023-24	113	3.0	2.9	3.0	2.8	3.1	2.7	2.4	2.0	2.4	2.6	2.9	2.4	2.6

Planning: Rubrics 1-4

Instruction: Rubrics 5-9

Assessment: Rubrics 10-13

Table 3: edTPA First Attempt Score Means by Individual Rubric for Education Specialist Candidates

Year	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
2022-23	151	2.7	2.9	2.7	3	2.7	3.1	3	2.9	2.9	2.6	1.8	3.2	2.3	2.8	2.7
2023-24	331	2.8	2.8	2.7	3.0	2.8	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.6	2.0	3.2	2.4	2.8	2.7

Planning: Rubrics 1-5

Instruction: Rubrics 6-10

Assessment: Rubrics 11-15

Tables 1-3 indicate more variability on the World Language rubrics than the Multiple/Single Subject and Education Specialist handbooks (apart from the latter's rubric 11). This data will be used with programs to identify ways to strengthen World Language preparation in the rubric areas related to Instruction and Assessment.

Figure 1: edTPA Rubric Essential Questions

Task 1: Planning	
Rubric 1	How do the candidate's plans build students' understanding of an essential literacy strategy for comprehending OR composing text and the skills that support that strategy?
Rubric 2	How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to target support for students' literacy learning?
Rubric 3	How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to justify instructional plans?
Rubric 4	How does the candidate identify and support language demands associated with a key literacy learning task?
Rubric 5	How are the formal and informal assessments selected or designed to monitor students' use of the essential literacy strategy to comprehend OR compose text and related skills?
Task 2: Instruction	
Rubric 6	How does the candidate demonstrate a positive literacy learning environment that supports students' engagement in learning?
Rubric 7	How does the candidate actively engage students in integrating strategies and skills to comprehend OR compose text?
Rubric 8	How does the candidate elicit student responses to promote thinking and apply the essential literacy strategy AND related skills to comprehend OR compose text?

Rubric 9	How does the candidate support students to learn, practice, and apply the essential literacy strategy for comprehending OR composing text in a meaningful context?
Rubric 10	How does the candidate use evidence to evaluate and change teaching practice to meet students' varied learning needs?
Task 3: Assessment	
Rubric 11	How does the candidate analyze evidence of student learning related to the essential literacy strategy and related skills?
Rubric 12	What type of feedback does the candidate provide to focus students?
Rubric 13	How does the candidate support focus students to understand and use the feedback to guide their further learning?
Rubric 14	How does the candidate analyze students' use of language to develop content understanding?
Rubric 15	How does the candidate use the analysis of what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction?
Task 4: Elementary Education Handbooks Only	
Rubric 16	How does the candidate analyze whole class evidence to identify patterns of student learning?
Rubric 17	How does the candidate use student work to analyze mathematical errors, confusions, and partial understandings?
Rubric 18	How does the candidate examine the re-engagement lesson to further student learning?

Appendix F

FAST Mean Rubric Scores and Level 2 Rubric Descriptions

FAST Passing Standard

- Candidates must receive a minimum score of 2 on the three SVP rubrics: Score of 6 out of 12 points.
- Candidates must receive a minimum score of 2 on the seven TSP rubrics: Score of 14 out of 28 points.

Table 1: FAST First Attempts of Site Visit Performance Score Means by Rubric (MS/SS/ES)*

Academic Year	Number Submitted	Planning Rubric Mean	Implementation Rubric Mean	Reflection Rubric Mean
2018-19 MS	190	2.7	2.6	2.7
2018-19 SS	171	2.7	2.7	2.8
2019-20 MS	123	2.8	2.8	2.9
2019-20 SS	125	2.7	2.6	2.6
2020-21 MS	269	2.7	2.7	2.7
2020-21 SS	150	2.8	2.9	2.8
2021-22 MS	263	2.6	2.7	2.7
2021-22 SS	165	2.5	2.5	2.6
2022-23 MS	279	2.7	2.7	2.6
2022-23 SS	162	2.6	2.6	2.6
2023-24 MS	210	2.7	2.7	2.7
2023-24 SS	146	2.7	2.6	2.7
2023-24 ES: MS/ES	65	2.8	2.8	2.7

Table 2: FAST First Attempts of Teaching Sample Project Rubric Score Means

Academic Year	N	TSP 1	TSP 2	TSP 3	TSP 4	TSP 5	TSP 6	TSP 7
2018-19 MS	212	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.5	2.5	2.4
2018-19 SS	181	2.7	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.6
2019-20 MS	229	2.8	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.5
2019-20 SS	165	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.7
2020-21 MS	222	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.6

2020-21 SS	165	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.6	2.7	2.7
2021-22 MS	261	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.5	2.6	2.5
2021-22 SS	140	2.7	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.7	2.6
2022-23 MS	278	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.7	2.5	2.6	2.6
2022-23 SS	148	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.7	2.6
2023-24 MS	247	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.6
2023-24 SS	149	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.8
2023-24 ES	34	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.8	2.6	2.7	2.7

TSP 1: Context Rubric

TSP 2: Outcomes Rubric

TSP 3: Assessment Rubric

TSP 4: Instruction Rubric

TSP 5: Decisions Rubric

TSP 6: Analysis Rubric

TSP 7: Reflection Rubric

Programmatically, Fresno State's goal is for the mean scores of candidates from the Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist programs on each rubric to be closer to 3.0. The mean scores for candidates in the Single Subject program were 3.0 on the TSP Context Rubric and 2.9 for the Instruction rubric, meaning the programmatic goal was met in both areas. Across programs, the lowest mean score was for Education Specialist candidates on the Outcomes rubric. In fact, developing clear learning outcomes has been identified as an area of growth for candidates across programs, and so faculty and coaches are working to ensure they have a firm grasp of how to do this earlier in the program

In the past academic year, Teacher Education program faculty and coaches have also begun to engage in more focused analyses of the data from both the SVP and TSP administrations to identify specific areas where candidates consistently face challenges. To do this more effectively, they have been examining both trends in rubric overall scores and trends in scores specific elements of each rubric.

Figure 1: FAST Site Visitation Performance Rubric Descriptions of Level 2 “Meets Expectations”

Planning	<p>Pedagogy: The lesson plan includes content and related activities or consistent with current subject-specific pedagogy and standards, that support the acquisition or use of academic language.</p> <p>Applying Knowledge: Information about students, gathered by the candidate, provides useful information for planning...candidate plans appropriate activities or strategies to promote access to the content.</p> <p>Student Engagement: Candidate’s plan for engaging students is appropriate to the grade level.</p>
Implementation	<p>Pedagogy: Candidate effectively implements instruction consistent with subject-specific pedagogy to teach the identified academic content standard(s). Instruction supports the acquisition or use of academic language appropriate for students at this grade level.</p> <p>Applying Knowledge: Candidate uses knowledge of the learning needs, backgrounds or interests of students to keep them on task.</p> <p>Student Engagement: Candidate uses primarily management techniques to promote and monitor participation by students in the learning activities. Candidate expresses and reinforces expectations for social or academic behavior. Candidate models generally positive interactions.</p>
Reflection	<p>Pedagogy: Candidate realistically describes strengths and weaknesses of lesson. Provides general justification for how the activity or strategy in the selected video clip represents subject- specific pedagogy. Demonstrates a realistic understanding of the relationship between content knowledge and planning or teaching.</p> <p>Applying Knowledge: Candidate realistically describes how the lesson promotes access to the content for the focus student, using evidence of participation. Provides appropriate suggestions to improve access to content for students, in general.</p> <p>Student Engagement: Candidate provides general examples of interactions from the lesson. Realistically describes how these interactions promote productive student learning, multiple perspectives, or equitable participation.</p>

Figure 2: FAST Teaching Sample Project Performance Rubric Descriptions of Level 2 “Meets Expectations”

Students in Context	<p>Implications for Instruction: Descriptions of instructional approaches are generally appropriate for at least two of the following student groups: different levels of English proficiency, identified special needs, and different instructional needs.</p> <p>Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments: Expectations for, and responses to, behavior include general examples related to at least two of the following: individual responsibility, intolerance, an inclusive climate.</p>
---------------------	---

	Routines focus on management, with a general description of how they were communicated to students.
Learning Outcomes	<p>Learning Outcomes and Standards: Outcomes primarily address either content or literacy standards. Most outcomes represent the content and level of learning (e.g. DOK level) reflected in the content standards, though they primarily focus on lower levels of learning.</p> <p>Appropriateness For Students: Description of unit and rationale provide general justification for development of either content knowledge or literacy skills, and past experiences, pre-requisite knowledge, or future learning, relevance for students at that grade level.</p>
Assessment Plan	<p>Congruence with Learning Outcomes and Content: Most assessment methods are congruent with learning outcomes in either content or level of learning. Attention to assessment of content knowledge or literacy skills.</p> <p>Variety in Methods of Assessment: The assessment plan assesses student knowledge or performance before, during, and after instruction, with <u>some variety</u> in the assessment methods.</p> <p>Clarity of Assessment Methods: Prompts, directions, scoring procedures, and criteria for meeting learning outcomes are given for most assessment methods. Candidate describes how the format of the assessments match the learning outcomes and the purpose of assessing</p>
Design for Instruction	<p>Use of Contextual Information and Data to Inform Instruction: Lessons show some attention to pre- assessment results and contextual factors. Lessons provide access to content <u>or</u> develop literacy skills for at least two of the following: identified special needs, different levels of English language proficiency, and different instructional needs.</p> <p>Alignment with Learning Outcomes & Standards: Lessons are aligned with unit learning outcomes and are consistent with current subject-specific pedagogy in the content area of instruction or literacy skills.</p> <p>Variety in Instruction: A variety of instructional methods and engagement strategies. Appropriate use of technology to engage students or promote access to content, though primarily used by teacher.</p>
Instructional Decision-Making	<p>Monitoring Student Learning: Evidence of monitoring students during instruction is implied or general. Focus is primarily on behavior or lesson structure rather than student learning</p> <p>Adjustments Based on Knowledge of Student Learning and Providing Access to Curriculum: Some adjustments of the instructional plan are made to address general student needs, with some connections to knowledge of student learning or providing access to curriculum.</p> <p>Alignment Between Adjustments and Learning Outcomes: Adjustments to instruction are generally aligned with learning outcomes. Reasons for adjustments address efforts to improve student progress.</p>
Analysis of Student Learning	<p>Analysis and Interpretation of Data: Analysis and interpretation of data provides some evidence of the number of students meeting at least one of the learning outcomes, is generally accurate, with some supporting</p>

	<p>evidence, and describes how the data/scores reflect learning related to at least one of the learning outcomes.</p> <p>Progress Report: Progress report for student who struggled that uses some data or examples to describe strengths or areas for growth related to one of the unit outcomes and provides general suggestions for improving student learning.</p>
Reflection and Self-Evaluation	<p>Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment: Describes effective instructional activities for at least two of these categories: a range of English proficiency, students with identified special learning needs, or students with different learning needs. Identifies the alignment between assessments and learning outcomes. Describes subject matter knowledge related to this unit.</p> <p>Implications for Future Teaching: Provides appropriate suggestions for redesigning learning outcomes, instruction, or assessment.</p> <p>Implications for Professional Development: Presents a reasonable professional learning goal connected to teaching in general. Appropriate steps described in general terms.</p>

Appendix G

CalAPA Mean Rubric Scores and Essential Questions

CalAPA Passing Standards (From 2019 through June 2024)

- Cycle 1: Analyzing Data to Inform School Improvement and Promote Equity (8 rubrics): A total score of 14 of 40 points
- Cycle 2: Facilitating Communities of Practice (7 rubrics): A total score of 12 of 35 points
- Cycle 3: Supporting Teacher Growth (7 rubrics): A total score of 12 of 35 points

Table 1a: CalAPA First Attempt Scores by Individual Rubric

Cycle 1 & Year	Rubric 1 (I)**	Rubric 2 (I)	Rubric 3 (I)	Rubric 4 (P)	Rubric 5 (P)	Rubric 6 (A)	Rubric 7 (A)	Rubric 8 (R)
C 1 2018-19	3.6	3.0	3.1	3.0	2.5	2.9	2.6	2.5
C 1 2019-20	3.2	2.8	3.0	3.0	2.8	3.0	2.5	2.4
C 1 2020-21	3.2	2.9	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.1	2.6	2.4
C 1 2021-22	3.0	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.7	2.9	2.4	2.4
C 1 2022-23	2.9	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.6	2.8	2.3	2.3
C 1 2023-24	2.8	2.6	2.5	2.8	2.6	2.8	2.3	2.4

**CalAPA Steps: (I) = Investigate, (P) = Plan, (A) = Act, (R) = Reflect

Table 1b

Cycle 2 & Year	Rubric 1 (I)	Rubric 2 (I)	Rubric 3 (P)	Rubric 4 (P)	Rubric 5 (A)	Rubric 6 (A)	Rubric 7 (R)
C 2 2018-19	2.9	2.5	2.6	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.8
C 2 2019-20	3.0	2.6	2.4	2.7	2.8	2.5	2.6
C 2 2020-21	3.1	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.6	2.2
C 2 2021-22	3.1	2.9	2.3	2.8	3.1	2.7	2.2
C 2 2022-23	3.0	2.8	2.3	2.6	2.8	2.6	2.1
C 2 2023-24	3.0	2.8	2.2	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.1

Table 1c

Cycle 3 & Year	Rubric 1 (I)	Rubric 2 (P)	Rubric 3 (A)	Rubric 4 (A)	Rubric 5 (A)	Rubric 6 (R)	Rubric 7 (R)
C 3 2018-19	3.1	2.9	2.9	3.1	2.7	2.8	2.7
C 3 2019-20	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.7
C 3 2020-21	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.9	2.6
C 3 2021-22	2.8	2.7	3.0	2.8	2.4	2.5	2.4
C 3 2022-23	2.6	2.7	3.0	2.6	2.3	2.5	2.5
C 3 2023-24	2.7	2.5	2.9	2.5	2.1	2.7	2.7

Table 1a-c shows candidate score means by individual rubric. Mean rubric scores have remained relatively consistent from year to year for six years with scores at or near score level 3. None of the slight mean score differences between years are statistically significant.

Figure 1: CalAPA Leadership Cycle 1 Rubric Essential Questions

Rubric 1.1	Based on the chosen California state indicator, how does the candidate select and analyze quantitative data sources across the three most recent years, identify patterns and/or trends related to equity, choose one student group, and relate their analysis to the school's vision, mission, and/or goals?
Rubric 1.2	How does the candidate collect and analyze relevant qualitative data and explain their relation to quantitative data findings and the student group equity issues?
Rubric 1.3	How does the candidate conduct an equity gap analysis based on the chosen California state indicator to inform their understanding of the equity issues for a student group?
Rubric 1.4	How does the candidate determine contributing factors, including institutional and/or structural factors, that created or added to the identified equity gap affecting a student group and cite the research supporting their determination?
Rubric 1.5	How does the candidate use the equity gap analysis and identification of potential contributing factors to develop a feasible problem statement related to student achievement and/or well-being?
Rubric 1.6	Are the strategies proposed for equitable school improvement for the student group well informed by the findings of the equity gap analysis, including contributing factors, and responsive to the problem statement? Are proposed strategies aligned to the school's vision, mission, and/or goals?
Rubric 1.7	How does the candidate apply the feedback received from a key stakeholder(s) familiar with the school culture and context and describe next steps for creating stakeholder buy-in and potential implications for the adjusted set of strategies?
Rubric 1.8	How does the candidate reflect on and analyze what they have learned about equity-driven leadership in Cycle 1 (citing from Steps 1, 2, and/or 3) and how, based on the school contexts, they might address a single equity gap for a group of students at the school? How does the candidate use this learning to identify strengths and areas for leadership growth?

Figure 2: CalAPA Leadership Cycle 2 Rubric Essential Questions

Rubric 2.1	How does the candidate describe and analyze the role of current practices of professional collaboration at the school as the current practices relate to student learning and/or well-being?
Rubric 2.2	How does the candidate select an area of educational focus based on student data and choose a group of educators to participate in a community of practice about student learning and/or well-being that corresponds to the school's vision, mission, and/or goals?
Rubric 2.3	Based on the agreed-upon area of educational focus, how does the candidate collaboratively work with the group to select a problem of practice (how practitioners may improve instructional practice or the system) related to student learning and/or well-being and build group ownership?
Rubric 2.4	How does the candidate explain the collaborative process used to select the relevant evidence-based strategy and work with the group to learn about and monitor implementation of that strategy to address the selected problem of

	practice? How does the candidate describe the potential impact on student learning and/or well-being?
Rubric 2.5	How does the candidate co-facilitate group learning—including establishing, reviewing, and using norms; documenting decisions; facilitating a collaborative process (group consensus, feedback, and progress); supporting diverse viewpoints; maintaining group focus and energy; and jointly determining next steps?
Rubric 2.6	How does the candidate demonstrate leadership as they co-facilitate group meetings and support members, individually and as a group, in learning to implement the evidence-based strategy and use initial results and feedback from members to help inform the learning process?
Rubric 2.7	How does the candidate use initial implementation results and feedback from the group—citing evidence from any of the four steps—to analyze their leadership skills and practices in order to identify areas for growth and identify next steps for equitably co-facilitating a community of practice?

Figure 3: CalAPA Leadership Cycle 3 Rubric Essential Questions

Rubric 3.1	How does the candidate describe and analyze the current role of teacher coaching, observation, and/or instructional feedback practices at the school, and explain the implications for their approach to conducting a coaching cycle?
Rubric 3.2	How does the candidate listen to and talk with the volunteer teacher to understand the learning goals, classroom context, and student assets and learning needs; jointly select with the volunteer teacher one or two CSTP elements, including evidence to be collected; and plan for the observation?
Rubric 3.3	How does the candidate recognize and document qualities of teaching practice related to the selected CSTP element(s) and learning goals of the lesson?
Rubric 3.4	How does the candidate foster a learning conversation in a post-observation meeting using CSTP-focused observation evidence, lesson observation video, and student work with the volunteer teacher regarding strengths and area(s) for growth?
Rubric 3.5	In partnership with the volunteer teacher, how does the candidate co-determine next steps for professional development, including resources and additional coaching support based on the CSTP-related evidence during the post-observation meeting?
Rubric 3.6	How does the candidate analyze their capacity to conduct a CSTP-focused coaching and observation process, based on their experience and feedback from the volunteer teacher, and cite evidence to demonstrate their ability to facilitate and maintain a coaching partnership?
Rubric 3.7	How does the candidate, informed by a continuous improvement mindset and focus on equitable leadership, understand the potential impact of coaching and reflect on benefits to both teachers and students?

Appendix H

Early Childhood Education CalFTP A Overview

The ECE CalFTP A has been developed as a component of the emerging Child Development Permit system and serves as the means for candidates to demonstrate they have made sufficient progress towards mastering the TPEs for their job role and are ready for state licensure. The CalFTP A was developed under the PDG-R grant with input and advice from the Early Childhood Education Design Team (ECEDT) appointed by the Commission's Executive Director in February 2021. Commission staff and the ECEDT began development work in March 2021 and will hold its final meeting after the completion of the assessment field test in December 2023. The CalFTP A measures the current, priority ECE CDP teacher level TPEs and is aligned to the California Department of Education's Preschool Learning Foundations and Early Childhood frameworks.

Three CalFTP A Learning Cycles

The ECE CalFTP A consists of three, inquiry based, formative assessment learning cycles that allow ECE candidates to demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and abilities (TPEs) in authentic practice with 3-5-year-old children. Each learning cycle moves through a four-step sequence of pedagogical tasks. Together, these learning cycles and the related three-point analytic rubrics provide the opportunity for ECE students to demonstrate their ability to support and teach young learners. The qualitative rubric descriptions provide direction for faculty to guide new teacher development.

Learning Cycle 1: Observing Young Children

ECE candidates observe one child from a larger class group and move through the sequence of **plan, observe and record, reflect, and apply**. Candidates observe the child in two play-based activities, interpret their recorded notes with consultation from their supervising teacher, reflect on their notes and interpretations, and apply their knowledge of the child to plan an appropriate next learning activity. Learning Cycle 1 is assessed with 5 rubrics.

Learning Cycle 2: Planning Learning Activities

ECE candidates develop an engaging and asset-based learning activity and move through the sequence of **observe and plan, teach and assess, reflect, and apply**. In collaboration with mentor teachers, candidates plan an activity based on their observations and knowledge of the children in the group. They select one focus child and provide accommodations to support the child's learning. The focus child can be an English learner, a child with an IEP or other learning need, or a child for whom learning has been impacted by their experiences in or outside of school. Candidates video record themselves teaching and monitoring the play-based activity with children. They reflect on how they monitored children's understanding and made appropriate in-the-moment adjustments to support learning. Finally, ECE candidates reflect on the children's experience and their own teaching and apply what they learned to the next activity. Learning Cycle 2 is assessed with 8 rubrics.

Learning Cycle 3: Building Family/Guardian Partnerships

ECE candidates plan communications and build relationships with families/guardians to support children's learning outside school by moving through the sequence of **observe and plan, design and connect, reflect, and apply**. Candidates observe a child in an in-school activity and connect with the child's family/guardian to discuss the child's learning in the activity. They design an out- of-school activity and connect with the family/guardian to explain the activity. Candidates gather information from the family/guardian about how the child experienced the out-of-school activity, reflect on the effectiveness of their family/guardian connections and apply what they learned to determine next steps for further connections and the focus child's learning. Learning Cycle 3 is assessed with 8 rubrics.