

---

# 3C

## Information/Action

### *Educator Preparation Committee*

#### **Draft Recommendations of the Workgroup to Review the Design and Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessments and Updates on Approved Interim Actions**

---

**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 the item and provide feedback on (a) the Draft Recommendations to RDI-TPA Workgroup and (b) the progress on the Interim Actions.

**Presenters:** Adam Ebrahim, Senior Director, Juliet Wahleithner, Special Consultant, Kristin Calderone, Consultant, Policy and Continuous Improvement; Mandy Redfern and Ursula Estrada-Reveles, Co-Chairs, 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.

---

# Draft Recommendations of the Workgroup to Review the Design and Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessments and Updates on the Approved Interim Actions

---

## Introduction

This agenda item presents draft 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 an update on progress on the implementation of the Commission approved interim actions to address issues identified by the RDI-TPA Workgroup. The goal of the interim actions is 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](#).

Since its first meeting on September 19-20, 2024, the RDI-TPA Workgroup has held a total of seven meetings (October, November, December, January, February, March). Of these, six were two-day meetings held in person at the Commission, and one was a one-day virtual meeting. The workgroup has one remaining two-day, in-person meeting scheduled (April 23-24, 2025).

Initial recommendations for the five specific focus areas identified in Education Code section 44320.4 ([Appendix B](#)) were presented to the Commission on February 6, 2025 ([Agenda Item 4A](#)), along with a set of seven Interim Actions recommended by Commission staff. Commission members provided feedback on the initial recommendation and approved Staff to move forward with the proposed Interim Actions. Feedback on the initial recommendations was shared with RDI-TPA Workgroup members in the February meeting.

During the February and March meetings, workgroup members revised and consolidated the initial recommendations shared and developed additional recommendations for Focus Areas 3-5. (For more details on the Recommendation Development Process, see [Appendix C](#)).

Simultaneously, staff have been working to implement six of the Interim Actions approved by the Commission.

This agenda item presents the Draft Recommendations of the RDI-TPA Workgroup for Focus Areas 1-5, along with an update on the progress on the approved Interim Actions.

## Draft Recommendations

The following section presents the draft recommendations for the Commission's review and feedback. These recommendations have been developed through an iterative process ([Appendix C](#)) that included brainstorming, consolidation, drafting of initial recommendations, and ongoing refinement and consolidation.

Following the refinement of workgroup recommendations during the March 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, which reflect the votes of 20/22 workgroup members who submitted their responses by the deadline, 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.

**General Recommendation:** After discussions in the February RDI-TPA Workgroup meeting about the possible implications of Artificial Intelligence on the TPA, workgroup members developed a general recommendation for the Commission, outside the designated Focus Areas.

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

This recommendation is necessary because programs may or may not have a policy on usage of AI for candidates, but currently the Commission defers to program policy choice on the use of AI. Additionally, AI may change the nature of the TPA tasks.

Implementation of this recommendation is intended to create more equity within the system.

% Strong Support/Support	95%
Average Support Score	1.6

**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 of the excessive time spent on the current

expectations of the TPA, expectations 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	95%
Average Support Score	1.55

- **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. As is the case with the secondary passing rate, 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	75%
Average Support Score	0.95

- **Recommendation 1C:**

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 to reduce the emphasis on the written components that can create barriers, inequities, and linguistic bias.

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.

% Strong Support/Support	95%
Average Support Score	1.55

- **Recommendation 1D:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that the lessons required for the TPAs be

centered around culturally responsive/sustaining and equity-focused pedagogy within the tasks by:

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

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	90%
Average Support Score	1.45

- **Recommendation 1E:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that assessor training:

- Focus on prioritizing the evaluation of candidate knowledge (what they CAN do) utilizing an asset-based approach.
- Deepen assessor knowledge of the specific competencies and contexts they are assessing, including areas such as 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	70%
Average Support Score	1.05

- **Recommendation 1F:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that the state of California create a specific loan/grant program to fund candidate TPA fees. If a candidate qualifies and serves as a

teacher in California for a certain number of years, the award becomes a grant. If a candidate does not teach in California 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	75%
Average Support Score	1.3

- **Recommendation 1G:**

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	85%
Average Support Score	1.45

- **Recommendation 1H:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that the CTC develop a continuum of practice from preservice through in-service that integrates Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) and California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTPs). This continuum

should align preservice training, Teacher Performance Assessments (TPAs), and induction expectations to clarify teacher development and support a smooth transition into the profession.

This is necessary because no unified framework currently exists, creating gaps in alignment and making it difficult for candidates and mentors to understand how preservice preparation connects to in-service growth.

This recommendation is intended to strengthen connections between TPA and professional practice, helping candidates and mentors identify where demonstrated competencies fit and develop meaningful growth plans. A well-defined continuum would improve teaching effectiveness and student learning by providing a clearer path for professional development.

% Strong Support/Support	85%
Average Support Score	1.40

**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)]

- **Clarification for Focus Area 2:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends embedding formative and final experiences with the TPA in both coursework and clinical work.

% Strong Support/Support	85%
Average Support Score	1.45

- **Recommendation 2A:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends adding to Program Standard 5B the requirement that programs provide candidates individualized and timely feedback on both formative and final TPA work throughout the process prior to submission. This includes feedback on both pedagogy and submission criteria in order to ensure the process is formative and educative. Therefore, the group also recommends that current guidelines for acceptable support be revised to ensure the entire TPA process is formative and educative.

This recommendation is necessary to help make the TPA process educative for both candidates and the program.

Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by allowing programs to provide support throughout the development of the candidates' TPA submission and ensuring programs are responsible for guiding candidates in their improvement.

% Strong Support/Support	100%
Average Support Score	1.6

- **Recommendation 2B:**

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

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 for credential candidates.

% Strong Support/Support	90%
Average Support Score	1.55

- **Recommendation 2C:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that the TPA assessors provide rubric-specific feedback that highlights the exact criteria met and not met. The group also recommends that feedback be individualized in order to identify for candidates how the criteria was met within their evidence.

This recommendation is necessary because the current overall score and rubric scores do not provide candidates with enough information to determine why they scored as they did and what improvements may be needed for either resubmission or future teaching.

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	100%
Average Support Score	1.75

- **Recommendation 2D:**

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	95%
Average Support Score	1.5



- **Recommendation 2E:**

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	75%
Average Support Score	1.0

- **Recommendation 2F:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that programs be allowed to provide clear, specific feedback without providing answers - and that this feedback can be provided by any educational partners with proper training (e.g. mentors, faculty, peers).

This recommendation is necessary because there is confusion within the system about what feedback can and cannot be provided to candidates on their TPA.

Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by creating a clear message to programs and participants about the use of feedback on the TPA.

% Strong Support/Support	85%
Average Support Score	1.35

- **Recommendation 2G:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that all individuals involved in supporting candidates in their development as teachers, including course instructors, coaches/university supervisors, and mentor teachers, learn the specifics of the program's adopted TPA model, including understanding the specific tasks, rubrics, and evidence.

This recommendation is necessary because candidates need all individuals who directly support them to have a well-developed understanding of the TPA tasks and rubrics

Implementation of this recommendation addresses this by engaging individuals involved in supporting candidates in a critical and collaborative analysis of sample candidate TPA submissions.

% Strong Support/Support	95%
Average Support Score	1.5

**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 5A (4) be updated to emphasize the ways that programs use qualitative and quantitative data for continuous improvement as part of the accreditation process:

1. all program personnel who support candidates should be engaged in collaborative analysis of data;
2. some of the data required for analysis should set by CTC so there is some standardization across programs;
3. analysis must also occur at the level of candidate work (not just scores); and
4. analysis should include a triangulation with other assessment data within the program.

This recommendation is necessary because programs need to engage in analysis of their program-specific data in order to better understand areas of programmatic strength and areas for growth and develop plans for moving forward.

% Strong Support/Support	80%
Average Support Score	1.2

- **Recommendation 3B:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends CTC develop and support a system of shared accountability between preparation programs, CTC, and TPA model sponsors to address disproportionate TPA success rates.

This recommendation is necessary because evidence shows that candidates from underrepresented groups face systemic barriers and inequities with the TPA instruments and processes that contribute to lower success rates, which TPA providers and programs have a responsibility to address and perpetuate inequities in the teaching profession.

Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address these disparities by fostering transparency; providing actionable data to preparation programs, model sponsors, and CTC; and promoting equitable outcomes for all candidates.

% Strong Support/Support	80%
Average Support Score	1.35

- **Recommendation 3C:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that Program Standard 3D be revised to include professional development for LEA stakeholders and district employed supervisors/mentor teachers specific to the program's TPA model and required and

acceptable forms of support.

This recommendation is necessary because all constituents involved in a candidate's preparation should know and understand how to support the candidate through the performance assessment.

Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by creating a common understanding of the TPA for all constituents.

% Strong Support/Support	90%
Average Support Score	1.3

- **Recommendation 3D:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that Program Standard 5(B-1) be updated to include required forms of support (e.g., MOU modification to include release days for TPA completion and submission) specific to the needs of candidates in intern pathways.

This recommendation is necessary because teacher candidates on internship credentials have difficulty completing/passing the TPA because of the demands of full-time teaching while also completing a preliminary credential.

Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by providing targeted support specific to the needs of an intern teacher.

% Strong Support/Support	80%
Average Support Score	1.35

- **Recommendation 3E:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends adjusting Program Standard 5B(3) to require institutions to submit documentation on how they will support credential candidates (cost-free?) that have not successfully completed the performance assessment.

This recommendation is necessary to make sure candidates receive adequate support for TPA completion even after they have completed other program requirements.

Implementation of this recommendation is intended to hold programs accountable in accreditation for supporting candidates through completion of the TPA.

% Strong Support/Support	90%
Average Support Score	1.25

- **Recommendation 3F:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends Program Standard 5 require the TPA to be embedded within programs, as required by Ed. Code 44320.2.

This recommendation is necessary because there is no language in Program Standard 5, which states that programs are required to embed the TPA.

Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by adding the requirement.

% Strong Support/Support	85%
Average Support Score	1.25

- **Recommendation 3G:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that Program Standard 5 include the requirement for programs to embed the TPA in both fieldwork and coursework assignments. As part of embedding the TPA in fieldwork and coursework, candidates will receive and implement feedback on their teaching and be assessed on their implementation of feedback.

This recommendation is necessary to ensure that embedding is part of program standards and not just in statute so that programs will demonstrate evidence of how they are embedding the TPA during accreditation.

Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by requiring programs to create key formative assessments and set expected program outcomes so that preparation for and feedback on the TPA is embedded throughout the program.

% Strong Support/Support	90%
Average Support Score	1.25

- **Recommendation 3H:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that Program Standard 3D be revised to include the requirement that programs provide evidence of how they are supporting mentor teachers with training and resources for supporting candidates to successfully complete a TPA, which is embedded in the field work experience.

This recommendation is necessary because in order to truly embed the assessment in clinical practice, those most familiar with the clinical context must be prepared to support candidates within that context.

Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by providing more direction for programs to more closely align their clinical practice with TPA recommendations.

% Strong Support/Support	90%
Average Support Score	1.45

- **Recommendation 3I:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that Program Standard 5 be revised to require programs to monitor, gather data, and analyze data related to results that come from embedding the assessment in both coursework and clinical practice and utilize learning from the multiple constituents who participate in the local scoring experience to improve embedding practices in the coursework and fieldwork.

This recommendation is necessary to ensure that data is used to provide continuous feedback to programs to be utilized for program improvement as it relates to embedding the TPA into coursework and fieldwork.

Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by requiring programs to evaluate data from key formative assessments to set expected program outcomes so that preparation for and feedback on the TPA is embedded throughout the program and to improve communication across segments and within the field.

% Strong Support/Support	75%
Average Support Score	1.0

- **Recommendation 3J:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that Program Standard 5 be revised to include an orientation to engage credential candidates, including interns and their administrators; mentor teachers; and credential candidate supervising staff and faculty with meaningful professional learning opportunities, specific to the TPA tasks, rubrics, and scoring, and how they can be supported/support candidates through the process.

This recommendation is necessary because credential candidates are entitled to continuous feedback and opportunities for reflection. Also, this may allow educators to create meaningful connections between praxis and assessment and to offer opportunities to reflect on candidate growth before submitting the assessment.

Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by connecting the candidate more explicitly to support, feedback, and revision of the TPA.

% Strong Support/Support	85%
Average Support Score	1.1

- **Recommendation 3K:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends the CTC update their webpage to include the TPA passing rates for each teacher preparation program, information on the type of TPA offered by each program, and required TPA-related documents, such as rubrics and task descriptions. Programs should explicitly link to this data within their applicant portals or websites.

This recommendation is necessary because, by presenting this information clearly and transparently, candidates can better evaluate which program and pathway align with their professional goals and needs.

Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by creating clear, accessible, publicly available data for all stakeholders.

% Strong Support/Support	60%
Average Support Score	0.7

- **Recommendation 3L:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that program standards be revised to require use of information from the TPA to inform the development of IDP goals to develop an ILP within an induction program.

This recommendation is necessary because it will support the formative nature of the TPA.

Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by creating space for continual professional growth.

% Strong Support/Support	90%
Average Support Score	1.2

- **Recommendation 3M:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that Induction Program Standard 3 be revised to include consideration of TPA and IDP information in the development of the ILP and induction goals.

This recommendation is necessary because it will support the formative nature of the TPA throughout preservice and induction.

Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by creating space for continual professional growth.

% Strong Support/Support	80%
Average Support Score	1.25

**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 programs should engage in a method of local scoring that aligns to program improvement needs and candidate needs for support. The workgroup recommends there be some flexibility in what local scoring looks like as long as it meets criteria for local scoring that includes: Collaboration in training and scoring, scoring common sets of work, meeting inter-rater reliability standards set by the CTC, scorer training.

Some options might include:

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

% Strong Support/Support	80%
Average Support Score	1.05

- **Recommendation 4A-1:**

If the RDI-TPA Workgroup assumes that the TPA will be embedded (the TPA assignments will be course assignments) throughout the credential program coursework:

The workgroup recommends that faculty and/or instructors responsible for said course will be responsible for feedback and scoring the assessment components that are embedded in their course. Faculty and/or instructors would collaborate in training and scoring, score common sets of work, meet inter-rater reliability standards set by the CTC, and participate in scorer training.

This recommendation is necessary because it provides immediate feedback to candidates and can assist with eliminating condition codes, is formative nature for programs and candidates, allows for scorers to understand contexts and environments of classroom, and provides possibility of responsiveness to the contexts of the candidate (linguistic, geographic, cultural).

Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by having faculty and instructors score the component of the TPA that is assigned in their course.

% Strong Support/Support	65%
Average Support Score	0.7

- **Recommendation 4B** (*if we assume the TPA is an embedded assignment, this would be unnecessary*):

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that programs meet inter-rater reliability standards set by CTC and double 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. This supports candidates by ensuring the scorers are aware of the relevant context of the assessment and ensuring alignment between formative feedback and the expectations of the assessment.

% Strong Support/Support	85%
Average Support Score	1.15

- **Recommendation 4C:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup assumes that there may be costs associated with locally scoring work embedded in the program. The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that additional costs related to inter-rater reliability, validity, collaboration, scoring re-submissions, or calibration training be provided through funding from the state.

This recommendation is necessary because the candidates should not be required to shoulder the entire financial burden.

Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by ensuring adequate funding is available to support both candidates and programs.

% Strong Support/Support	75%
Average Support Score	1.0

- **Recommendation 4D:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that the local scoring process include rigorous calibration and a central auditing process to ensure reliability in scoring across programs.

This recommendation is necessary because it is important that the process be a strong one so that the schools, CTC, and legislators can rely on the outcomes.

Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by providing opportunities for collaboration in training and scoring, scoring common sets of work, meeting inter-rater reliability standards set by the CTC, and scorer calibration.

% Strong Support/Support	95%
Average Support Score	1.55

- **Recommendation 4E:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that the CTC works to identify barriers and necessary resources and supports to enable programs to engage in local scoring. Some mitigation of barriers and supports might include 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.

This recommendation is necessary because candidates have satisfactorily completed other aspects of the program, demonstrating proficiency, but have not passed the TPA, which can create financial hardship for credential candidates.

Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by providing instructional support to credential candidates in completing their final credential requirements. This is intended to address disproportionate candidate experience and opportunities for systemic improvement.



% Strong Support/Support	90%
Average Support Score	1.30

- **Recommendation 4F:**

*\*\*If 4A-1 is adopted, this is not needed.*

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that Program Standard 5 be revised to include the requirement that teacher preparation educators and LEA partners (e.g., cooperating teachers, administrators, district coaches, etc.) collaboratively engage together in scoring candidate TPA work.

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 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	70%
Average Support Score	0.95

- **Recommendation 4G:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that Program Standard 5 be revised to include the requirement that programs engage in local scoring as a way to look at student work in the disaggregate in order to better understand disproportionate pass rates. Programs will use the findings to refine their curricula in order to equitably support the development of all candidates, especially candidates who are disproportionately impacted by low pass rates.

This recommendation is necessary to build capacity for all constituents to understand and support candidates disproportionately affected by lower TPA pass rates.

Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address disproportionate candidate experience and to develop opportunities for systemic improvement.

% Strong Support/Support	75%
Average Support Score	1.15

- **Recommendation 4H:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that Program Standard 5 be revised to include an orientation to engage credential candidates, including interns and their administrators; mentor teachers; and credential candidate supervising staff and faculty with meaningful professional learning opportunities specific to the TPA tasks, rubrics, and scoring and how they can be supported/support candidates through the process.

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 candidates' work recommended above.

Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by requiring programs to conduct, monitor, and support this activity.

% Strong Support/Support	80%
Average Support Score	1.2

- **Recommendation 4I:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that the following be added to Required Elements for Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness 1(g): The TPA model sponsor must provide additional materials to programs, including passing examples for each credential area for all sections of the test, examples of common condition code issues, and examples of both successful/non successful responses, in order to help all educators involved in the preparation of credential candidates become familiar with the design of the TPA model, the candidate tasks, and the scoring rubrics so that they can effectively assist candidates to prepare for the assessment and assist in scoring candidate submissions with local scoring.

This recommendation is necessary to support programs in embedding the TPA within their program and provide more quality support for candidates while being more transparent on expectations to pass the TPA.

Implementation of this recommendation is intended to address this by requiring model sponsors to provide differentiated and more specific materials to programs and candidates.

% Strong Support/Support	80%
Average Support Score	1.15

- **Recommendation 4J:**

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that a TPA Model Sponsor shall be an accredited institution, group of accredited institutions, or the state commission.

This recommendation is necessary because a focused, local, non-profit assessment reflects the values of the TPA.

% Strong Support/Support	50%
Average Support Score	0.45

**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 that the existing CalTPA survey be reviewed and revised to ensure that it gathers relevant and meaningful data about each of the RDI-TPA Workgroup Focus Areas. This survey would include both close-ended and open-ended items and be incorporated within each of the approved TPA models.

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 identifying preparation practices to ensure better support for future candidates.

% Strong Support/Support	85%
Average Support Score	1.2

### **Interim Actions**

In addition to presenting the Initial Recommendations at the February Commission meeting, Commission staff and RDI-TPA Co-Chairs presented seven Interim Actions developed in response to concerns raised by the RDI-TPA Workgroup. The actions 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. The Commission voted to approve the Interim Actions.

Interim Actions 1 and 2 both relate to condition codes, which are issued by assessors to submissions deemed un-scorable. For example, content-based condition codes (Interim Action 1) include, among other things, issues such as the response does not align with the cycle to which it was submitted, or the response does not cite English Language Development Standards. Technical condition codes (Interim Action 2) are issued when a response is submitted to the wrong content area or there is a problem with the submitted video. Candidates whose submissions are given a condition code do not receive a score and instead must address the issue and resubmit.

The following is an update on progress made in implementing the actions.

**Interim Action 1: Update TPAs as necessary to eliminate the use of content-based condition codes.**

## CalTPA

**Current Progress:** The Commission Performance Assessment Team reviewed the existing condition code system and made multiple recommendations. These recommendations included consolidating existing codes, revising policies, and revising rubrics to maximize opportunities for scoring. The proposed revisions have been reviewed internally and are currently being reviewed by Evaluation Systems. In the short term, scoring guidelines have been revised to allow for video edits, so candidates will no longer receive a condition code if the assessor determines the video was edited.

**Next Steps:** Rubrics and scoring procedures for the 25-26 versions, which are currently being finalized and will be operationalized in late summer 2025, will be reviewed and revised to maximize scoring opportunities in an effort to eliminate condition codes. For example, scoring guidelines will be revised to ensure that candidates who do not cite a specific English Language Development Standard will not receive a condition code and will have their submissions scored.

## edTPA

**Current Progress:** Commission staff met with Evaluation Systems to do an initial review of the edTPA condition codes.

**Next Steps:** Based on proposed revisions to CalTPA condition codes, Commission staff will work with Evaluation Systems to implement revisions to the edTPA scoring guidelines in an effort to eliminate as many content-based condition codes as possible.

## FAST

FAST does not issue condition codes to candidates. Instead, submissions are scored as submitted.

**Interim Action 2: Redirect candidate submissions with technical condition codes back to the candidates so they can resolve identified technical issue(s) and resubmit at no additional cost.**

**Current Progress:** In February, Evaluation Systems began providing vouchers to candidates who receive the A2 Condition Code: "Submission corresponds to a different content or credential area than the area for which the candidate registered" on their submission of either the CalTPA or the edTPA. This voucher allows the candidate to resubmit without paying an additional fee. The A2 code was selected because it is the most frequently assigned condition code (155 instances on CalTPA submissions between August and January 2024).

Additionally, beginning in February, vouchers are now issued to candidates who have submitted an assessment two or more times and who, on the most recent submission, received a condition code or failed the attempt. In the February 6, 2025, score reporting, 15 candidates received vouchers due to two or more submission attempts and receipt of at least one technical condition code.

As highlighted above, for all remaining scoring periods, candidates will be allowed to edit their submission videos, meaning condition codes will no longer be issued for video edits.

**Next Steps:** While the steps described above allow candidates to resubmit without paying additional fees, there is still an extended timeline from candidates' initial submission, when they are notified, and when they are able to resubmit. Commission staff are currently working with Evaluation Systems to shorten this timeline so that candidates may resubmit in a more timely manner.

**Interim Action 3: Issue updated *Guidelines for Acceptable Support* clarifying that direct, ongoing feedback from faculty, supervisors, and mentor teachers aimed at improving candidate responses and addressing technical issues leading to condition codes are important, acceptable and encouraged forms of support.**

**Current Progress:** Commission staff have drafted a Program Sponsor Alert to be distributed to programs that (a) reiterates the language of the program standards that address supporting candidates with the TPA and (b) provides examples of the types of supports that programs can provide, generally and through coursework and clinical practice.

Additionally, the Commission Performance Assessment Team led a Digging Deeper webinar in March for CalTPA programs focused on providing acceptable supports to candidates. The webinar featured representatives from two programs sharing their best practices.

**Next Steps:** In the coming months, staff intend to hold additional webinars for programs, regardless of which TPA model they use, and speak at program faculty conferences/convenings to provide guidance on what acceptable support looks like in practice.

Existing CalTPA, edTPA, and FAST Acceptable Support documents will also be reviewed by Commission staff and revisions will be suggested to ensure what constitutes acceptable support is clearly communicated.

**Interim Action 4: Standardize the Commission's system for collecting and reporting TPA outcome data. Establish clear metrics to inform policy decisions and support improvements in preparation programs.**

**Current Progress:** The Office of Policy and Improvement has convened a Data Team to centralize TPA reporting moving forward and to develop standards for pass rate calculations and other key metrics that illuminate candidates' experiences and outcomes. These standards will apply to both the Accreditation Data System (ADS) environment and future Performance Assessment Annual Reports.

**Next Steps:** Detailed Performance Assessment data and visualizations will be provided back to programs so they can review their candidates' pass rates, average length of time and number of attempts to pass, condition code distribution, and eligibility for the secondary passing standard for continuous improvement. The same data will be visible to Accreditation staff to ensure programs are adequately preparing and supporting candidates for the TPA.

**Interim Action 5: Ensure a system of notification is in place for candidates that fall within the secondary passing standard that includes simultaneous notification to the preparation**

**program and clear information for candidates and programs regarding the process for demonstrating readiness by alternate means.**

**Current Progress:** The Commission Performance Assessment Team revised the notification sent by Evaluation Systems to candidates whose submission scores fall within the secondary passing range. The updated notification ([Appendix D](#)) provides specific details for candidates about the secondary passing standard and guidelines about what next steps they can take. The updated notification was first distributed to candidates with the March 13, 2025, score reports, with a copy to their designated program TPA coordinators, and will continue to be distributed with each future score report.

**Next Steps:** Commission staff will next develop a notification specifically for programs whose candidates' scores fall within the secondary passing standard. In particular, the notification will aim to clarify, at a minimum, (a) programs' responsibility to evaluate candidates for the secondary passing standard, (b) which candidates are eligible for the evaluation, and (c) what is required to be evaluated.

**Interim Action 6: Issue a notification to all programs identifying their TPA first-time pass rates, based on both scorable and non-scorable submissions, and provide evidence-based recommendations for strengthening candidate supports and guidance to reduce/eliminate candidate condition codes.**

**Current Progress:** First-time pass rates are being calculated pursuant to the TPA Reporting Standards from Interim Action Item 4 above. As high performing programs are identified, Commission staff will field and consolidate recommendations and best practices for preparing and supporting candidates throughout the TPA process.

**Next Steps:** The notification will go out to programs in the coming months and will include clear data definitions.

**Interim Action 7: Direct staff to report on implementation progress of these interim actions during future RDI-TPA Workgroup items before the Commission.**

The Interim Actions and the progress on their implementation were reported to RDI-TPA Workgroup members at the group's February meeting.

#### **Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Commission review the item and provide feedback on (a) the Draft Recommendations to RDI-TPA Workgroup and (b) the progress on the Interim Actions.

#### **Next Steps**

Staff will relay Commission feedback to the RDI-TPA Workgroup for consideration in the development of final recommendations.

## Appendix A

<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>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>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>Devin Beasley</b> CalTPA Coordinator CSU Dominguez Hills	<b>Alicia Herrera</b> Assistant Professor CSU Sacramento
<b>Vanessa Escobar</b> Director LA Charter School Teacher Residency Consortium	<b>Benjamin Odell</b> Director of Intern Program Sacramento County Office of Education
<b>Tory Harvey</b> Director of Teacher Education UC Santa Barbara	<b>Shayna Sullivan</b> Dean Alder Graduate School of Education
<b>Colin Haysman</b> Senior Clinical Associate Stanford University	<b>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>Cathy Creasia</b> Director of Accreditation and Credentialing USC Rossier School of Education	<b>Tine Sloan</b> Professor Emeritus UC Santa Barbara
<b>Brent Duckor</b> Professor of Education San Jose State University	<b>Matt Wallace</b> Associate Professor of Teaching UC Davis
<b>Ursula Estrada-Reveles</b> Executive Director, School of Education Riverside County Office of Education	<b>Beverly Young</b> Executive Director Above & Beyond Teaching

*\*Juliet 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**

### **Five Focus Areas Identified in Education Code section 44320.4**

Education Code section 44320.4 identifies five specific areas for which the RDI-TPA Workgroup is to make recommendations. 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)]

## Appendix C

### 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 articulated their initial ideas either verbally or by submitting them through a form. Each idea was 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 were grouped into thematic categories and ranked by priority score. Workgroup members met in groups according to thematic categories to consolidate duplicative recommendations. Each group developed a concise rationale and a theory of action for their recommendations, which were 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 were presented to the Commission at the February 2025 meeting for feedback.
- **Phase 4: Draft Recommendations**  
The workgroup incorporated feedback from the February 2025 Commission meeting into the recommendations during a workgroup meeting two weeks later. During its February and March meetings, the workgroup further developed Focus Area 3, 4, and 5 recommendations. The full set of refined recommendations are being presented here as Draft Recommendations for additional feedback.
- **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.

## Appendix D

### CalPA & CA edTPA Secondary (-1 SEM) Passing Standards Email Template

**Subject:** Important Information Regarding the Performance Assessment Secondary Passing Standard

Dear [Candidate],

You are receiving this notification because you have met the criteria for the secondary passing standard. Under this standard, a candidate who has demonstrated competence across all Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) but narrowly missed the adopted passing score may still satisfy the performance assessment requirement, provided that other evidence of the candidate's performance related to the Teaching Performance Expectations is considered.

The decision to recommend a candidate using the secondary passing standard rests with an approved preparation program. Programs are responsible for evaluating whether a candidate has met the required competencies through coursework, clinical practice, and other available evidence. If a program determines that sufficient evidence exists to support your readiness for a credential, it may recommend you to the Commission without requiring resubmission of the performance assessment.

Please contact your program to discuss your eligibility, next steps, and any additional options available to you. (Refer to PSA-24-02).

#### CalTPA, EdSp CalTPA, and edTPA Secondary Passing Standard\*

Teaching Performance Assessment	Adopted TPA Passing Standard	Secondary Passing Standard with TPE Evidence
Cal TPA Multiple and Single Subject Cycle 1	19 with no more than one score of 1 allowed	16 with no more than one score of 1 allowed
Cal TPA Multiple and Single Subject Cycle 2	21 with no more than one score of 1 allowed	18 with no more than one score of 1 allowed
Cal TPA Mild to Moderate Support Needs Cycle 1	17 with no more than one score of 1 allowed	15 with no more than one score of 1 allowed
Cal TPA Mild to Moderate Support Needs Cycle 2	19 with no more than one score of 1 allowed	17 with no more than one score of 1 allowed
Cal TPA Extensive Support Needs Cycle 1	15	12
Cal TPA Extensive Support Needs Cycle 2	17	15
edTPA 13 rubric handbook	35	32
edTPA 15 rubric handbook	41	38
edTPA 18 rubric handbook	49	46
edTPA Education Specialist	5	32

\*If you have already passed your performance assessment at the adopted passing standard, congratulations! You may disregard this notice.

Sincerely,  
*California Educator Credentialing Assessments Customer Support*

cc: [EPP Primary Score Report Contact Name]