

Focus Area 2: Reviewing/Revising Initial Recommendations

March 2025 RDI-TPA Meeting

RDI-TPA Workgroup Charge

RDI-TPA Workgroup 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, and contribute to program improvement through the accreditation system.

RDI-TPA Focus Areas

Focus Area 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)]

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

Focus Area 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)]

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

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

Recommendations Development Process

RDI-TPA Workgroup (WG) recommendations are developed in five distinct phases and remain open for refinement until they are prioritized in their final form and sent to the June 2025 Commission Meeting for action. The recommendation development phases are as follows:

1. Recommendation Brainstorm

Following a period of inquiry, WG members articulate initial ideas verbally or submit recommendation ideas through a form. Each idea is prioritized by WG members using a scoring system (+2 for strong support, +1 for support, 0 for neutral, -1 for oppose, and -2 for strong oppose).

2. Consolidated Recommendations

Prioritized brainstorm recommendations were grouped into thematic categories and arrayed in order of priority score. Workgroup members met in groups according to the thematic category and consolidated duplicative recommendations. WG members then developed a concise rationale and theory of action for each recommendation and present it to the whole group for feedback.

Focus Area 2: Reviewing/Revising Initial Recommendations

March 2025 RDI-TPA Meeting

3. Initial Recommendations

During the February 2025 RDI-TPA Workgroup meeting, all consolidated recommendations were further refined based on feedback received in between meetings. The initial list of consolidated recommendations organized by focus area and thematic category was assembled. Workgroup members then prioritized and scored the revised consolidated recommendation.

4. Draft Recommendations

The WG will consider members' scores and feedback to the initial recommendations at the March meeting and make further refinements. The refined set of initial recommendations will go forward to the April 2025 Commission meeting as Draft Recommendations.

5. Final Recommendations

The WG will consider feedback generated during the April 2025 Commission meeting at their WG meeting two weeks later and make further refinements. The refined set of draft recommendations will go forward to the June 2025 Commission meeting as Final Recommendations.

Note: Scoring reflects 22/24 RDI-TPA Workgroup Members support polls received by the deadline.

Focus Area 2: Reviewing/Revising Initial Recommendations

March 2025 RDI-TPA Meeting

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

Focus Area 2: Reviewing/Revising Initial Recommendations

March 2025 RDI-TPA Meeting

- **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

Focus Area 2: Reviewing/Revising Initial Recommendations

March 2025 RDI-TPA Meeting

- **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