



2019 No. 120

An Investigation of the Comparability of Commission-Approved Teaching Performance Assessment Models

Final Report – Volume II: Appendices

Prepared for: California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95811
Attn: Michael Taylor

Editors: Andrea L. Sinclair
Arthur Thacker

Date: December 31, 2019

An Investigation of the Comparability of Commission-Approved Teaching Performance Assessment Models Year 2 Report – Volume II: Appendices

Table of Contents

Chapter 1. Appendices.....	1.A-1
Appendix 1.A: TPA Documentation Requested and Reviewed.....	1.A-1
Chapter 3. Appendices.....	3.A-10
Appendix 3.A: FAST Candidate Survey	3.A-10
Appendix 3.B: edTPA Candidate Survey	3.B-12
Appendix 3.C: CalTPA Candidate Survey.....	3.C-15
Appendix 3.D: Coordinator Surveys	3.D-17
Chapter 4. Appendices.....	4.A-20
Appendix 4.A: In-Person Marker Selection Data Collection Instrument	4.A-20
Appendix 4.B: In-Person Scoring and Calibration Data Collection Instrument.....	4.B-22
Appendix 4.C: Alignment of ADS and Joint Standards to Claims.....	4.C-27
Appendix 4.D: FAST Site Visitation Project Rubric Sample (Field Test compared to Operational).....	4.D-34
Appendix 4.E: FAST Teaching Sample Project Rubric Sample (Field Test compared to Operational).....	4.E-35
Appendix 4.F: FAST Assessor TSP Report of Scores	4.F-36
Appendix 4.G: FAST SVP Student Score Report from TK20	4.G-37
Appendix 4.H: FAST TSP Student Score Report from TK20.....	4.H-38
Appendix 4.I: FAST TSP Student Non-Passing Score Email.....	4.I-39
Appendix 4.J: edTPA Task 1 (Planning) Rubric Overview.....	4.J-40
Appendix 4.K: edTPA Task 2 (Instruction) Rubric Overview	4.K-41
Appendix 4.L: edTPA Task 3 (Assessment) Rubric Overview	4.L-42
Appendix 4.M: edTPA Institution Report Layout.....	4.M-43
Appendix 4.N: edTPA Score Profile Interpretation Document	4.N-49
Appendix 4.O: CalTPA Cycle 1 Rubrics for Multiple Subject	4.O-52
Appendix 4.P: CalTPA Cycle 2 Rubrics for Multiple Subject	4.P-62
Appendix 4.Q: CalTPA Scorer Process Flow	4.Q-73
Appendix 4.R: CalTPA Score Report (Draft).....	4.R-74
Chapter 5. Appendix	5.A-77
Appendix 5.A: Site Visit Notes from Observation of FAST SVP Passing Standard Workshop	5.A-77
Appendix 5.B: CalTPA Standard Setting Policy Capture Activity Instructions.....	5.B-80
Appendix 5.C: CalTPA Standard Setting Final Passing Standard Recommendation Form	5.C-104
Chapter 7. Appendices.....	7.A-105
Appendix 7.A: Common Scoring Rubric.....	7.B-105
Appendix 7.B: Common Rubric and Model Rubric Correlations (TPE Element Level).....	7.B-114

Table of Contents (Continued)

List of Tables

Table 1.A.1.	TPA Documentation Requested and Reviewed	1.A-2
Table 3.A.1.	FAST SVP: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.....	3.A-10
Table 3.A.2.	FAST TSP: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.....	3.A-10
Table 3.A.3.	FAST Resources: Please rate your level of satisfaction with the FAST Tk20 online system	3.A-11
Table 3.A.4.	FAST: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.....	3.A-11
Table 3.A.5.	FAST SVP: Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements.....	3.A-11
Table 3.A.6.	FAST TSP: Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements.....	3.A-11
Table 3.B.1.	edTPA Task 1: Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements.....	3.B-12
Table 3.B.2.	edTPA Task 2: Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements.....	3.B-12
Table 3.B.3.	edTPA Task 3: Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements.....	3.B-13
Table 3.B.4.	edTPA Resources: Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following resources.....	3.B-13
Table 3.B.5.	edTPA: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statement	3.B-13
Table 3.B.6.	edTPA Task 1: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.....	3.B-14
Table 3.B.7.	edTPA Task 2: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.....	3.B-14
Table 3.B.8.	edTPA Task 3: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.....	3.B-14
Table 3.C.1.	CalTPA: Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement...	3.C-15
Table 3.C.2.	CalTPA Resources: Please rate the helpfulness of each of the following resources	3.C-15
Table 3.C.3.	CalTPA Resources: Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement	3.C-15
Table 3.C.4.	CalTPA: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.....	3.C-16
Table 3.D.1.	Coordinators: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.....	3.D-17
Table 3.D.2.	Coordinators: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.....	3.D-17

Table of Contents (Continued)

List of Tables

Table 3.D.3. Coordinators: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.....	3.D-18
Table 3.D.4. Coordinators: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.....	3.D-19
Table 4.A.1. Marker Selection Instrument.....	4.A-21
Table 4.B.1. General Training Procedures Checklist	4.B-22
Table 4.B.2. Opportunity to View Performance/Task and Performance Intent Checklist ...	4.B-23
Table 4.B.3. Calibration Procedures	4.B-24
Table 4.B.4. Rater Read-Behind Checklist	4.B-25
Table 4.B.5. Rater Monitoring Checklist	4.B-26
Table 4.C.1. Assessment Design Standard 1 Design Element Alignment by Claim	4.C-27
Table 4.C.2. Assessment Design Standard 2 Design Element Alignment by Claim	4.C-28
Table 4.C.3. Joint Standards Alignment to Claims	4.C-29
Table 7.B.1. Common Rubric and TPA Model Polychoric Correlations at Rubric Level (CalTPA)	7.B-114
Table 7.B.2. Common Rubric and TPA Model Polychoric Correlations at Rubric Level (edTPA).....	7.B-115
Table 7.B.3. Common Rubric and TPA Model Polychoric Correlations at Rubric Level (FAST)	7.B-116

Chapter 1. Appendices

Appendix 1.A: TPA Documentation Requested and Reviewed

Table 1.A.1. TPA Documentation Requested and Reviewed

Documentation Requested	Documentation Provided by Model Representatives		
	FAST	edTPA	CalTPA
Documentation of changes to the assessment tasks and/or to the scoring rubrics and associated program, candidate, and scoring materials.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Update on the Redevelopment of the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (i.e., FAST2 Transition Plan and FAST Transition Plan revised 8/3/17) - Request for Commission Authority to Waive the Professional Preparation Requirement for Candidates Participating in the FAST Field Test. - Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers: FAST 2.0 Changes: Response to Assessment Design Standards (March 2018 & May 2018) - FAST PowerPoint slides presented at TAC meeting on 11/16/17 - FAST Response to Assessment Design Standards (5/31/18) - FAST v2.0 Complete Manual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - edTPA Transition Plan 03.02.2017.pdf - edTPA PowerPoint slides presented at TAC meeting on 11/16/17 - edTPA Transition Plan Update_May 2018.pdf. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CalTPA Program Summary Timeline_8.22.17.pdf - TPA-Assessment-Design-Standards Table for Validity_Draft_100716.docx - CalTPA PowerPoint slides presented at TAC meeting on 11/16/17 - Update on the Redevelopment of the California Teaching Performance Assessment.pdf (June 2017 and August 2018) - Program Implementation Presentations (downloaded from website) - Program Implementation Resources (downloaded from website) - CalTPA Design Team Meeting Materials (downloaded from website) - Bilingual Candidates and the CalTPA - CalTPA_TPE_Mapping_OP

(continued)

Table 1.A.1. (Continued)

Documentation Requested	Documentation Provided by Model Representatives		
	FAST	edTPA	CalTPA
Most recent annual report submitted to the Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not being requested by the Commission at this time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not being requested by the Commission at this time - edTPA Bi-annual summary from 2016-2017 year (7/2017 release) - CA state summary and National summary see CA file: rtpaCA_admin-edTPA_Summary_Reports_State_2016JUL-2017JUN.pdf - National file: rtpaCA_admin-edTPA_Summary_Reports_National_2016JUL-2017JUN.pdf 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not being requested by the Commission at this time
User manual/handbook for teacher candidates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FASTv2.0 Complete Manual.pdf - FAST Candidate Resources Sp18.pdf - FAST Candidate Support Table.pdf - FAST TSP SS candidate overview.pptx 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - edTPA Handbooks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CalTPA_AssessmentGuide_MS Cycle 1.pdf - CalTPA_AssessmentGuide_MS Cycle 2.pdf - CalTPA AssessmentGuide_SS_Cycle 1.pdf - CalTPA AssessmentGuide_SS_Cycle 2.pdf

(continued)

Table 1.A.1. (Continued)

Documentation Requested	Documentation Provided by Model Representatives		
	FAST	edTPA	CalTPA
User manual/handbook for programs/faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FASTv2.0 Complete Manual.pdf - FAST orientation.ppt 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - edTPA Handbooks - Making Good Choices (see file: edtpa Making Good Choices.pdf) - edTPA Program Support site (http://edtpa.aacte.org/) - edTPA.com Faculty -page http://www.edtpa.com/PageView.aspx?f=GEN_Faculty.html) - Guidelines for supporting candidates (see file: edtpa-guidelines-for-acceptable-candidate-support-2016-final.pdf) - Understanding Rubric Level Progressions (URLPs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CalTPA_AssessmentGuide_MS Cycle 1.pdf - CalTPA_AssessmentGuide_MS Cycle 2.pdf - CalTPA AssessmentGuide_SS_Cycle 1.pdf - CalTPA AssessmentGuide_SS_Cycle 2.pdf - CalTPA Program Workshop_Oct 25_Agenda.pdf - CalTPA Program Workshop_Oct 25_Gallery Notes.pdf - CalTPA Program Workshop_Oct 25_No video.ppt
Technical Manual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appendix G of FAST Response to Assessment Design Standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Admin Reports here: https://secure.aacte.org/apps/rl/resource.php?resid=647&ref=edtpa - edTPA Transition Plan 03.02.2017.pdf 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CalTPA_Templates.zip - The templates, assessment guides and Candidate and Faculty supports on www.ctcpa.nesinc.com
Test specifications/test blueprint	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teaching Performance Expectations (Multiple and Single Subject): FAST Tasks Matrix 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - see file: edTPA technical specifications.docx - see TPEs measured by edTPA rubrics.pdf - edTPA Transition Plan 03.02.2017.pdf 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CalTPA_FT_TPE Map.pdf - CalTPA_TPE_Mapping_OP.pdf

(continued)

Table 1.A.1. (Continued)

Documentation Requested	Documentation Provided by Model Representatives		
	FAST	edTPA	CalTPA
Procedures for administering assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FASTv2.0 Complete Manual.pdf 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - edTPA handbooks - Registration: http://www.edtpa.com/Content/Docs/edTPARegistrationOverview.pdf - Building the portfolio: http://www.edtpa.com/PageView.aspx?f=GEN_Prepare.html 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - See information/policies on www.ctcpa.nesinc.com - Performance Assessment Guides
Documentation of content, bias, sensitivity, and fairness reviews and edits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FAST Response to Assessment Design Standards (Appendix F) - FAST Assessor Guidelines 2018.pdf - FAST Bias Training Sp18.pdf - FAST Supervisor Scorer Training Table.pdf 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FT Summary report here: https://secure.aacte.org/apps/rl/res_get.php?fid=827&ref=edtpa - edTPA Scoring - Bias Training Module.pdf - Global Handbook Bias Report.doc - Orientation Manual FINAL.pdf - edTPA Transition Plan 03.02.2017.pdf 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CalTPA_CEPFeedback_Report.docx - CalTPA BRC Bias Action Summary_20161018.doc - CalTPA_FT_BRC Bias Action Summary_20170918.doc - TPA_OP_BRC_Instructions.pdf - CalTPA_2018 BRC_Orientation.ppt - CalAPA-TPA_OP_BRC_Instructions.pdf
Sample candidate score report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FAST Candidate Score Reports - TSP Report of Scores2.0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interpreting your edTPA score profile here: http://www.edtpa.com/Content/Docs/edTPA_InterpretingYourProfile.pdf 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CalTPA Teacher Candidate Assessment Results Report - CalTPA Supplemental Materials: Assessment Results Report
Sample program score report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not applicable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Educator Preparation Program (EPP) reporting is described here: http://www.edtpa.com/PageView.aspx?f=GEN_edTPAReporting.html - EPP file layout here: http://www.edtpa.com/Content/Docs/edTPA_InstitutionReportLayout.pdf 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CalTPA Teacher Candidate Assessment Results Report

(continued)

Table 1.A.1. (Continued)

Documentation Requested	Documentation Provided by Model Representatives		
	FAST	edTPA	CaTPA
Information on standard-setting and on developing performance level descriptors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FAST Response 5-31-18.pdf 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FT Summary report here (see National Standard Setting): https://secure.aacte.org/apps/rl/res_get.php?fid=827&ref=edtpa - Description of National Recommended Professional Performance Standard here: http://www.edtpa.com/PageView.aspx?f=GEN_PerformanceStandard.html - Description of California's passing standard: https://www.edtpa.com/PageView.aspx?f=GEN_California.html - https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/commission/agendas/2014-10/2014-10-3f-pdf.pdf?sfvrsn=0 - edTPA Transition Plan 03.02.2017.pdf 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2019-06-2d_CalTPA Standard Setting Agenda Item.pdf - 2019-06-2d-CalTPA Standard Setting appendix.pdf

Table 1.A.1. (Continued)

Documentation Requested	Documentation Provided by Model Representatives		
	FAST	edTPA	CalTPA
Scoring Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FAST Response 5-31-18.pdf - FAST Assessor Guidelines.pdf - FAST Bias Training Sp18.pdf - FAST Supervisor Scorer Training Table.pdf 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - edTPA Training Improvement Timeline_Final.doc - TBR and URLP - http://scoreedtpa.pearson.com/ - Tech Reports (https://secure.aacte.org/apps/rl/resource.php?resid=647&ref=edtpa) - edTPA OP19 Quality Management Plan (QMP) - edTPA Transition Plan 03.02.2017.pdf 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CalTPA Scoring QMP_v2 - CalTPA_2018 BRC_Orientation.ppt - CalAPA-TPA_OP_BRC_Instructions - How to look at score data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - https://www.ctcexams.nesinc.com/content/docs/CalTPA_VTT_February_2019_Slides.pdf - Assessor Survey data (2018-19) - CalTPA Revised Pilot Scoring Manual 04182017.docx - CalTPA Scoring Session Agenda_v2.docx - CalTPA Scoring_Program Overview.ppt - CalTPA_Submission Review_Cycle 1_ROE_v2.docx - CalTPA_Submission Review_Cycle 2_ROE_v2.docx - Preventing Bias_Performance Assessments.ppt - Pilot Rubric Placemats.zip - CalTPA_Feild Test Scoring_Cycle 1 Assessor Training_MS_3.22.18.pdf

(continued)

Table 1.A.1. (Continued)

Documentation Requested	Documentation Provided by Model Representatives		
	FAST	edTPA	CalTPA
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cycle 1 Assessor Training Prep Homework - CalTPA Cycle 2 Agenda.pdf - CalTPA Cycle 2 ELA PreWork Consensus Sample Lead Assessor Notes.pdf - CalTPA Cycle 2 MS Literacy PreWork Consensus Sample Lead Assessor Notes.pdf - -CalTPA Steps for Determining Rubric Scores.pdf - CalTPA_DailyScoringMgmt_Sample for HumRRO.xls - Update on the Redevelopment of the California Teaching Performance Assessment.pdf - CalTPA Design Team Meeting PowerPoint_July 2018_final.ppt - Score report information - https://www.edtpa.com/PageView.aspx?f=GEN_Scores.html

(continued)

Table 1.A.1. (Continued)

Documentation Requested	Documentation Provided by Model Representatives		
	FAST	edTPA	CaTPA
Test retake/appeal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FASTv2.0 Complete Manual.pdf - FAST Response 5-31-18.pdf 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Retaking edTPA: http://www.edtpa.com/PageView.aspx?f=GEN_RetakingedTPA.html - Appeal Process (Requesting a score confirmation): http://www.edtpa.com/PageView.aspx?f=GEN_RequestingAScoreConfirmation.html - Retake policy: http://www.edtpa.com/PageView.aspx?f=GEN_CandidatePolicies.html 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Update on the Redevelopment of the California Teaching Performance Assessment.pdf - Appeal Process (Requesting a score verification): - https://www.ctcexams.nesinc.com/PageView.aspx?f=GEN_RequestingAREscore.html
Validity, reliability, and fairness studies for the updated assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FAST Response 5-31-18.pdf 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - edTPA Transition Plan 03.02.2017.pdf 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Summary of HumRRO TPE Validity Study presented to Commission in June 2016: - https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/commission/agendas/2016-06/2016-06-2b-pdf.pdf?sfvrsn=beb9009e_0 - TPA Assessment Design Standards Table for Validity (dated 10/7/16)
Quality Control procedures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FAST Response 5-31-18.pdf - (additional relevant materials listed above) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - edTPAScoringQMP_Fall2017_DRAFT_9.29.2017.docx - edTPA Training Improvement Timeline_Final - (additional relevant materials listed above) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CaTPA Scoring QMP_v2 - Update on the Redevelopment of the California Teaching Performance Assessment.pdf (August 2018) - CaTPA Design Team Meeting PowerPoint_July 2018_final.ppt - (additional relevant materials listed above)

Chapter 3. Appendices

Appendix 3.A: FAST Candidate Survey

Table 3.A.1. FAST SVP: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements

Question	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Don't know/ Does not apply (%)
Overall, the directions for the SVP were easy to understand.	2.4	11.0	56.1	29.3	1.2
The form templates (class profile, activity/strategy table, self-evaluation of lesson) for the SVP helped me prepare my submission.	2.4	2.4	47.6	46.3	1.2
I understood what was expected in the reflection for the SVP.	2.4	3.7	51.2	41.5	1.2
I understood what I was asked to submit as evidence for the SVP.	2.4	7.3	40.2	48.8	1.2
The four levels of performance were clearly stated in the rubrics.	0.0	7.3	41.5	50.0	1.2
The rubrics helped me in preparing my submission.	3.7	6.1	46.3	42.7	1.2

Table 3.A.2. FAST TSP: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements

Question	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Don't know/ Does not apply (%)
Overall, the directions for the TSP were easy to understand.	3.7	23.5	40.7	32.1	0.0
I understood what was expected in the commentary (e.g., responses to questions and reflections) for the TSP.	4.9	14.8	48.1	32.1	0.0
I understood what I was asked to submit as evidence for the TSP.	2.5	11.1	50.6	35.8	0.0
The four levels of performance were clearly stated in the rubrics.	1.2	9.9	45.7	43.2	0.0
The rubrics helped me in preparing my submission.	2.5	7.4	53.1	37.0	0.0

Table 3.A.3. FAST Resources: Please rate your level of satisfaction with the FAST Tk20 online system

Question	Not Helpful (%)	Somewhat Helpful (%)	Very Helpful (%)	No Opinion (%)
Please rate your level of satisfaction with the FAST Tk20 online system used for uploading submissions.	48.8	39.0	11.0	1.2

Table 3.A.4. FAST: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements

Question	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Don't know/ Does not apply (%)
The FAST Manual guidance provided sufficient information to assist me throughout the process.	3.7	13.6	56.8	18.5	7.4

Table 3.A.5. FAST SVP: Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements

Question	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Don't know/ Does not apply (%)
Overall, the SVP provided me sufficient opportunity to demonstrate my instructional knowledge, skills, and abilities.	1.2	12.2	46.3	39.0	1.2
The teaching knowledge, skills, and abilities assessed in the SVP are emphasized in my preparation program.	1.2	7.4	45.7	43.2	2.5

Table 3.A.6. FAST TSP: Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements

Question	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Don't know/ Does not apply (%)
Overall, the TSP provided me sufficient opportunity to demonstrate my instructional knowledge, skills, and abilities.	1.3	7.7	42.3	46.2	2.6
The teaching knowledge, skills, and abilities assessed in the TSP are emphasized in my preparation program.	2.4	11.0	43.9	41.5	1.2

Appendix 3.B: edTPA Candidate Survey

Table 3.B.1. edTPA Task 1: Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements

Question	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Don't know/ Does not apply (%)
Overall, the directions for this task were easy to understand.	13.6	26.5	47.4	11.8	0.7
The “Context for Learning” form for this task helped me prepare my submission.	9.9	29.8	43.4	15.4	1.5
I understood what was expected in the commentary for this task.	10.3	26.4	50.2	12.5	0.7
I understood what I was asked to submit as evidence for this task.	7.8	16.4	54.6	20.1	1.1
The five levels of performance were clearly stated in the rubrics.	9.9	18.7	52.0	17.9	1.5
The rubrics helped me in preparing my submission.	7.7	17.6	48.7	25.6	0.4

Table 3.B.2. edTPA Task 2: Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements

Question	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Don't know/ Does not apply (%)
Overall, the directions for this task were easy to understand.	12.7	26.2	47.7	12.3	1.2
I understood what was expected in the commentary for this task.	10.0	23.1	52.7	13.1	1.2
I understood what I was asked to submit as evidence for this task.	7.7	17.4	58.3	15.8	0.8
The five levels of performance were clearly stated in the rubrics.	7.7	20.4	53.1	17.3	1.5
The rubrics helped me in preparing my submission.	10.8	15.0	51.2	22.7	0.4

Table 3.B.3. edTPA Task 3: Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements

Question	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Don't know/ Does not apply (%)
Overall, the directions for this task were easy to understand.	10.2	25.6	51.6	11.8	0.8
I understood what was expected in the commentary for this task.	9.1	25.2	52.4	12.6	0.8
I understood what I was asked to submit as evidence for this task.	7.1	19.4	58.5	14.2	0.8
The five levels of performance were clearly stated in the rubrics.	8.3	19.7	53.9	16.9	1.2
The rubrics helped me in preparing my submission.	9.5	15.5	52.8	21.0	1.2

Table 3.B.4. edTPA Resources: Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following resources

Resources	Not Helpful (%)	Somewhat Helpful (%)	Very Helpful (%)	No opinion/ Did not use (%)
Making Good Choices	13.9	48.0	29.1	9.0
Understanding Rubric Level Progressions	15.2	40.2	40.6	4.1
Academic Language Handouts	18.6	45.9	25.2	10.3
Candidate registration website (edTPA.com)	27.2	46.5	15.2	11.1

Table 3.B.5. edTPA: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statement

Question	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Don't know/ Does not apply (%)
The Handbook and templates provided sufficient information to assist me throughout the assessment process.	12.2	22.0	44.5	20.4	0.8

Table 3.B.6. edTPA Task 1: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements

Question	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Don't know/ Does not apply (%)
Overall, Task 1 (Planning) provided me sufficient opportunity to demonstrate my knowledge, skills, and abilities related to planning.	14.0	18.8	54.2	12.5	0.4
The pedagogical and content knowledge, skills, and abilities assessed in Task 1 (Planning) are emphasized in my preparation program.	10.5	11.7	52.3	24.4	1.1

Table 3.B.7. edTPA Task 2: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

Question	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Don't know/ Does not apply (%)
Overall, Task 2 (Instruction) provided me sufficient opportunity to demonstrate my instructional knowledge, skills, and abilities.	14.0	26.4	48.8	10.5	0.4
The pedagogical and content knowledge, skills, and abilities assessed in Task 2 (Instruction) are emphasized in my preparation program.	8.2	15.6	53.1	22.3	0.8

Table 3.B.8. edTPA Task 3: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements

Question	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Don't know/ Does not apply (%)
Overall, Task 3 (Assessment) provided me sufficient opportunity to demonstrate my knowledge, skills, and abilities related to assessment.	11.8	21.6	53.3	11.8	1.6
The pedagogical and content knowledge, skills, and abilities assessed in Task 3 (Assessment) are emphasized in my preparation program.	9.5	18.2	48.2	23.3	0.8

Appendix 3.C: CalTPA Candidate Survey

Table 3.C.1. CalTPA: Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement

Question	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Don't know/ Does not apply (%)
Overall, I had a clear understanding of CalTPA requirements.	13.7	27.8	43.5	14.1	1.0

Table 3.C.2. CalTPA Resources: Please rate the helpfulness of each of the following resources

Resources	Not Helpful (%)	Somewhat Helpful (%)	Very Helpful (%)	I was not aware of this resource (%)
Website resources for reviewing general information about the CalTPA including materials and policies	12.9	55.5	25.5	6.1
Website resources for video recording ("Tips and Tools")	16.5	43.7	26.2	13.6
Website resources for video upload	14.4	45.4	30.1	10.1
Website resources for using the ePortfolio system	11.6	43.9	27.7	16.8
The ePortfolio upload and submission system	11.3	43.0	39.5	6.1
The ePortfolio video annotation tool	11.3	45.5	38.1	5.2
The registration system	11.0	50.2	35.9	2.9
CalTPA support services (e.g., FAQs, Customer Support)	17.7	32.9	20.0	29.4

Table 3.C.3. CalTPA Resources: Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement

Question	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	I was not aware of this resource (%)
The Performance Assessment Guides were helpful.	7.6	15.2	50.0	24.7	2.5

Table 3.C.4. CalTPA: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements

Question	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Don't know/ Does not apply (%)
The CalTPA assesses the knowledge, skills, and abilities emphasized in my preparation program.	7.4	14.7	59.8	17.6	0.6

Appendix 3.D: Coordinator Surveys

Table 3.D.1. Coordinators: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements

Question	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Don't know/ Does not apply (%)
FAST: After reviewing supporting materials, I had a clear understanding of FAST's purposes before I began assisting candidates.	0.0	3.9	37.3	58.8	0.0
edTPA: After reviewing supporting materials, I had a clear understanding of the edTPA's purposes before I began assisting candidates.	4.8	4.8	42.9	42.9	4.8
CalTPA: After reviewing all support materials, I had a clear understanding of the CalTPA's purposes before I began assisting candidates.	0.0	6.5	58.7	32.6	2.2
FAST: After reviewing supporting materials, I had a clear understanding of FAST's requirements before I began assisting candidates.	0.0	7.8	35.3	56.9	0.0
edTPA: After reviewing supporting materials, I had a clear understanding of the edTPA's requirements before I began assisting candidates.	0.0	14.3	42.9	38.1	4.8
CalTPA: After reviewing all support materials, I had a clear understanding of the CalTPA's requirements before I began assisting candidates.	0.0	13.0	54.3	30.4	2.2

Table 3.D.2. Coordinators: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements

Question	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Don't know/ Does not apply (%)
FAST: Overall, I was well informed during the implementation process.	0.0	3.9	45.1	51.0	0.0
edTPA: Overall, I was well informed during the process of assisting candidates.	0.0	9.5	61.9	23.8	4.8
CalTPA: Overall, I was well-informed about the CalTPA.	0.0	8.7	58.7	30.4	2.2

Table 3.D.3. Coordinators: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements

Question	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Don't know/ Does not apply (%)
FAST: Resources, orientations, and seminars provided me with sufficient information to assist candidates.	0.0	5.9	51.0	43.1	0.0
edTPA: The website supports for accessing information about edTPA, including the test overview, materials, and policies, were valuable to me as I prepared for my responsibilities.	9.5	19.0	47.6	23.8	0.0
CalTPA: The webinars were valuable to me as I prepared for my CalTPA responsibilities.	0.0	4.3	63.0	19.6	13.1
CalTPA: The "Office Hours" sessions were valuable to me as I prepared for my CalTPA field test responsibilities.	2.2	13.0	39.1	13.0	32.6
CalTPA: The "Virtual Think Tank" sessions were valuable to me as I prepared for my CalTPA field test responsibilities.	2.2	6.5	45.7	21.7	23.9
CalTPA: The "Program Updates" online sessions were valuable to me as I prepared for my CalTPA field test responsibilities.	2.2	2.2	34.8	39.1	21.7
CalTPA: The in-person CalTPA Program workshop in Riverside was valuable to me as I prepared for my CalTPA field test responsibilities.	0.0	9.1	29.5	20.5	40.9
CalTPA: The in-person CalTPA Program workshop in Sacramento was valuable to me as I prepared for my CalTPA field test responsibilities.	2.3	2.3	15.9	18.2	61.4
CalTPA: The CalTPA page on the CTC assessments website provided valuable information.	0.0	8.9	46.7	37.8	6.6
CalTPA: The CalTPA EPP Support Mailbox was a valuable resource when I had a question.	2.2	6.5	28.3	10.9	52.2

Table 3.D.4. Coordinators: Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements

Question	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Don't know/ Does not apply (%)
CalTPA: The CalTPA focuses on the appropriate skills and practices necessary for beginning teachers.	0.0	2.1	58.3	39.6	0.0
FAST: FAST focuses on the appropriate skills and practices necessary for beginning teachers.	0.0	3.9	37.3	58.8	0.0
edTPA: The edTPA focuses on the appropriate skills and practices necessary for beginning teachers.	0.0	0.0	76.2	23.8	0.0
CalTPA: The CalTPA assesses the knowledge, skills, and abilities emphasized in our preparation program.	0.0	2.1	66.7	31.3	0.0
FAST: FAST appropriately assesses candidate readiness in the areas measured.	2.0	5.9	37.3	52.9	2.0
edTPA: The edTPA appropriately assesses candidate readiness in the areas measured.	0.0	19.0	61.9	19.0	0.0

Chapter 4. Appendices

Appendix 4.A: In-Person Marker Selection Data Collection Instrument

HumRRO observers will conduct themselves as unobtrusive observers during scoring events (e.g., Marker Selection, Assessor Training & Calibration). Generally, one staff member will attend any given event. The staff member will introduce him/herself to lead facilitators, explain his/her role, and ask where best to position themselves during the observation. S/he will ask the facilitator to please speak up if the observer seems to be making anyone uncomfortable or is interfering in the scheduled process in any way. Ideally, the observer would have sufficient desk space for a computer and notepad, and access to power.

The observer will:

- Receive a copy of non-proprietary handouts;
- With permission of the facilitator(s), move around the room periodically to more thoroughly observe activities;
- Take notes during the event;
- Complete an event-specific checklist either during or after the event;
- Conduct informal interviews of a small number of attendees during breaks, if feasible; and
- Conduct a brief interview with the facilitator(s) after the event.

The observer will not:

- Answer any technical questions from attendees; rather the observer will refer the attendee to a facilitator;
- Offer any evaluative feedback at the event.

Table 4.A.1. Marker Selection Instrument

Aspects (Assessment Design Standard where applicable)	Yes/No	Notes
1. The model sponsor selects personnel for marker selection with a deep understanding of the TPEs, the pedagogical assessment tasks, and the multi-level scoring rubrics. (Based on ADS 2c)		
2. A documented process exists to train personnel to conduct marker selection.		
3. Marker selection training includes an appropriate amount of practice.		
4. Marker selection training provides time for discussion of the process and questions by those undertaking the activity.		
5. A process is in place to monitor and review marker selection decisions.		
6. Efforts are taken within the marker selection process to minimize the effects of candidate factors that are not clearly related to pedagogical competence, which may include (depending on the circumstances) factors such as personal attire, appearance, demeanor, speech patterns and accents or any other bias that are not likely to affect job effectiveness and/or candidate learning. (Based on ADS 1h)		
7. Where appropriate, a wide range of pedagogical practices that are educationally effective are reflected in marker selection. (Based on ADS 1c)		
8. Marker selection emphasizes <i>entry-level pedagogical competence</i> to teach the curriculum and student population of California's TK-12 public schools. (Based on ADS 1n)		
9. Interview only: Are the rubrics clear and do they provide enough detail to select markers?		

Appendix 4.B: In-Person Scoring and Calibration Data Collection Instrument

Table 4.B-1 presents our checklist for general training procedures.

Table 4.B.1. General Training Procedures Checklist

Checklist Item (Assessment Design Standard where applicable)	Yes/No	Notes (Include whether observed or documented)
1. Use of markers in conjunction with the scoring guide emphasized.		
2. Rater biases addressed. Raters must remember to set aside personal biases and utilize the training materials in making scoring decisions.		
3. Purpose of various training sets explained.		
4. Scorers have ample practice material.		
5. Practice material is discussed.		
6. Distinctions are made between scoring procedures for pilot/field test and operational candidate submissions (e.g., use of pair and group scoring).		
7. An assessor training program demonstrates convincingly that prospective assessors gain and continuing assessors have and maintain a deep understanding of the TPEs. (ADS 2c)		
8. An assessor training program demonstrates convincingly that prospective assessors gain and continuing assessors have and maintain a deep understanding of the pedagogical assessment tasks. (ADS 2c)		
9. An assessor training program demonstrates convincingly that prospective assessors gain and continuing assessors have and maintain of the multi-level scoring rubrics. (ADS 2c)		
10. The training program includes task-based scoring trials in which an assessment trainer evaluates and certifies each assessor's scoring accuracy and calibration in relation to the scoring rubrics associated with the task. (ADS 2c)		

(continued)

Table 4.B.1. (Continued)

Checklist Item (Assessment Design Standard where applicable)	Yes/No	Notes (Include whether observed or documented)
11. When new pedagogical tasks and scoring rubrics are incorporated into the assessment, the model sponsor provides additional training to the assessors, as needed. (ADS 2c)		
12. Were there any changes to scoring guides, marker papers, or practice sets during scoring?		
13. The model sponsor develops assessor training procedures that focus primarily on teaching performance and that minimize the effects of candidate factors that are not clearly related to pedagogical competence, which may include (depending on the circumstances) factors such as personal attire, appearance, demeanor, speech patterns and accents or any other bias that are not likely to affect job effectiveness and/or student learning. (Based on ADS 1h)		

Table 4.B.2 displays checklist performances and findings related to our review of performance and task presentation to raters and coverage of performance intent and context.

Table 4.B.2. Opportunity to View Performance/Task and Performance Intent Checklist

Checklist Item	Yes/No	Notes (Include whether observed or documented)
1. Scorers score qualifying set(s) independently.		
2. Discussion uses the language of the scoring guide/rubric.		
3. All responses in the qualifying set(s) are discussed/reviewed/available.		
4. Conduct additional training for all scorers using recalibration or refresher after any sustained break in scoring (e.g., lunch), or at the discretion of the trainer (e.g., if reliability is too low overall).		
5. The model sponsor uses only assessors who successfully calibrate during the required TPA model assessor training sequence. (ADS 2c)		

Table 4.B.3 presents calibration procedures.

Table 4.B.3. Calibration Procedures

Checklist Item	Yes/No	Notes (Include whether observed or documented)
1. Scorers score qualifying set(s) independently.		
2. Discussion uses the language of the scoring guide/rubric.		
3. All responses in the qualifying set(s) are discussed/reviewed/available.		
4. Conduct additional training for all scorers using recalibration or refresher after any sustained break in scoring (e.g., lunch), or at the discretion of the trainer (e.g., if reliability is too low overall).		
5. The model sponsor uses only assessors who successfully calibrate during the required TPA model assessor training sequence. (ADS 2c)		

Table 4.B.4 displays checklist performances and findings related to second readings.

Table 4.B.4. Rater Read-Behind Checklist

Checklist Item	Yes/No	Notes (Include whether observed or documented)
1. Scoring Leader views reports frequently to monitor reliability.		
2. Scoring Leader slows or pauses scoring to review reports.		
3. Monitor pace of scoring (to determine whether on schedule).		
4. Watch for downward changes.		
5. Second scoring – Follow-up when reliability is below set standards.		
6. Second scoring – Backread to check for individual scorer problems.		
7. Second Scoring – Review all responses given a specific score to determine if the team as a whole is scoring consistently.		
8. Second scoring – Review discrepant scores and follow established procedures for resolution.		
9. The scoring process conducted by the model sponsor to assure the reliability and validity of candidate outcomes on the assessment may include, for example, regular auditing, selective back reading, and double scoring of candidate responses near the cut score by the qualified, calibrated scorers trained by the model sponsor. (ADS 2e)		
10. The model sponsor provides a detailed plan for establishing and maintaining scorer accuracy and inter-rater reliability during field testing and operational administration of the assessment. (ADS 2e)		

Table 4.B.5 displays checklist performances and findings related to rater monitoring.

Table 4.B.5. Rater Monitoring Checklist

Checklist Item	Yes/No	Notes (Include whether observed or documented)
1. Closely monitor any raters who have difficulty applying the scoring guide consistently.		
2. Refer to scoring guide, markers, and practice papers in answering questions.		
3. Inform the group of raters (as needed) to highlight scoring distinctions.		
4. Soon after scoring begins, review each rater's progress using read-behinds and validity papers.		
5. Provide feedback to raters regarding errors noted during read-behinds and validity checks.		
6. Provide individual training for raters who are having trouble (detected in read-behinds, validity papers, second scoring, or scoring rate).		
7. Retrain and re-score performance responses as directed.		
8. Were any scorers were released from scoring the item due to falling below standards following the calibration set? (Provide date/time in the notes)		
9. Back-read an appropriate percentage of performances.		

Appendix 4.C: Alignment of ADS and Joint Standards to Claims

Tables 4.C.1 and 4.C.2 present the full, unedited claim elements that we determined were aligned with Claims 3, 4, 7, and 8. Table 4.C-3 presents the full, unedited Joint Standards with Comments.

Table 4.C.1. Assessment Design Standard 1 Design Element Alignment by Claim

Label	Assessment Design Standard 1 Elements	Aligned Claim(s)
1(a)	The Teaching Performance Assessment includes complex pedagogical assessment tasks to prompt aspects of candidate performance that measure the TPEs. Each task is substantively related to two or more major domains of the TPEs. For use in judging candidate-generated responses to each pedagogical task, the assessment also includes multi-level scoring rubrics that are clearly related to the TPEs that the task measures. Each task and its associated rubrics measure two or more TPEs. Collectively, the tasks and rubrics in the assessment address key aspects of the six major domains of the TPEs. The sponsor of the performance assessment documents the relationships between TPEs, tasks and rubrics.	Claim 3, Claim 8
1(g)	The TPA model sponsor must provide materials appropriate for use by programs in helping faculty become familiar with the design of the TPA model, the candidate tasks and the scoring rubrics so that faculty can effectively assist candidates to prepare for the assessment. The TPA model sponsor must also provide candidate materials to assist candidates in understanding the nature of the assessment, the specific assessment tasks, the scoring rubrics, submission processes and scoring processes.	Claim 4
1(h)	The model sponsor develops scoring rubrics and assessor training procedures that focus primarily on teaching performance and that minimize the effects of candidate factors that are not clearly related to pedagogical competence, which may include (depending on the circumstances) factors such as personal attire, appearance, demeanor, speech patterns and accents or any other bias that are not likely to affect job effectiveness and/or student learning.	Claim 3, Claim 4

Table 4.C.2. Assessment Design Standard 2 Design Element Alignment by Claim

Label	Assessment Design Standard 2 Elements	Aligned Claim(s)
2(a)	In relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the TPEs, the pedagogical assessment tasks, rubrics, and the associated directions to candidates are designed to yield enough valid evidence for an overall judgment of each candidate's pedagogical qualifications for a Preliminary Teaching Credential as one part of the requirements for the credential.	Claim 3
2(c)	The Teaching Performance Assessment system includes a comprehensive process to select and train assessors who score candidate responses to the pedagogical assessment tasks. An assessor training program demonstrates convincingly that prospective and continuing assessors gain a deep understanding of the TPEs, the pedagogical assessment tasks and the multi-level scoring rubrics. The training program includes task-based scoring trials in which an assessment trainer evaluates and certifies each assessor's scoring accuracy and calibration in relation to the scoring rubrics associated with the task. The model sponsor establishes selection criteria for assessors of candidate responses to the TPA. The selection criteria include but are not limited to appropriate pedagogical expertise in the content areas assessed within the TPA. The model sponsor selects assessors who meet the established selection criteria and uses only assessors who successfully calibrate during the required TPA model assessor training sequence. When new pedagogical tasks and scoring rubrics are incorporated into the assessment, the model sponsor provides additional training to the assessors, as needed.	Claim 4
2(e)	The model sponsor provides a consistent scoring process for all programs using that model, including programs using a local scoring option provided by the model sponsor. The scoring process conducted by the model sponsor to assure the reliability and validity of candidate outcomes on the assessment may include, for example, regular auditing, selective back reading, and double scoring of candidate responses near the cut score by the qualified, calibrated scorers trained by the model sponsor. All approved models must include a local scoring option in which the assessors of candidate responses are program faculty and/or other individuals identified by the program who meet the model sponsor's assessor selection criteria. These local assessors are trained and calibrated by the model sponsor, and whose scoring work is facilitated and their scoring results are facilitated and reviewed by the model sponsor. The model sponsor provides a detailed plan for establishing and maintaining scorer accuracy and inter-rater reliability during field testing and operational administration of the assessment. The model sponsor demonstrates that the assessment procedures, taken as a whole, maximize the accurate determination of each candidate's overall pass-fail status on the assessment. The model sponsor must provide an annual audit process that documents that local scoring outcomes are consistent and reliable within the model for candidates across the range of programs using local scoring, and informs the Commission where inconsistencies in local scoring outcomes are identified. If inconsistencies are identified, the sponsor must provide a plan to the CTC for how it will address and resolve the scoring inconsistencies both for the current scoring results and for future scoring of the TPA.	Claim 4
2(g)	The model sponsor conducting scoring for the program provides results on the TPA to the individual candidate based on performance relative to TPE domains and/or to the specific scoring rubrics within a maximum of three weeks following candidate submission of completed TPA responses. The model sponsor provides results to programs based on both individual and aggregated data relating to candidate performance relative to the rubrics and/or domains of the TPEs. The model sponsor also follows the timelines established with programs using a local scoring option for providing scoring results.	Claim 7

Table 4.C.3. Joint Standards Alignment to Claims

#	Joint Standard	Aligned Claim(s)
1.1	<p>The test developer should set forth clearly how test scores are intended to be interpreted and consequently used. The population(s) for which a test is intended should be delimited clearly, and the construct or constructs that the test is intended to assess should be described clearly.</p> <p>Comment: Statements about validity should refer to particular interpretations and consequent uses. It is incorrect to use the unqualified phrase “the validity of the test.” No test permits interpretations that are valid for all purposes or in all situations. Each recommended interpretation for a given use requires validation. The test developer should specify in clear language the population for which the test is intended, the construct it is intended to measure, the contexts in which test scores are to be employed, and the processes by which the test is to be administered and scored.</p>	<p>Claim 7 Claim 8</p>
1.2	<p>A rationale should be presented for each intended interpretation of test scores for a given use, together with a summary of the evidence and theory bearing on the intended interpretation.</p> <p>Comment: The rationale should indicate what propositions are necessary to investigate the intended interpretation. The summary should combine logical analysis with empirical evidence to provide support for the test rationale. Evidence may come from studies conducted locally, in the setting where the test is to be used; from specific prior studies; or from comprehensive statistical syntheses of available studies meeting clearly specified study quality criteria. No type of evidence is inherently preferable to others; rather, the quality and relevance of the evidence to the intended test score interpretation for a given use determine the value of a particular kind of evidence. A presentation of empirical evidence on any point should give due weight to all relevant findings in the scientific literature, including those inconsistent with the intended interpretation or use. Test developers have the responsibility to provide support for their own recommendations, but test users bear ultimate responsibility for evaluating the quality of the validity evidence provided and its relevance to the local situation.</p>	<p>Claim 7</p>
2.13	<p>The standard error of measurement, both overall and conditional (if reported), should be provided in units of each reported score.</p> <p>Comment: The standard error of measurement (overall or conditional) that is reported should be consistent with the scales that are used in reporting scores. Standard errors in scale-score units for the scales used to report scores and/or to make decisions are particularly helpful to the typical test user. The data on examinee performance should be consistent with the assumptions built into any statistical models used to generate scale scores and to estimate the standard errors for these scores.</p>	<p>Claim 7</p>
3.0	<p>All steps in the testing process, including test design, validation, development, administration, and scoring procedures, should be designed in such a manner as to minimize construct-irrelevant variance and to promote valid score interpretations for the intended uses for all examinees in the intended population.</p> <p>Comment: The central idea of fairness in testing is to identify and remove construct-irrelevant barriers to maximal performance for any examinee. Removing these barriers allows for the comparable and valid interpretation of test scores for all examinees. Fairness is thus central to the validity and comparability of the interpretation of test scores for intended uses.</p>	<p>Claim 4</p>

(continued)

Table 4.C.3. (Continued)

#	Joint Standard	Aligned Claim(s)
3.4	<p>Test takers should receive comparable treatment during the test administration and scoring process.</p> <p>Comment: Those responsible for testing should adhere to standardized test administration, scoring, and security protocols so that test scores will reflect the construct(s) being assessed and will not be unduly influenced by idiosyncrasies in the testing process. Those responsible for test administration should mitigate the possibility of personal predispositions that might affect the test administration or interpretation of scores. Computerized and other forms of technology-based testing add extra concerns for standardization in administration and scoring. Examinees must have access to technology so that aspects of the technology itself do not influence scores. Examinees working on older, slower equipment may be unfairly disadvantaged relative to those working on newer equipment. If computers or other devices differ in speed of processing or movement from one screen to the next, in the fidelity of the visuals, or in other important ways, it is possible that construct-irrelevant factors may influence test performance. Issues related to test security and fidelity of administration can also threaten the comparability of treatment of individuals and the validity and fairness of test score interpretations. For example, unauthorized distribution of items to some examinees but not others, or unproctored test administrations where standardization cannot be ensured, could provide an advantage to some test takers over others. In these situations, test results should be interpreted with caution.</p>	Claim 4
3.8	<p>When tests require the scoring of constructed responses, test developers and/or users should collect and report evidence of the validity of score interpretations for relevant subgroups in the intended population of test takers for the intended uses of the test scores.</p> <p>Comment: Subgroup differences in examinee responses and/or the expectations and perceptions of scorers can introduce construct-irrelevant variance in scores from constructed response tests. These, in turn, could seriously affect the reliability/precision, validity, and comparability of score interpretations for intended uses for some individuals. Different methods of scoring could differentially influence the construct representation of scores for individuals from some subgroups.</p> <p>For human scoring, scoring procedures should be designed with the intent that the scores reflect the examinee’s standing relative to the tested construct(s) and are not influenced by the perceptions and personal predispositions of the scorers. It is essential that adequate training and calibration of scorers be carried out and monitored throughout the scoring process to support the consistency of scorers’ ratings for individuals from relevant subgroups. Where sample sizes permit, the precision and accuracy of scores for relevant subgroups also should be calculated.</p> <p>Automated scoring algorithms may be used to score complex constructed responses, such as essays, either as the sole determiner of the score or in conjunction with a score provided by a human scorer. Scoring algorithms need to be reviewed for potential sources of bias. The precision of scores and validity of score interpretations resulting from automated scoring should be evaluated for all relevant subgroups of the intended population.</p>	Claim 4, Claim 7

(continued)

Table 4.C.3. (Continued)

#	Joint Standard	Aligned Claim(s)
4.18	<p>Procedures for scoring and, if relevant, scoring criteria, should be presented by the test developer with sufficient detail and clarity to maximize the accuracy of scoring. Instructions for using rating scales or for deriving scores obtained by coding, scaling, or classifying constructed responses should be clear. This is especially critical for extended-response items such as performance tasks, portfolios, and essays.</p> <p>Comment: In scoring more complex responses, test developers must provide detailed rubrics and training in their use. Providing multiple examples of responses at each score level for use in training scorers and monitoring scoring consistency is also common practice, although these are typically added to scoring specifications during item development and tryouts. For monitoring scoring effectiveness, consistency criteria for qualifying scorers should be specified, as appropriate, along with procedures, such as double-scoring of some or all responses. As appropriate, test developers should specify selection criteria for scorers and procedures for training, qualifying, and monitoring scorers. If different groups of scorers are used with different administrations, procedures for checking the comparability of scores generated by the different groups should be specified and implemented.</p>	Claim 3
4.20	<p>The process for selecting, training, qualifying, and monitoring scorers should be specified by the test developer. The training materials, such as the scoring rubrics and examples of test takers' responses that illustrate the levels on the rubric score scale, and the procedures for training scorers should result in a degree of accuracy and agreement among scorers that allows the scores to be interpreted as originally intended by the test developer. Specifications should describe processes for assessing scorer consistency and potential drift over time in raters' scoring.</p> <p>Comment: To the extent possible, scoring processes and materials should anticipate issues that may arise during scoring. Training materials should address any common misconceptions about the rubrics used to describe score levels. When written text is being scored, it is common to include a set of prescored responses for use in training and for judging scoring accuracy. The basis for determining scoring consistency (e.g., percentage of exact agreement, percentage within one score point, or some other index of agreement) should be indicated. Information on scoring consistency is essential to estimating the precision of resulting scores.</p>	Claim 4, Claim 7
4.22	<p>Test developers should specify the procedures used to interpret test scores and, when appropriate, the normative or standardization samples or the criterion used.</p> <p>Comment: Test specifications may indicate that the intended scores should be interpreted as indicating an absolute level of the construct being measured or as indicating standing on the construct relative to other examinees, or both. In absolute score interpretations, the score or average is assumed to reflect directly a level of competence or mastery in some defined criterion domain. In relative score interpretations the status of an individual (or group) is determined by comparing the score (or mean score) with the performance of others in one or more defined populations. Tests designed to facilitate one type of interpretation may function less effectively for the other type of interpretation. Given appropriate test design and adequate supporting data, however, scores arising from norm-referenced testing programs may provide reasonable absolute score interpretations, and scores arising from criterion referenced programs may provide reasonable relative score interpretations.</p>	Claim 7

(continued)

Table 4.C.3. (Continued)

#	Joint Standard	Aligned Claim(s)
5.0	<p>Test scores should be derived in a way that supports the interpretations of test scores for the proposed uses of tests. Test developers and users should document evidence of fairness, reliability, and validity of test scores for their proposed use.</p> <p>Comment: Specific standards for various uses and interpretations of test scores and score scales are described below. These include standards for norm referenced and criterion-referenced interpretations, interpretations of cut scores, interchangeability of scores on alternate forms following equating, and score comparability following the use of other procedures for score linking. Documentation supporting such interpretations provides a basis for external experts and test users to judge the extent to which the interpretations are likely to be supported and can lead to valid interpretations of scores for all individuals in the intended examinee population.</p>	Claim 7
6.9	<p>Those responsible for test scoring should establish and document quality control processes and criteria. Adequate training should be provided. The quality of scoring should be monitored and documented. Any systematic source of scoring errors should be documented and corrected.</p> <p>Comment: Criteria should be established for acceptable scoring quality. Procedures should be instituted to calibrate scorers (human or machine) prior to operational scoring, and to monitor how consistently scorers are scoring in accordance with those established standards during operational scoring. Where scoring is distributed across scorers, procedures to monitor raters' accuracy and reliability may also be useful as a quality control procedure. Consistency in applying scoring criteria is often checked by independently rescoring randomly selected test responses. Periodic checks of the statistical properties (e.g., means, standard deviations, percentage of agreement with scores previously determined to be accurate) of scores assigned by individual scorers during a scoring session can provide feedback for the scorers, helping them to maintain scoring standards. In addition, analyses might monitor possible effects on scoring accuracy of variables such as scorer, task, time or day of scoring, scoring trainer, scorer pairing, and so on, to inform appropriate corrective or preventative actions. When the same items are used in multiple administrations, programs should have procedures in place to monitor consistency of scoring across administrations (e.g., year-to-year comparability). One way to check for consistency over time is to rescore some responses from earlier administrations. Inaccurate or inconsistent scoring may call for retraining, rescoring, dismissing some scorers, and/or reexamining the scoring rubrics or programs. Systematic scoring errors should be corrected, which may involve rescoring responses previously scored, as well as correcting the source of the error. Clerical and mechanical errors should be examined. Scoring errors should be minimized and, when they are found, steps should be taken promptly to minimize their recurrence.</p> <p>Typically, those responsible for scoring will document the procedures followed for scoring, procedures followed for quality assurance of that scoring, the results of the quality assurance, and any unusual circumstances. Depending on the test user, that documentation may be provided regularly or upon reasonable request. Computerized scoring applications of text, speech, or other constructed responses should provide similar documentation of accuracy and reliability, including comparisons with human scoring.</p> <p>When scoring is done locally and requires scorer judgment, the test user is responsible for providing adequate training and instruction to the scorers and for examining scorer agreement and accuracy. The expected level of scorer agreement and accuracy should be documented, as feasible.</p>	Claim 4

(continued)

Table 4.C.3. (Continued)

#	Joint Standard	Aligned Claim(s)
6.9 (cont'd)	When scoring is done locally and requires scorer judgment, the test user is responsible for providing adequate training and instruction to the scorers and for examining scorer agreement and accuracy. The expected level of scorer agreement and accuracy should be documented, as feasible.	
6.10	<p>When test score information is released, those responsible for testing programs should provide interpretations appropriate to the audience. The interpretations should describe in simple language what the test covers, what scores represent, the precision/reliability of the scores, and how scores are intended to be used.</p> <p>Comment: Test users should consult the interpretive material prepared by the test developer and should revise or supplement the material as necessary to present the local and individual results accurately and clearly to the intended audience, which may include clients, legal representatives, media, referral sources, test takers, parents, or teachers. Reports and feedback should be designed to support valid interpretations and use, and minimize potential negative consequences. Score precision might be depicted by error bands or likely score ranges, showing the standard error of measurement. Reports should include discussion of any administrative variations or behavioral observations in clinical settings that may affect results and interpretations. Test users should avoid misinterpretation and misuse of test score information. While test users are primarily responsible for avoiding misinterpretation and misuse, the interpretive materials prepared by the test developer or publisher may address common misuses or misinterpretations. To accomplish this, developers of reports and interpretive materials may conduct research to help verify that reports and materials can be interpreted as intended (e.g., focus groups with representative end-users of the reports). The test developer should inform test users of changes in the test over time that may affect test score interpretation, such as changes in norms, test content frameworks, or scale score meanings.</p>	Claim 7, Claim 8

Appendix 4.D: FAST Site Visitation Project Rubric Sample (Field Test compared to Operational)

Sections	Lesson Planning							
	Field Test 1 Does Not Meet Expectations	Operational 1 Does Not Meet Expectations	Field Test 2 Meets Expectations	Operational 2 Meets Expectations	Field Test 3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	Operational 3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	Field Test 4 Exceeds Expectations	Operational 4 Exceeds Expectations
Subject Specific Pedagogy TPE 3.1, 3.3, 3.5	The lesson plan includes few activities or strategies consistent with current subject-specific pedagogy and/or acquisition of academic language. Candidate <u>does not</u> identify appropriate activities or strategies that represent subject-specific pedagogy or acquisition of academic language.	The lesson plan includes content and related activities or strategies inconsistent with current subject-specific pedagogy and standards, with limited support for acquisition or use of academic language.	The lesson plan includes content, activities, or strategies consistent with current subject-specific pedagogy or acquisition of academic language. Candidate <u>identifies</u> appropriate activities or strategies within the lesson that demonstrate a <u>general</u> understanding of subject-specific pedagogy or acquisition of academic language.	The lesson plan includes content and related activities or strategies: (a) <u>consistent</u> with current subject-specific pedagogy and standards, (b) that support the acquisition or use of academic language.	The lesson plan includes content, activities or strategies consistent with current subject-specific pedagogy and acquisition of academic language. Candidate <u>describes clear connections</u> between activities and strategies within the lesson and their <u>relationship to</u> subject-specific pedagogy and acquisition of academic language.	The lesson plan includes content and related activities and strategies: (a) consistent with current subject-specific pedagogy and standards, (b) that provide multiple opportunities for students to acquire and use academic language.	The lesson plan includes content, activities or strategies consistent with current subject-specific pedagogy and acquisition of academic language. Candidate <u>describes strong alignment</u> between activities or strategies within the lesson and how they <u>represent</u> subject-specific pedagogy and the acquisition and use of academic language.	The lesson plan includes content and related activities and strategies adapted for specific needs of students: (a) consistent with current subject-specific pedagogy and standards, (b) that provide multiple opportunities for students to acquire and use academic language; (c) with clear evidence of a plan to monitor students' access to content.
Applying Knowledge of Students TPE 3.2, 4.1, 4.2	Candidate gathers <u>limited</u> information on students. The lesson plan and identified activity or strategy demonstrates <u>little or no</u> understanding of the connection between knowledge of students and lesson planning.	Information about students, gathered by the candidate, provides little or no useful information for planning. Candidate <u>plans activities</u> or strategies that demonstrate <u>little or no</u> understanding of the connection between knowledge of students and promoting access to the content.	Candidate gathers <u>acceptable</u> information on students. The lesson plan and identified activity or strategy demonstrates a <u>general</u> understanding of the connection between knowledge of students at that grade level and promoting access to the content.	Information about students, gathered by the candidate, provides useful information for planning. Based on a general knowledge of students at this grade level, candidate plans appropriate activities or strategies to promote access to the content.	Candidate gathers <u>relevant</u> information on students. The lesson plan and identified activity or strategy demonstrates a <u>specific</u> understanding of the connection between knowledge of students in the class and promoting access to the content.	Information about students, gathered by the candidate, provides useful information for planning. Based on knowledge of students in this class, candidate plans appropriate activities or strategies that include accommodations or modifications to promote access to the content.	Candidate gathers <u>relevant and detailed</u> information on students. The lesson plan and identified activity or strategy <u>clearly</u> uses <u>specific</u> knowledge of <u>individuals or groups of students</u> in the class to promote access to content.	Candidate gathers <u>relevant and detailed</u> information on students to be used for planning. Based on knowledge of individuals or groups of students in the class, candidate plans appropriate activities or strategies that include accommodations or modifications to promote access to the content specifically referencing these students.
Student Engagement TPE 1.1, 1.3, 1.5, 4.7	The lesson plan and identified activity or strategy includes <u>few or no</u> student engagement techniques <u>appropriate to the grade level</u> , such as real-life contexts, connections to students' experiences or interests, opportunities for critical or creative thinking, or varied communication strategies.	Candidate <u>plans few or inappropriate methods for student engagement.</u>	The lesson plan and identified activity or strategy includes <u>some</u> student engagement techniques <u>appropriate to the grade level</u> , such as real-life contexts, connections to students' experiences or interests, opportunities for critical or creative thinking, or varied communication strategies.	Candidate's plan for engaging students is appropriate to the grade level (e.g. real-life contexts, connections to students' experiences or interests, opportunities for critical or creative thinking, varied communication strategies). Note: Field test mentioned that the plan includes some student engagement techniques whereas the Operational rubric does not.	The lesson plan and identified activity or strategy includes <u>varied</u> student engagement techniques <u>appropriate to students in this class</u> , such as real-life contexts, connections to students' experiences or interests, opportunities for critical or creative thinking, or varied communication strategies.	Candidate's plan for engaging students includes <u>varied methods appropriate to students in this class</u> (e.g. real-life contexts, connections to students' experiences or interests, opportunities for critical or creative thinking, varied communication strategies).	The lesson plan and identified activity or strategy includes <u>many</u> student engagement techniques <u>specifically connected to the backgrounds and needs of individuals or groups of students</u> in the class, such as real-life contexts, connections to students' experiences or interests, opportunities for critical or creative thinking, or varied communication strategies.	Candidate's plan for engaging students includes varied methods specifically connected to the backgrounds and needs of individuals or groups of students in the class (e.g. real-life contexts, connections to students' experiences or interests, opportunities for critical or creative thinking, varied communication strategies). Note: Field test rubric mentions many student engagement techniques whereas the operational rubric does not.

Appendix 4.E: FAST Teaching Sample Project Rubric Sample (Field Test compared to Operational)

	Students in Context							
	Field Test	Operational	Field Test	Operational	Field Test	Operational	Field Test	Operational
Sections	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations	4 Exceeds Expectations
Implications for Instruction TPE 1.6, 4.1, 5.8	Descriptions of instructional approaches are <u>inappropriate</u> for: (a) different levels of English proficiency, (b) students with identified special needs, (c) students with different instructional needs.	Descriptions of instructional approaches are limited or inappropriate for at least two of the following groups: (a) different levels of English proficiency, (b) students with identified special needs, (c) students with different instructional needs.	Descriptions of instructional approaches are <u>generally appropriate</u> for this grade level for at least two of the following groups: (a) different levels of English proficiency, (b) students with identified special needs, (c) students with different instructional needs. (b) students with identified special needs, (c) students with different instructional needs.	Descriptions of instructional approaches are <u>generally appropriate</u> for at least two of the following groups: (a) different levels of English proficiency, (b) students with identified special needs, (c) students with different instructional needs.	Descriptions of instructional approaches are <u>specifically appropriate for this class</u> for at least two of the following groups and: (a) <u>address a range of levels of English proficiency</u> , (b) are <u>aligned</u> with the identified special needs of the students, (c) <u>reflect the needs</u> of students with different instructional needs.	Descriptions of instructional approaches are <u>specifically aligned with the needs of at least two</u> of the following groups: (a) different levels of English proficiency , (b) students with identified special needs, (c) students with different instructional needs .	Description of instructional approaches are <u>appropriate, detailed, and connected to specific students in the class</u> for all of the following groups and: (a) address a <u>full</u> range of English proficiency levels, (b) are <u>clearly matched</u> with the identified special needs of the students, (c) reflect the needs of <u>specific</u> students with different instructional needs.	Description of instructional approaches are <u>detailed and specifically aligned</u> with the needs of <u>all</u> of the following groups: (a) a full range of English proficiency levels, (b) students with identified special needs , (c) students with different instructional needs .
Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments TPE 2.1, 2.3, 2.6	-Describes no or ineffective expectations for classroom behavior. <u>Or</u> -Management strategies are inappropriate for the grade level. -Identifies no routines or procedures or Describes an ineffective plan for communicating procedures to students.	Expectations for, and responses to, behavior are limited or inappropriate related to at least two of the following: (a) individual responsibility , (b) intolerance , (c) an inclusive climate . Routines are ineffective, with no or limited description of how they were communicated to students.	-Describes expectations for classroom behavior related to individual responsibility, intolerance, and/or an inclusive climate. -Management strategies are <u>appropriate for the grade level</u> . -Identifies routines or procedures and describes a <u>general plan</u> for communicating them to students.	Expectations for, and responses to, behavior include general examples related to at least two of the following: (a) individual responsibility, (b) intolerance, (c) an inclusive climate. Routines focus on management, with a general description of how they were communicated to students.	-Describes expectations related to individual responsibility, intolerance, and an inclusive climate, which focus on <u>positive</u> classroom behavior and interactions. -Management strategies <u>reflect fair and respectful treatment of students</u> and are appropriate for students in the class. -Identifies routines or procedures <u>that facilitate learning</u> and describes a <u>specific plan</u> for communicating them to students.	Expectations for, and responses to, behavior include specific examples related to all of the following: (a) individual responsibility, (b) intolerance , (c) an inclusive climate, and focus on <u>positive, fair and respectful treatment of students</u> . Routines are specifically designed to facilitate learning, with a detailed description of how they were communicated to students.	-Describes expectations focusing on positive classroom behavior and interactions, and provides a <u>justification</u> . -Management strategies reflect fair and respectful treatment of students, are <u>specifically designed for students in the class, and connect climate to learning</u> . -Identifies routines or procedures that facilitate learning, describes a specific plan for communicating them to students and <u>families, and maintaining them throughout the year</u> .	Expectations for, and responses to, behavior include specific examples and justification related to (a) individual responsibility, (b) intolerance, and (c) an inclusive environment, which reflect fair and respectful treatment specifically designed for the full range of students in the class. Routines, designed to facilitate learning, are described and justified, including a description of how they were communicated to students and families, and maintained throughout the year .

Appendix 4.F: FAST Assessor TSP Report of Scores

Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST)

Report of Scores:

TEACHING SAMPLE PROJECT

Teacher Candidate: _____

ID Number: _____

Phase 3 Supervisor: _____

1=Does Not Meet Expectations; 2=Meets Expectations; 3=Meets Expectations at a High Level; 4=Exceeds Expectations. Teacher candidates must receive passing score of 2 or more on each section of this project. Teacher Candidates may retake and submit for evaluation any section on which they earn a score of “1.” (See FAST Manual for appropriate policies and procedures.)

Teaching Sample Project, FAST 2.0		
SECTION	SCORE	COMMENTS
Students in Context		
Learning Outcomes		
Assessment Plan		
Design for Instruction		
Instructional Decision Making		
Analysis of Student Learning		

Appendix 4.G: FAST SVP Student Score Report from TK20

Tk20 FRESNO STATE
FRESNO STATE UNIVERSITY

HOME >
APPLICATIONS >
COURSES >
FIELD EXPERIENCE >
PORTFOLIOS >
PORTFOLIOS >
Partfolios >
Presentation Portfolios

Portfolios > Partfolios > P
SITE VISITATION PROJECT
Site Visitation Project
Phase 1

SVP - Scoring Rubrics - Final Score: A1

Assessed By :
Danella Barnes

Use this form to enter the students FINAL scores on each of the rubrics.

SVP - FINAL SCORE

Site Visitation Project - Final Score:
Lesson Planning
(2) Meets Expectations

Site Visitation Project - Final Score:
Observation of Lesson
(2) Meets Expectations

Site Visitation Project - Final Score:
Self-Evaluation of Lesson
(2) Meets Expectations

Committee Member
Barnes, Danella
scher

Close

Appendix 4.H: FAST TSP Student Score Report from TK20

TSP Rubrics

LEARNING OUTCOMES

Teaching Process Standard: *The teacher sets significant, challenging, varied and appropriate learning outcomes.*

TPE 3: Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning

Rating / Indicator	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations at a High Level	Exceeds Expectations
Learning Outcomes and Standards TPE 3.1, 3.3	-Standards and outcomes do not address appropriate content knowledge or literacy skills. -Outcomes poorly represent the content and level of learning reflected in the content standards. - Outcomes reflect a <u>one-dimensional</u> level of learning.	-Standards and outcomes primarily address <u>either</u> content knowledge <u>or</u> literacy skills. -Some outcomes represent the content and level of learning reflected in the content standards. -Outcomes reflect a <u>limited range</u> in the type or level of learning.	-Standards and outcomes clearly address <u>both</u> content knowledge and literacy skills. -Most outcomes represent the content and level of learning reflected in the content standards. -Outcomes reflect a range in the type or level of learning, <u>including a focus on higher level learning.</u>	-Standards and outcomes clearly <u>reflect a connection between</u> content knowledge and literacy skills. -All outcomes represent the content and level of learning reflected in the content standards. - Outcomes reflect a range in the type or level of learning, including a focus on higher level learning <u>and the integration of</u> content and literacy skills.
Appropriateness For Students TPE 3.2	Description of unit and rationale provide limited justification for the appropriateness of the unit for students.	Description of unit and rationale provide <u>general</u> justification for: (a) development of either content knowledge <u>or</u> literacy skills; (b) past experiences, pre-requisite knowledge, or future learning. (c) <u>relevance for students at that grade level</u>	-Description of unit and rationale provide <u>specific</u> justification for: (a) development of content knowledge and literacy skills, (b) past experiences, pre-requisite knowledge, or future learning. (c) <u>relevance for students in that class.</u>	Description of unit and rationale provide specific justification for: (a) <u>integration of</u> content knowledge and literacy skills, (b) past experiences, pre-requisite knowledge, <u>and</u> future learning, (c) <u>relevance for students in that class, specifically referencing information from Students in Context section.</u>

Learning Outcomes

	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations at a High Level	Exceeds Expectations
Learning Outcomes - overall rating	●	●	●	●

Appendix 4.I: FAST TSP Student Non-Passing Score Email



Jean Behrend <jeanb@mail.fresnostate.edu>

TSP - not passing

1 message

Jean Behrend <jeanb@csufresno.edu>

Mon, Apr 16, 2018 at 6:05 PM

To:

Cc:

I regret to inform you that you did not pass the Teaching Sample Project (TSP). You earned a passing score on five of the sections, but did not pass the other two sections.

The two non-passing sections are: Analysis of Student Learning and Reflection and Self-Evaluation. In each of these sections you are missing important elements included in the rubric. In each section you have a good start and just need additional information.

You have the opportunity to redo the sections for a passing score. Please contact me by replying to this email to make an appointment to discuss what you will need to do to revise your TSP. I'm available many days between 4:00-6:00 pm. Let me know what days or dates would work for you.

A passing score on the TSP is a requirement to pass EHD 170.

Dr. Jeanie Behrend
FAST Coordinator
jeanb@csufresno.edu

Appendix 4.J: edTPA Task 1 (Planning) Rubric Overview



edTPA Task 1 Rubrics	Construct Measured
R1 – Planning for Content Learning	Candidate’s plans for instruction address content-specific skills, concepts, strategies, and/or processes
R2 - Planning to support varied student learning needs	Candidate uses knowledge of his/her students to target support for students to develop content-specific skills, concepts, strategies, and/or processes
R3 - Using knowledge of students to inform teaching and learning	Candidate uses knowledge of his/her students to justify instructional plans
R4 - Identifying and Supporting Language Demands	Candidate identifies and supports language demands associated with content learning tasks
R5 - Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning	Candidate selects or designs informal and formal assessments to monitor students’ progress toward developing content-specific skills, concepts, strategies, and/or processes



Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, & Equity

Copyright © 2020 Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. All rights reserved. The edTPA trademarks are owned by The Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University.
 Use of the edTPA trademarks is permitted only pursuant to the terms of a written license agreement. Copyright © 2020 Pearson Education, Inc. or its affiliate(s). All rights reserved.
 Pearson, P.O. Box 226, Amherst, MA 01004

Appendix 4.K: edTPA Task 2 (Instruction) Rubric Overview



edTPA Task 2 Rubrics	Construct Measured
R6 - Learning Environment	Candidate demonstrates a positive learning environment that supports students' engagement in learning
R7 - Engaging Students in Learning	Candidate actively engages students in developing content-specific skills, concepts, strategies, and/or processes
R8 - Deepening Student Knowledge	Candidate elicits student responses to promote thinking and to develop content-specific skills, concepts, strategies, and/or processes
R9 - Subject-Specific Pedagogy	Candidate uses subject specific pedagogical strategies and/or materials to support students' understanding of content-specific skills, concepts, strategies and/or processes
R10 - Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness	Candidate uses the analysis of what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction

SCALE

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, & Equity

Copyright © 2020 Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. All rights reserved. The edTPA trademarks are owned by The Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University.
 Use of the edTPA trademarks is permitted only pursuant to the terms of a written license agreement. Copyright © 2020 Pearson Education, Inc. or its affiliate(s). All rights reserved.
 Pearson, P.O. Box 226, Amherst, MA 01004

Appendix 4.L: edTPA Task 3 (Assessment) Rubric Overview



edTPA Task 3 Rubrics	Construct Measured
R11 - Analysis of Student Learning	Candidate analyzes evidence of student learning of content specific skills, concepts, strategies, and/or processes
R12 - Providing Feedback to Guide Learning	Candidate provides feedback to focus students that addresses their strengths and needs
R13 - Student Use of Feedback	Candidate provides opportunities for students to use feedback to guide their further learning
R14 - Analyzing Students' Language Use and Content Learning	Candidate analyzes students' use of language to develop content understanding
R15 - Using Assessment to Inform Instruction	Candidate uses the analysis of what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction

SCALE

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, & Equity

Copyright © 2020 Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. All rights reserved. The edTPA trademarks are owned by The Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University.
 Use of the edTPA trademarks is permitted only pursuant to the terms of a written license agreement. Copyright © 2020 Pearson Education, Inc. or its affiliate(s). All rights reserved.
 Pearson, P.O. Box 226, Amherst, MA 01004

Appendix 4.M: edTPA Institution Report Layout



edTPA[®] Institution Report Layout

The edTPA Institution Report will be produced as an ASCII-formatted, pipe-delimited (“|”) data file. The data file will not include a header record. The file contains the data elements in the order shown below.

The extract files will contain data only for Candidates who submitted an edTPA assessment to Pearson for scoring (no withdrawals or void data will be reported).

File naming convention: rTPAXXXXXXXXX-ZZeYYYYMMDD.asc

R stands for “report”
 TPA acronym for edTPA
 XXXXXXXX 6 or 8 institution code
 - dash
 ZZ 2-character state code
 E examinee (candidate) file identifier
 YYYYMMDD extract posting date (year/month/day)

Data Element	Max Length	Description
Last Name	40	Candidate last name
First Name	20	Candidate first name
Middle initial	1	Candidate middle initial
SSN	5	Last 5 digits of Candidate Social Security Number only
DOB	8	Candidate date of birth (YYYYMMDD)
Submitted date	8	Date Candidate submitted (YYYYMMDD)
Reporting date	8	Date Candidate scores reported (YYYYMMDD)
Assessment Program	10	Assessment program identifier
Field code	3	Unique edTPA field code (See below for values).
Score 1	3	See below for Score to Rubric Mapping
...	3	
Score 21	3	

Data Element	Max Length	Description
edTPA Total Score	3 Alpha	<p>Candidate score on total score point scale (sum of all rubric scores, excluding Washington Student Voice Rubrics)</p> <p>In the case of a .5 score at the Total edTPA Score level (e.g., 39.5), the Total edTPA score will be rounded up to the next highest whole number. For example, a Total edTPA Score of 39.5 will be reported as a 40. Only the Total edTPA Score will be rounded (Rubric Scores and Task Totals are not rounded).</p> <p>Effective 10/22/2015: If a candidate receives two or more condition codes within the same task, the task total score, average total rubric score, and total portfolio score will be reported as "I" for "incomplete."</p>
Average Total Rubric Score	3 Alpha	<p>Average rubric score obtained for all scored rubrics (excluding Washington Student Voice Rubrics)</p> <p>Effective 10/22/2015: If a candidate receives two or more condition codes within the same task, the task total score, average total rubric score, and total portfolio score will be reported as "I" for "incomplete."</p>
Is Prep Inst Code	1	<p>A value of "1" indicates the candidate has identified this institution as his/her educator preparation institution during edTPA registration.</p>
Customer Number	20	<p>Pearson's unique identifier for the Candidate during this reporting cycle.</p>
Platform Provider ID	255	<p>This field is used only at campuses that are using an edTPA Platform Provider System integrated with the Pearson system. If the Platform Provider sends a Partner Candidate ID with a transferred portfolio, the Pearson system will return it with the appropriate scores.</p>
edTPA Total Score with Student Voice	3 Alpha	<p>Candidate score on total score point scale (sum of all rubric scores, including Washington Student Voice Rubrics). This field will be blank for candidates who have taken a National Handbook.</p> <p>This value will include the rounded Total edTPA Score (if applicable). The Total Score with Student Voice is not also rounded.</p> <p>Effective 10/22/2015: If a candidate receives two or more condition codes within the same task, the task total score, average total rubric score, and total portfolio score will be reported as "I" for "incomplete."</p>
Average Total Rubric Score with Student Voice	3 Alpha	<p>Average rubric score obtained for all scored rubrics (including Washington Student Voice Rubrics). This field will be blank for candidates who have taken a National Handbook.</p> <p>Effective 10/22/2015: If a candidate receives two or more condition codes within the same task, the task total score, average total rubric score, and total portfolio score will be reported as "I" for "incomplete."</p>

Data Element	Max Length	Description
State Pass Fail Status Code	1	Test status based on state-approved passing standard (P=Pass, F=Fail, T=Taken). States that approved a state passing standard for assessments will have P or F. States that do not have an approved passing standard for assessments will have a T for Taken.
Field Specialty	57	Specialty Area selected by candidate in edTPA Registration process.
State Identifier	20	Unique state identification code assigned by the state licensing agency and supplied by the candidate during edTPA registration, when applicable.

edTPA Score to Rubric Mapping

Notes about the Score mapping to Handbook Rubric Descriptions:

- The World Language (WL) and Classical Languages (CL) Handbooks (both National and Washington) will contain null values for the Academic Language Rubrics.
- The Washington Handbooks contain Student-Voice rubrics which will have null values for all National assessments.
- The Elementary Education Handbook contains Mathematics Assessment Rubrics which will have null values for all other assessments.

See below for detailed field mapping to Handbook Rubrics.

Score	Rubric Numbers				Rubric Description
	National Handbooks		Washington Handbooks		
	World Language and Classical Languages	Other	World Language and Classical Languages	Other	
Score 1	1	1	1	1	Planning: Planning for Subject-Specific Understandings
Score 2	2	2	2	2	Planning: Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs
Score 3	3	3	3	3	Analyzing Teaching: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning
Score 4	Null	4	Null	4	Academic Language: Identifying and Supporting Language Demands
Score 5	4	5	4	5	Planning: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning
Score 6	5	6	5	6	Instruction: Learning Environment
Score 7	6	7	6	7	Instruction: Engaging Students in Learning
Score 8	7	8	7	8	Instruction: Deepening Student Learning

Score	Rubric Numbers				Rubric Description
	National Handbooks		Washington Handbooks		
	World Language and Classical Languages	Other	World Language and Classical Languages	Other	
Score 9	8	9	8	9	Instruction: Subject-Specific Pedagogy: Using Representations
Score 10	9	10	9	10	Analyzing Teaching: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness
Score 11	10	11	10	11	Assessment: Analysis of Student Learning
Score 12	11	12	11	12	Assessment: Providing Feedback to Guide Learning
Score 13	12	13	12	13	Assessment: Student Understanding and Use of Feedback
Score 14	Null	14	Null	14	Academic Language: Analyzing Students' Language Use and Subject-Specific Learning
Score 15	13	15	13	15	Analyzing Teaching: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction
Score 16	Null	Null	14	16	Student Voice: Eliciting Student Understanding of Learning Targets
Score 17	Null	Null	15	17	Student Voice: Supporting Student Use of Resources to Learn and Monitor Their Own Progress
Score 18	Null	Null	16	18	Student Voice: Reflecting on Student-Voice Evidence to Improve Instruction
Score 19	Null	Elem. Ed only	Null	Null	Rubric 16: Mathematics Assessment: Analyzing Whole Class Understandings
Score 20	Null	Elem. Ed only	Null	Null	Rubric 17: Mathematics Assessment: Analyzing Individual Student Work Samples
Score 21	Null	Elem. Ed only	Null	Null	Rubric 18: Mathematics Assessment: Using Evidence to Reflect on Teaching

edTPA Field Codes

edTPA Field Code	edTPA Content Area
001	Elementary Literacy (National)
002	Elementary Mathematics (National)
003	Secondary English-Language Arts (National)
004	Secondary History/Social Studies (National)
005	Secondary Mathematics (National)
006	Secondary Science (National)
007	Secondary English-Language Arts (Washington)
008	Secondary Mathematics (Washington)
009	Secondary Science (Washington)
010	Secondary History/Social Studies (Washington)
011	Physical Education (National)
012	Special Education (National)
014	Early Childhood (National)
015	Visual Arts (National)
016	Middle Childhood Mathematics (National)
017	Middle Childhood Science (National)
018	Middle Childhood English-Language Arts (National)
019	Middle Childhood History/Social Studies (National)
020	World Language (National)
021	K-12 Performing Arts (National)
022	Elementary Mathematics (Washington)
023	Elementary Literacy (Washington)
024	Physical Education (Washington)
025	Special Education (Washington)
027	Early Childhood (Washington)
028	Visual Arts (Washington)
029	World Language (Washington)
030	K-12 Performing Arts (Washington)
100	Agricultural Education (National)
101	Agricultural Education (Washington)
102	Business Education (National)
103	Business Education (Washington)
104	Classical Languages (National)
105	Classical Languages (Washington)
108	Educational Technology Specialist (National)
109	Educational Technology Specialist (Washington) Effective June 27, 2016: This handbook is no longer available.

edTPA Field Code	edTPA Content Area
110	Elementary Education (National)
115	English as an Additional Language (National)
116	English as an Additional Language (Washington)
117	Family and Consumer Sciences (National)
118	Family and Consumer Sciences (Washington)
119	Health Education (National)
120	Health Education (Washington)
127	Library Specialist (National)
128	Library Specialist (Washington)
143	Technology and Engineering Education (National)
144	Technology and Engineering Education (Washington)
147	Literacy Specialist (National)

Rubric Score Values and Condition Codes

Rubric Scores are detailed in the edTPA Handbooks and the values are 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5. If a scorer is unable to assign a score, a condition code is assigned. The following table explains the condition codes. Complete descriptions of these codes are available at www.edTPA.com.

Condition Code	Description
A	Rubrics for Planning Task are unscorable
B	Video technical issues
C	Audio technical issues
D	Insufficient or excessive information to score
E	Incorrect or missing, blank, or otherwise inaccessible file
F	Video is edited
G	Materials unrelated to Handbook or fail to conform to Handbook instructions
H	English translation requirement not met

“Incomplete” Status. *Effective October 22, 2015:* Portfolios receiving two or more condition codes within the same task will be considered “incomplete.” The following scoring rules will be applied if candidates receive two or more condition codes within the same task:

- All scored rubrics with the rubric score value and any condition code indicators will continue to be reported.
- Task Total will be reported as “I” for “incomplete.”
- Total edTPA score will be reported as “I” for “incomplete.”
- Average rubric score will be reported as “I” for “incomplete.”

Candidates will be required to retake any task(s) reported as incomplete (receiving two or more condition codes within the same task) in order to receive a Task Total, Total edTPA score, and Average Rubric Score.

Appendix 4.N: edTPA Score Profile Interpretation Document



Interpreting Your edTPA Score Profile

Your edTPA Score Profile provides your results and a description of your performance for the assessment that you submitted.

1 Score Summary

The most recent scores you have earned on this assessment across all attempts.

2 Rubric Score

This column displays your score for each edTPA rubric. These scores may be reported as an average, as more than one scorer may score your portfolio.

Note: If your score is a letter (e.g., "A"), and not a number, the submission could not be scored due to one of the conditions listed in the "Condition Codes" in the Submission Requirements document on the Candidate Policies page at www.edTPA.com.

3 Total edTPA Score

The total is the sum of all rubric scores. In the case of a .5 score at the Total edTPA Score level (e.g., 39.5), the Total edTPA score will be rounded up to the next highest whole number (e.g., 40).

Note: Rubrics without a numeric score are not included in the Total edTPA Score, and Portfolios receiving two or more condition codes within the same task will be considered "Incomplete."

4 Average Rubric Score

The average score is calculated by dividing the Total edTPA Score (unrounded) by the number of scored rubrics.

Note: Rubrics without a numeric score are not included in the Total edTPA Score.

edTPA

Score Profile

Secondary Mathematics
Submitted: Month DD, 20YY
Reported: Month DD, 20YY

Name: Firstname Lastname
Social Security Number: 5-1234
For privacy/confidentiality reasons, only the last five digits of your social security number are collected.

Score Summary

Rubric What to Submit	Rubric Score (1-5)
Task 1: Planning	
Rubric 1: Planning for Mathematical Understandings	3.0
Rubric 2: Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs	4.0
Rubric 3: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning	4.0
Rubric 4: Identifying and Supporting Language Demands	3.0
Rubric 5: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning	3.0
Task Total	17.0 out of 25
Task 2: Instruction	
Rubric 6: Learning Environment	3.0
Rubric 7: Engaging Students in Learning	3.0
Rubric 8: Deepening Student Learning	4.0
Rubric 9: Subject-Specific Pedagogy: Using Representations	2.5
Rubric 10: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness	3.0
Task Total	15.5 out of 25
Task 3: Assessment	
Rubric 11: Analysis of Student Learning	4.0
Rubric 12: Providing Feedback to Guide Learning	5.0
Rubric 13: Student Use of Feedback	4.0
Rubric 14: Analyzing Students' Language Use and Mathematics Learning	3.0
Rubric 15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction	3.0
Task Total	19.0 out of 25

Total edTPA Score	62 out of 75
Average Rubric Score	3.43

Note: Your edTPA Score Profile indicates your Total edTPA Score. Please refer to www.edTPA.com/Scores for information about any state- or institution-specific passing score requirements.



This barcode contains unique candidate information.

Copyright © 2013 Florida Board of Education of the State of Florida. All rights reserved.
edTPA assessments are owned by The Board of Trustees of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument and are used under license only pursuant to the terms of a written license agreement.

edTPA

5 Condition Codes

The following table identifies the possible condition codes. Complete descriptions of these codes are available in the Submission Requirements document on the Candidate Policies page at www.edTPA.com. Note that Condition Code descriptions were updated for the 2015–2016 program year.

Condition Code Reason

- A** Rubrics for Planning Task are unscorable
- B** Video technical issues
- C** Audio technical issues
- D** Insufficient or excessive information to score
- E** Incorrect or missing, blank, or otherwise inaccessible file
- F** Video is edited
- G** Materials unrelated to Handbook or fail to conform to Handbook instruction
- H** English translation requirement not met

6 “Incomplete” Status

Effective October 22, 2015, Portfolios receiving **two or more** condition codes within the same task will be considered “Incomplete.” The following scoring rules will be applied if you receive two or more condition codes within the same task:

- All scored rubrics with the rubric score value and any condition code indicators will continue to be reported.
- Task Total will be reported as “incomplete.”
- Total edTPA Score will be reported as “incomplete.”
- Average Rubric Score will be reported as “incomplete.”

You will be required to retake any task(s) reported as incomplete (receiving two or more condition codes within the same task) in order to receive a Task Total, Total edTPA Score, and Average Rubric Score.

edTPA

Score Profile

Secondary Mathematics
Submitted: Month DD, 20YY
Reported: Month DD, 20YY

Name: Firstname Lastname

Social Security Number: 6-1234

For privacy/confidentiality reasons, only the last five digits of your social security number are collated.

Score Summary

Rubric What to Submit	Rubric Score (1–5)
Task 1: Planning	
Rubric 1: Planning for Mathematical Understandings	3.0
Rubric 2: Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs	D
Rubric 3: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning	4.0
Rubric 4: Identifying and Supporting Language Demands	D
Rubric 5: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning	3.0
Task Total	Incomplete
Task 2: Instruction	
Rubric 6: Learning Environment	3.0
Rubric 7: Engaging Students in Learning	3.0
Rubric 8: Deepening Student Learning	4.0
Rubric 9: Subject-Specific Pedagogy: Using Representations	2.5
Rubric 10: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness	3.0
Task Total	15.5 out of 25
Task 3: Assessment	
Rubric 11: Analysis of Student Learning	4.0
Rubric 12: Providing Feedback to Guide Learning	5.0
Rubric 13: Student Use of Feedback	4.0
Rubric 14: Analyzing Students' Language Use and Mathematics Learning	3.0
Rubric 15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction	3.0
Task Total	19.0 out of 25

Total edTPA Score **6** **Incomplete**

Average Rubric Score: Incomplete

Note: Your edTPA Score Profile indicates your Total edTPA Score. Please refer to www.edTPA.com/Scores for information about any state- or institution-specific passing score requirements.



This Barcode contains unique candidate information.

Copyright © 2015 Council of Chief State School Officers. All rights reserved. edTPA trademarks are owned by The Board of Trustees of the National Council on Education and the Profession. All other trademarks are the property of their respective owners.

edTPA

7 Performance Description

This section describes your performance on each scoring rubric. Use this information to interpret your performance.

If a condition code has been applied to a scoring rubric(s), the description provides information indicating the requirement(s) not met.

8 Score Reporting

These states and/or institutions also received your results, as you requested during registration.

Additional Information

Retaking the edTPA

There are multiple options for retaking an edTPA assessment:

- retake a single or multiple tasks, or
- retake the entire assessment.

Consult with your program faculty about retaking edTPA and refer to www.edTPA.com/Scores for registration and submission instructions.

Copyright © 2016 Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. All rights reserved.

edTPA trademarks are owned by The Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. Use of edTPA trademarks is permitted only pursuant to the terms of a written license agreement.

edTPA

Score Profile

Secondary Mathematics
Submitted: Month DD, 20YY
Reported: Month DD, 20YY

Name: Firstname Lastname

Social Security Number: 5-1234

For privacy/confidentiality reasons, only the last five digits of your social security number are collected.

Performance Description

Planning:

Rubric	Performance Description
1	Plans for instruction build on each other to support learning of facts and procedures with clear connections to concepts AND mathematical reasoning and/or problem solving skills.
2	Planned supports are tied to learning objectives and the central focus. Supports address the needs of specific individuals or groups with similar needs AND candidate attends to requirements in IEPs and 504 plans.
3	Candidate justifies why learning tasks (or their adaptations) are appropriate using examples of students' prior academic learning and examples of personal/cultural/community assets. Candidate makes connections to research and/or theory.
4	Candidate identifies vocabulary and/or symbols AND additional language demand(s) associated with the language function. Plans include general support for use of vocabulary and/or symbols as well as additional language demand(s).
5	The assessments provide evidence to monitor students' conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, AND mathematical reasoning and/or problem solving skills during the learning segment. Assessment adaptations required by IEP or 504 plans are made.

7

Instruction:

Rubric	Performance Description
6	The candidate demonstrates rapport with and respect for students. Candidate provides a positive, low-risk social environment that reveals mutual respect among students.
7	In the clips, students are engaged in learning tasks that address understandings of mathematical concepts, procedures, AND mathematical reasoning and/or problem solving skills. Candidate links prior academic learning to new learning.
8	Candidate elicits and builds on students' responses to develop understanding of mathematical concepts, procedures, AND mathematical reasoning and/or problem solving skills.
9	Candidate makes vague or superficial use of representations to help students understand mathematical concepts and procedures.
10	Candidate proposes changes that address students' collective learning needs related to the central focus. Candidate makes superficial connections to research and/or theory.

8

Score Reporting

Your scores have been released to the following state(s) and/or institution(s):

State(s):	Sample state #1, sample state #2
Institution(s):	Sample institution



2118 84808 000438 01040 04010408 1101041001

Copyright © 2016 Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. All rights reserved. edTPA trademarks are owned by The Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. Use of edTPA trademarks is permitted only pursuant to the terms of a written license agreement.

Appendix 4.O: CalTPA Cycle 1 Rubrics for Multiple Subject

CalTPA Performance Assessment Guide
Multiple SubjectInstructional Cycle 1
Learning About Students and Planning Instruction

Step 1 Rubrics

Rubric 1.1 — Step 1: Plan

Essential Question: How does the candidate's proposed learning goal(s) connect with prior knowledge and define specific outcomes for students? How do proposed learning activities and instructional strategies support, engage, and challenge all students to meet the learning goal(s)?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Candidate's lesson plan includes goal(s) that are not based on students' prior content knowledge.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate does not identify evidence of student learning they will look for, and assessment strategy is not purposefully connected to content-specific learning goal(s).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Planned learning activities are not well structured to meet the learning goal(s), or instructional strategies do not respond to the diverse needs of learners.</p>	<p>Candidate's lesson plan includes goal(s) that are loosely built on students' prior content knowledge, and scaffolding is not likely to support student learning.</p> <p>Candidate identifies evidence of learning that focuses on rote knowledge of content or is only partially connected to content-specific learning goal(s).</p> <p>Plan for student grouping is not conducive to the type of lesson being planned, and rationale for approach is not clear.</p>	<p>Candidate's lesson plan includes manageable and appropriate goal(s) that clearly build on students' prior content knowledge.</p> <p>Candidate clearly identifies the kinds of evidence they will look for to determine that students met the learning goal and the assessment(s) they will use to make this determination.</p> <p>Lesson plan includes learning activities that are appropriately engaging, challenging, and/or accessible for students, and grouping strategies are appropriate.</p> <p><u>Content-specific instructional strategies</u></p>	<p>All of Level 3, plus:</p> <p>Candidate's lesson plan provides a detailed explanation of proposed instructional adaptations and accommodations to support focus students and other individuals during the lesson.</p>	<p>All of Levels 3 & 4, plus:</p> <p>Candidate's lesson plan is based on <u>UDL</u> principles and is sufficiently flexible to provide for an inclusive learning environment reflective of students' assets and needs where all students clearly have equal access to content by engaging in challenging learning activities that develop academic language and higher-order thinking.</p>

Copyright © 2018 by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95811. All rights reserved.

1

<p>CalTPA Performance Assessment Guide Multiple Subject</p>		<p>Instructional Cycle 1 Learning About Students and Planning Instruction</p>		
		<p>include modeling and scaffolding that will assist students to reach expectations embedded in the learning activities, including higher-order thinking and academic language development.</p>		
<p>TPEs and Elements: TPE 1, Elements 1, 4; TPE 2, Element 2; TPE 3, Elements 1, 2, 3, 5; TPE 4, Elements 1, 4, 7; TPE 6, Element 5</p> <p>Primary Sources of Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written Narrative: Getting to Know Your Students (Description of Students’ Assets and Needs [whole class]) • Lesson Plan • Written Narrative: Lesson Plan Rationale • Related Instructional Resources and Materials <p><u>Content-Specific Pedagogy</u></p>				

Rubric 1.2 — Step 1: Plan (Focus Student 1—English Learner)

Essential Question: How does the candidate plan instruction using knowledge of FS1's (English learner) assets and needs* to support meaningful engagement with the content-specific lesson goal(s)?				
Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Candidate's plan does not take into account the reading, writing, listening, or speaking requirements of the content taught in the lesson.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate primarily displays deficit thinking in relation to FS1.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate does not connect knowledge of FS1's assets and needs to the lesson.</p>	<p>Planned adaptations and/or accommodations minimally connect FS1's assets or learning needs to the expected reading, writing, listening, or speaking abilities required of the content taught in the lesson.</p>	<p>Planned supports for student learning are clearly built on FS1's assets and learning needs.</p> <p>Candidate's plan provides appropriate adaptations and accommodations, as needed, to support FS1 to access core content of the lesson through required reading, writing, listening, or speaking.</p> <p>Candidate provides a cogent rationale in plan for how language adaptations and accommodations used during the lesson encourage FS1's progress toward meeting learning goal(s).</p>	<p>All of Level 3, plus:</p> <p>Candidate plans opportunities for FS1 to participate in different modes of communication (e.g., collaborative, interpretive, and/or productive language) during the lesson to access content needed to meet learning goal(s).</p>	<p>All of Levels 3 & 4, plus:</p> <p>Candidate plans a lesson using <u>UDL</u> strategies that purposefully create an inclusive environment to support FS1's content-specific learning through reading, writing, listening, and/or speaking as part of the whole class community.</p> <p>Candidate's rationale cites evidence-based English language development practice(s).</p>
<p>TPEs and Elements: TPE 1, Elements 1, 6; TPE 3, Elements 1, 2, 5; TPE 4, Elements 1, 4, 7; TPE 5, Element 2</p> <p>Primary Sources of Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written Narrative: Getting to Know Your Students (Description of Focus Student 1's Assets and Needs) • Lesson Plan • Written Narrative: Lesson Plan Rationale • Related Instructional Resources and Materials 				

* For example: prior academic knowledge; social-emotional development; social identity; cultural and linguistic resources and funds of knowledge; prior experiences and interests; developmental considerations; proficiency in reading, writing, speaking, and listening

Rubric 1.3 — Step 1: Plan (Focus Student 2—Student with identified special needs)

Essential Question: How does the candidate plan instruction using knowledge of FS2's (student with identified special needs) assets and needs* to support meaningful engagement with the content-specific lesson goal(s)?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Candidate does not connect knowledge of FS2's assets, needs, or IEP/504/GATE goals to lesson plan.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate primarily displays deficit thinking in relation to FS2.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Planning for gifted students only includes additional, similar work and does not expand or extend their developmental or academic learning.</p>	<p>Planned accommodations minimally attend to IEP/504/GATE goals or do not identify needs between FS2's current developmental or academic abilities and the learning demands of the lesson.</p> <p>Candidate's plan includes limited or inappropriate scaffolding, support(s), or accommodations to address learning needs of FS2 during the lesson.</p> <p>Candidate reduces the rigor of learning activities and instructional strategies in ways that limit student access to content-specific learning goal(s).</p>	<p>Planned accommodations attend to IEP/504/GATE goals and identified assets and needs between FS2's current developmental or academic abilities and the demands of the lesson, allowing FS2 to fully access content and meet learning goals.</p> <p>Candidate provides a cogent rationale in plan for scaffolding activities and strategies to accommodate FS2's progress toward meeting learning goal(s).</p>	<p>All of Level 3, plus:</p> <p>Candidate's lesson plan builds on and highlights FS2's assets and learning needs.</p>	<p>All of Level 4, plus:</p> <p>Candidate plans a lesson using <u>UDL</u> that purposefully creates an inclusive environment to support FS2's content-specific learning as part of the whole class community.</p> <p>Candidate's rationale cites evidence-based practice(s) appropriate to the IEP, 504 plan, or other pre-determined learning goals for FS2.</p>

TPEs and Elements: TPE 1, Elements 1, 4; TPE 3, Elements 1, 2, 5; TPE 4, Elements 1, 2, 4, 5; TPE 5, Elements 2, 8

Primary Sources of Evidence:

- Written Narrative: Getting to Know Your Students (Description of Focus Student 2's Assets and Needs)
- Lesson Plan
- Written Narrative: Lesson Plan Rationale
- Related Instructional Resources and Materials

* For example: prior academic knowledge; social-emotional development; social identity; cultural and linguistic resources and funds of knowledge; prior experiences and interests; developmental considerations; assistive technologies; learning challenge (identified IEP goals; focus of 504 plan or MTSS support; or need for greater challenge through GATE)

Rubric 1.4 — Step 1: Plan (Focus Student 3—Student with academic/emotional support needs due to life experiences inside or outside of school)

Essential Question: How does the candidate plan instruction using knowledge of FS3's* assets and needs** to support meaningful engagement with the content-specific lesson goal(s) and address the student's well-being by creating a safe and positive learning environment during or outside of the lesson***?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Candidate's support during or outside of the lesson provides limited support for FS3 to address needs for a safe, positive, and inclusive environment.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate primarily displays deficit thinking in relation to FS3.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Activities or strategies are reduced in rigor or are inappropriate in ways that could expose student vulnerability or undermine a safe learning environment.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate demonstrates inaccurate understanding of FS3's needs and how to ensure a safe and positive environment for learning.</p>	<p>Planned activities and/or strategies and assessment during or outside of the lesson may be responsive to the life experience(s) of FS3, but it is not clear that the supports contribute to establishing a safe and positive environment and promote FS3's well-being.</p> <p>Candidate minimally connects knowledge of FS3's assets and needs to selection of activities, strategies, and <u>informal assessment</u> OR provides a superficial understanding of student needs and how to create a safe and positive environment for learning during or outside of the lesson.</p>	<p>Planned activities, strategies, and assessment during or outside of the lesson are designed to provide a safe and positive learning environment, promote FS3's well-being, and support FS3's progress toward meeting the content-specific learning goal(s).</p>	<p>All of Level 3, plus:</p> <p>Candidate articulates how plans build on FS3's assets and learning needs and explains why the lesson is likely to be responsive to FS3's life experience(s).</p>	<p>All of Level 4, plus:</p> <p>Candidate plans a lesson using <u>UDL</u> that purposefully creates an inclusive environment to support FS3's content-specific learning as part of the whole class community.</p> <p>Candidate's rationale cites appropriate evidence-based practice(s) to support the needs of FS3.</p>

TPEs and Elements: TPE 1, Elements 1, 4; TPE 2, Elements 1, 2, 3, 4; TPE 3, Elements 1, 2, 5; TPE 4, Elements 1, 2, 4; TPE 5, Elements 2, 8

Primary Sources of Evidence:

- Written Narrative: Getting to Know Your Students (Description of Focus Student 3's Assets and Needs)
- Lesson Plan
- Written Narrative: Lesson Plan Rationale
- Related Instructional Resources and Materials

* FS3 is a student whose life experience(s) either inside or outside of school (including, but not limited to, challenges in the home, community, or school as a result of bullying, illness, loss of parents, divorce, trauma, homelessness, poverty, or incarceration, or as a result of needs as a Standard English learner; a migrant, an immigrant, or an undocumented student; or a student in foster care) may result in a need for additional academic and/or emotional support and whose behavior in class catches your attention (e.g., does not participate, falls asleep in class, remains silent, acts out, demands attention).

** For example: prior academic knowledge, social-emotional development, social identity, cultural and linguistic resources and funds of knowledge, prior experiences and interests, and developmental considerations

*** Describe any additional supports that you provide to FS3 that occur outside of the lesson being taught in Cycle 1.

Step 2 Rubrics

Rubric 1.5 — Step 2: Teach and Assess

Essential Question: How does the candidate establish clear learning expectations based on an understanding of students' prior knowledge and maintain a positive learning environment* that supports all students to access and meet the content-specific learning goal(s)?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Candidate does not set clear learning expectations during the opening of the lesson.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate does not connect lesson to prior learning or explain how it fits in the larger unit of instruction.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate's annotations do not explain why or how a positive and safe learning environment is established.</p>	<p>Candidate sets vague learning expectations during the opening of the lesson and minimally connects lesson to prior learning.</p> <p>Candidate's annotations minimally explain strategy(ies) attempted to establish a positive and safe learning environment.</p> <p>It is not clear that strategies will support students to access and meet content-specific learning goal(s).</p>	<p>Candidate sets learning expectations during the opening of the lesson, directly connects the lesson to prior learning of content, and explains how this lesson fits in the larger unit of instruction.</p> <p>Candidate's annotations explain how a positive and safe learning environment was established.</p> <p>Strategies seen in video(s) support students to access and meet content-specific learning goal(s).</p>	<p>All of Level 3, plus:</p> <p>Candidate and students interact with each other through questioning and conversation that demonstrates positive and respectful rapport with each other and reinforces deep learning of content.</p>	<p>All of Levels 3 & 4, plus:</p> <p>Candidate's annotations explain how and why the <u>UDL</u> strategy(ies) used establish an inclusive environment that supports all students to learn and how these strategies provide equitable access to content.</p>

TPEs and Elements: TPE 2, Elements 2, 3, 5, 6; TPE 4, Element 4

Primary Source of Evidence:

- 3 Annotated Video Clips

* For example: setting clear expectations, framing the lesson, creating a safe and welcoming environment, greeting students, establishing central question(s) and/or lesson hook, engaging students, establishing positive rapport

Rubric 1.6 — Step 2: Teach and Assess

Essential Question: How does the candidate actively engage students in deep learning of content and monitor/assess their understanding?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Instruction and assessment demonstrate lack of attention to the levels of student engagement with content and/or classroom management necessary for student learning.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>There are inaccuracies in presented content.</p>	<p>Instruction and assessment require students to engage in <u>lower-order thinking</u> about content, AND/OR strategies engage students in passive learning of content during the lesson (e.g., primarily the candidate talks throughout the lesson while students sit and listen or take notes).</p>	<p>Instruction and assessment require students to actively engage in <u>higher-order thinking/deep learning</u> (analysis, synthesis, evaluation, interpretation, transfer) about content.</p> <p>Candidate monitors student learning to check for understanding throughout the lesson.</p>	<p>All of Level 3, plus:</p> <p>Students have opportunities to actively develop their own understandings linked to lesson goal(s).</p> <p>Candidate monitors student learning throughout the lesson and adjusts instruction for whole class.</p>	<p>All of Levels 3 & 4, plus:</p> <p>Instruction and assessment promote inclusion for all students through providing opportunities to participate in classroom discourse and as members of the community.</p> <p>Students independently facilitate their own work either in a whole group, small group, pairs, or individually, choosing how to advance their learning.</p>

TPEs and Elements: TPE 1, Elements 5, 8; TPE 2, Element 5; TPE 4, Element 4

Primary Sources of Evidence:

- 3 Annotated Video Clips

Content-Specific Pedagogy

Step 3 Rubric

Rubric 1.7 – Step 3: Reflect

Essential Question: How does the candidate analyze and describe the impact of their asset and needs-based lesson planning, teaching, and assessment of student learning and explain how the lesson supports this group of students and the three focus students?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Candidate's reflection provides no connection between student assets and needs and impact on their planning, teaching, and monitoring of student learning.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate does not describe approach to support learning for the whole class and three focus students.</p>	<p>Candidate's reflection demonstrates a minor or narrow understanding of what was learned about planning, teaching, AND/OR monitoring student learning in regard to students' assets or needs.</p> <p>Candidate describes approach to support learning for the whole class OR three focus students.</p>	<p>Candidate connects the importance of knowing students' assets and needs to student learning, and analyzes and describes how knowing this information can lead to the development of instruction that is engaging, challenging, and motivating to learners, including the whole class and three focus students.</p>	<p>All of Level 3, plus:</p> <p>Candidate provides a clear rationale for how and why adaptations to instruction were or were not made during the lesson to meet whole class, group, and/or individual student needs.</p>	<p>All of Levels 3 & 4, plus:</p> <p>Candidate demonstrates a clear understanding of the principles of <u>UDL</u> regarding the development of flexible learning environments that can support individual learning differences, allowing for an inclusive classroom, and applies that understanding to an analysis of the planning and implementation of this lesson.</p>
<p>TPEs and Elements: TPE 1, Element 1; TPE 6, Element 1</p> <p>Primary Source of Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written Narrative: Reflection on What You Learned 				

Step 4 Rubric

Rubric 1.8 — Step 4: Apply

Essential Question: How will the candidate apply what they have learned in Cycle 1 about students' learning to next steps for instruction to strengthen and extend students' understanding of content and develop academic language?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Candidate description of future instruction for students is not connected to what was learned by planning, teaching, assessing, and/or reflecting on the lesson taught.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate does not describe next steps for instruction.</p>	<p>Candidate provides a vague description of future instruction for students that is partially related to promotion of content learning and development of academic language.</p> <p>Candidate describes next steps for instruction that are unconnected to what was learned about students.</p>	<p>Candidate applies what they have learned to describe future instruction for students that is designed to strengthen and extend deep content learning and academic language development for all students.</p> <p>Candidate provides next steps for instruction, citing evidence of student learning assessed during the lesson.</p>	<p>Candidate describes targeted instructional adaptations to support, strengthen, and extend whole class, group, and/or individual student learning needs during future lessons.</p>	<p>All of Level 4, plus:</p> <p>Candidate describes in detail how to support all students in an inclusive, safe, and positive learning environment (<u>UDL</u> strategies), explaining what steps they will take to ensure that all students are welcome to be part of the class community and discourse.</p> <p>Candidate's response demonstrates that they understand all students can learn when assets and learning needs are the focus of instruction.</p>

TPEs and Elements: TPE 3, Element 2; TPE 4, Element 4; TPE 6, Element 1

Primary Source of Evidence:

- Narrative: Application of What You Learned

Appendix 4.P: CalTPA Cycle 2 Rubrics for Multiple Subject

CalTPA Performance Assessment Guide
Multiple SubjectInstructional Cycle 2
Assessment-Driven Instruction

Step 1 Rubrics

Rubric 2.1 — Step 1: Plan

Essential Question: How does the candidate's learning segment plan provide appropriate content-specific learning goals and assessments that offer multiple ways for all students to demonstrate knowledge?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Candidate's learning segment includes learning goal(s) that are not based on students' prior content knowledge and modeling, or <u>scaffolding</u> is not clearly described or is not appropriate.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Assessments are not included or are not purposefully connected to content-specific learning goal(s).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Student grouping is not determined or rationale for grouping is not provided.</p>	<p>Candidate's learning goal(s) in the learning segment are loosely based on students' prior content knowledge and modeling, or scaffolding is not clearly described.</p> <p>Assessments check for rote knowledge of content or are only partially connected to content-specific learning goal(s).</p> <p>Student grouping within the learning segment may not be conducive to the type of lessons being planned, and reasonable rationale is not provided.</p>	<p>Candidate's learning segment includes manageable and appropriate learning goals that clearly build on students' prior content knowledge.</p> <p>Candidate clearly identifies the multiple kinds of evidence they will look for to determine that students met the learning goal(s) and the assessment(s) they will use to make this determination.</p> <p>Learning segment includes learning activities that are appropriately engaging, challenging, and accessible for students, and grouping strategies are appropriate.</p> <p><u>Content-specific instructional strategies</u> include adaptations and accommodations that will assist students to reach learning goals in multiple ways.</p>	<p>All of Level 3, plus:</p> <p>Instruction and assessment are purposefully chosen and planned to develop deep understanding of content through active learning (product, process, performance) and academic language to support students to meet, in multiple ways, content-specific learning goal(s).</p>	<p>All of Levels 3 & 4, plus:</p> <p>Candidate's plan includes individualized and whole class adaptations and accommodations that are purposefully and clearly drawn from the classroom context, resulting in an <u>inclusive learning environment</u>.</p> <p>Students have opportunities to independently facilitate their own work in a whole group, small group, pairs, or individually.</p>

Copyright © 2018 by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95811. All rights reserved.

1

TPEs and Elements: TPE 1, Elements 1, 4; TPE 3, Elements 1, 2, 6; TPE 4, Elements 4, 7, 8; TPE 6, Element 5

Primary Sources of Evidence:

- Learning Segment Template
- Written Narrative: Assessment Descriptions
- Formal Assessment Rubric and/or Scoring Criteria

Content-Specific Pedagogy

Rubric 2.2 — Step 1: Plan

Essential Question: How does the candidate plan a learning segment where assessments, instructional strategies, and learning activities align and provide a progression of learning that develops students' concepts and skills to achieve the learning goal(s)?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>The assessments (including scoring criteria), activities, and strategies of the learning segment are misaligned in ways that will hinder students' access to learning goal(s).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>There are inaccuracies in lesson content.</p>	<p>The assessments (including scoring criteria), activities, and strategies of the learning segment are partially aligned in ways that could limit students' access to learning goal(s).</p>	<p>The assessments (including scoring criteria), learning activities, and instructional strategies of each lesson are aligned to meet the learning goal(s).</p> <p>Lessons build on one another to develop students' higher-order thinking skills (analysis, synthesis, evaluation, interpretation, transfer), academic language, and concepts and skills that are likely to support students to engage with the learning segment content.</p>	<p>All of Level 3, plus:</p> <p>Learning segment plan builds in opportunities that provide multiple access points (different ways to learn content visually, through writing or reading, listening, acting out, verbalizing) to learning content and multiple modes (different ways for students to show what they know through writing, speaking, performing) to demonstrate learning of content.</p>	<p>All of Levels 3 & 4, plus:</p> <p>Candidate's learning segment plan is sufficiently flexible to provide for an inclusive learning environment reflective of students' assets and needs where all students clearly have equal access to content by engaging in challenging learning activities (<u>UDL</u> with multiple means of representation, action and expression, and engagement) that develop academic language and higher-order thinking.</p>

TPEs and Elements: TPE 1, Element 1; TPE 3, Elements 2, 5; TPE 5, Elements 1, 3

Primary Sources of Evidence:

- Learning Segment Template
- Written Narrative: Assessment Descriptions

Step 2 Rubrics

Rubric 2.3 — Step 2: Teach and Assess

Essential Question: How does the candidate support student development of academic language in relation to the content-specific learning goal(s)?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Informal assessment(s) are not used to monitor language development.</p> <p>Candidate does not provide language adaptations/accommodations OR provides adaptations/accommodations that do not align with language demands of the lesson content.</p>	<p>Candidate uses informal assessment(s) to loosely monitor students' academic language development OR candidate has a superficial understanding of the language demands of the lessons, providing minimal adaptations or accommodations.</p>	<p>Candidate uses specific learning activities to provide opportunities for students to develop academic language specific to the language demands of the learning segment and content-specific learning goals.</p> <p>Language demands are generally addressed for the whole class as a group through instructional adaptations to support content learning.</p>	<p>All of Level 3, plus: Candidate <u>differentiates</u> instruction to address the needs of individual learners relative to the language demands of the lessons through specific adaptations or accommodations.</p>	<p>All of Levels 3 & 4, plus: Candidate provides evidence-based, developmentally appropriate individualized, small group, and whole class academic language adaptations and accommodations, resulting in an inclusive environment where all students are actively engaged in learning.</p>

TPEs and Elements: TPE 1, Elements 1, 8; TPE 3, Element 5; TPE 5, Element 8

Primary Sources of Evidence:

- 4 Annotated Video Clips
- Written Narrative: Analysis of Informal and Student Self-Assessments

Content-Specific Pedagogy

Rubric 2.4 — Step 2: Teach and Assess (educational technology)

Essential Question: How does the candidate incorporate educational technology (digital/virtual tools and resources) to provide opportunities for students to achieve and/or demonstrate the content-specific learning goal(s)?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Candidate does not provide opportunities for students to use or access educational technology to learn or demonstrate the content-specific learning goal(s).	Candidate uses educational technology to present information in a one-to-many learning environment for a drill or practice type activity to achieve and/or demonstrate the content-specific learning goal(s).	Candidate provides students with opportunities to use educational technology to achieve and/or demonstrate the content-specific learning goal(s).	<p>All of Level 3, plus: Candidate provides students choice of a selected range of educational technology to use to achieve and/or demonstrate content-specific learning goal(s).</p> <p>Students use educational technology to facilitate and enhance peer or group collaboration in or beyond the classroom (e.g., online documents, email pen pals, online interviews with students at another school or in another state or country).</p>	<p>All of Levels 3 & 4, plus: Students are knowledgeable enough about educational technology to independently choose which educational technology resources they want to use to achieve, demonstrate, and extend beyond the learning goal(s) of the lesson (e.g., students choose to use a graphics program to create and add images to their online document without being told to do this by the candidate).</p>
<p>TPEs and Elements: TPE 3, Elements 6, 8; TPE 4, Elements 4, 7, 8 Primary Sources of Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 Annotated Video Clips 				

Rubric 2.5 — Step 2: Teach and Assess

Essential Question: How does the candidate use informal assessment to monitor students' deep understanding of content (higher-order thinking) and adjust instruction to meet the needs of all learners?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Candidate's use of informal assessment is insufficient for monitoring students' deep understanding of content.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Assessments are irrelevant to measuring content-specific learning goal(s) or are a cursory check for understanding or asking students how they feel.</p>	<p>Candidate's use of informal assessment monitors students' <u>lower-order thinking skills</u> (memorize, duplicate, repeat, define), resulting in a limited view of students' deep understanding of content.</p> <p>Assessments are too few to lead to instructional adjustments or miss key concepts of lesson content.</p>	<p>Candidate's use of informal assessment monitors students' higher-order thinking (analysis, synthesis, evaluation, interpretation, transfer), resulting in an understanding of whole class progress toward meeting the learning goal(s) and deep understanding of content.</p> <p>Monitoring is sufficient to inform teaching in the moment, and candidate adjusts instruction for the whole class based on assessment results.</p>	<p>All of Level 3, plus:</p> <p>Candidate provides adaptations or accommodations during informal assessments for specific students to meet their unique learning needs and makes targeted adjustments to their instruction.</p> <p>Students are provided multiple ways to demonstrate their learning (e.g., verbal, written, drawing, diagramming, performing, and more) through a range of informal assessments.</p>	<p>All of Levels 3 & 4, plus:</p> <p>Assessments are purposefully used to advance or deepen learning and are administered in a transparent and intellectually safe way that celebrates student progress and supports growth for all students (e.g., candidate reviews learning goal(s) with students so that they are aware of exactly what they are expected to know and be able to demonstrate; candidate notes progress of learning first, then reviews what students have not yet demonstrated).</p>

TPEs and Elements: TPE 1, Elements 1, 8; TPE 3, Element 3; TPE 4, Elements 3, 4; TPE 5, Elements 1, 2

Primary Sources of Evidence:

- 4 Annotated Video Clips
- Written Narrative: Analysis of Informal and Student Self-Assessments

Content-Specific Pedagogy

Rubric 2.6 — Step 2: Teach and Assess

Essential Question: How does the candidate engage students in self-assessment to build their awareness of what they have learned and support their progress toward meeting learning goal(s)?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Candidate does not provide criteria or rubric for self-assessment.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate does not engage students in self-assessment.</p>	<p>Candidate provides criteria or rubric for self-assessment that is either not linked to learning goal(s) OR is too broad to be helpful in students' self-assessment of their own understanding of how they are progressing toward meeting learning goal(s).</p> <p>Candidate provides inadequate direction or practice for students to learn to conduct the self-assessment.</p>	<p>Candidate provides criteria for self-assessment by which students build their awareness of what they have learned and what they need to continue to learn to measure their own progress toward meeting learning goal(s).</p> <p>Candidate supports students in understanding criteria and how to conduct the self-assessment.</p>	<p>All of Level 3, plus:</p> <p>Criteria for self-assessment directs students to analyze complex content, specific concepts, or processes that engage them in higher-order thinking (analysis, synthesis, evaluation, interpretation, transfer).</p> <p>Candidate includes adaptations and accommodations for self-assessment based on individual student assets and learning needs.</p>	<p>All of Levels 3 & 4, plus:</p> <p>Candidate helps individual students use self-assessment results to establish revision to student work to improve process, product, or performance.</p>

TPE and Element: TPE 5, Element 3

Primary Sources of Evidence:

- 4 Annotated Video Clips
- Written Narrative: Analysis of Informal and Student Self-Assessments

Rubric 2.7 — Step 2: Teach and Assess

Essential Question: How does the candidate use results of informal assessments, including student self-assessment, to provide feedback to students about how to improve or revise their work to continue progress toward and/or beyond the learning goal(s)?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Candidate does not provide assessment feedback to students.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Feedback is inaccurate or irrelevant.</p>	<p>Candidate uses assessment to provide feedback that either focuses on student errors and/or minimally clarifies what students need to improve or revise their work.</p> <p>Candidate does not explain to students how to use feedback to advance learning of content.</p>	<p>Candidate uses assessment results to provide feedback to students based on criteria for performance that clarifies what was done well, where there are errors, and what they need to do next (to revise or advance learning) to continue progress toward meeting the content-specific learning goal(s).</p>	<p>All of Level 3, plus:</p> <p>Candidate connects feedback to students' prior learning to draw attention to broader understandings and skills, knowledge, or abilities related to content-specific learning goal(s).</p>	<p>All of Levels 3 and 4, plus:</p> <p>Candidate differentiates how they provide feedback to students based on individual learning needs.</p> <p>Informal assessment feedback informs continual improvement for the whole class and individuals and leads the candidate to make purposeful decisions about next steps for student learning.</p>

TPE and Elements: TPE 5, Elements 1, 3, 5

Primary Sources of Evidence:

- 4 Annotated Video Clips
- Written Narrative: Analysis of Informal and Student Self-Assessments

Step 3 Rubric

Rubric 2.8 — Step 3: Reflect

Essential Question: How does the candidate analyze the formal assessment results based on the scoring criteria and identify and describe emerging learning patterns and trends for the whole class in relation to the learning goal(s)?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Candidate does not analyze formal assessment results, or analysis is inaccurate.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Assessment scoring criteria or rubric does not measure content-specific learning goal(s).</p>	<p>Candidate's analysis of formal assessment results is incomplete and results in a minimal or cursory description of whole class performance in relation to the learning goal(s). Individualized feedback is not provided.</p> <p>Formal assessment is used to identify deficits or lack in students' learning capacity and is not educative (e.g., students do not advance their knowledge by completing the assessment, no application or transfer is evidenced; students demonstrate rote knowledge or lower-order thinking skill[s]).</p>	<p>Candidate's analysis of the formal assessment results accurately describes performance for the whole class in relation to the scoring criteria/rubric and identifies general patterns and trends in relation to the learning goal(s).</p> <p>Assessment scoring criteria/rubric align with the learning goal(s) and enable the candidate to score student work consistently.</p>	<p>All of Level 3, plus:</p> <p>Candidate accurately describes learning patterns or trends for individuals, citing clear evidence from the student work samples.</p> <p>Candidate identifies students' partial and developing understanding of content.</p>	<p>All of Levels 3 & 4, plus:</p> <p>Formal assessment is used to advance and deepen students' learning through analysis and transfer of knowledge.</p> <p>Assessment is administered in a transparent and intellectually safe way that celebrates student progress, allows students to take risks, and clearly supports growth for all students as they strive to meet the learning goal(s).</p>

TPE and Elements: TPE 5, Elements 2, 8

Primary Sources of Evidence:

- Scored Formal Assessments from 3 Students
- Narrative: Analysis of Assessment Results and Reflection

Step 4 Rubric

Rubric 2.9 – Step 4: Apply

Essential Question: How does the candidate use the analysis of assessment results to plan and teach a follow-up learning activity and provide a rationale for the activity choice, citing evidence?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Candidate does not relate what was learned from reviewing assessment results to plan and teach follow-up activity.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate's rationale for activity choice is not clearly related to content-specific learning goal(s) taught in the learning segment, and evidence citations are not provided.</p>	<p>Candidate loosely applies what was learned from reviewing assessment results to plan and teach follow-up activity, OR analysis of assessment results is limited and does not reflect class abilities in regard to the learning goal(s) of the learning segment.</p> <p>Candidate's rationale for activity choice is unclear, and evidence citations do not align with why activity was planned and taught.</p>	<p>Candidate applies what was learned from an analysis of assessment results to plan and teach a content-specific follow-up activity.</p> <p>If re-teaching, the candidate provides instruction in a new way to support students to meet learning goal(s). If providing an extension activity, the activity deepens and advances students' learning.</p> <p>Candidate provides a rationale for activity based on analysis of student performance during the learning segment and cites evidence from assessment results that supports choice of follow-up activity.</p>	<p>All of Level 3, plus:</p> <p>Candidate provides specific adaptations or accommodations for individuals to increase access and meaningful engagement.</p>	<p>All of Levels 3 & 4, plus:</p> <p>Follow-up learning activity, whether a re-teaching or extension activity, is focused on deepening key performance skills and understanding of content through higher-order thinking processes (analysis, synthesis, evaluation, interpretation, transfer) and develops academic language.</p>

TPEs and Elements: TPE 5, Elements 2, 3, 8; TPE 6, Element 1

Primary Sources of Evidence:

- Re-Teaching or Extension Activity Description
- Annotated Video Clip of Follow-Up Instruction

Content-Specific Pedagogy

Appendix 4.Q: CalTPA Scorer Process Flow

Rubric 1.3 Scorer Process Flow

ESSENTIAL QUESTION: How does the candidate plan instruction using knowledge of FS2's (student with identified special needs) assets and needs* to support meaningful engagement with the content-specific lesson goal(s)?

PRIMARY SOURCE OF EVIDENCE: *Written Narrative: Getting to Know Your Students (Description of Focus Student 2 Assets and Needs); Lesson Plan; Written Narrative: Lesson Plan Rationale; Related Instructional Resources and Materials*

***EXAMPLES:** Prior academic knowledge; social-emotional development; social identity; cultural and linguistic resources and funds of knowledge; prior experiences and interests; developmental considerations; assistive technologies; learning challenge (identified IEP goals; focus of 504 plan or MTSS support; or need for greater challenge through GATE)

LEVEL 3 Evidence:

Do the planned accommodations attend to IEP/504/GATE goals and identified assets and needs between FS2's current developmental or academic abilities and the demands of the lesson, allowing FS2 to fully access content and meet learning goals?	YES/NO
Does the candidate provide a cogent rationale in planning for scaffolding of activities and strategies to accommodate FS2's progress toward meeting learning goal(s)?	YES/NO

If all "YES," go to Level 4

If one or more "NO," go to Level 2

Level 4 Evidence: All of Level 3 PLUS:

Does the candidate's lesson plan build on and highlight FS2's assets and learning needs?	YES/NO
--	--------

If all "YES," go to Level 5. If one or more "NO," Score is 3.

LEVEL 2 Evidence

Do the planned accommodations minimally attend to IEP/504/GATE goals or not identify needs between FS2's current developmental or academic abilities and the learning demands of the lesson?	YES/NO
Does the candidate's plan include limited or inappropriate scaffolding, support(s), or accommodations to address learning needs of FS2 during the lesson?	YES/NO
Does the candidate reduce the rigor of learning activities and instructional strategies in ways that limit student access to content-specific learning goal(s)?	YES/NO

If all "YES," score is 2.

If one or more "NO," go to Level 1.

LEVEL 5 EVIDENCE: All of Levels 3 and 4 PLUS:

Does the candidate plan a lesson using UDL that purposefully creates an inclusive environment to support FS2's content-specific learning as part of the whole class community?	YES/NO
Does the candidate's rationale cite evidence-based practice(s) appropriate to the IEP, 504 plan, or other pre-determined learning goals for FS2?	YES/NO

If all "YES," score is 5.

If one or more "NO," score is 4.

LEVEL 1 Evidence

Does the candidate not connect knowledge of FS2's assets, needs, or IEP/504/GATE goals to lesson plan? OR	YES/NO
Does the candidate primarily display deficit thinking in relation to FS2? OR	YES/NO
Does the planning for gifted students only include additional, similar work and not expand or extend their developmental or academic learning?	YES/NO

If one or more "YES," score is 1.

Copyright © 2018 by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
 1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95811. All rights reserved.

Appendix 4.R: CalTPA Score Report (Draft)



Assessment Results Report

Understanding Your CalTPA Assessment Results Report

Overview

Your CalTPA Assessment Results Report provides the results for the cycle(s) that you submitted for this reporting period. If you re-submitted an instructional cycle, your report includes the new results on that instructional cycle. Results are reported to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the Commission-approved educator preparation program you selected during registration.

Cautions. Your CalTPA Assessment Results Report is for your records only. This assessment was not designed to compare your performance to that of other candidates. Your score is used to compare your performance to the performance level set by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Rubric Performance Summary

This section indicates the most recent results you have earned on the cycle(s) scored during this reporting period. For each rubric, this table provides a description of your performance, the score you earned, and the total cycle score (sum of scores across all rubrics). This information may help you identify your relative strengths and areas for improvement.

Performance description information is provided only for any cycles scored during this reporting period. If a condition code has been applied instead, the description provides information indicating the requirement not met. Please see "Condition Codes" below for more information.

Rubric Scores. Each rubric consists of from one to five performance levels, with a score of five (5) indicating high performance. For any rubric assigned a letter (e.g., "A1") instead of a numeric value, some or all of the submission is deemed unscorable in accordance with the CalTPA Submission Requirements. As indicated in the CalTPA Submission Requirements, any cycle receiving a condition code will be unscorable and reported overall as "N/A" for Not Applicable. See "Condition Codes" below for more information.

Cycle Performance Summary

The Cycle Performance Summary indicates the cycle status and reporting date for all submitted and scored cycles and your overall CalTPA requirement status. Cycle status will be reported as "Pass" or "Did Not Pass" for any cycle submitted and scored. If you received a condition code for any rubric, the cycle in which that condition code was assigned will indicate "N/A" for Not Applicable. Please see "Condition Codes" below for more information. CalTPA Requirement Status indicates your status for the entire assessment and will be reported as "Requirement Not Yet Met" or "Requirement Met."

Retaking CalTPA

Refer to the Get Results/Retake Assessments page on the program website at www.ctcexams.nesinc.com for registration and submission requirements for retaking CalTPA.

Condition Codes

Condition codes are applied when a submission does not meet the requirements as defined in the CalTPA Submission Requirements. Complete descriptions of these codes are available on the Assessments/CalTPA/Policies page on the program website at www.ctcexams.nesinc.com. Details indicating the requirements not met are shown in the **Rubric Performance Summary** for any rubric(s) in which you received a condition code.

- Each rubric for which a condition code is assigned will receive a letter and number (instead of a numeric score) indicating which condition code was applied.
- All other Rubrics within the cycle will receive a condition code "X," indicating that no numeric score was assigned, due to condition code(s) elsewhere in the cycle.
- Any cycle containing an indicator with a condition code(s) will be reported as Not Applicable, or "N/A."


Assessment Results Report

 TPA USERxxxx
 123 Example Lane
 Example CA 12345

 Social Security Number: XXX-X0-0000
 Submission Deadline: 10/25/2018
 Reporting Date: 11/29/2018

Your assessment results will be reported to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the following Commission-approved educator preparation program: Sample University

Multiple Subject Cycle 1: Learning About Students and Planning Instruction (Mathematics)
Rubric Performance Summary

Cycle Step and Rubric		Rubric Score
Step 1: Plan		
Rubric 1.1	Connect learning goals with prior knowledge, engage all students	
	Candidate's lesson plan includes goal(s) that are loosely built on students' prior content knowledge, and scaffolding is not likely to support student learning. Candidate identifies evidence of learning that focuses on rote knowledge of content or is only partially connected to content-specific learning goal(s). Plan for student grouping is not conducive to the type of lesson being planned, and rationale for approach is not clear.	2
Rubric 1.2	Plan instruction using knowledge of FS1's assets and needs	
	Planned adaptations and/or accommodations minimally connect FS1's assets or learning needs to the expected reading, writing, listening, or speaking abilities required of the content taught in the lesson.	2
Rubric 1.3	Plan instruction using knowledge of FS2's assets and needs	
	Planned accommodations minimally attend to IEP/504/GATE goals or do not identify needs between FS2's current developmental or academic abilities and the learning demands of the lesson. Candidate's plan includes limited or inappropriate scaffolding, support(s), or accommodations to address learning needs of FS2 during the lesson. Candidate reduces the rigor of learning activities and instructional strategies in ways that limit student access to content-specific learning goal(s).	2
Rubric 1.4	Plan instruction using knowledge of FS3's assets and needs	
	Planned activities and/or strategies and assessment during or outside of the lesson may be responsive to the life experience(s) of FS3, but it is not clear that the supports contribute to establishing a safe and positive environment and promote FS3's well-being. Candidate minimally connects knowledge of FS3's assets and needs to selection of activities, strategies, and informal assessment OR provides a superficial understanding of student needs and how to create a safe and positive environment for learning during or outside of the lesson.	2
Step 2: Teach and Assess		
Rubric 1.5	Establish clear learning expectations and maintain a positive learning environment	
	Candidate sets vague learning expectations during the opening of the lesson and minimally connects lesson to prior learning. Candidate's annotations minimally explain strategy(ies) attempted to establish a positive and safe learning environment. It is not clear that strategies will support students to access and meet content-specific learning goal(s).	2
Rubric 1.6	Engage students and monitor understanding	
	Instruction and assessment require students to engage in lower-order thinking about content, AND/OR strategies engage students in passive learning of content during the lesson (e.g., primarily the candidate talks throughout the lesson while students sit and listen or take notes).	2
Step 3: Reflect		
Rubric 1.7	Analyze & describe the impact of planning, teaching and assessment of student learning	
	Candidate's reflection provides no connection between student assets and needs and impact on their planning, teaching, and monitoring of student learning. OR Candidate does not describe approach to support learning for the whole class and three focus students.	1

 CalTPA <small>California Teaching Performance Assessment</small>	Assessment Results Report
--	----------------------------------

TPA USERxxxx

Social Security Number: XXX-X0-0000

Step 4: Apply

Rubric 1.8	Apply learning and provide next steps for instruction to strengthen and extend students' understanding of content	
	Candidate description of future instruction for students is not connected to what was learned by planning, teaching, assessing, and/or reflecting on the lesson taught. OR Candidate does not describe next steps for instruction.	1
Cycle 1 Total Score		14

Chapter 5. Appendix

Appendix 5.A: Site Visit Notes from Observation of FAST SVP Passing Standard Workshop

Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST)
Observation of Passing Standard Workshop, May 14, 2018
Fresno State University
Site Visitation Project (SVP)

The site visit occurred on May 14, 2018 from 2:00 – 4:00 pm (PT).

The purpose of the workshop was to check whether the existing rubric for a level 2 (passing) candidate reflects reasonable expectations for beginning teachers for the Site Visitation Project (SVP) assessment.

For the SVP, students are supposed to plan, teach, and evaluate a 20- to 45-minute lesson that is observed by a University Coach and videotaped. The lesson plan and instruction should address goals and skills aligned with the adopted California content, English Language Development (ELD), and English Language Arts (ELA) standards and frameworks. The students are supposed to submit the written lesson plan at least 3 days prior to implementation. The lesson is observed by a University Coach and/or a subject-matter expert and videotaped. After the student watches the video, he or she evaluates lesson planning and implementation, and selects a segment of the video to demonstrate subject-specific pedagogy. For each of the three activities (planning, implementation, and reflection) there is a scoring rubric consisting of three entries/ evaluation areas: subject-specific pedagogy, applying knowledge of students, and student engagement. There are 4 levels in which students may be scored for each of these rubrics: 1=Does not meet expectations; 2=Meets expectations (passing level); 3=Meets expectations at a high level; and 4=Exceeds expectations (FAST SVP F17 field test guidance, 2017).

The group of panelists consisted of 9 participants, all members of Fresno State University teacher preparation program in the capacity of site coordinators or multiple or single subject instructors.

The participants were familiar with the assessment rubric and scoring, and with student performance. Due to this, the panelists were not administered portions of the assessments. Participants received the following documents in email before the workshop, and were also provided with the printout of these documents in the beginning of the workshop:

1. Passing Standard Workshop Agenda SVP
2. Class Profile SVP FAST2.0 -- A template the teacher candidate may use to prepare for the SVP, including Information for instructional planning, class summary, selection of the three focus students and explanation of why these students were selected and their learning needs and how the candidate plans to make content more accessible to the learning needs of the three focus students
3. Lesson Plan Template - A template to be used by a candidate teacher to provide an outline of the lesson plan

4. SVP 2.0 Fall - Contains the overview of SVP, the general directions for the teacher candidate, instructions on how to prepare for the site visitation project (SVP), parts of the SVP, and the evaluation rubric for Lesson Planning, Observation of Lesson, and Self-Evaluation of Lesson.
5. SVP rubric passing standard - The rubric for levels 1 and 2 only
6. Activity or Strategy Table SVP 2.0 - A document that candidates use as part of the SVP to describe instructional activities they will be using and to show the relationship between the activities or strategies and the four categories: subject specific pedagogy, acquisition of academic language, knowledge of students, and student engagement.

At the beginning of the workshop, the participants introduced themselves and explained their role in the FAST assessment process. Then, the facilitator introduced the main purpose of the workshop (to check whether the existing rubric for a level 2 candidate reflects reasonable expectations for beginning teachers). The facilitator introduced the history of the FAST assessment development, stating that the preliminary passing standard was developed in the fall of 2017 with the assistance of mentor teachers and site supervisors. The teacher education program received feedback from mentor teachers and site supervisors on the assessment and the rubric and made changes based on that information. The purpose of the present meeting was to look only at the SVP passing standard and to determine if what candidates are asked to do at level 2 is a reasonable expectation for beginning teachers.

The facilitator then handed out the print documents and explained their purpose. She reviewed the structure of the SVP assessment (planning, implementation, self-reflection) and the three rubrics associated with each of those tasks (subject-specific pedagogy, applying knowledge of students, and student engagement). She also reviewed the passing score—the student has to get a 2 in all rubrics of the assessment to get a score of 2 overall. If the student gets a 1 on a rubric, he or she needs to revise and resubmit that portion of the SVP assessment.

The facilitator then introduced the brainstorming activity and noted that the participants will be focusing on three main areas for these sections: lesson planning, implementation, and self-evaluation during this activity. The purpose of the brainstorming activity was outlined as follows: “When you think about a competent beginning teacher, but not necessarily outstanding, beginning teacher – what characteristics should you be seeing?” The brainstorming activity took approximately 1 hour 15 minutes. As the panelists were brainstorming, the facilitator was recording their suggestions in a Word document projected on the overhead screen.

During the activity, the panelists listed the KSAs for the planning and teaching parts that they think a beginning teacher should have. The panelists stressed the importance of setting high expectations for the candidates and ensuring that they are aware of what it takes to become a highly qualified teacher. The facilitator reminded the panelists that they should be thinking about a beginning teacher who may not have the characteristics of an experienced and successful teacher. To facilitate the differentiation between candidates who are not meeting the passing standard and those who are meeting the standard, the facilitator suggested that the panelists provide examples of teacher performance that they themselves observed that was above or below the passing standard, and that the panelists recall what specific tasks were challenging for them as beginning teachers and why. The panelists were able to come up with some behaviors characteristic of an unsuccessful teacher candidate that they observed during site visits. The facilitator prompted the panelists to think about whether those actions by the teacher candidates would mean that they would fail the SVP portion of the assessment and again

directed their attention to how the skills of a passing teacher candidate may be different from those of a non-passing teacher candidate.

As the final part of the workshop (approximately 30 minutes), the panelists reviewed the three rubrics for three tasks (planning, implementation, reflection) for the two levels – 1 (Does Not Meet Expectations) and 2 (Meets Expectations). The purpose of the review was to evaluate whether the rubric reflects reasonable expectations of what beginning teachers should know and be able to do, and whether the rubrics are worded clearly. They discussed some wording that appeared vague to them (e.g., “little or no understanding”, “typical student”) and possible changes to the wording. Small changes were made to the wording; the consensus among the panelists was that the rubric for Level 2 reflects reasonable expectations for the KSAs of candidate teachers. The finalized rubric will be posted on the CTC web site.

Overall, the panel appeared to be representative enough for the evaluation of the rubric content and appropriateness. The participants worked together effectively to reach consensus regarding their opinion of the appropriateness of the rubric. The process was conducted efficiently; the facilitator kept the discussion focused and was able to prompt the panelists to evaluate the rubrics using their experience and knowledge of teacher candidates and summarize their decisions.

Appendix 5.B: CalTPA Standard Setting Policy Capture Activity Instructions



CalTPA Standard Setting Conference

Standard Setting Policy Capture Activity

Instructions

In this activity, you will collaborate with panelists who also reviewed the same submissions for the pre-work assignment. Table assignments are posted on the PowerPoint slides.

You will first spend time recalling each submission you reviewed prior to the conference and provide an individual rating for each, using “Form 1: Standard Setting Policy Capture—Individual” (provided by ES staff). Then you will discuss your ratings with other panelists at your table, with the goal of arriving at a consensus on the rating. As a group, you and the other panelists at your table will complete “Form 2: Standard Setting Policy Capture—Group” (provided by ES staff).

After rating the first submission, you will move to your next table assignment and repeat the process for the second “pre-work” submission you reviewed (and so on). In total, six individual- and group-rating “rounds” will be completed by the end of the day (three submissions per two CalTPA cycles).

Table Activity Instructions

You and other panelists at your table will have 30 minutes per “round” to complete the following activities. Please stay focused, refrain from off-topic discussion, and try to complete the activity within the time limit. Use the protocol below to guide how much time is spent on each component of the activity. The facilitator will guide you through each cycle and help you follow the protocol.

3 minutes	Introductions: Make a brief introduction of your name and role in relation to the CalTPA. Please do not spend more than 3 minutes as a group introducing yourselves. Assign a table leader to keep the group focused and on track.
12 minutes	Recall the submission you reviewed and provide an individual (independent) rating on Form 1 , including a brief rationale for your rating. PLEASE DO NOT DISCUSS YOUR RATINGS OR RATIONALE YET WITH OTHER PANELISTS AT THE TABLE. You may consult with others in the group to confirm you are recalling the correct submission.
13 minutes	Discuss your ratings with other panelists at your table and come to consensus on your group’s rating. Make sure everyone has had a chance to explain their individual ratings and that all voices have been heard.
2 minutes	Complete Form 2 with your table.
	Submit your INDIVIDUAL RATINGS (Form 1) and GROUP RATING (Form 2) to your facilitator.

You will repeat this 30-minute process for each submission you reviewed.

Instructions for Completing Individual and Group Ratings

Review your notes on the submission you reviewed for pre-work to refresh your memory. Make sure you are recalling the correct submission. Check the Submission ID on **Form 1**. You may want to consult with others at your table to confirm you are reviewing the correct submission.

Consider:

- the content-specific aspect for this CalTPA credential area
- the evidence (videos, artifacts, and written narratives) you viewed in this candidate’s submission
- the scores given to the submission, and
- your understanding of the meaning of the CalTPA rubric levels

Now, think about whether this candidate is **"a teacher candidate who is just at the level of knowledge and skills required to perform effectively the job of a new teacher in California public schools."**

Form 1: Standard Setting Policy Capture—Individual

The goal of this activity is to help the panelists at your table come closer together on what this passing standard might be, in order to narrow the range of cut scores under consideration. Depending on where you initially set your own passing standard, think about whether the submission you reviewed is:

Clearly below the passing standard	CLEARLY NOT performing effectively the job of a new teacher. This teacher has demonstrated one or more <i>major</i> problems in teaching knowledge or skills that require remediation and may need additional time and opportunity for learning and improvement.
Just below the passing standard	APPROACHING but NOT YET effective in performing the job of a new teacher. This teacher has demonstrated some strengths but has one too many issues in teaching knowledge or skill that will keep him/her from being effective.
Just meets the passing standard	JUST MEETS your definition of performing effectively the job of a new teacher. This teacher has demonstrated some consistent strengths in teaching knowledge and skills and has a foundation on which to build. The teacher may have shown one or more minor flaws in teaching knowledge or skill that will likely improve with more time and experience.
Clearly meets the passing standard	CLEARLY MEETS your definition of performing effectively the job of a new teacher. This teacher has demonstrated clear strengths in teaching knowledge and skills, and a strong foundation for effective teaching.

How you define each of the ratings above will vary from other panelists depending on how **you** define “just meets” the passing standard. Remember the passing standard is framed as:

“a teacher candidate who is just at the level of knowledge and skills required to perform effectively the job of a new teacher in California public schools.”

You have four rating levels to select from:

- **Clearly below** the passing standard
- **Just below** the passing standard
- **Just meets** the passing standard
- **Clearly meets** the passing standard

PLEASE CHECK ONE RATING LEVEL ONLY. Then state the reason(s) that **most influenced** your rating. You may include your assessment of the candidate’s performance on specific rubrics. The rationale you provide will help you as you discuss your rating with other panelists and help us draw patterns about how panelists justified their ratings.

Form 2: Standard Setting Policy Capture—Group

Following the completion of Form 1, **discuss your rating** with other panelists at your table and come to **consensus** on a table rating. Make sure everyone has had a chance to explain their individual ratings and that all voices have been heard. Then complete “Form 2: Standard Setting Policy Capture—Group” (one per table) for this submission. Finally, select a table leader who be prepared to discuss your table’s rating with all CalTPA standard setting panelists.

Appendix 5.C: CalTPA Standard Setting Final Passing Standard Recommendation Form

Panelist ID: 136

CalTPA Standard Setting Conference

May 8-9, 2019

Final Passing Standard Recommendations

Cycle 1:

1) Think about a teacher candidate who is just at the level of knowledge and skills required to perform effectively the job of a new teacher in California public schools.

What total score (the sum of all rubric scores) of the CalTPA Cycle 1 represents the level of performance achieved by this individual?

Cycle 1 _____

2) Given the committee-recommended passing standard, what (if any) additional condition should be applied?

Apply additional condition?: Yes No

If Yes, recommend a passing standard that includes no more than _____ individual rubric score points of _____. (Example: No more than 1 individual rubric score points of "1")

Cycle 2:

1) Think about a teacher candidate who is just at the level of knowledge and skills required to perform effectively the job of a new teacher in California public schools.

What total score (the sum of all rubric scores) of the CalTPA Cycle 2 represents the level of performance achieved by this individual?

Cycle 2 _____

2) Given the committee-recommended passing standard, what (if any) additional condition(s) should be applied?

Apply additional condition?: Yes No

If Yes, recommend a passing standard that includes no more than _____ individual rubric score points of _____. (Example: No more than 1 individual rubric score points of "1")

Printed Name

Institution/Affiliation

Signature

Date

Chapter 7. Appendices

Appendix 7.A: Common Scoring Rubric

TPE	Element	Score Level				
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
TPE 1: Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning	1.8. Monitor student learning and adjust instruction while teaching so that students continue to be actively engaged in learning.	No or minimal evidence of monitoring of student learning; AND no or minimal evidence of adjusting of instruction.	* Candidate loosely monitors students' learning and/or monitors students' learning of lower-order concepts (memorize, duplicate, repeat, define) about the content being taught, thereby contributing to a shallow understanding of students' understanding of the learning goals. * Monitoring is insufficient to inform appropriate adjustments to instruction and thus adjustments are limited in their usefulness for advancing student learning.	* Candidate actively monitors students' learning of higher-order concepts (analysis, synthesis, evaluation, interpretation, transfer) throughout the lesson, thereby contributing to a deeper understanding of students' understanding of the learning goals. * Adjustments are appropriately based on information learned from monitoring student learning. * Adjustments are applied in-the-moment to adjust instruction for the whole class.	All of Level 3, plus: * Candidate monitors learning for individual learners and differentiates instruction to address needs of specific students. * Candidate provides adaptations or accommodations for specific students to meet their unique learning needs.	All of Levels 3 & 4, plus: * Candidate's differentiated instruction and provision of adaptations or accommodations yields opportunities for inclusion for all students to participate in the learning community and facilitate their own learning.

TPE	Element	Score Level				
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
TPE 2: Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning	2.5. Maintain high expectations for learning with appropriate support for the full range of students in the classroom.	<p>* No discussion or inclusion of high expectations in the lesson plan, commentaries/reflections, or videos of teaching practice.</p>	<p>* Expectations are minimally addressed by the candidate, and there is limited or weak evidence of how expectations are maintained.</p> <p>* Candidate provides some discussion and/or evidence for implementing supports (e.g., adaptations and accommodations) to help students attain expectations, but supports do not address the full range of learners in the class.</p>	<p>* High expectations for student learning are evident in lesson plan(s) and instruction.</p> <p>* Expectations are revisited--as opposed to a singular reference--and progress in meeting expectations is monitored and adjusted, as needed, to ensure that expectations remain high.</p> <p>* To help ensure that students can meet the high expectations, the candidate effectively uses supports (e.g. adaptations and accommodations) that are appropriate for the full range of learners.</p>	<p>All of 3, plus:</p> <p>* Candidate provides a clear rationale for how they (a) identify expectations, (b) monitor progress in meeting those expectations, and (c) identify individualized supports to help students meet expectations.</p>	<p>All of 3 & 4, plus:</p> <p>* Candidate demonstrates an intentional focus on flexible learning environments that support all students and allows for all students to participate in the learning community and facilitate their own learning.</p>

TPE	Element	Score Level				
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
TPE 3: Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning	3.1. Demonstrate knowledge of subject matter, including the adopted California State Standards and curriculum frameworks.	Candidate demonstrates limited and weak evidence of his/her knowledge of the subject matter, California State Standards, and curriculum frameworks (e.g., use of incorrect academic language, inability to answer student questions due to limited content knowledge, lesson plans or instructional strategies that are not grade-level appropriate).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Lesson plan(s) includes content and activities or strategies that are loosely or vaguely aligned with appropriate grade-level content standards. * Instruction includes content and activities or strategies that are loosely or vaguely aligned with appropriate grade-level content standards. * Candidate sometimes uses appropriate academic language during instruction and in analysis of student work, but not always. * Candidate demonstrates, through submitted evidence (e.g., lesson plan, video, analysis of student work), basic understanding of the subject matter and curriculum frameworks, but limited provision of scaffolds, representations, and/or modeling to advance student learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Lesson plan(s) includes content and activities or strategies that are clearly aligned with appropriate grade-level content standards. * Instruction includes content and activities or strategies that are clearly aligned with appropriate grade-level content standards. * Candidate regularly uses appropriate academic language during instruction and in analysis of student work. * Candidate demonstrates, through submitted evidence (e.g., lesson plan, video, analysis of student work), sufficient understanding of the subject matter and curriculum frameworks to identify scaffolds, representations, and/or modeling to advance student learning. 	Level 3, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Checks for student understanding of academic language during lessons. * Content-specific strategies, such as modeling and scaffolding, are used to advance student learning. 	Level 3 & 4, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Candidate connects knowledge of subject matter to practical applications/real world topics that are relatable to students with varying learning needs.

TPE	Element	Score Level				
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
TPE 3: Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning	3.2. Use knowledge about students and learning goals to organize the curriculum to facilitate student understanding of subject matter and make accommodations and/or modifications as needed to promote student access to the curriculum.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Candidate's approach to organizing the curriculum is a "one plan fits all" approach. * No accommodations and/or modifications. OR, if used, are used inappropriately. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Candidate's knowledge of their students is not clear in the lesson plan (e.g., few or weak connections between students' prior knowledge and learning goals) and/or their instructional strategies and activities. * Accommodations and/or modifications are not adequately informed by knowledge of students and thereby fall short of promoting student access to the curriculum. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Candidate uses knowledge of students (e.g., learning needs, backgrounds, interests) to design lesson plan(s) that include specific instructional strategies and activities that promote access to the curriculum. * Candidate sets learning goals that build on students' prior knowledge. * Candidate makes adjustments to instruction that are informed by prior knowledge of the students. * Candidate implements adaptations and accommodations that are tailored to the specific needs of the students in this class and promote access to curriculum. 	<p>All of 3, plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Lesson planning and instruction are informed by knowledge of both whole group and specific students. * Candidate's lesson plan(s) provides detailed explanation of why the proposed instructional approach (e.g., adaptations, accommodations, modifications) is appropriate for supporting specific students. 	<p>All of 3 & 4, plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Candidate's instructional approach (e.g., adaptations, accommodations, modifications) are evidence-based and/or supported by principles from research and/or theory. * Candidate's planning and instruction are flexible and responsive to the needs of the students. * Candidate's planning and instructing contribute to a classroom environment in which all students feel equally valued.

TPE	Element	Score Level				
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
TPE 3: Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning	3.5. Adapt subject matter curriculum, organization, and planning to support the acquisition and use of academic language within learning activities to promote the subject matter knowledge of all students, including the full range of English learners, Standard English learners, students with disabilities, and students with other learning needs in the least restrictive environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Candidate does not include plans or learning activities to promote students' acquisition of academic language. * Instruction fails to use or demonstrates inadequate use of adaptations or accommodations to support diverse learners' acquisition of academic language. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Candidate loosely or superficially ties academic language to lesson plans and/or instructional activities (i.e., not a clear connection to the academic language and the topic of instruction). * Adaptations or accommodations to support acquisition of academic language are connected to some, but not all, student groups in this class. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Candidate plans for and uses learning activities that provide opportunities for students to acquire and use academic language. * Candidate uses academic language in a way that promotes and deepens students' understanding of the subject matter. * Access to academic language is promoted through instructional adaptations or accommodations that support learning for all students, including the full range of English learners, Standard English learners, students with disabilities, and students with other learning needs. 	All of 3, plus: * There is clear evidence of the candidate differentiating instruction, through adaptations or accommodations, to promote acquisition of academic language for diverse learners in the class.	All of 3 & 4, plus: * Candidate's use of adaptations and/or accommodations to support academic language acquisition are evidence-based and developmentally appropriate, which contributes to a classroom environment where all students feel equally valued.

TPE	Element	Score Level				
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
TPE 4: Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students	4.1. Locate and apply information about students' current academic status, content- and standards-related learning needs and goals, assessment data, language proficiency status, and cultural background for both short-term and long-term instructional planning purposes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * It is not clear how or <i>if</i> the candidate located information about students' background. * No evidence of the candidate applying background information about students to their short-term <i>or</i> long-term instructional planning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Candidate's efforts to gather background information about students reflect a minimal level of effort (e.g., consulting a single source, such as last year's test scores). * The connection between student background information and its application to instructional planning is unclear or weak. * Candidate applies information about students to short-term planning, but no evidence of using that information for long-term instructional planning purposes (i.e., beyond the next couple of lessons). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Candidate gathers adequate amount of information about students' background (academic and non-academic information) from multiple sources (e.g., assessment data, student records, discussion with prior teachers, discussions with students). * Candidate clearly applies that background information to instructional planning, both short-term and long-term (i.e., beyond the next couple of lessons). 	All of level 3, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Candidate provides rationale for how the information he/she gathered was used to make decisions for short-term and long-term instructional planning. 	All of 3 and 4, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Candidate makes clear reference to how they individualized short-term and long-term planning based on the full range of learners in the classroom. * Candidate's instructional plans are supported by evidence-based research and/or principles from research and/or theory.

TPE	Element	Score Level				
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
TPE 5: Assessing Student Learning	1. Apply knowledge of the purposes, characteristics, and appropriate uses of different types of assessments (e.g., diagnostic, informal, formal, progress-monitoring, formative, summative, and performance) to design and administer classroom assessments, including use of scoring rubrics.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Candidate does not demonstrate knowledge of multiple assessments and their appropriate uses. * Assessment(s) and scoring rubrics are poorly aligned to the learning goals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Candidate demonstrates knowledge of only one type of assessment. * Candidate demonstrates limited understanding of the connection between assessment purpose and learning goals. * Assessment(s) and scoring rubrics are loosely aligned to the learning goals. * Candidate makes one or more errors in designing, administering and/or scoring assessments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Candidate demonstrates knowledge of more than one type of assessment. * Candidate demonstrates understanding of the connection between assessment purpose and learning goals. * Assessments and/or scoring rubrics are aligned to the learning goals. * Candidate demonstrates ability to design, administer and score a variety of assessments. * Candidate appropriately administers assessments and accurately applies scoring rubrics. 	<p>All of 3, plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Through his/her effective use of assessments, candidate demonstrates knowledge of the purposes, characteristics, and appropriate uses of different types of assessment. * Candidate demonstrates the ability to design effective informal and/or progress-monitoring assessments. * Appropriate prompts, directions, and criteria for meeting the learning outcomes are provided to students. 	<p>All of 3 & 4, plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Assessments are purposefully used to advance or deepen learning. * Candidate evaluates and justifies how the assessments align to the learning goals. * Candidate provides assessments that allow for multiple pathways for students to demonstrate their learning.

TPE	Element	Score Level				
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
TPE 5: Assessing Student Learning	5.2. Collect and analyze assessment data from multiple measures and sources to plan and modify instruction and document students' learning over time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Candidate does not collect and analyze data, or collects and analyzes data from a single measure. * Candidate demonstrates little to no connection between results from assessment and modifications to instruction. * Candidate fails to document students' learning over time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Candidate collects and analyzes data from more than one measure, but the body of evidence is limited and does not support strong conclusions about student learning. * Modifications to instruction are based on tenuous conclusions drawn from a limited body of assessment data. * Weak documentation of student learning over time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Candidate uses assessment data from multiple measures and sources and uses the body of evidence to make changes to their plans and instruction. * Candidate accurately analyzes assessment data and uses results to make appropriate modifications to his/her instruction. * Candidate uses assessment data from multiple measures to document students' learning over time. 	<p>All of 3, plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Candidate provides clear rationale and justification for the assessments he/she used and how he/she used the assessment data to plan and modify instruction. * Candidate describes use of information on student learning to make targeted, as well as class wide, changes to instruction. * Candidate explains how he/she documents students' learning and how he/she uses assessment data and other information sources to track learning over time. 	<p>All of 3 & 4, plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Candidate explains how assessments and other information sources can be improved, either by capturing additional evidence of student learning and/or eliminating the capture of uninformative data.

TPE	Element	Score Level				
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
TPE 6: Developing as a Professional Educator	6.1. Reflect on their own teaching practice and level of subject matter and pedagogical knowledge to plan and implement instruction that can improve student learning.	<p>* Candidate's reflections about the (a) effectiveness of his/her teaching practice, (b) level of subject matter knowledge and/or (c) level of pedagogical knowledge are absent or contain some inaccuracies.</p> <p>* Candidate does not connect reflections to adjustments (e.g., follow-up activities) to improve student learning.</p>	<p>* Candidate's reflections about the (a) effectiveness of his/her teaching practice, (b) level of subject matter knowledge and/or (c) level of pedagogical knowledge represent a shallow level of analysis.</p> <p>* Candidate makes vague or superficial connections between his/her reflections and planned adjustments to improve student learning.</p>	<p>* Candidate adequately reflects on the effectiveness of their <u>lesson plan</u>--from both a pedagogy and content perspective-- and implements (or discusses plans to implement) adjustments to improve student learning.</p> <p>* Candidate adequately reflects on the effectiveness of their <u>instructional strategies and/or activities</u>--from both a pedagogy and content perspective-- and implements (or discusses plans to implement) adjustments to improve student learning.</p> <p>*Candidate adequately reflects on the effectiveness of their <u>assessments</u> (formal and informal) and implements (or discusses plans to implement) adjustments to improve student learning.</p> <p>* Candidate's reflections include connections to the particular learning needs of the students in their class.</p>	<p>All of 3, plus:</p> <p>* Candidate provides rationale for reflections and includes justifications for adjustments.</p> <p>* Candidate includes explicit focus on differentiating adjustments for specific learners, showing responsiveness and flexibility in his/her teaching practice.</p>	<p>All of 3 & 4, plus:</p> <p>* Candidate provides clear rationale for all reflections and includes justifications for most/all adjustments.</p> <p>* Candidate makes astute connections among the cyclical relationship between planning, instructing and assessing.</p>

Appendix 7.B: Common Rubric and Model Rubric Correlations (TPE Element Level)

Table 7.B.1. Common Rubric and TPA Model Polychoric Correlations at Rubric Level (CalTPA)

Common Rubric TPE Element	CalTPA Rubrics																	
	Rubric1_1	Rubric2_1	Rubric3_1	Rubric4_1	Rubric5_1	Rubric6_1	Rubric7_1	Rubric8_1	Rubric1_2	Rubric2_2	Rubric3_2	Rubric4_2	Rubric5_2	Rubric6_2	Rubric7_2	Rubric8_2	Rubric9_2	
1.8						.19							.22					
2.5					.46	.42												
3.1	.03	-.10	-.07	.20					.10									
3.2	.27	.29	.44	.55				.58	.46	.21								
3.5	.64	.59	.38	.56						.48	.60							
4.1	-.08	.37	.50	.58														
5.1										.23			-.12		.22			
5.2		.20	.34	.38									.73			.72	.60	
6.1							.29	.21										.39

Note. Because the rubrics are rated on ordinal scales, polychoric correlations are reported.

Table 7.B.2. Common Rubric and TPA Model Polychoric Correlations at Rubric Level (edTPA)

edTPA Rubrics															
Common Rubric TPE Element	Rubric 1	Rubric 2	Rubric 3	Rubric 4	Rubric 5	Rubric 6	Rubric 7	Rubric 8	Rubric 9	Rubric 10	Rubric 11	Rubric 12	Rubric 13	Rubric 14	Rubric 15
1.8					.40			.79		.45					
2.5															
3.1	.46														
3.2		.59	.58	.24						.67					
3.5				.30										.18	
4.1															
5.1					.83						.45				
5.2															
6.1										.89					.52

Note. Because the rubrics are rated on ordinal scales, polychoric correlations are reported.

Table 7.B.3. Common Rubric and TPA Model Polychoric Correlations at Rubric Level (FAST)

Common Rubric TPE Element	FAST Rubrics									
	Planning	Implementation	Reflection	Students in Context	Learning Outcomes	Assessment Plan	Design for Instruction	Instructional Decision Making	Analysis of Student Learning	Reflection & Self- Evaluation
1.8		.27						.55		
2.5										
3.1	.25	.18			.58		.29			
3.2	.70	.43	.06		.57		.39	.72		
3.5	.27	.39								
4.1				.32						
5.1						.34				
5.2						.33			.54	
6.1			-.02							.49

Note. Because the rubrics are rated on ordinal scales, polychoric correlations are reported.