
3B

Information/Action

Educator Preparation Committee

Implementation Plan for Commission-Adopted Recommendations from the Workgroup to Review the Design and Implementation of Teaching Performance Assessments

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents a plan to implement the Commission-adopted recommendations from the Workgroup to Review the Design and Implementation of Teaching Performance Assessments. It outlines phases of work, including updates to standards, preconditions, and assessment policies, as well as improvements to data collection and reporting. The item also identifies areas where staff may return with options to support clear and coordinated implementation.

Recommended Action: That the Commission review, provide feedback, and if appropriate, approve the proposed Senate Bill 1263 Implementation Plan.

Presenters: Adam Ebrahim, Chief Deputy Director, Erin Sullivan, Director, Professional Services Division, and Juliet Wahleithner, Director, Division of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment

Strategic Plan Goal

Continuous Improvement

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

Implementation Plan for Commission-Adopted Recommendations from the Workgroup to Review the Design and Implementation of Teaching Performance Assessments

Introduction

Senate Bill 1263 (Newman) directed the Commission to review California’s teaching performance assessment and broader educator preparation systems. In June 2025, the Commission adopted recommendations from the RDI-TPA Workgroup as the foundation for the next phase of this work. This item presents a proposed implementation plan organized around three core components: redesigning the performance assessment system, strengthening program implementation and integration, and developing Commission supports for the field.

Background

Since 2008, California has required teaching candidates to complete a program that includes a Commission-approved performance assessment for initial licensure, grounding educator preparation in observable teaching aligned to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. The system matured, as the state transitioned from a single assessment model to multiple approved options, strengthened alignment to coursework and clinical practice, and began implementation of performance assessment into accreditation and continuous improvement processes.

In 2014, the Commission adopted a five-part accountability framework to support high-quality educator preparation in California. The framework includes: (1) streamlined, outcomes-focused program standards; (2) valid and reliable performance assessments; (3) consistent outcomes measures, including surveys of program completers and employers; (4) accreditation processes that prioritize evidence over narrative; and (5) public transparency through accessible, comparable data. These components are interdependent and designed to work together as a coherent system. Within this structure, the teaching performance assessment was to function as a central mechanism for verifying candidate competence, strengthening program quality, and informing both accreditation and public reporting.

Over time, implementation of the performance assessment drifted from the original framework and intent. Candidates increasingly experienced the TPA as a time-intensive requirement that felt separate from their preparation. Faculty reported challenges embedding the assessment effectively in coursework, and programs felt a disconnect with accreditation activities. The added cost and frequency of candidate retakes sustained real concerns about equity and access. These dynamics diminished the TPA’s value as a formative tool and limited its effectiveness as a source of evidence for candidate and program growth.

The current moment presents a distinct set of challenges for educator preparation. Rising student needs, staffing shortages, and greater demands on teacher adaptability are reshaping

classroom conditions. Generative artificial intelligence is altering the teaching and learning landscape in ways still emerging. Economic pressures on educators and students alike have intensified, with classrooms often becoming the venue for challenging behaviors linked to increased disparity and trauma. In this context, the performance assessment must serve as a meaningful vehicle for contextualized candidate development, a source of clear, reliable evidence of readiness, and a tool to inform growth during induction.

Senate Bill 1263 (Newman) reaffirmed California’s use of performance assessment as both a condition of licensure and an accountability tool to ensure educator preparation programs deliver value commensurate with the investment made by candidates. The law directed the Commission to examine and improve the design, implementation, and use of the current system, including convening a workgroup to develop recommendations that support high-quality, accessible, and educative preparation. In June 2025, the Commission adopted the recommendations of the RDI-TPA Workgroup and directed staff to return with a phased implementation plan.

Item Organization

This proposed implementation plan is organized into five sections. The Legal Foundation outlines statutory requirements for the teaching performance assessment, including design expectations, implementation conditions, and accountability functions. It also defines the roles of the Commission and educator preparation programs. The Project Areas section organizes the adopted RDI-TPA recommendations into a structure that supports implementation across three areas of work: assessment design, program implementation, and Commission supports. This section also provides detailed implementation strategies for each area. The Phased Implementation Plan presents a sequenced timeline of major deliverables across four phases. The Risk and Mitigation Strategies section identifies key risks and outlines actions to support successful implementation. The item concludes with a summary and the requested action.

Legal Foundation for Performance Assessments

California’s requirement for a teaching performance assessment is established in Education Code section 44259, which provides that candidates for a preliminary credential must demonstrate the ability to teach through a performance-based assessment. This requirement is further developed in Education Code section 44320.2 ([Appendix A](#)), which defines design expectations for the assessment, assigns responsibilities to educator preparation programs, and outlines obligations of the Commission.

Education Code section 44320.2 subdivision (b) requires that performance assessments be aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession ([Appendix B](#)) and applied consistently across similar preparation programs. Subdivision (b) also states that assessments must be embedded in preparation programs to the maximum feasible extent and must provide formative information to candidates, faculty, and supervisors to support the development of teaching knowledge, skills, and abilities. Results must be used to inform credential recommendations and the development of individual induction plans. In addition, subdivision

(f) authorizes the use of a secondary passing standard in combination with other evidence of candidate competence.

Preparation programs are required to implement a teaching performance assessment that meets these standards. Under subdivision (b), programs may adopt an assessment developed and approved by the Commission or develop their own model for Commission approval. Subdivision (c) requires that assessments be administered during the regular duration of the candidate’s preparation program. Programs are also responsible for orienting candidates and educational partners to the structure and expectations of the selected model and for using assessment results to support credential decisions.

The Commission is responsible for ensuring the quality, fairness, and integrity of the performance assessment system. Under subdivision (d), the Commission must convene an expert advisory panel, composed of at least one-third classroom teachers, to advise on assessment design, performance standards, and developmental scoring scales. Subdivision (e) requires the Commission to establish and maintain standards for assessment content, assessor training, administration, and review; conduct analyses of validity and reliability; identify and address sources of bias; and collect and report individual and aggregated results. Subdivision (e) also directs the Commission to revise its accreditation systems as needed to ensure that programs provide adequate opportunities for candidates to demonstrate the required competencies.

In addition, subdivision (e) requires the Commission to report the number of programs with low pass rates and support those programs in implementing evidence-based strategies to assist candidates. The statute prohibits charging candidates for these supports, reinforcing the expectation that both programs and the state share responsibility for candidate success.

Together, these provisions establish a clear statutory framework for a performance assessment system that serves both formative and accountability functions. Education Code section 44320.2 positions performance assessment as an embedded learning process, a source of actionable data, and a safeguard for preparation quality. The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommendations adopted by the Commission in June 2025 were developed with direct reference to these statutory obligations and are intended to ensure that the system continues to serve candidates, programs, and the public with integrity and purpose.

The following table summarizes the specific provisions of Education Code section 44320.2 for ease of reference. Requirements are organized by entity to reflect the division of responsibilities across the assessment system.

Table 1. Education Code Section 44320.2 Quick Reference Guide

Educator Preparation Programs Must:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Include teaching performance assessment aligned with CSTP and state content standards (b)(1)• Choose between Commission-developed or own locally developed assessment (b)(1)

- Orient candidates and educational partners to structure and expectations of the assessment (c)
- Administer assessment during the regular term/duration of candidate's preparation program (c)
- Use Commission-reported performance assessment results to serve as basis for individual induction plans (b)(5)
- Use Commission-reported performance assessment results as one basis for credential recommendations (b)(4)

The Commission Must:

Assessment Development and Standards

- Convene expert panel (at least 1/3 classroom teachers) to advise on design, content, administration, scoring (d)(1)
- Design, develop, and implement assessment standards and assessor training program (d)(2)
- Establish review panel to examine other assessment options against Commission standards (d)(3)
- Establish appropriate performance standards (d)(5)

Quality Assurance

- Initially and periodically analyze validity and reliability (d)(4)
- Analyze sources of bias and act promptly to eliminate discovered bias (d)(6)
- Ensure state-approved assessments are consistently applied across similar programs (e)(1)

Implementation Requirements

- Implement without increasing number of required assessments (c)
- Ensure assessment during normal term/duration of preparation program (c)
- Ensure assessment is aligned with CSTP and meets Commission administration standards (e)(1)
- Ensure assessments are ongoing and blended into preparation program to maximum feasible extent (b)(2)
- Provide formative assessment information to improve teaching knowledge, skills, abilities (b)(3)

Data and Accountability

- Collect, analyze, and report individual and aggregated results (d)(7)
- Use aggregated results as one source of program quality information (e)(2)
- Report number of programs with low pass rates (e)(3)
- Assist low-performing programs with evidence-based strategies (no fees to candidates for instructional supports) (e)(3)
- Examine and revise accreditation system as necessary to ensure preparation opportunities (e)(4)
- Maintain secondary passing standard (used with other evidence of candidate performance) (f)

Project Areas and RDI-TPA Recommendations Clusters

The SB 1263 implementation plan is organized into three project areas. The first area focuses on the redesign of California’s teaching performance assessment, including revisions to assessment tasks, rubrics, and overall design to improve alignment with preparation practice, candidate experience, and statutory requirements. The second addresses preparation program implementation, including review and potential revision of Program Standards, Common Standards, and accreditation processes to integrate the revised assessment system. The third centers on Commission supports for the field, including candidate surveys, programmatic resources, accountability structures for low pass rates, and strategies to improve financial accessibility for candidates.

Each project area includes clusters of related recommendations from the RDI-TPA Workgroup, organized as coherent packages of work for Commission staff to carry forward. As directed by the Commission in June 2025, these recommendations inform the development of a phased implementation plan. Staff will implement the recommendations as guiding principles, translating them into updated standards, assessment and platform specifications, and procedural improvements consistent with statutory requirements and Commission authority. This structure enables effective sequencing, identifies cross-program implementation dependencies, and supports coherent development across assessment, preparation programs, and support systems. In subsequent sections of this item, these clusters are translated into a work breakdown structure that is mapped to a phased implementation timeline. Alignment tables for each project area appear in the sections that follow and illustrate how selected recommendations inform the scope and focus of implementation. The full text of the recommendations is provided in [Appendix C](#).

Table 2. Project Area 1 Performance Assessment Design

Project Area 1: Performance Assessment Design
<i>Assessment/Platform Design</i>
1C – Expand flexibility and multiple modalities for candidate evidence
1B – Redesign PA structure for clarity, UDL alignment, and smaller segments
1A – Embed asset-based, inclusive teaching in PA tasks
<i>Feedback Systems</i>
3B – Require individualized formative feedback throughout PA process
1D – Require individualized, rubric-specific, asset-based scorer feedback
1E – Require prompt candidate notification for technical condition codes
5A – Create a candidate survey on PA experience
<i>Cost Control</i>
1F – Ensure the PA is financially accessible
4B – PA upgrade costs not passed to candidates

Project Area 1: Performance Assessment Design

Assessment/Platform Design

Project Area 1 focuses on the comprehensive redesign of California's performance assessment system to fulfill the requirements of Education Code section 44320.2 and strengthen its instructional value for candidates and utility for preparation programs.

The redesigned assessment is expected to emphasize inclusive and asset-based teaching practices (Recommendation 1A). Candidates would demonstrate the ability to draw on students' strengths, prior knowledge, and community contexts to support learning.

The revised structure also calls for supporting multiple modalities for evidence submission (Recommendation 1C) to better reflect diverse instructional contexts. Tasks are expected to be reorganized into smaller, manageable segments embedded throughout coursework and clinical experiences, in alignment with Universal Design for Learning principles and intended to reduce duplication and improve usability (Recommendation 1B).

A secure statewide platform will support submission, feedback, scoring, and data reporting for all approved assessments. Together, these changes aim to align the assessment more closely with the instructional realities of preparation programs, reducing friction and enabling meaningful integration.

Feedback Systems

The redesign also calls for strengthened feedback systems to support the assessment's educative function. Preparation programs would provide candidates with ongoing, individualized feedback throughout the performance assessment process (Recommendation 3B), using an asset-based approach aligned to rubric criteria (Recommendation 1D).

The performance assessment platform could also include features that notify candidates of technical issues that prevent submission, reducing delays and minimizing resubmission burden (Recommendation 1E). In parallel, a statewide candidate survey is proposed to gather data on preparation experiences and the perceived formative value of the assessment (Recommendation 5A).

The goal is to ensure the assessment provides timely, relevant information that helps candidates improve, helps programs adapt, and helps the system function more efficiently.

Cost Controls

Affordability remains a core design principle. The implementation plan calls for minimizing direct costs to candidates wherever possible (Recommendation 1F) and avoiding the transfer of platform development or maintenance expenses to users (Recommendation 4B).

While the staff cannot commit to the feasibility of a no-cost model at this stage, staff will engage broadly with preparation programs and stakeholders and conduct targeted market research to explore viable cost structures. These efforts will inform decisions to ensure the assessment system remains financially accessible while still being of sufficient quality to

support embedding within coursework, formative use by candidates and programs, and continuous improvement across the system.

Table 3. Project Area 2 Accountability and Support for the Field

Project Area 2: Program Implementation
<p><i>Embedding</i></p> <p>3A – Embed PA tasks in coursework and clinical practice</p> <p>2B – Require orientation for all educational partners on adopted PA model</p> <p>3B – Require individualized formative feedback throughout PA process</p> <p>4A – Require local scoring methods that align with improvement needs</p> <p>3F – Require educator analysis of candidate PA responses</p> <p>3H – Require program monitoring of PA embedding and local scoring outcomes</p> <p><i>Program Implementation Oversight</i></p> <p>3G – Emphasize use of PA data in Common Standard 4</p> <p>3D – Include PA as an assessment in each program matrix for accreditation</p> <p>3C – Require documentation on how programs will support non-passing candidates</p> <p>3I – Require support tailored for intern pathway candidates</p> <p>3E – Use PA results to inform IDP and ILP goals</p>

Embedding

Education Code section 44320.2(e) requires that performance assessment results inform licensure decisions, guide induction planning, support accreditation review, and that results be reported publicly as part of a statewide program accountability system.

Implementation calls for re-embedding performance assessment tasks within coursework and clinical practice (Recommendation 3A). This shift is foundational to restoring the assessment’s instructional relevance and will likely require a reset in how programs approach the use of performance assessments.

To support this shift, the plan calls for structured orientations for faculty, supervisors, and educational partners to build shared understanding of the revised model (Recommendation 2B). It also affirms expectations for individualized formative feedback throughout the assessment process (Recommendation 3B) and the use of local scoring methods that align with each program’s internal improvement goals (Recommendation 4A).

Programs would be expected to monitor the implementation and outcomes of embedded and locally scored assessments as part of their ongoing improvement efforts (Recommendation 3H). Faculty who support candidates would review candidate submissions as part of their regular responsibilities, using that analysis to strengthen instruction and inform program design (Recommendation 3F).

Program Implementation Oversight

The Commission will explore updating Common Standard 4 to clarify expectations for the use of assessment data in continuous improvement (Recommendation 3G) and require inclusion of assessment tasks within program matrices submitted for accreditation review (Recommendation 3D).

Programs will be required to document structured support systems for candidates who do not pass on their initial attempt (Recommendation 3C) and provide tailored assistance for candidates in intern pathways (Recommendation 3I).

Assessment results will inform both preservice Individual Development Plans and induction-based Individual Learning Plans (Recommendation 3E), establishing a coherent connection across the educator preparation continuum. These recommendations provide a framework for reinforcing program oversight through clearer standards, enhanced documentation, and alignment of assessment data with candidate support and continuous improvement.

Table 4. Project Area 3 Accountability and Support for the Field

Project Area 3: Accountability and Support for the Field
<i>Supports for the Field: Current and Future PA Models</i> 2D – Develop a preservice-to-induction continuum of practice 2C – Initiate statewide learning and feedback loops for PA Supplemental – Convene expert group to study AI impact on PA 3J – Establish criteria for identifying lower performing programs
<i>Supports for the Field: Future PA Model</i> 2B – Develop orientation for all educational partners on adopted PA model 2A – Provide exemplar materials to support program familiarity with PA

Project Area 3: Accountability and Support for the Field

Supports for the Field: Current and Future PA Models

The third project area establishes the tools, structures, and resources the Commission will provide to ensure effective implementation of the revised teaching performance assessment system. It also includes the development of the system of support and improvement for programs with low candidate performance assessment pass rates.

As assessment design and program expectations are updated, preparation programs will require coherent guidance, shared materials, and accessible infrastructure to integrate the assessment meaningfully into coursework and clinical practice. This project area builds the operational bridge between policy and practice, ensuring implementation is supported at both the program and candidate levels and that reforms are sustainable over time.

The Commission recently released a comprehensive Continuum of Teaching Practice that integrates the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) and the California Standards for the

Teaching Profession (CSTPs), providing a shared reference point for candidate growth and evaluation (Recommendation 2D).

To support broader engagement with the field, statewide convenings will be held to facilitate shared learning, multi-directional feedback, and a common understanding of system goals (Recommendation 2C). Early in 2026, an expert advisory group will examine the role of artificial intelligence in the future of performance assessment design and implementation, with findings expected to inform the revision of assessment design standards and specifications (Supplemental Recommendation).

Supports for the Field: Future PA Model

The Commission will develop a suite of implementation resources to support program and faculty readiness. These include annotated exemplars of candidate submissions across credential areas (Recommendation 2A), orientation materials for faculty and educational partners (Recommendation 2B), and guidance on integrating tasks and rubrics into existing program structures.

Training modules, exemplar workflows, and technical documentation will also be developed to assist faculty, mentors, and supervisors in embedding assessment activities into instructional practice. These resources will also be supportive of other entities interested in developing their own performance assessment model.

The supports provided by the Commission will also function to support educator preparation programs with persistently low pass rates (Recommendation 3J). Consistent with Education Code section 44320.2, the Commission holds a critical responsibility to establish clear criteria for identifying lower performing educator preparation programs, including analyzing pass rates and disaggregated outcomes for specific candidate populations.

Recommendation 3J calls for the Commission to address these findings through accreditation and continuous improvement processes, ensuring targeted support and oversight for programs needing intervention. This dual focus on accountability and support serves not only to uphold program quality but also to safeguard the substantial investment candidates make in their preparation. Maintaining rigorous standards and fostering program improvement will be central to sustaining confidence in the licensure system and advancing equitable access to the teaching profession.

Phased Implementation Plan

The project areas provide a throughline from concept to execution. They group related recommendations into coherent work streams in performance assessment design, program implementation, and Commission supports so that policy goals, statutory requirements, and operational steps remain connected. The project areas also help organize the work internally, as they align roughly with different areas of responsibility across Commission divisions and teams. Within each project area, the recommendations have been translated into concrete actions and sequenced in the Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) to define deliverables, dependencies, and decision points. This organization is carried forward into the phased development plan. The phases describe how these actions will be staged over time, showing how standards, specifications, program requirements, and field supports will be built, tested,

and refined in a deliberate sequence leading to full statewide implementation. The complete chronological WBS is available in [Appendix D](#).

Table 5. Phase 1: Foundational Design and Early Alignment (Q3 2025–Q1 2026)

WBS	Qtr.	Yr	Short Description
1.1	Q3	2025	Staff prepares updated PA Design Standards revisions
3.1	Q3	2025	Staff plans statewide Meredith Fellows PA conference and AI preconference
1.2	Q4	2025	Expert Panel reviews updated PA Design Standards revisions
2.1	Q4	2025	Staff begin drafting Program and Common Standards revisions
3.2	Q4	2025	Staff develops low performing program identification criteria/support system

Phase 1: Foundational Design and Early Alignment (Q3 2025–Q1 2026)

The initial phase focuses on establishing the foundational standards, specifications, and planning tools necessary to implement statutory requirements. Division of Research Evaluation and Assessment (DREA) will prepare proposed revisions to the Performance Assessment Design Standards in alignment with statute and the RDI-TPA recommendations (WBS 1.1). These standards, once adopted, will govern the design, implementation, and approval of any performance assessment submitted to the Commission, establishing a common set of requirements across all sponsors. They will translate requirements such as formative feedback, alignment to the CSTPs, and bias reduction into updated expectations for model sponsors. The Expert Panel, which includes classroom teachers as specified in law, will review the proposed standards in Q4 2025 (WBS 1.2), with revisions brought to the Commission for review and possible adoption in Q1 2026 (WBS 1.3)

Concurrently, the Professional Services Division (PSD) will begin drafting revisions to the Program and Common Standards to ensure structural alignment between program expectations and the revised assessment system (WBS 2.1). These updates form the basis for future accreditation revisions and will carry forward the policy shift toward deeper integration of assessment into coursework and clinical practice. DREA and PSD will jointly develop the framework for identifying and supporting lower performing programs (WBS 3.2). This framework will define clear, data-informed thresholds using candidate performance, program improvement data, and implementation indicators. It will be designed to support continuous improvement while ensuring that candidates receive quality preparation for their investment of time and money.

Field engagement will begin in this phase. DREA will coordinate the 2026 Meredith Fellows Conference and a targeted AI preconference (WBS 3.1) to introduce the direction of the revised assessment system, gather feedback on design priorities, and establish the learning loops necessary to support the system over time. Staff will also provide updates through Commission communications, webinars, and appearances at regional preparation program convenings to ensure broad awareness and early input.

Table 6. Phase 2: Task, Content, and Platform Specification (Q1–Q3 2026)

WBS	Qtr.	Yr	Short Description
1.3	Q1	2026	Info/Action item: Revised Performance Assessment Design Standards
1.4	Q1	2026	Staff develops initial task, content, and platform specifications
1.5	Q1	2026	Expert Panel reviews initial task, content, and platform specifications
3.3	Q1	2026	Staff holds statewide Meredith Fellows PA conference and AI preconference
3.4	Q1	2026	Panel reviews low performing program identification criteria/support system
1.6	Q2	2026	Info/Action item: Initial Task, Content, and Platform specifications
1.7	Q2	2026	Staff initiates PA development research and cost models based on specifications
2.2	Q2	2026	Expert Panel reviews draft Program and Common Standards revisions
3.5	Q2	2026	Staff plans PA resource development for program pilot implementation
1.8	Q3	2026	Info/Action item: PA Development Pathway Recommendation
2.3	Q3	2026	Info/Action Item: Program and Common Standards revisions
3.6	Q3	2026	Info/Action Item: Low performing program identification criteria/support system
1.9	Q3	2026	PA and platform minimum viable product begin development and user testing

Phase 2: Task, Content, and Platform Specification (Q1–Q3 2026)

This phase translates the adopted design standards into task, content, and platform specifications that will guide assessment development, define candidate expectations, and establish the technical requirements for implementation. Task specifications will describe the pedagogical actions candidates must demonstrate, aligned to the CSTPs, and identify the types of artifacts they must submit. Content specifications will elaborate on these expectations by differentiating requirements by credential area and explicitly connecting them to the State Board-adopted K–12 content standards. Platform specifications will define the functional and technical requirements needed to support submission, scoring, formative use, and system usability. Together, these specifications will form the blueprint for procurement, development, and field use.

DREA will develop the initial specifications (WBS 1.4) for review by the Expert Panel in Q1 2026 (WBS 1.5) and bring them to the Commission for consideration in Q2 2026 (WBS 1.6). Staff will also develop cost models and conduct research to assess the implications of the specifications for candidate experience, program implementation, and platform scalability (WBS 1.7). PSD will continue refinement of the Program and Common Standards (WBS 2.2), leading to Commission review and possible adoption in Q3 2026 (WBS 2.3).

Program accountability work will move forward as the proposed criteria and support system for identifying and assisting lower performing programs undergo stakeholder review (WBS 3.4) and

Commission action (WBS 3.6). To prepare for piloting, staff will begin developing assessment resources such as handbooks, rubrics, training modules, and supervisor guidance for program implementation (WBS 3.5).

Field engagement will continue with the Meredith Fellows Conference in Q1 2027 along with webinars and regional meetings with preparation programs. These forums will allow the field to respond to draft specifications, surface program-specific considerations, and clarify technical and operational questions, while helping programs plan for the development and piloting stages that follow.

Table 7. Phase 3: Development, Piloting, and Capacity Building (Q4 2026–Q4 2027)

WBS	Qtr.	Yr	Short Description
2.4	Q4	2026	Staff begin drafting updates to matrices and accreditation processes
2.5	Q1	2027	Expert Panel reviews updates to matrices and accreditation processes
2.6	Q1	2027	Info/Action Item: Updates to matrices and accreditation processes
3.7	Q1	2027	Staff completes initial PA resource development for pilot program implementation
3.8	Q1	2027	Staff holds statewide Meredith Fellows PA conference
1.10	Q2	2027	PA and platform minimum viable product are piloted with select programs
1.11	Q4	2027	Expert Panel reviews PA pilot results, platform roadmap, recommends refinements
1.12	Q4	2027	Info/Action item: PA pilot results, platform roadmap, recommends refinements
3.9	Q4	2027	Staff plans PA resource development for program field test implementation

Phase 3: Development, Piloting, and Capacity Building (Q4 2026–Q4 2027)

With specifications and standards in place, the Commission will move into the development of the performance assessment system and digital platform using a minimum viable product approach. DREA will lead the design and build of the assessment and platform, ensuring that core features reflect the adopted task, content, and platform specifications. A select group of preparation programs and candidates will participate in pilots beginning in Q2 2027 (WBS 1.10). These pilots will test functionality, scoring reliability, usability, and alignment with program workflows. Structured feedback from pilot participants will inform refinements to the assessment, platform, and support materials.

To prepare for and support pilot participation, staff will complete development of candidate-facing materials, scoring tools, and training resources (WBS 3.7), and will begin work on additional implementation supports for the 2028 field test, including calibration tools and contextualized guidance (WBS 3.9). The 2027 Meredith Fellows Conference will focus on previewing information about the evolving design of performance assessments, sharing early support resources developed by the DREA team, and deepening engagement with preparation program faculty, supervisors, and mentors (WBS 3.8).

In parallel, PSD will update accreditation tools to ensure alignment with the revised assessment system. Staff will draft revisions to matrices and site visit protocols in Q4 2026 (WBS 2.4), with Expert Panel review in Q1 2027 (WBS 2.5) and Commission consideration in Q1 2027 (WBS 2.6). These updates will prepare accreditation reviewers to evaluate how well programs integrate the new assessment model into coursework and clinical practice and will reinforce the link between candidate readiness and program quality.

Field engagement will remain a priority. In addition to the Meredith Fellows Conference, staff will provide updates through webinars, targeted technical assistance sessions, and participation in regional preparation program convenings. These activities will ensure that programs have the information, tools, and lead time needed to integrate the revised assessment and platform into their local systems ahead of the 2028 field test.

Table 8. Phase 4: Statewide Implementation and Accountability Launch (Q1–July 2028)

WBS	Qtr.	Yr	Short Description
1.13	Q1	2028	PA and platform refinements are implemented; feature development prioritized
3.10	Q1	2028	Staff completes PA resource development for field test implementation
1.14	July	2028	Adopted recommendations fully implemented and field test begins
2.7	July	2028	Implement revised system of accreditation/program continuous improvement
3.11	July	2028	Implement revised system of accreditation/program continuous improvement

Phase 4: Statewide Implementation and Accountability Launch (Q1–July 2028)

The final phase transitions the system from pilot use to full-scale statewide implementation. Following the Expert Panel’s review of pilot results and the platform roadmap in Q4 2027 (WBS 1.11), staff will bring final refinements to the Commission for consideration and action (WBS 1.12). DREA will oversee completion of feature development and platform adjustments in Q1 2028 (WBS 1.13), ensuring functionality, scoring processes, and usability are fully aligned with adopted specifications. Concurrently, program and candidate resources needed for the field test will be finalized (WBS 3.10), providing consistent tools and guidance across all preparation programs.

Beginning in July 2028, the revised performance assessment system will be fully operational for all candidates entering educator preparation programs (WBS 1.14). At the same time, PSD will implement the updated accreditation and continuous improvement system (WBS 2.7 and 3.11), applying revised standards, protocols, and performance indicators aligned to the new assessment model. Candidate results will be used to inform licensure decisions, support the development of individual induction plans, and strengthen program accountability, consistent with Education Code section 44320.2(e).

Implementation in this phase is designed to safeguard candidate protections and ensure a smooth statewide transition. Staff will continue to provide programs with targeted technical

assistance, structured training, and responsive feedback channels to address emerging needs. These supports will help maintain consistency in application, reinforce equitable access to high-quality preparation, and uphold the state’s responsibility to protect the public interest in the quality of the educator workforce.

Risk and Mitigation Strategies

Implementation of SB 1263 spans policy reform, technical development, and field engagement over multiple years. This scope creates inherent risks that, if unmanaged, could compromise timelines, quality, or credibility. The primary risk areas are internal capacity, vendor reliability, financial sustainability, platform dependency, and field readiness. Each is addressed through targeted strategies that are embedded in the work breakdown structure, linked to statutory responsibilities under Education Code section 44320.2, and designed to protect both the state’s policy goals and the value of investment in this system.

Table 9: Abbreviated Risk Register

Risk Area	Summary	Mitigation
Internal Capacity	Staffing and coordination gaps could delay or fragment implementation.	PSD and DREA maintain scoped roles, synchronized timelines, and cross-divisional checkpoints; targeted external contracts supplement capacity.
Vendor Reliability	Platform delays or usability issues could disrupt rollout.	Agile development with short cycles, early pilot testing, and phased minimum viable product (MVP) release in 2027.
Financial Sustainability	Unstable funding could compromise development and operations.	Model multiple funding strategies early; evaluate for public stewardship, candidate affordability, and long-term viability before commitments.
Platform Dependency	Vendor lock-in may limit flexibility and increase long-term costs.	Contracts retain public ownership of content and architecture; modular design and milestone-based agreements include off-ramps.
Field Readiness	Programs may resist or struggle with implementation.	Align tasks with coursework, provide scoring tools, and maintain structured technical assistance.

Internal Capacity

Staffing and coordination demands remain a sustained challenge, even with the positions allocated to the Commission under SB 1263. The scope of work spans multiple years and requires alignment across policy, technology, and field engagement. Risks include staff turnover, limited internal bandwidth, and competing priorities that could delay deliverables or fragment implementation. To address this, PSD and DREA will maintain clearly scoped roles and synchronized timelines, supported by cross-divisional checkpoints in the work breakdown structure. Targeted external contracts will supplement internal capacity, and the Chief Deputy will provide project oversight in collaboration with DREA and PSD Directors. Retention of institutional knowledge and continuity of value over time will be supported through documentation, process mapping, and structured knowledge transfer.

Vendor Collaboration and Delivery

The success of the digital platform introduces technical risks tied to reliability, scalability, and usability. Delays or failures could disrupt implementation. To mitigate this, the Commission is using an agile development approach, advancing the platform in short, testable cycles that integrate feedback from early pilots. This structure allows the Commission to identify and address problems before full rollout. A minimum viable product will be piloted in 2027 to validate core functions before statewide launch. Platform specifications will be shaped by the revised standards and informed by insights from the Artificial Intelligence and Educator Readiness Forum.

Financial Sustainability

Financial viability is another central concern. Development, scoring, and ongoing support will require stable funding. Risks arise if projected resources do not materialize or if operating costs exceed expectations. Early modeling of multiple funding strategies that include state appropriations, cost recovery mechanisms, philanthropic support, and hybrid models will be conducted to evaluate long-term sustainability and affordability for candidates. No commitments will be made without reviewing cost projections against operational requirements and candidate affordability.

Platform Dependency

Overreliance on proprietary systems poses risks to adaptability and cost control. To prevent platform lock-in and protect the public interest, contracts will be structured to retain public ownership of assessment content, platform architecture, and user interface specifications. Source code and documentation will be licensed for Commission use to ensure continuity of operations regardless of vendor changes. Contract provisions will include performance milestones, termination clauses, and requirements for modular system design so components can be updated or replaced without disrupting the entire system. This approach preserves public control over essential functions, safeguards against excessive future costs, and ensures that the system can evolve in response to changes in policy, technology, and educator preparation needs.

Field Readiness

Successful implementation depends on program readiness and adoption. Educator preparation programs operate under staffing and budget constraints and will struggle if new requirements are misaligned with established practice. The revised system should be intentionally structured to align with existing program practices, reducing friction by embedding assessment tasks within coursework and clinical experiences and linking them clearly to accreditation requirements. This alignment should not be additive and must be clearly visible in program documentation.

To ensure quality implementation, programs must equip faculty, supervisors, and mentors to use scoring rubrics for formative purposes, providing actionable, improvement-focused feedback that supports candidate growth. This can be supported through professional learning developed by the Commission to engage these audiences with rubrics and annotated exemplars. This balance between embedded learning and structured feedback reinforces both the educative value of the assessment and its role in accountability.

The revised system should make clear where performance assessment takes place within the candidate experience and how it aligns with instructional activity. Assessment tasks should be embedded in coursework and clinical practice and supported by faculty in their existing roles. This approach allows programs to receive credit for performance assessment-related instruction and avoids shifting summative scoring responsibilities to local faculty. Final scoring for licensure and accountability purposes should remain with trained, calibrated assessors who are independent of the candidate's program. Faculty may opt to participate in scoring if they complete the required training, though this role remains distinct from their work supporting candidates within the program. This structure preserves scoring integrity while ensuring performance assessment remains grounded in the candidate's actual preparation.

Ongoing Monitoring

Ongoing engagement will be maintained through conferences, webinars, and program outreach. Training materials, exemplars, and feedback channels will help programs integrate the revised system and ensure candidates receive quality preparation for their investment of time and money. Risks will be monitored across all phases, with mitigation strategies adapted to maintain alignment between policy intent, instructional value, and operational feasibility.

Conclusion

The implementation plan presented here advances the coherent system first envisioned by the Commission in 2014 built on five interconnected components: clear standards, valid assessments, measurable outcomes, structured accreditation, and public transparency. SB 1263 reaffirms and updates that vision by directing the Commission to deliver a redesigned performance assessment system that supports candidate learning, informs program accountability, and aligns with licensure and accreditation requirements.

This plan provides a deliberate, phased approach to meeting those statutory responsibilities. Sequenced work across assessment design, program expectations, and Commission supports allows early decisions to inform later stages, reduces disruption to programs and candidates, and maintains steady progress toward full implementation. PSD and DREA will lead distinct but coordinated workstreams, supported by aligned timelines, targeted contracts, and cross-divisional oversight.

Field engagement is built into every phase to ensure that design and implementation reflect the realities of preparation programs, faculty, and candidates. Risks have been analyzed and addressed through embedded mitigation strategies, and financial sustainability is being evaluated in parallel with system development. Every stage of the plan is designed to preserve long-term value for the state by producing tools, resources, and infrastructure that remain usable across credential areas and future assessment cycles.

By connecting this work to its original policy foundation, aligning it with current statute, and sequencing it to balance feasibility with ambition, the Commission is positioned to deliver a performance assessment system that strengthens preparation, reinforces accountability, and meets the needs of California's educator workforce and the students they serve. This is a system built not only to launch successfully in 2028, but to sustain its relevance and credibility for years to come.

Staff Recommendation

That the Commission review, provide feedback, and if appropriate, approve the proposed Senate Bill 1263 Implementation Plan.

Next Steps

If adopted, staff will proceed with implementation as outlined.

Appendix A

Education Code Sections 44320.2 and 44320.4

44320.2.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

44320.4.

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

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

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

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

(2) Recommendations for how programs might embed the assessments into coursework and clinical work to avoid duplicative work for candidates.

(3) Suggested questions for program completer surveys to understand candidate experience of programmatic support for assessment completion.

(4) Recommendations to strengthen the accreditation system to ensure programs embed the assessment in coursework and clinical work, offer sufficient clinical and pedagogical support, and support candidates to pass the assessment.

(5) Recommendations for how programs can engage in local scoring of the assessment to inform program improvement.

(d) Notwithstanding Section 10231.5 of the Government Code, the commission shall report to the Legislature annually, beginning on October 15, 2025, and through October 15, 2028, and in compliance with Section 9795 of the Government Code, on the progress of the workgroup in making its recommendations and actions taken by the commission to implement the recommendations it adopts.

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

Appendix B

The 2024 California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP)

CSTP 1: Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning

Teachers apply knowledge about each student to activate an approach to learning that strengthens and reinforces each student’s participation, engagement, connection, and sense of belonging.

CSTP 2: Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning

Teachers create and uphold a safe, caring, and intellectually stimulating learning environment that affirms student agency, voice, identity, and development and promotes equity and inclusivity.

CSTP 3: Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning

Teachers integrate content, processes, materials, and resources into a coherent, culturally relevant, and equitable curriculum that engages and challenges learners to develop the academic and social–emotional knowledge and skills required to become competent and resourceful learners.

CSTP 4: Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students

Teachers set a purposeful direction for instruction and learning activities, intentionally planning, and enacting challenging and relevant learning experiences that foster each student’s academic and social–emotional development.

CSTP 5: Assessing Students for Learning

Teachers employ equitable assessment practices to help identify students’ interests and abilities, to reveal what students know and can do, and to determine what they need to learn. Teachers use that information to advance and monitor student progress as well as to guide teachers’ and students’ actions to improve learning experiences and outcomes.

CSTP 6: Developing as a Professional Educator

Teachers develop as effective and caring professional educators by engaging in relevant and high-quality professional learning experiences that increase their teaching capacity, leadership development, and personal well-being. Doing so enables teachers to support each student to learn and thrive.

Appendix C

Final Recommendations from the RDI-TPA Workgroup

1A – asset-based, inclusive teaching in TPA tasks

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

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

1B – Redesign TPA structure for clarity, UDL alignment, and smaller segments

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that the TPA structure be redesigned to align with Universal Design for Learning principles. The TPA structure shall be adjusted in at least the following ways:

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

1C – Expand flexibility and multiple modalities for candidate evidence

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

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

- Allow coursework to be utilized as part of the final submission.

1D – Require individualized, rubric-specific, asset-based scorer feedback

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

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

1E – Require prompt candidate notification for technical condition codes

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.

1F – Ensure the TPA is free or financially accessible

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

2A – Provide exemplar materials to support program familiarity with TPA

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

The TPA model sponsor must provide additional materials to programs, including passing examples for each credential area for all sections of the assessment, examples of common condition code issues, and examples of both successful/non successful responses, in order to help all educators involved in the preparation of credential candidates become familiar with the design of the TPA model, the candidate tasks, and the scoring rubrics.

2B – Require orientation for all educational partners on adopted TPA model

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

2C – Create statewide learning and feedback loops for TPA

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

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

- Collecting resources such as both passing and non-passing samples for each credential submission-type for program and participant use.

2D – Develop a preservice-to-induction continuum of practice

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

3A – Embed TPA tasks in coursework and clinical practice

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

3B – Require individualized formative feedback throughout TPA process

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends adding to Program Standards the requirement that programs provide candidates individualized and timely feedback throughout the TPA process prior to submission. This includes feedback on both pedagogy and submission criteria in order to ensure the process is formative and educative. As part of embedding the TPA in fieldwork and coursework, candidates will receive and implement feedback on their teaching and be assessed on the implemented feedback. All candidates must be supported with reflective activities based on the feedback they receive, regardless of whether they pass or fail the TPA. Therefore, the group also recommends that current guidelines for acceptable support be revised to ensure the entire TPA process is formative and educative.

3C – Require documentation on how programs will support non-passing candidates

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

3D – Include TPA as an assessment in each program matrix for accreditation

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

3E – Use TPA results to inform IDP and ILP goals

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that Preliminary Program Standards and Induction Program Standards be revised to require the use of information from the TPA to inform the development of IDP goals at the end of preservice and ILP goals during induction.

3F – Require educator analysis of candidate TPA responses

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that Program Standards include a requirement that a program's teacher educators who support candidates engage in analyzing candidate level responses to the TPA in order to better understand and support candidate performance, as a central component of continuous improvement and accreditation.

3G – Emphasize use of TPA data in Common Standard 4

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

3H – Require program monitoring of TPA embedding and local scoring outcomes

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that programs monitor and evaluate outcomes from embedding the TPA in coursework and clinical practice and engaging in local scoring/analysis. Programs would then use insights from these processes to inform and improve instructional design and support strategies, as stipulated in Common Standard 4 (Continuous Improvement).

3I – Require support tailored for intern pathway candidates

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that Program Standards be updated to include required forms of support specific to the needs of candidates in intern pathways.

3J – Establish criteria for identifying lower performing programs

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

4A – Require local scoring methods that align with improvement needs

The RDI-TPA Workgroup recommends that Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist Program Standard 5 and PK3 Early Childhood Specialist Standard 6 include a requirement that programs' teacher educators who support candidates engage in a method of local scoring that aligns to program improvement needs and candidate needs for support.

4B – Prohibit passing additional costs to candidates for local scoring

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

5A – Create a candidate survey on TPA experience

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

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

Supplemental – Convene expert group to study AI impact on TPA

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

Appendix D

Complete Proposed Senate Bill 1263 Implementation Plan

Phase	WBS	Qtr.	Yr.	Short Description
Phase 1	1.1	Q3	2025	Staff prepares updated PA Design Standards revisions
Phase 1	3.1	Q3	2025	Staff plans statewide Meredith Fellows PA conference and AI preconference
Phase 1	1.2	Q4	2025	Expert Panel reviews updated PA Design Standards revisions
Phase 1	2.1	Q4	2025	Staff begin drafting Program and Common Standards revisions
Phase 1	3.2	Q4	2025	Staff develops low performing program id criteria and system of support
Phase 2	1.3	Q1	2026	Info/Action item: Revised Performance Assessment Design Standards
Phase 2	1.4	Q1	2026	Staff develops initial task, content, and platform specifications
Phase 2	1.5	Q1	2026	Expert Panel initial task, content, and platform specifications
Phase 2	3.3	Q1	2026	Staff holds statewide Meredith Fellows PA conference and AI preconference
Phase 2	3.4	Q1	2026	Panel reviews low performing program id criteria and system of support
Phase 2	1.6	Q2	2026	Info/Action item: Initial Task, Content, and Platform specifications
Phase 2	1.7	Q2	2026	Staff initiates PA development research and cost models based on specs
Phase 2	2.2	Q2	2026	Expert Panel reviews draft Program and Common Standards revisions
Phase 2	3.5	Q2	2026	Staff plans PA resource development for program pilot implementation
Phase 2	1.8	Q3	2026	Info/Action item: PA Development Pathway Recommendation
Phase 2	2.3	Q3	2026	Info/Action Item: Program and Common Standards revisions
Phase 2	3.6	Q3	2026	Info/Action Item: Low performing program id criteria/system of support
Phase 2	1.9	Q3	2026	PA and platform minimum viable product begin development and user testing
Phase 3	2.4	Q4	2026	Staff begin drafting updates to matrices and accreditation processes
Phase 3	2.5	Q1	2027	Expert Panel reviews updates to matrices and accreditation processes
Phase 3	2.6	Q1	2027	Info/Action Item: Updates to matrices and accreditation processes
Phase 3	3.7	Q1	2027	Staff completes initial resource development for pilot implementation
Phase 3	3.8	Q1	2027	Staff holds statewide Meredith Fellows PA conference
Phase 3	1.10	Q2	2027	PA and platform minimum viable product are piloted with select programs
Phase 3	1.11	Q4	2027	Expert Panel reviews PA pilot results, platform roadmap, refinements
Phase 3	1.12	Q4	2027	Info/Action item: PA pilot results, platform roadmap, refinements
Phase 3	3.9	Q4	2027	Staff plans PA resource development for program field test implementation
Phase 4	1.13	Q1	2028	PA and platform refinements implemented; feature development prioritized
Phase 4	3.10	Q1	2028	Staff completes PA resource development for field test implementation
Phase 4	1.14	July	2028	Adopted recommendations fully implemented and field test begins
Phase 4	2.7	July	2028	Implement revised system of accreditation/program continuous improvement
Phase 4	3.11	July	2028	Implement revised system of accreditation/program continuous improvement