

---

# 4A

## Information/Action

### *Educator Preparation Committee*

#### **Initial Recommendations of the Workgroup to Review the Design and Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessments**

---

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item presents initial recommendations from the workgroup to Review the Design and Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessments (RDI-TPA) for feedback from the Commission. This item also includes staff-recommended interim actions to address issues identified by the RDI-TPA Workgroup to provide immediate or near-term support to current teacher candidates.

**Recommended Action:** That the Commission review and provide feedback on the initial RDI-TPA recommendations. That the Commission consider, and if appropriate, adopt interim recommendations.

**Presenters:** Adam Ebrahim, Senior Director, and Juliet Wahleithner, Special Consultant, Policy and Continuous Improvement; Mandy Redfern and Ursula Estrada-Reveles, Co-Chairs of the RDI-TPA Workgroup

#### **Strategic Plan Goal**

##### ***Continuous Improvement***

- **Goal 7.** The Commission's work is grounded in research, informed by the voices of practitioners and communities of interests, and supports continuous improvement in educator preparation and licensure.
  - Q. Use data to inform Commission and staff decision-making and continuous improvement.

---

# Initial Recommendations of the Workgroup to Review the Design and Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessments

---

## Introduction

This agenda item presents initial recommendations from the Workgroup to Review the Design and Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessments (RDI-TPA) for feedback from the Commission. This item also includes staff-recommended interim actions to address issues identified by the RDI-TPA Workgroup to provide immediate or near-term support to current teacher candidates.

## Background

In August 2024, the Commission adopted a charge for a workgroup to review the design and implementation of Commission-adopted Teaching Performance Assessments, aligning with the anticipated passage of [Senate Bill 1263](#), which was signed by the Governor one month later. The Commission also approved a scope and sequence for the workgroup meetings, as well as a roster of 24 educators, evenly divided among classroom teachers, teacher educators, and performance assessment experts. Details of the adopted charge, member roster, member demographics, and workgroup scope and sequence are provided in [Appendix A](#).

The RDI-TPA Workgroup held its first meeting on September 19-20, 2024, to review its charge, become familiar with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act rules governing meeting conduct, and examine relevant statutes and Commission guidelines related to performance assessments. The workgroup then focused on five specific sections of Education Code section 44320.4, which defined the key areas for developing recommendations for the Commission. These five focus areas are as follows:

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

The workgroup convened for its second meeting on October 14-15, 2024. During the first day, members worked to clarify concepts in the charge and statute that allowed for broad

interpretation. Breakout groups defined key phrases, including "formative in nature," "valid and authentic to the work of teaching," "reasonable to implement in diverse classroom settings," and "appropriate for beginning teachers." These agreed upon definitions were shared with the full group and refined to ensure clarity for the Commission, partners, and the public when evaluating recommendations. An example of an agreed upon concept definition is included in figure 1 below and the full set of agreed upon concept definitions and attributes are included in [Appendix B](#).

*Figure 1: Concept definition example*

**Valid and Authentic to the Work of Teaching**

Definition: Accurately measures a candidate's ability to meet the relevant aspects of the intended Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) across a wide range of CA classroom settings.

- Attribute 1: Relevance to TPEs—Does the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) measure essential components of the TPEs in a meaningful way?
- Attribute 2: Evidence Aligns with Typical Practices of Beginning Teachers—Are the tasks, evidence, and rubrics designed to emphasize the key competencies expected of beginning teachers and what we want emphasized in teacher prep programs?
- Attribute 3: Criteria is Focused to Provide Accurate Reflection of Candidates Competency—Does the TPA provide a fair and accurate reflection of candidates' abilities, without overwhelming them, and validate competencies with appropriate evidence?
- Attribute 4: Assumes a Developmental Trajectory for Beginning Teachers—Does the TPA assume a developmental trajectory for beginning teachers, allowing space for honest reflection, imperfection in performance, and growth?
- Attribute 5: Equitably Addresses Context to Mitigate the Disadvantage to Candidates—Does the TPA account for various classroom contexts, ensuring fairness and adaptability to different teaching environments and alternative methods of demonstrating competence?
- Attribute 6: Adaptability vs. Standardization—Does the TPA strike a balance between flexibility for individualized evidence and maintaining consistency and fairness through standardized criteria?

During the second part of the October meeting, members addressed Focus Area 1 by analyzing current TPAs and identifying modifications needed to meet the criteria outlined in Education Code section 44320.4(c)(1), now grounded in the newly defined terms. Members engaged in independent inquiry using resources provided by staff, attended presentations from model sponsors, asked questions, and brainstormed potential recommendations. These ideas were later prioritized, consolidated, and refined by the workgroup. This iterative cycle—independent

inquiry, group inquiry with presentations, recommendation idea generation, and refinement—was repeated for Focus Areas 2 and 3 during the November, December, and January meetings.

### **Recommendation Development Process**

The recommendations of the RDI-TPA Workgroup are being developed in five phases. The process is iterative and remains open for refinement until submitted for final action by the Commission at the June 2025 meeting. The process for recommendation development is described in five distinct phases below and associated with upcoming Commission meetings.

- **Phase 1: Recommendation Brainstorm**  
Following a period of inquiry, workgroup members articulate their initial ideas either verbally or by submitting them through a form. Each idea is prioritized by members using a 5-point Likert scale: +2 for strong support, +1 for support, 0 for neutral, -1 for opposition, and -2 for strong opposition.
- **Phase 2: Consolidated Recommendations**  
The prioritized brainstorm ideas are grouped into thematic categories and ranked by priority score. Workgroup members meet in groups according to thematic categories to consolidate duplicative recommendations. Each group develops a concise rationale and a theory of action for their recommendations, which are then presented to the entire workgroup for feedback and refinement.
- **Phase 3: Initial Recommendations**  
During the January 2025 workgroup meeting, consolidated recommendations were further refined in breakout sessions by members. An initial list of recommendations, organized by focus area, was assembled, prioritized, and scored. These initial recommendations are presented here to the Commission for feedback.
- **Phase 4: Draft Recommendations**  
The workgroup will incorporate feedback from the February 2025 Commission meeting into the recommendations during a workgroup meeting two weeks later. Members will further develop Focus Area 3, 4, and 5 recommendations. The full set refined recommendations will be presented to the Commission at the April 2025 meeting as Draft Recommendations.
- **Phase 5: Final Recommendations**  
The workgroup will review feedback from the April 2025 Commission meeting at a subsequent workgroup meeting two weeks later. After additional refinements, the finalized recommendations will be submitted to the Commission for action at the June 2025 meeting.
- **Beyond Adoption of Recommendations**  
Adopted recommendations will be operationalized by staff through project plans and implemented. Progress on the implementation of adopted recommendations will be reported to the Commission and the Legislature at least annually in accordance with the provisions of Senate Bill 1263.

The initial recommendations developed by the RDI-TPA Workgroup represent the outcomes of the first three phases of the iterative process described above. These recommendations, organized by Focus Area, reflect the workgroup’s collective analysis, inquiry, and refinement efforts to date. Presented below, they are now offered to the Commission for feedback to guide further development.

### Initial Recommendations

The following section presents the initial recommendations for the Commission's review and feedback. These recommendations were developed during workgroup activities related to Focus Areas 1 and 2. Due to the interconnected nature of the topics under consideration, several recommendations strongly aligned with Focus Areas 3, 4, and 5 and are presented accordingly in this section. Additionally, some recommendations generated in separate focus areas demonstrated significant overlap; these will likely be consolidated in subsequent workgroup meetings.

Following the refinement of workgroup recommendations during the January 2025 meeting, members were asked to complete a poll to indicate their degree of support with each recommendation using a 5-point Likert scale. The results of this poll are integrated in the list of recommendations below, expressed as two measures. The first measure indicates the percentage of workgroup members who expressed support or strong support for a recommendation. The second measure captures the average support, where strong support = 2, support = 1, neutrality = 0, opposition = -1, and strong opposition = -2.

**Focus Area 1 Recommendations:** An analysis of any modifications needed to current assessments to ensure they are valid and authentic to the work of teaching, reasonable to implement in the wide range of classroom settings across the state, and appropriate for beginning teachers. [44320.4(c)(1)]

- **Recommendation 1A:** The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends streamlining the TPA exam structure by reducing the number of pages submitted, streamlining rubric instructions, eliminating duplicate activities, and incorporating contextualized, real-world teaching scenarios, so that candidates can focus on demonstrating their competencies without navigating unnecessary complexity. This recommendation is necessary because the time spent on the current expectations of the TPA which are overwhelming to candidates, high stakes, duplicative, and summative in nature. Reducing the navigational workload allows the assessment to become more authentic as it is contextualized in real world teaching contexts.

% Strong Support/Support	74%
Average Support Score	1.00

- **Recommendation 1B:** The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that the TPA be broken into multiple segments, with TPEs specified, that are contained within existing coursework and reflected in the program standards. Coursework that is assigned and evaluated by faculty should be used for the TPA submission. The intent of this recommendation is not to expand coursework or programs, but to revise learning outcomes in the coursework to align with the TPEs and TPA. This recommendation is necessary because current TPA practices cause overwhelming stress for teacher candidates and are duplicative in nature due to the inability to submit coursework. Implementation of this recommendation is intended to reduce the overall stress experienced by the candidate, provide more opportunity for prompt feedback and continuous improvement, develop authentic and meaningful growth opportunities for candidates, and eliminate duplicative experiences.

% Strong Support/Support	74%
Average Support Score	1.00

- **Recommendation 1C:** The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that TPAs allow for multiple modalities for submission components. This recommendation is necessary because the expected writing components can be overwhelming for candidates and cause a barrier that creates inequity and racial bias as well as unnecessary stress. Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address the multiple types of learners that exist among teacher candidates. Multiple modalities will address many of the current condition codes and barriers that prohibit candidates from completing the TPA. This allows for accessibility.

% Strong Support/Support	100%
Average Support Score	1.74

- **Recommendation 1D:** The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that candidates have opportunities to submit evidence for the TPA using multiple modalities (audio, visual, written) and collect multiple points of evidence for their teaching. This recommendation is necessary to make the assessment more accessible and equitable for all candidates.

% Strong Support/Support	100%
Average Support Score	1.70

- **Recommendation 1E:** The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that TPAs center culturally responsive/sustaining and equity-focused pedagogy within the required tasks by:
  - Requiring candidates to incorporate culturally sustaining practices that are directly responsive to the backgrounds, identities, and cultures of their students and communities in their learning contexts.
  - Requiring candidates to design and deliver equitable learning opportunities that address systemic/institutional barriers to ensure accessibility for diverse student

populations, including multilingual learners, students with exceptional/different abilities, and historically underserved groups.

- Requiring candidates to demonstrate asset-based pedagogical approaches that value and build upon students' strengths, experiences, and community assets/knowledge as central to their teaching practices.
- Requiring candidates to disaggregate and analyze student data (e.g., by race/ethnicity, language proficiency, and exceptional\*needs) to inform instructional practice to provide a high-quality educational experience. This recommendation is necessary because of the inequities that exist within our current system. Implementation of this recommendation is intended to explicitly address the inequity that we know exists in the data of our current system.

\*Exceptional needs (students on IEPs/504s, gifted)

% Strong Support/Support	92%
Average Support Score	1.48

- **Recommendation 1F:** The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that assessor training prioritize evaluating candidate knowledge (what they CAN do) over penalizing problematic errors and revise scoring practices to focus on what can be assessed without the use of condition codes. Additionally, assessors should receive training to deepen their knowledge of the specific competencies and contexts they are assessing, including areas like culturally responsive teaching and ethnic studies. This recommendation is necessary because rigid scoring practices, limited content knowledge, and condition codes often penalize candidates unfairly, diverting attention from core teaching competencies. Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by ensuring a fairer and more accurate evaluation of candidates, emphasizing substantive teaching skills over superficial compliance.

% Strong Support/Support	78%
Average Support Score	1.17

- **Recommendation 1G:** The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that the state of CA create a specific loan/grant program to fund the candidate TPA fees. If the candidate qualifies and serves as a teacher in CA for a certain number of years, the award becomes a grant. If the student does not teach in CA for the identified period, the award will be treated as a loan and must be repaid. This recommendation is necessary because the assessment fee can be a burden and a barrier for credential candidates. Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this barrier by covering the immediate cost while preliminary credential candidates are students and incentivizing remaining in the profession.

% Strong Support/Support	92%
Average Support Score	1.57

- Recommendation 1H:** The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that the CTC convene regular statewide gatherings of the entire preparation community (e.g., teacher preparation program faculty, assessment designers, LEA administrators, mentor teachers, candidates, scorers, etc.) to engage in multi-directional feedback and collaborative learning that informs teacher preparation programs, LEAs and the assessment itself. This recommendation is necessary because the current practice lacks sufficient stakeholder perspectives and scope of improvement. Diverse collaboration is essential for fostering continuous improvement in both program practices and assessment design, ensuring alignment with real-world teaching and equity-focused practices. Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by creating structured opportunities for stakeholders to:
  - Review current practices and identify gaps in alignment between the TPA and preparation programs.
  - Analyze recent assessment results, including both quantitative and qualitative data.
  - Calibrate performance expectations in scoring to ensure consistency and fairness across evaluators.
  - Share effective practices and collaboratively develop strategies to improve the TPA, its integration into teacher preparation programs, and LEA clinical experiences.
  - Facilitate meaningful contributions from all community members, ensuring diverse perspectives are incorporated into continuous improvement efforts.

% Strong Support/Support	96%
Average Support Score	1.57

- Recommendation 1I:** The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that the CTC develop a continuum of practice from preservice through in-service. The continuum should integrate TPEs and CSTPs to capture the trajectory of preservice through inservice practice to the skills and behaviors that lead to successful student learning and to a successful teaching career. We recommend that there is an exploration of the connection between the TPA rubrics and the continuum of practice so that the continuum would guide the connection between the TPAs and the ILP and help candidates and mentors know where the practice demonstrated on the TPA falls on the continuum. This recommendation is necessary because at this time a continuum does not exist that integrates the TPEs with CSTPs which causes a breakdown in understanding the full spectrum of a teacher's development. This continuum would ensure that a preservice program's curriculum and tasks, including the TPEs and TPA align with the expectations at the end of the preparation program as well as the expectations of the induction programs. This recommendation is intended to address this by ensuring that the TPA rubrics are aligned more closely with the continuum so that it would be easier for candidates and mentors to develop growth plans within preservice and in-service practice.



% Strong Support/Support	83%
Average Support Score	1.43

**Focus Area 2 Recommendations:** Recommendations for how programs might embed the assessments into coursework and clinical work to avoid duplicative work for candidates. [44320.4(c)(2)]

- **Recommendation 2A:** The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that programs be required to provide candidates scaffolded and sequenced feedback on their work throughout the process prior to submission, and current guidelines for acceptable support be examined and revised to ensure entire process be formative and educative. This recommendation is necessary because candidates need formative feedback on the various components of the tasks in order to reflect on and develop their praxis prior to submission. Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by requiring programs to provide feedback to candidates throughout the process to guide their ongoing development and their preparation of their final submission.

% Strong Support/Support	96%
Average Support Score	1.43

- **Recommendation 2B:** The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that programs must provide substantive, differentiated, and individualized, ongoing feedback on both pedagogy and submission criteria to candidates throughout the TPA process to guide the candidate's development of the TPA. This recommendation is necessary because candidates need feedback throughout the process, not just after the TPA. Programs need opportunities to see firsthand where candidates are in their development in order to provide clear guidance towards improvement. Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by allowing programs to provide support throughout the development of the candidates' TPA submission, ensuring programs are responsible for guiding candidates in their improvement.

% Strong Support/Support	83%
Average Support Score	1.52

- **Recommendation 2C:** The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that a defined time period be created between TPA submission and before TPA scoring begins, to review candidate submissions, identify those that have scoring issues, and allow students to resubmit without incurring additional costs. This recommendation is necessary because currently too many submissions are returned with condition codes that may be easily corrected and don't reflect the candidate's skill or ability to demonstrate mastery of the TPEs. Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by reducing the

number of non-scorable submissions and reducing excessive costs to credential candidates.

% Strong Support/Support	92%
Average Support Score	1.57

- **Recommendation 2D:** The RDI-TPA workgroup recommends that candidates be able to submit their initial TPA or TPA resubmission within 2 weeks when a technical or logistical issue leads to TPA failure or receipt of condition code. This recommendation is necessary because current submission dates restrict candidates who need to resubmit by delaying their ability to seek employment, having access to faculty for support, and often requires candidates to incur additional tuition costs. Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by allowing candidates to be able to resubmit sections that they failed or that were deemed unscorable after scores are received by the candidate.

% Strong Support/Support	87%
Average Support Score	1.43

- **Recommendation 2E:** The RDI-TPA workgroup recommends that the TPA assessors provide rubric-specific feedback that highlights the exact criteria met and not met. TPA assessors will also provide clear and actionable next steps within three weeks of submission deadline, not generic feedback. This recommendation is necessary because the current overall score and rubric scores do not provide candidates with enough information to determine what improvements are needed. Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by giving candidates specific feedback to guide their necessary growth for resubmission or the development of the Individualized Learning Plan to use in the Induction program.

% Strong Support/Support	96%
Average Support Score	1.43

- **Recommendation 2F:** The RDI-TPA workgroup recommends that the TPAs allow candidates to use the feedback received to revise and resubmit individual sections that candidates failed as many times as necessary to achieve a passing score. This recommendation is necessary because the profession needs strong teacher candidates who are competent and capable of supporting California's diverse student needs. Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by allowing the process to be more formative for candidates with an emphasis on continuous improvement.

% Strong Support/Support	78%
Average Support Score	1.04

- **Recommendation 2G:** The RDI-TPA workgroup recommends that the CTC or model sponsors collect exemplary practices for embedding the TPA from preparation programs and regularly provide these practices to programs. This recommendation is necessary to ensure programs understand the multiple ways they can support candidates through embedding the assessment.

% Strong Support/Support	79%
Average Support Score	1.17

- **Recommendation 2H:** The RDI-TPA workgroup recommends that programs must support candidates with reflective activities based on the feedback received on the TPA to further the candidate's ongoing growth and development, regardless of pass or fail. This recommendation is necessary because candidates need feedback to grow, including after the TPA. Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by allowing programs to provide support throughout the development of the candidates' growth. Ensuring programs are responsible for guiding candidates in their improvement throughout their role as a beginning teacher.

% Strong Support/Support	70%
Average Support Score	0.87

**Focus Area 3 Recommendations:** Recommendations to strengthen the accreditation system to ensure programs embed the assessment in coursework and clinical work, offer sufficient clinical and pedagogical support, and support candidates to pass the assessment.  
[44320.4(c)(4)]

- **Recommendation 3A:** The RDI-TPA workgroup recommends that Program Standard 5 includes embedding the TPA in both fieldwork AND coursework with the option to use the TPA templates for these assignments. As part of embedding the TPA in fieldwork, candidates will receive and implement feedback on their teaching and be assessed on their implementation of feedback. This recommendation is necessary to enable programs to prepare candidates to address local and contextual factors and align with program methodologies.

% Strong Support/Support	91%
Average Support Score	1.30

- **Recommendation 3B:** The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that the CTC examine the current credential program standards, in particular Standard 5, to evaluate the implementation practices of the TPA, IDP, and ILP and the original guidelines for such implementation and identify where original guidelines need to be enforced, revised,

and/or additional guidelines created to reflect current needs. This recommendation is necessary because solutions to issues currently identified may be due, in part, to flawed or inconsistent implementation. It will also address the candidates' experience of the TPA as a disconnected, high-stakes demand with little impact on their actual professional practice. Implementation of this recommendation is intended to ensure program accountability, thereby reassuring the public and the professional community that the TPA is a critical part of teachers' career-long learning progression and reducing financial costs for candidates.

% Strong Support/Support	87%
Average Support Score	1.43

- Recommendation 3C:** The RDI-TPA workgroup recommends that programs use the data from the TPA to engage in programmatic continuous improvement, including alignment of academic program with TPA cycles and tasks. This recommendation is necessary because TPAs provide data on what candidates have learned and are able to apply in their teaching to address equity and disproportionality in results. Many programs may not be aligned with TPA tasks. Many candidates express that coursework and TPA tasks seem duplicative. Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by requiring programs to directly engage with the data on their candidates' submissions.

% Strong Support/Support	89%
Average Support Score	1.30

- Recommendation 3D:** The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends CTC develop a system of shared accountability between preparation programs, CTC, and TPA providers for addressing disproportionate TPA success rates. TPA providers are required to research and publish findings on inequities, particularly by race and ethnicity, in order to redesign the assessment and support programs in reducing these disparities, including but not limited to providing recommendations to programs. This recommendation is necessary because evidence shows that candidates from underrepresented groups face systemic barriers and inequities with the TPA itself that contribute to lower success rates, which TPA providers have a responsibility to address and perpetuates inequities in the teaching profession. Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address these disparities by fostering transparency, providing actionable data to preparation programs, and promoting equitable outcomes for all candidates.

% Strong Support/Support	78%
Average Support Score	1.26

- Recommendation 3E:** The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends positioning the TPA as one of multiple measures of candidate readiness, allowing candidates to demonstrate mastery through other coursework or approved assessments or implementing UDL

principles. This recommendation is necessary because relying solely on the TPA may not fully capture a candidate's readiness, especially when considering diverse preparation pathways, candidates with learning differences, and individual strengths. Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by providing a more comprehensive and equitable evaluation framework, ensuring candidates have multiple avenues to demonstrate their teaching competencies.

% Strong Support/Support	57%
Average Support Score	0.65

**Focus Area 4:** Recommendations for how programs can engage in local scoring of the assessment to inform program improvement. [44320.4(c)(5)]

- Recommendation 4A:** The RDI-TPA workgroup recommends that a portion of the TPA be locally scored and that the TPA model sponsors provide resources to train and support institutions to score a portion of the assessment. (“Portion of the assessment” could be interpreted to indicate one task of the TPA or percentage of candidate submissions.) In accreditation, programs will demonstrate how they are using data from local scoring to inform continuous improvement for the institution. This recommendation is necessary to ensure that programs study their program’s impact on candidate practice.

% Strong Support/Support	83%
Average Support Score	1.30

- Recommendation 4B:** The RDI-TPA workgroup recommends that work be done to identify barriers and necessary resources to enable programs to score their own candidates’ TPAs and explore ways to incentivize programs to engage in local scoring. Programs participate in ongoing CTC-sponsored statewide moderation (sampling), calibration, and cross-fertilization in “what works” in scoring and feedback. This recommendation is necessary because localized scoring increases programs’ opportunities to engage with the quality of their candidates’ submissions. Local scorers have better knowledge of the specific context in which the candidates are teaching. Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by requiring programs to engage in scoring their candidates’ submissions as a way to learn more specifically about the programs’ areas of strength and areas for growth.

% Strong Support/Support	79%
Average Support Score	1.26

- Recommendation 4C:** The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that teacher preparation educators and LEA administrators and teachers collaboratively engage in TPA data

review and analysis for the candidates they work with. This recommendation is necessary to foster mutual responsibility for candidate development and success, ensuring that both preparation programs and school-based practitioners are aligned in supporting candidates effectively. Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address the disconnect that currently exists between IHE/LEA/COE programs and school-based practitioners by creating authentic opportunities to collaboratively review TPA data, inform practices in teacher preparation programs, and enhance the instructional practices that credential candidates are refining in their classrooms.

% Strong Support/Support	96%
Average Support Score	1.30

- **Recommendation 4D:** The RDI-TPA Workgroups recommend that there is a collaborative scoring overview required for all educators involved in the preparation of new teachers. This training is not as extensive as a scorers' training, but it engages educators with the process of examining the programs' own candidate's evidence vis-à-vis the TPA rubrics. Ideally, it occurs during the first year the educator is part of candidate preparation. This recommendation is necessary to improve educators' understanding of evidence of practice, in order to support their candidates' preparation, as well as candidates' analysis of their practice. It will also facilitate the collaborative examination of candidate's work recommended above. Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by requiring CTC or assessment sponsors to conduct/support this training via gatherings, materials.

% Strong Support/Support	88%
Average Support Score	1.35

- **Recommendation 4E:** The RDI-TPA workgroup recommends that programs score their candidates' TPA re-submissions. This recommendation is necessary because localized scoring increases programs' opportunities to engage with the quality of their candidates' submissions. Local scorers have better knowledge of the specific context in which the candidates are teaching. Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by requiring programs to engage in scoring their candidates' submissions as a way to learn more specifically about the programs' areas of strength and areas for growth.

% Strong Support/Support	61%
Average Support Score	0.74

- **Recommendation 4F:** The RDI-TPA workgroup recommends that programs score their candidates' TPAs. This recommendation is necessary because programs are tasked with the responsibility of ensuring candidates are able to implement the TPEs. Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by involving the

programs and their teacher education faculty in the scoring process in order for them to be aware of where candidates are in their development so they are able to effectively support candidates.

% Strong Support/Support	57%
Average Support Score	0.52

**Focus Area 5:** Suggested questions for program completer surveys to understand candidate experience of programmatic support for assessment completion. [44320.4(c)(3)]

- **Recommendation 5A:** The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends including a reflection question in the TPA to gather candidate feedback on the support they received in their prep programs. This recommendation is necessary because understanding candidates' perspectives can identify gaps in preparation and inform improvements in both teacher preparation programs and the TPA itself. Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address alignment issues by using candidate feedback as a means of improving the implementation of the TPA and accountability for TPA model sponsors and prep programs, and preparation practices to ensure better support for future candidates.

% Strong Support/Support	91%
Average Support Score	1.43

### **Interim Actions the Commission Might Take to Enhance Candidate Support**

The interim actions outlined below were developed in response to concerns raised by the RDI-TPA Workgroup and are presented for Commission consideration and possible action to address urgent needs. They are intended to enhance candidate support by clarifying program responsibilities, reducing technical errors that result in condition codes, and ensuring programs are aware of their current pass rates. Additionally, the actions aim to standardize data collection and reporting to provide clearer metrics for tracking outcomes and identifying opportunities for policy and program improvements.

These targeted steps are designed to drive progress while the workgroup continues refining its broader recommendations and, if adopted, would be implemented expeditiously by Commission staff.

1. Update TPAs as necessary to eliminate the use of content-based condition codes.
2. Redirect candidate submissions with technical condition codes back to the candidates so they can resolve identified technical issue(s) and resubmit at no additional cost.
3. Issue updated *Guidelines for Acceptable Support* clarifying that direct, ongoing feedback from faculty, supervisors, and mentor teachers aimed at improving candidate responses

and addressing technical issues leading to condition codes are important, acceptable and encouraged forms of support.

4. Standardize the Commission's system for collecting and reporting TPA outcome data. Establish clear metrics to inform policy decisions and support improvements in preparation programs.
5. Ensure a system of notification is in place for candidates that fall within the secondary passing standard that includes simultaneous notification to the preparation program and clear information for candidates and programs regarding the process for demonstrating readiness by alternate means.
6. Issue a notification to all programs identifying their TPA first-time pass rates, based on both scorable and non-scorable submissions, and provide evidence-based recommendations for strengthening candidate supports and guidance to reduce/eliminate candidate condition codes.
7. Direct staff to report on implementation progress of these interim actions during future RDI-TPA Workgroup items before the Commission.

#### **Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends:

- That the Commission review and provide feedback on the initial recommendations of the RDI-TPA Workgroup.
- That the Commission consider, and if appropriate, direct staff to implement interim actions.



## Appendix A

### *Adopted RDI-TPA Workgroup Charge*

**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.

**II. Composition:** The workgroup shall include classroom teachers, teacher educators, and performance assessment experts. The composition of the workgroup shall reflect racial and ethnic diversity, appropriate geographic representation, and a balance of professional experiences. 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.

*Roster of Appointed RDI-TPA Workgroup*

Classroom Teachers	
<b>Patricia Camarillo, NBCT</b> Teacher of the Visually Impaired Fresno Unified School District	<b>Joshua Nothom</b> World History Teacher Burbank Unified School District
<b>Thalia Diazcatano, NBCT</b> History/Ethnic Studies Teacher Los Angeles Unified School District	<b>Dr. Mandy Redfern</b> Second Grade Teacher La Cañada Unified School District
<b>Linda Hoang, NBCT</b> First Grade Teacher Los Angeles Unified School District	<b>Dr. Kathleen Rowley, NBCT</b> English Language Arts Teacher William S. Hart Union High School District
<b>Jason Morgan</b> Math Teacher/AVID Coordinator Compton Unified School District	<b>Karla Valdez</b> World Language Teacher-Spanish Vacaville Unified School District

Teacher Educators	
<b>Dr. Devin Beasley</b> CalTPA Coordinator CSU Dominguez Hills	<b>Dr. Alicia Herrera</b> Assistant Professor CSU Sacramento
<b>Ms. Vanessa Escobar</b> Director LA Charter School Teacher Residency Consortium	<b>Benjamin Odell</b> Director of Intern Program Sacramento County Office of Education
<b>Dr. Tory Harvey</b> Director of Teacher Education UC Santa Barbara	<b>Dr. Shayna Sullivan</b> Dean Alder Graduate School of Education
<b>Colin Haysman</b> Senior Clinical Associate Stanford University	<b>Dr. Juliet Wahleithner*</b> Director, Education Prep Programs and Accreditation, CSU Fresno

Teaching Performance Assessment Experts	
<b>Alicia Brown</b> Graduate Lead San Francisco Urban Teacher Residency	<b>Rebecca Sackett</b> Curriculum Specialist/Induction Mentor Santa Ana Unified School District
<b>Dr. Cathy Creasia</b> Director of Accreditation and Credentialing USC Rossier School of Education	<b>Dr. Tine Sloan</b> Professor Emeritus UC Santa Barbara
<b>Dr. Brent Duckor</b> Professor of Education San Jose State University	<b>Matt Wallace</b> Associate Professor of Teaching UC Davis
<b>Dr. Ursula Estrada-Reveles</b> Executive Director, School of Education Riverside County Office of Education	<b>Dr. Beverly Young</b> Executive Director Above & Beyond Teaching

*\*Dr. Wahleithner joined Commission staff for a nine-month term beginning on February 1, 2025.*

*Demographics of Appointed RDI-TPA Workgroup Members*

<b>Required participant groups</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Classroom Teachers	8	24	33.33%
Teacher Educators	8	24	33.33%
Teacher Performance Assessment Experts	8	24	33.33%

<b>Black, Indigenous, and/or People of Color (BIPOC)</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
BIPOC	14	24	58.33%

<b>Teaching Performance Assessment Experience</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Have taken any TPA	8	24	33.33%
Took the EdTPA	3	24	12.50%
Took the CalTPA	3	24	12.50%
Took the PACT	2	24	8.33%

<b>Represented Regions</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Bay Area	4	24	16.67%
Sacramento Area	4	24	16.67%
Central Valley	2	24	8.33%
Central Coast	2	24	8.33%
Inland Empire	1	24	4.17%
Los Angeles/Orange County	11	24	45.83%

<b>Teacher Preparation Segment</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
California State University	4	14	28.57%
University of California	3	14	21.43%
Private	3	14	21.43%
Local Education Agency	3	14	21.43%

<b>Credentials Held</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Total Credential Holders	23	24	95.83%

Single Subject	13	24	54.17%
Multiple Subject	9	24	37.50%
Administrative Services	5	24	20.83%
Education Specialist	4	24	16.67%
Bilingual Authorizations	4	24	16.67%
National Board Certification	4	24	16.67%

<b>Teacher Preparation Experience</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Teacher Education Faculty	16	24	66.67%
Induction Mentor Teacher	14	24	58.33%
Cooperating Teacher	12	24	50.00%

<b>Accreditation Experience</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
CTC Board of Institutional Reviewers	3	24	12.50%
Accreditation Report Development	11	24	45.83%
National Accreditation	4	24	16.67%

*RDI-TPA Scope and Sequence*

<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Topic</b>
RDI-TPA 1	Sept. 19-20, 2024	Organizational meeting; lines of inquiry
RDI-TPA 2	Oct. 14-15, 2024	Focus Area 1: Ensuring validity, authenticity and feasibility in TPAs
RDI-TPA 3	Nov. 5-6, 2024	Focus Area 2: Embedding TPAs to avoid duplicative work
RDI-TPA 4	Dec. 4-5, 2024	Focus Area 3: Strengthening accreditation to ensure embedding of TPAs and support for candidates in programs
RDI-TPA 5	Jan. 8-9, 2025	Develop initial Workgroup recommendations
Commission	Feb. 6-7, 2025	Present initial Workgroup recommendations for feedback
RDI-TPA 6	Feb. 26-27, 2025	Topic 4: Local Scoring and Topic 5: Survey Questions; Revise recommendations based on feedback and analysis
Commission	Apr. 10-11, 2025	Present draft recommendations for feedback
RDI-TPA 7	Apr. 23-24, 2025	Revise recommendations based on feedback and analysis
Commission	Jun. 26-27, 2025	Present final recommendations for action

## **Appendix B**

### *RDI-TPA Workgroup Concept Definitions*

#### **1. Valid and Authentic to the Work of Teaching**

Definition: Accurately measures a candidate's ability to meet the relevant aspects of the intended TPEs across a wide range of CA classroom settings.

- Attribute 1: Relevance to TPEs—Does the TPA measure essential components of the TPEs in a meaningful way?
- Attribute 2: Evidence Aligns with Typical Practices of Beginning Teachers—Are the tasks, evidence, and rubrics designed to emphasize the key competencies expected of beginning teachers and what we want emphasized in teacher prep programs?
- Attribute 3: Criteria is Focused to Provide Accurate Reflection of Candidates Competency—Does the TPA provide a fair and accurate reflection of candidates' abilities, without overwhelming them, and validate competencies with appropriate evidence?
- Attribute 4: Assumes a Developmental Trajectory for Beginning Teachers—Does the TPA assume a developmental trajectory for beginning teachers, allowing space for honest reflection, imperfection in performance, and growth?
- Attribute 5: Equitably Addresses Context to Mitigate the Disadvantage to Candidates—Does the TPA account for various classroom contexts, ensuring fairness and adaptability to different teaching environments and alternative methods of demonstrating competence?
- Attribute 6: Adaptability vs. Standardization—Does the TPA strike a balance between flexibility for individualized evidence and maintaining consistency and fairness through standardized criteria?

#### **2. Formative In Nature**

Definition: Designed for formative purposes more than summative purposes. It must be a process where feedback is articulated, transparent, user-friendly, actionable.

- Attribute 1: Provided, specific feedback with actionable steps
- Attribute 2: Strengths based
- Attribute 3: Equity Focused
- Attribute 4: Just in time supports
- Attribute 5: Differentiated Supports
- Attribute 6: Continuous revision / Continuum of Practice & process based to demonstrate growth
- Attribute 7: Progress based

- Attribute 8: Dynamic
- Attribute 9: Personalized feedback
- Attribute 10: Reflective

**3. Appropriate For ~~Beginning Teachers~~ Credential Candidates** (*Note: Strikethrough and adjustment intended by workgroup*)

Definition: The TPA assesses the current experiences in their TPE aligned teacher preparation program.

- Attribute 1: TPAs are specifically aligned to the TPE's
- Attribute 2: TPAs are holistically reflective of the TPE's
- Attribute 3: Tiers of support
- Attribute 4: Reflective practice
- Attribute 5: Embedded into credential program coursework

**4. Reasonable To Implement in a Wide Range of Classroom Settings Across the State**

Definition: The assessment is fair for credential candidates to complete in all content areas and classroom settings.

- Attribute 1: Fair is defined as equitable and accessible.
- Attribute 2: The assessment is formative and embedded in program progress.
- Attribute 3: The assessment assesses teaching.
- Attribute 4: Credential candidates are supported by qualified mentors and an accredited program
- Attribute 5: Programs and assessments are localized and based on best practices.
- Attribute 6: Candidates cannot be penalized or disadvantaged based on the student populations in their classrooms.