
5C

Information/Action

Educator Preparation Committee

Request for Approval of Field Test for the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers Literacy Performance Assessment

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents a request from California State University, Fresno to field test an updated version of their Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers that assesses candidates on literacy instruction that meets the requirements of Senate Bill 488 (Chap. 678, Stats. 2021).

Recommended Action: Staff recommends the Commission: 1) Approve the FAST 3.0 field test as proposed for fall 2024, 2) Approve waiver requests from Fresno State to waive the requirement for the assessment of reading instruction competence requirement for their candidates who successfully complete the FAST 3.0 and to meet the TPA requirement, and 3) Require field test participants to pass with a minimum of 2 points on each rubric of both the Site Visitation Project and the Teaching Sample Project.

Presenters: David DeGuire, Director, Professional Services Division; Juliet Wahleithner, Associate Professor of Literacy Education and Director of Educator Preparation Programs & Accreditation, and Suzie Brandl, Lecturer & FAST Coordinator, Kremen School of Education and Human Development at Fresno State University.

Strategic Plan Goal

Educator Preparation and Advancement

- **Goal 1.** Educator preparation programs hold candidates to high standards and adequately prepare them to support all students by using culturally and linguistically responsive and sustaining practices in equitable, inclusive and safe environments.
 - B. Develop educator performance assessments that are embedded in clinical preparation to ensure readiness to begin professional practice.

Request for Approval of Field Test for the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers Literacy Performance Assessment

Introduction

This agenda item presents a request from California State University, Fresno to field test an updated version of their Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) that assesses candidates on literacy instruction that meets the requirements of Senate Bill 488 (Chap. 678, Stats. 2021).

The [FAST 3.0](#) is intended to meet the requirements in [Senate Bill 488 \(Chap. 678, Stats. 2021\)](#), commonly referred to as SB 488, so that it can serve as a replacement for the currently adopted Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) by measuring priority elements appropriate for new teachers of the newly adopted [Literacy Teaching Performance Expectations \(TPE\) Domain 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for All Students](#).

The faculty of Fresno State plans to pilot the FAST 3.0 this fall with approximately 85 Multiple Subject candidates who completed a literacy methods course aligned with TPE 7 last spring or are currently enrolled in one this semester.

This item recommends that the Commission approve a field test the FAST 3.0; approve the requested waiver for selected candidates who will take part in the field test; and adopt an expected performance level for successful completion of the FAST 3.0, administered and scored during the fall 2024 field test. A second field test is planned for spring 2025, and a separate item will be brought to the Commission for approval of that field test.

Background for Teaching Performance Assessment Requirement

[Education Code §44320.2](#) requires all candidates for a Preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential to pass an assessment of their teaching performance with TK-12 public school students as part of the requirements for earning a preliminary teaching credential. The teaching performance assessment (TPA) must be approved by the Commission and meet the Commission's current [Performance Assessment Design Standards](#) (PADS). In addition, the assessment must be aligned to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP).

Currently there are three Commission-approved TPA models: CalTPA, edTPA, and FAST for Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialists for MMSN and ESN candidates. Completion of a Commission-approved TPA is only one of multiple measures that an approved preliminary preparation program is required to use in determining a recommendation for a Multiple or Single Subject, Education Specialist (MMSN and ESN), or PK-3 Specialist credential.

The FAST has been approved for use in California since 2008, and the Site Visitation Project (SVP) component of FAST has been revised to meet the requirements of SB 488. New literacy assessment tasks and scoring rubrics have been developed to assess both the current TPEs

(Domains 1 through 6) and the newly adopted TPE Domain 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for all Students.

Background on the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment Requirement and Literacy Instruction

Following the passage of SB 488, Education Code sections [44259](#) and [44283](#) were amended and section [44283.2](#) was added to require the Commission to complete a series of actions related to preparation for literacy instruction. These sections of statute require that the study of effective means of teaching literacy and evidence-based means of teaching foundational reading skills be included as a minimum requirement for Multiple Subject, Single Subject in English, and Education Specialist teaching credentials. It further requires that Commission standards and Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) align with the [English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve \(ELA/ELD Framework\)](#) adopted by the State Board of Education and incorporate the [California Dyslexia Guidelines](#). The Commission committed to apply these same requirements to the PK-3 Early Childhood Education Specialist Instruction credential, which was retooled after SB 488 was passed by the Legislature and signed by the Governor.

Current law requires individuals seeking to obtain a teaching credential in California to fulfill several requirements. For those seeking a Multiple Subject (elementary) or an Education Specialist (special education) credential, candidates must pass the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) to obtain a preliminary teaching credential. Established in 1996, the RICA was one part of a broader set of policies known collectively as the California Reading Initiative (CRI). The Commission implemented the RICA requirement in 1998 for Multiple Subject credential candidates and in 2000 for Education Specialist credential candidates.

Since the enactment of the California Reading Initiative statute over 25 years ago, the State Board of Education adopted a significantly updated *K-12 English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework*. These updates impact candidate preparation for teaching reading and developing literacy, including for students identified as English learners, as well as assessment of candidate competency in these areas. Additionally, the *California Dyslexia Guidelines* were published to address teaching reading to students with dyslexia. To meet the needs of all California students, SB 488 required the Commission to update its program standards and Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) for teacher preparation with respect to reading and literacy instruction, as well as corresponding candidate assessments.

During the 2022-23 academic year, the Commission consulted broadly with experts, preparation program personnel, and members of the public to update the program standards and literacy TPEs. The Commission adopted new standards for most teaching credentials in October 2022 and for the low incidence Education Specialist areas of Early Childhood Special Education, Visual Impairments, and Deaf and Hard of Hearing in February 2023. See [Agenda Item 2A](#) presented to the Commission at the June 2023 meeting.

Multiple Subject, Education Specialist, and PK-3 candidates must successfully complete TPE-aligned coursework and clinical practice, as well as meet the passing standard for a performance assessment, which beginning in Fall 2025, must include literacy. The teaching performance assessment provides the opportunity to measure priority TPEs that beginning teachers must be able to demonstrate prior to being recommended for a preliminary credential. All of TPE Domain 7 will be introduced, practiced, and assessed within the curriculum at the local level in the candidate's teacher preparation program. Additionally, priority TPE Domain 7 elements and/or portions of elements will be assessed on the FAST 3.0. For a chart of TPEs to be measured by the FAST 3.0, please see [Appendix A](#).

Part 1: Development of the FAST 3.0

In response to the 2023 updates to the Performance Assessment Design Standards, which now require explicit attention to candidates' literacy development as articulated subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (4) of subdivision (b) of Education Code sec. 44259, Fresno State engaged in a revision of the FAST 2.0.

Process

In spring 2024, Fresno State faculty with expertise in literacy instruction and assessment and experience working with the FAST came together to examine the current version of the FAST and plan revisions. (Please see [Appendix B](#) for a list of faculty involved and their CVs.) In the process, they consulted the updated literacy requirements. Revisions continued through summer 2024.

Structure

As in previous versions of the FAST, the FAST 3.0 consists of both a Site Visitation Project and a Teaching Sample Project. The Site Visitation Project has been revised to address the literacy elements specified in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (4) of subdivision (b) of Education Code section 44259.

Site Visitation Project: The Site Visitation Project has been revised to now focus on assessing candidates' knowledge of literacy instruction in a manner that aligns with subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (4) of subdivision (b) of Education Code section 44259.

- **Part 1 - Planning:** In the revised Site Visitation Project, candidates will plan a 3-day lesson sequence prior to the observation, formally gather data on students in the class, and use this information, along with their knowledge of the identified learning needs, to explain their instructional choices in the lesson sequence. Candidates will assess their class to determine students' initial level of literacy proficiency. Based on their assessment results, candidates will (a) identify a focal small group with common specific learning needs in literacy and (b) complete additional assessment(s) for a more detailed understanding of their literacy needs. Based on assessment data, candidates will then plan and teach a 3-day lesson sequence focused on literacy that incorporates both foundational skills and meaning making abilities from TPE 7.

- **Part 2 - Implementation and Observation of the Lesson:** In addition to teaching the lesson sequence that is observed by an educational expert, the lesson sequence will also be videotaped. After each instructional day, candidates will document student progress in developing their foundational skills and meaning making abilities and make adjustments to the following lessons.
- **Part 3 - Self-evaluation of the Lesson Sequence:** Teacher candidates will use the three videos as a tool for self-evaluation of the lesson sequence and select and submit two 3- to 5-minute unedited video clips to clearly demonstrate examples of targeted reading foundation skill instruction in one or more of the following areas: phonemic awareness, phonics, decoding/encoding, and/or fluency; and candidates ability to provide targeted meaning making instruction in one or more of the following areas: identity reading, oral language/discussion, and/or writing.

Teaching Sample Project: This task assesses a candidate's ability to: (a) identify the context of their classroom, (b) plan and teach a series of at least 5 cohesive lessons (a unit of study) with a focus on mathematics and literacy, (c) to assess a class of students' learning before, during, and after the unit, (d) document their teaching and their students' learning, and (e) reflect on the effectiveness of their teaching. The Teaching Sample Project includes sections designed to measure seven Teaching Process Standards that have been identified by research and best practice as fundamental to improving student learning. The revised version requires candidates to design lessons that focus on teaching mathematics using current subject specific pedagogies.

- **Students in Context:** *The teacher uses information about the learning-teaching context, including student individual differences, to set learning goals and plan instruction and assessment.* The prompt requires candidates to describe the specific learning needs of their English language learners, students with identified special needs, and students from another group needing specialized instruction and how these students' needs will influence their instructional planning and assessment. The expectations and management strategies identified by the candidates in their classroom management plan have a specific focus related to the new TPEs.
- **Learning Outcomes:** *The teacher sets significant, challenging, varied, and appropriate learning goals.* Candidates must plan and implement an integrated unit that addresses CA ELA/Literacy standards and the mathematics framework.
- **Assessment Plan:** *The teacher uses assessments aligned with learning goals to assess student learning before, during, and after instruction.*
- **Design for Instruction:** *The teacher designs instruction for specific learning goals, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts.* The revised prompt focuses on incorporating universal lesson design elements and technology. The candidate must respond to questions about how they designed their lessons to provide access to the

content and to support the acquisition of English language, the development of literacy skills, and the use of technology.

- **Instructional Decision-Making:** *The teacher uses regular and systematic evaluations of student learning to make instructional decisions.*
- **Analysis of Student Learning:** *The teacher uses assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement.*
- **Reflection and Self-Evaluation:** *The teacher reflects on student learning and the effectiveness of their instruction in order to improve teaching practice.*

Each of the tasks continues to have detailed instructions as well as task-specific, four-point scoring rubrics used to evaluate the project. The rubric levels are unchanged in the revised FAST:

- 1 = Does not meet expectations
- 2 = Meets expectations
- 3 = Meets expectations at a high level
- 4 = Exceeds expectations

The rubrics have been modified as necessary to align with the TPE elements being assessed, including TPE 7. (See [Appendix D](#) for the revised Site Visitation Project rubrics.)

For the Site Visitation Project, the rubrics are organized by the three sections which comprise the task: *Planning, Implementation, and Reflection*. Each rubric is organized by *Reading Pedagogy: Foundational Skills, Reading Pedagogy: Meaning Making, Instructional Decision Making, and Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy*, with a slightly different emphasis for each section (planning, implementation, and reflection).

The Teaching Sample Project is assessed by rubrics aligned by section: *Students in Context, Learning Outcomes, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction, Instructional Decision-Making, Analysis of Student Learning, and Reflection and Self-Evaluation*.

A comprehensive overview of the FAST 3.0 system is presented in the [FAST 3.0 Manual](#).

Part 2: Commission Authority to Issue a Waiver

The Commission has the authority to grant waivers that are requested from school districts, county offices of education, private schools, and postsecondary institutions through Education Code §44225(m), which states that:

§44225 The commission shall do all of the following:

- (m) Review requests from school districts, county offices of education, private schools, and postsecondary institutions for the waiver of one or more of the provisions of this chapter or other provisions governing the preparation or licensing of educators. The commission may grant a waiver upon its finding

that professional preparation equivalent to that prescribed under the provision or provisions to be waived will be, or has been, completed by the credential candidate or candidates affected. (emphasis added)

The underlined section of statute sets criteria for the issuance of a waiver that requires equivalence or comparability of requirement to be established. The process of the development of the FAST 3.0 involves multiple steps, including faculty meetings to design of tasks and rubrics to measure the elements of TPE Domain 7; a field test of the revised assessment; a standard setting study; and finally, review and approval by the Commission for use in California. The FAST 3.0 has not completed the Commission's review process yet, as it is still under development. The FAST 3.0 is expected to be presented to the Commission for review and final approval at its June 2025 Commission meeting and be fully implemented starting July 1, 2025.

A panel of psychometricians reviewed the original version of the FAST in 2008 and found that it met the Commission's adopted [Performance Assessment Design Standards](#) (PADS). In addition, the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) completed a [comparability study](#) in 2019 and found that the FAST was sufficiently comparable to the other TPA models approved by the Commission (CalTPA and edTPA) in its representation of the PADS and its assessment and weighting of the Commission-adopted Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs).

Commission staff, with the support of literacy experts, conducted a review of how well the FAST 3.0 met the 2023 updates to the PADS and the requirements of SB 488. The review indicates that the FAST 3.0 satisfies these standards adopted by the Commission. On this basis, the FAST 3.0 can be considered to represent professional preparation equivalent and therefore comparable to the current RICA requirements for a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential.

Under these conditions, the Commission has the authority to provide waivers to candidates that meet the expected performance level on the FAST 3.0 rather than on the current RICA. The Commission has previously allowed a waiver for the TPA under similar circumstances for the initial pilot of the edTPA during 2012-13, the [redeveloped CalTPA in 2017](#), and most recently, for a [pilot test](#) of the Commission's Literacy Performance Assessment.

Detailed information about the current structure of the FAST 3.0 and summary information about how it addresses key provisions of the Commission's adopted PADS are presented below to illustrate how the completion of the FAST 3.0 can be considered comparable to completion of the RICA. [Appendix C](#) provides more detailed information based on the Commission staff review of progress toward meeting the PADS.

Comparison of the FAST 3.0 with the Current RICA Video Performance Assessment

Candidates currently have the option to take either a written or video performance assessment to fulfil the current RICA requirement. The table below provides an overview of the **current** RICA video performance assessment requirements.

Evidence to be Submitted	RICA Video Requirements
Setting 1: Whole-Class Instruction Video and Template	<p>Instructional Setting: This lesson must be delivered to an entire class of no fewer than 5 students.</p> <p>Domains: Domain 1 (Planning, Organizing, and Managing Reading Instruction Based on Ongoing Assessment) and Domain 4 (Vocabulary, Academic Language, and Background Knowledge)</p> <p>Description: Video and template should demonstrate your ability to: (a) plan, organize, and manage reading instruction based on ongoing assessment, as described in Domain 1, and (b) plan and deliver to a whole class an effective lesson that develops the students' vocabulary, academic language, and background knowledge.</p> <p>The central instructional objective of the lesson must be derived from Competency 11 of Domain 4. You must demonstrate knowledge and skills in this competency.</p>
Setting 2: Small-Group Instruction Video and Template	<p>Instructional Setting: This lesson must be delivered to a group of at least 3 but no more than 12 students.</p> <p>Domains: Domain 1 (Planning, Organizing, and Managing Reading Instruction Based on Ongoing Assessment) and Domain 2 (Word Analysis)</p> <p>Description: Video and template should demonstrate your ability to: (a) plan, organize, and manage reading instruction based on ongoing assessment, as described in Domain 1, and (b) plan and deliver to a small group of students an effective lesson that develops the students' word analysis.</p> <p>The central instructional objective of the lesson must be derived from Competency 6 or 7 of Domain 2. You must demonstrate knowledge and skills in one of these competencies.</p>
Setting 3: Individual Instruction Video and Template	<p>Instructional Setting: This lesson must be delivered to an individual student.</p> <p>Domains: Domain 1 (Planning, Organizing, and Managing Reading Instruction Based on Ongoing Assessment) and Domain 5 (Comprehension)</p> <p>Description: Video and template should demonstrate your ability to: (a) plan, organize, and manage reading instruction based on ongoing assessment, as described in Domain 1, and (b) plan and deliver to an individual student an effective lesson that develops the student's comprehension.</p> <p>The central instructional objective of the lesson must be derived from Competency 13, 14, or 15 of Domain 5. You must demonstrate knowledge and skills in one of these competencies.</p>

Current RICA Competencies are available [here](#). It should be noted that the RICA competencies are not fully aligned to the currently adopted ELA/ELD Framework or TPE Domain 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for All Students.

The revised FAST 3.0 is comparable to the requirements asked of candidates in the video version of the current RICA performance assessment. The following table provides a comparison between the two assessments and their requirements.

Table 1: Comparison of Requirements: FAST 3.0 and Current Video RICA Performance Assessment

Components of FAST 3.0	Components of Current Video RICA Performance Assessment	Description
Contextual Information about students, including previous assessments and/or screenings	Assessment and Planning Student Information	Assessment methods used to determine the lesson(s) Student background information
Assess entire class using the Words Their Way (WTW) assessment	N/A	Description of assessments with rubrics
Analysis of Assessments	N/A	Analysis of Assessments
3-day lesson sequence with small focus group focused on literacy that incorporates both foundational skills and meaning making abilities from TPE 7	Lesson Plan (whole group, small group, or individual)	Explanation of learning activities and assessments
Video Clips (3)	Video Clips (3)	Video recording of candidate's instruction
Analysis of Assessments	N/A	Analysis of assessments
Choose specific video clips that highlight key moments of instruction and reflect on their teaching practices to identify areas for improvement	Reflection	Using assessment data to plan future instruction and reflecting on effectiveness

In addition to the differences in the requirements of the two assessments, the rubrics associated with each assessment are very different. The RICA rubrics are holistic in nature, while the FAST 3.0 relies on analytic rubrics directly aligned to the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE), especially TPE Domain 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for All Students, which aligns to the current ELA/ELD Framework and the expectations of SB 488. [Appendix D](#) provides the analytic rubrics for the FAST 3.0.

With these comparable features, candidates will demonstrate an equivalent and therefore comparable, if not more comprehensive, body of evidence than what is asked for in the current video RICA performance assessment. Given the specificity and alignment of the FAST 3.0 analytic rubrics to SB 488 and the more comprehensive set of evidence required of candidates to demonstrate both foundational reading skills and the additional crosscutting themes of the ELA/ELD Framework, staff submit that the FAST 3.0 is at least equivalent to the current RICA video performance assessment and therefore meets the statutory provision for the Commission to waive the current requirement for candidates who take and pass the field test version of the FAST 3.0. Staff further recommends that pilot participants who are taking the FAST 3.0 to meet their TPA requirement receive a TPA waiver that recognizes a passing score on the Site Visitation Project as a replacement for the currently approved FAST 2.0 SVP.

In summary, successful completion of Fresno State's approved teacher preparation program and the FAST 3.0 is comparable to completion of a program and passage of a fully approved TPA and assessment of reading instruction competence. Therefore, staff recommends that the Commission utilize its authority to grant waivers to Fresno State candidates, upon request of the institution. Granting of this waiver will allow candidates who successfully complete the FAST 3.0 to meet the current RICA requirement and also meet the TPA requirement for a credential.

Part 3: Proposed Performance Level to Pass the FAST 3.0

Developers of TPA models typically conduct a standard setting study in order to establish the requirements for successful completion of the assessment. Fresno State will conduct a standard setting study following a second field test in spring 2025. The purpose of the current field test is to engage participants to collect additional validity evidence about the design of the literacy performance assessment components, specifically the tasks and rubrics, and use these data to refine the FAST 3.0.

Fresno State faculty have recommended that the passing standard for the field test of the FAST 3.0 be the same as the currently approved passing for the FAST 2.0: a minimum score of 2 on all rubrics of both the Site Visitation Project and the Teaching Sample Project. Commission staff recommend that the Commission approve this passing standard. Candidates who do not meet the Commission's expected minimum performance level will be supported in retaking rubrics on which they score a 1.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Commission:

1. Approve the FAST 3.0 field test as proposed for fall 2024.
2. Approve waiver requests from Fresno State to waive the requirement for the assessment of reading instruction competence requirement for their candidates who successfully complete the FAST 3.0 and to meet the TPA requirement. An initial list of candidates participating in the field test of FAST 3.0 is provided in [Appendix E](#). *Note: a final list of candidates participating in the field test will be provided as a consent agenda item at the October 2024 Commission meeting.*
3. Require field test participants to pass with a minimum of 2 points on each rubric of both the Site Visitation Project and the Teaching Sample Project.

Next Steps

If the Commission approves the FAST 3.0 for field test and the waiver requests from Fresno State and adopts the proposed passing standard, then staff will work with Fresno State to conduct the initial field test.

Appendix A

TPEs Measured by the FAST 3.0

Site Visitation Project (SVP)

TPE Elements Assessed	Planning	Implementation	Reflection
1.1	X		
1.3	X		
1.4	X		X
1.5			
1.6			
1.8		X	
2.1			
2.2	X	X	X
2.3	X	X	X
2.5	X	X	X
2.6			
3.1	X		
3.2	X		
3.3	X		
3.5			

4.1	X		
4.2	X		
4.3			
4.4	X	X	
4.7	X		
5.1			
5.2	X	X	
5.5	X		
5.8	X		X
6.1			X
6.2			X
6.3			
6.5			
7.1	X		
7.2	X		
7.3	X		X
7.4	X	X	X
7.5	X	X	X
7.6	X	X	X
7.7	X		X
7.8	X	X	X
7.9			
7.10	X	X	
7.11	X	X	

Teaching Sample Project

TPE Elements Assessed	Students in Context	Learning Outcomes	Assessment Plan	Design for Instruction	Instructional Decision Making	Analysis of Student Learning	Reflection & Self Evaluation
1.1							
1.3							
1.4							
1.5				X			
1.6	X			X			
1.8					X		
2.1	X						
2.2							
2.3	X						
2.5							
2.6	X						
3.1		X		X			
3.2		X		X	X		
3.3		X		X			
3.5							
4.1	X						
4.2							
4.3			X				

4.4				X			
4.7				X			
5.1			X				
5.2			X			X	
5.5						X	
5.8	X			X			
6.1							X
6.2							
6.3							X
6.5							X
7.1		X		X			
7.2							
7.3	X			X			X
7.4							
7.5							
7.6							
7.7	X			X			
7.8							
7.9				X			
7.10			X		X	X	
7.11	X			X			

Site Visitation Project TPE Alignment Map

Teaching Performance Expectation	Addressed in SVP
TPE 1: Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning	
1. Apply knowledge of students, including their prior experiences, interests, and social-emotional learning needs, as well as their funds of knowledge and cultural, language, and socioeconomic backgrounds, to engage them in learning.	Yes
2. Maintain ongoing communication with students and families, including the use of technology to communicate with and support students and families, and to communicate achievement expectations and student progress.	No
3. Connect subject matter to real-life contexts and provide active learning experiences to engage student interest, support student motivation, and allow students to extend their learning.	Yes
4. Use a variety of developmentally and ability-appropriate instructional strategies, resources, and assistive technology, including principles of Universal Design of Learning (UDL) and Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) to support access to the curriculum for a wide range of learners within the general education classroom and environment.	Yes
5. Promote students' critical and creative thinking and analysis through activities that provide opportunities for inquiry, problem solving, responding to and framing meaningful questions, and reflection.	Yes
6. Provide a supportive learning environment for students' first and/or second language acquisition by using research-based instructional approaches, including focused English Language Development, Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE), scaffolding across content areas, and structured English immersion, and demonstrate an understanding of the difference among students whose only instructional need is to acquire Standard English proficiency, students who may have an identified disability affecting their ability to acquire Standard English proficiency, and students who may have both a need to acquire Standard English proficiency and an identified disability.	No
7. Provide students with opportunities to access the curriculum by incorporating the visual and performing arts, as appropriate to the content and context of learning.	No

Teaching Performance Expectation	Addressed in SVP
8. Monitor student learning and adjust instruction while teaching so that students continue to be actively engaged in learning.	Yes
TPE 2: Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning	
1. Promote students' social-emotional growth, development, and individual responsibility using positive interventions and supports, restorative justice, and conflict resolution practices to foster a caring community where each student is treated fairly and respectfully by adults and peers.	No
2. Create learning environments (i.e., traditional, blended, and online) that promote productive student learning, encourage positive interactions among students, reflect diversity and multiple perspectives, and are culturally responsive.	Yes
3. Establish, maintain, and monitor inclusive learning environments that are physically, mentally, intellectually, and emotionally healthy and safe to enable all students to learn, and recognize and appropriately address instances of intolerance and harassment among students, such as bullying, racism, and sexism.	Yes
4. Know how to access resources to support students, including those who have experienced trauma, homelessness, foster care, incarceration, and/or are medically fragile.	No
5. Maintain high expectations for learning with appropriate support for the full range of students in the classroom.	Yes
6. Establish and maintain clear expectations for positive classroom behavior and for student-to-student and student-to-teacher interactions by communicating classroom routines, procedures, and norms to students and families.	Yes
TPE 3: Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning	
1. Demonstrate knowledge of subject matter, including the adopted California State Standards and curriculum frameworks.	Yes
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.	Yes
3. Plan, design, implement, and monitor instruction consistent with current subject-specific pedagogy in the content area(s) of instruction,	Yes

Teaching Performance Expectation	Addressed in SVP
and design and implement disciplinary and cross-disciplinary learning sequences, including integrating the visual and performing arts as applicable to the discipline.	
4. Individually and through consultation and collaboration with other educators and members of the larger school community, plan for effective subject matter instruction and use multiple means of representing, expressing, and engaging students to demonstrate their knowledge.	No
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.	Yes
6. Use and adapt resources, standards-aligned instructional materials, and a range of technology, including assistive technology, to facilitate students' equitable access to the curriculum.	No
7. Model and develop digital literacy by using technology to engage students and support their learning, and promote digital citizenship, including respecting copyright law, understanding fair use guidelines and the use of Creative Commons license, and maintaining Internet security.	No
8. Demonstrate knowledge of effective teaching strategies aligned with the internationally recognized educational technology standards.	No
TPE 4: Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students	
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.	Yes
2. Understand and apply knowledge of the range and characteristics of typical and atypical child development from birth through adolescence to help inform instructional planning and learning experiences for all students.	Yes
3. Design and implement instruction and assessment that reflects the interconnectedness of academic content areas and related student skills development in literacy, mathematics, science, and other	Yes

Teaching Performance Expectation	Addressed in SVP
disciplines across the curriculum, as applicable to the subject area of instruction.	
<p>4. Plan, design, implement and monitor instruction, making effective use of instructional time to maximize learning opportunities and provide access to the curriculum for all students by removing barriers and providing access through instructional strategies that include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • appropriate use of instructional technology, including assistive technology; • applying principles of UDL and MTSS; • use of developmentally, linguistically, and culturally appropriate learning activities, instructional materials, and resources for all students, including the full range of English learners; • appropriate modifications for students with disabilities in the general education classroom; • opportunities for students to support each other in learning; and • use of community resources and services as applicable. 	Yes
5. Promote student success by providing opportunities for students to understand and advocate for strategies that meet their individual learning needs and assist students with specific learning needs to successfully participate in transition plans (e.g., IEP, IFSP, ITP, and 504 plans).	No
6. Access resources for planning and instruction, including the expertise of community and school colleagues through in-person or virtual collaboration, co-teaching, coaching, and/or networking.	No
7. Plan instruction that promotes a range of communication strategies and activity modes between teacher and student and among students that encourage student participation in learning.	Yes
8. Use digital tools and learning technologies across learning environments as appropriate to create new content and provide personalized and integrated technology-rich lessons to engage students in learning, promote digital literacy, and offer students multiple means to demonstrate their learning.	No
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.	Yes

Teaching Performance Expectation	Addressed in SVP
2. Collect and analyze assessment data from multiple measures and sources to plan and modify instruction and document students' learning over time.	Yes
3. Involve all students in self-assessment and reflection on their learning goals and progress and provide students with opportunities to revise or reframe their work based on assessment feedback.	No
4. Use technology as appropriate to support assessment administration, conduct data analysis, and communicate learning outcomes to students and families.	No
5. Use assessment information in a timely manner to assist students and families in understanding student progress in meeting learning goals.	Yes
6. Work with specialists to interpret assessment results from formative and summative assessments to distinguish between students whose first language is English, English learners, Standard English learners, and students with language or other disabilities.	No
7. Interpret English learners' assessment data to identify their level of academic proficiency in English as well as in their primary language, as applicable, and use this information in planning instruction.	No
8. Use assessment data, including information from students' IEP, IFSP, ITP, and 504 plans, to establish learning goals and to plan, differentiate, make accommodations and/or modify instruction.	Yes
TPE 6: Developing as a Professional Educator	
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.	Yes
2. Recognize their own values and implicit and explicit biases, the ways in which these values and implicit and explicit biases may positively and negatively affect teaching and learning, and work to mitigate any negative impact on the teaching and learning of students. They exhibit positive dispositions of caring, support, acceptance, and fairness toward all students and families, as well as toward their colleagues.	Yes
3. Establish professional learning goals and make progress to improve their practice by routinely engaging in communication and inquiry with colleagues.	No

Teaching Performance Expectation	Addressed in SVP
4. Demonstrate how and when to involve other adults and to communicate effectively with peers and colleagues, families, and members of the larger school community to support teacher and student learning.	No
5. Demonstrate professional responsibility for all aspects of student learning and classroom management, including responsibility for the learning outcomes of all students, along with appropriate concerns and policies regarding the privacy, health, and safety of students and families. Beginning teachers conduct themselves with integrity and model ethical conduct for themselves and others.	No
6. Understand and enact professional roles and responsibilities as mandated reporters and comply with all laws concerning professional responsibilities, professional conduct, and moral fitness, including the responsible use of social media and other digital platforms and tools.	No
7. Critically analyze how the context, structure, and history of public education in California affects and influences state, district, and school governance as well as state and local education finance.	No
TPE 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for All Students	
1. Plan and implement evidence-based literacy instruction (and integrated content and literacy instruction) grounded in an understanding of applicable literacy-related academic standards and the themes of the California English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework (Foundational Skills, Meaning Making, Language Development, Effective Expression, and Content Knowledge) and their integration.	Yes
2. Plan and implement evidence-based literacy instruction (and integrated content and literacy instruction) grounded in an understanding of Universal Design for Learning; California's Multi-Tiered System of Support (Tier 1–Best first instruction, Tier 2–Targeted, supplemental instruction, and Tier 3–Referrals for intensive intervention); and the California Dyslexia Guidelines, including the definition and characteristics of dyslexia and structured literacy (i.e., instruction for students at risk for and with dyslexia that is comprehensive, systematic, explicit, cumulative, and multimodal and that includes phonology, orthography, phonics, morphology, syntax, and semantics).	Yes
3. Incorporate asset-based pedagogies, inclusive approaches, and culturally and linguistically affirming and sustaining practices in literacy	Yes

Teaching Performance Expectation	Addressed in SVP
instruction (and in integrated content and literacy instruction), recognizing and incorporating the diversity of students' cultures, languages, dialects, and home communities. Promote students' literacy development in languages other than English in multilingual (dual language and bilingual education) programs.	
4. Provide literacy instruction (and integrated content and literacy instruction) for all students that is active, motivating, and engaging; responsive to students' age, language and literacy development, and literacy goals; reflective of family engagement, social and emotional learning, and trauma-informed practices; and based on students' assessed learning strengths and needs, analysis of instructional materials and tasks, and identified academic standards.	Yes
5. Foundational Skills. Multiple Subject Candidates: Develop students' skills in print concepts, including letters of the alphabet; phonological awareness, including phonemic awareness; phonics, spelling, and word recognition, including letter-sound, spelling-sound, and sound-symbol correspondences; decoding and encoding; morphological awareness; and text reading fluency, including accuracy, prosody (expression), and rate (as an indicator of automaticity), through instruction that is structured and organized as well as direct, systematic, and explicit and that includes practice in connected, decodable text. Multiple Subject and Single Subject English Candidates: Provide instruction in text reading fluency that emphasizes spelling and syllable patterns, semantics, morphology, and syntax. Multiple Subject and Single Subject Candidates: Advance students' progress in the elements of foundational skills, language, and cognitive skills that support them as they read and write increasingly complex disciplinary texts with comprehension and effective expression.	Partial based on Candidate Choice
6. Meaning Making. Engage students in meaning making by building on prior knowledge and using complex literary and informational texts (print, digital, and oral), questioning, and discussion to develop students' literal and inferential comprehension, including the higher-order cognitive skills of reasoning, perspective taking, and critical reading, writing, listening, and speaking across the disciplines. Engage students in reading, listening, speaking, writing, and viewing closely to draw evidence from texts, ask and answer questions, and support analysis, reflection, and research.	Partial based on Candidate Choice
7. Language Development. Promote students' oral and written language development by attending to vocabulary knowledge and use, grammatical structures (e.g., syntax), and discourse-level	Partial based on Candidate Choice

Teaching Performance Expectation	Addressed in SVP
<p>understandings as students read, listen, speak, and write with comprehension and effective expression. Create environments that foster students’ oral and written language development, including discipline-specific academic language. Enhance language development by engaging students in the creation of diverse print, oral, digital, and multimedia texts. Conduct instruction that leverages students’ existing linguistic repertoires, including home languages and dialects, and that accepts and encourages translanguaging.</p>	
<p>8. Effective Expression. Develop students’ effective expression as they write, discuss, present, and use language conventions. Engage students in a range of frequent formal and informal collaborative discussions, including extended conversations, and writing for varied purposes, audiences, and contexts. Teach students to plan, develop, provide feedback to peers, revise using peer and teacher feedback, edit, and produce their own writing and oral presentations in various genres, drawing on the modes of opinion/argumentation, information, and narration. Develop students’ use of keyboarding, technology, and multimedia, as appropriate, and fluency in spelling, handwriting, and other language conventions to support writing and presentations. Teach young children letter formation/printing and related language conventions, such as capitalization and punctuation, in conjunction with applicable decoding skills.</p>	<p>Partial based on Candidate Choice</p>
<p>9. Content Knowledge. Promote students’ content knowledge by engaging students in literacy instruction, in all pertinent content areas, that integrates reading, writing, listening, and speaking in discipline-specific ways, including through printed and digital texts and multimedia, discussions, experimentation, hands-on explorations, and wide and independent reading. Teach students to navigate increasingly complex literary and informational texts relevant to the discipline, research questions of interest, and convey knowledge in a variety of ways. Promote digital literacy and the use of educational technology, including the ability to find, evaluate, use, share, analyze, create, and communicate digital resources safely and responsibly, and foster digital citizenship.</p>	<p>Partial based on Candidate Choice</p>
<p>10. Multiple Subject and Single Subject English Candidates: Monitor students’ progress in literacy development using formative assessment practices, ongoing progress monitoring, and diagnostic techniques that inform instructional decision making. Understand how to use screening to determine students’ literacy profiles and identify potential reading and writing difficulties, including students’ risk for dyslexia and other literacy-related disabilities. Understand how to appropriately assess</p>	<p>Partial based on Classroom Context</p>

Teaching Performance Expectation	Addressed in SVP
<p>and interpret results for English learner students. If indicated, collaborate with families and guardians as well as with teachers, specialists, other professionals, and administrators from the school or district to facilitate comprehensive assessment for disabilities in English and as appropriate in the home language; plan and provide supplemental instruction in inclusive settings; and initiate referrals for students who need more intensive support.</p>	
<p>11. Multiple Subject and Single Subject Candidates: Provide instruction in English language development (ELD) for students identified as English learner students based on an understanding of comprehensive ELD, which includes both integrated and designated ELD and is part of Tier 1 instruction. Understand how integrated and designated ELD are related and how designated ELD is taught in connection with (rather than isolated from) content areas and topics. Use ELA/literacy standards (or other content standards) and ELD standards in tandem to plan instruction that attends to students' literacy profiles, levels of English language proficiency, and prior educational experiences. Provide ELD instruction that builds on students' cultural and linguistic assets and develops students' abilities to use English purposefully, interact in meaningful ways, and understand how English works across the disciplines.</p>	<p>Partial based on Classroom Context</p>

Appendix B

Faculty Involved in Revision of Site Visitation Project

- Dr. Lisa Bennett, Associate Professor, Literacy Education, Fresno State ([CV](#))
- Dr. Monica Billen, Associate Professor, Literacy Education, Fresno State ([CV](#))
- Suzie Brandl, Lecturer & FAST Coordinator, Fresno State ([CV](#))
- Dr. Juliet Wahleithner, Associate Professor, Literacy Education, & Director, Educator Preparation and Accreditation, Fresno State ([CV](#))

Appendix C

Revised FAST Site Visitation Project (SVP) Alignment with Commission's Performance Assessment Design Standards (adopted June 2023)

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by Revised FAST SVP
Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness	
<p>The sponsor* of a teaching performance assessment seeking approval for use in California (model sponsor) designs a Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) in which complex pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring scales are linked to and assess California's Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). The model sponsor clearly describes the uses for which the assessment has been validated (i.e., to serve as a determination of a candidate's status with respect to the TPEs and to provide an indication of preparation program quality and effectiveness), anticipates its potential misuses, and identifies appropriate uses consistent with the assessment's validation process. The model sponsor maximizes the fairness of the assessment design for all groups of candidates in the program. A passing standard is recommended by the model sponsor based on a standard setting study where educators have made a professional judgment about an appropriate performance standard for beginning teachers to meet prior to licensure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple, task-specific, 4-level rubrics supporting the assessment of the TPEs including TPE Domain 7 (see Appendix D) • Candidates must score a minimum of a 2 on each task-specific rubric in order to pass the SVP • Fall 2024 pilot and Spring 2025 field test with a diverse representation of Multiple Subject candidates • A standard setting will be held with literacy faculty, university supervisors, and practicing teachers using a subset of submitted assessments to establish scoring guidelines.
<p>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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A literacy-focused lesson sequence based on the pedagogical sequence of assess, plan, teach, reflect, and apply that directly addresses the TPEs including TPE Domain 7

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by Revised FAST SVP
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 all major domains of the TPEs. The sponsor of the performance assessment documents the relationships between TPEs, tasks, and rubrics.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SVP revision includes: TPEs 1.1, 1.3, 1.5, 1.8, 2.2, 2.6, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.7, 6.1, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 7.7, 7.8, 7.10, 7.11 (see Appendix C) Each section of the SVP and rubric indicate the TPEs addressed
1(b) 1. The multiple subject general education TPA model sponsor must include in its performance assessment a focus on content-specific pedagogy within the design of the TPA tasks and scoring scales to assess the candidate's ability to effectively teach literacy in a manner aligned to the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (4) of subdivision (b) of Education Code sec. 44259; the Commission's standards of program quality and effectiveness and current Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs); and the current English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework adopted by the State Board as well as the content areas authorized by the credential.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised SVP task and rubrics assess candidate's ability to effectively plan and teach literacy; TSP will be focused on Mathematics (FAST 3.0 Manual)
1 (b) 2. (<i>Single Subject</i>)	(not applicable)
1 (b) 3. (<i>Education Specialist</i>)	(not applicable)
1 (b) 4. (<i>PK-3</i>)	(not applicable)
1(c) Consistent with the language of the TPEs, the model sponsor defines scoring rubrics so candidates for credentials can	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SVP structure allows for a variety of response options based on candidate's assessment of students

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by Revised FAST SVP
<p>earn acceptable scores on the Teaching Performance Assessment with the use of different literacy and content-specific pedagogical practices that support implementation of the state-adopted content standards, curriculum frameworks, and Preschool Learning Foundations. The model sponsor takes steps to plan and anticipate the appropriate scoring of candidates who use a wide range of pedagogical practices that are educationally effective and builds scoring protocols to take these variations into account.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates will choose specific video clips that highlight key moments of instruction and reflect on their teaching practices to identify areas for improvement. • Evaluators of the SVP task will be literacy-trained university supervisors and literacy faculty • Task assessor training (literacy as per SB 488), calibration, and scoring designed to address a variety of response options including training on implicit bias
<p>1(d) 1. For Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and PK-3 candidates, the model sponsor must include within the design of the TPA candidate tasks a focus on addressing the teaching of English learners, all underserved education groups or groups that need to be served differently, and students with disabilities in the general education classroom to adequately assess the candidate's ability to effectively teach all students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both FAST tasks require classroom context and student characteristics; including numbers of English learners and students with IEPs, 504 Plans; description of English language proficiency levels; description of social-emotional and academic learning strengths and needs; and description of funds of knowledge, ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, language, religion, as well as students whose first language is English, English learners, and reclassified English learners
<p>1(e) 1. For Multiple Subject, PK-3, and Education Specialist candidates, the model sponsor must include assessments of the candidate's ability to demonstrate pedagogical competence related to teaching current, state-adopted core content areas of at least Literacy and Mathematics. Programs use local program performance assessments for History/Social Science and Science if not already included as part of the TPA.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The TSP has been revised to require that candidates construct a five-lesson integrated unit that addresses mathematics and literacy
<p>1(f) The model sponsor must include a teaching performance within the TPA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised SVP requires candidates include 3 videos of their literacy lesson sequence

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by Revised FAST SVP
<p>during the required clinical experience, including a video of the candidate's teaching performance with candidate commentary describing the lesson plan and rationale for teaching decisions shown and evidence of the effect of that teaching on student learning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised SVP requires candidates include 2 video clips that demonstrate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targeted foundational literacy skill instruction Targeted meaning making instruction
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Face-to-face and online zoom orientations and training sessions provided for program coordinators, credential faculty, and university coaches to ensure familiarity with tasks and processes Face-to-face and online zoom orientations, along with multiple mid-semester training sessions, provided for candidates FAST pilot assessment manuals, templates, and rubrics provided for university coaches, professors, and candidates
<p>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 any actual or perceived characteristic protected by AB 537, which includes sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, ethnic group identification, race, ancestry, national origin, religion, color, or mental or physical disability or any other bias that is not likely to affect job effectiveness and/or student learning, such as appearance, hairstyles and/or hair texture, demeanor, speech patterns and accents, or personal attire.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bias prevention addressed in training, calibration, and ongoing scoring during pilot, field test, and operation administration Candidate personal information is protected Performance scoring data monitored on an ongoing basis for issues of potential bias

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by Revised FAST SVP
<p>1(i) 1. The model sponsor provides a clear statement acknowledging the intended uses of the assessment. The statement demonstrates the model sponsor’s clear understanding of the implications of the assessment for Multiple Subject, PK-3, and Education Specialist candidates, preparation programs, public schools, and public school students within the authorization of the credential. The statement includes appropriate cautions about additional or alternative uses for which the assessment is not valid. All elements of assessment design and development are consistent with the intended uses of the assessment for determining the literacy and content-specific pedagogical competence of candidates for Preliminary Teaching Credentials in California and as information useful for determining program quality and effectiveness.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A statement of intent use is included within the FAST 3.0 manual. • Each task also includes specific language that details the purpose of the assessment
<p>1(i) 2. The model sponsor provides a clear statement acknowledging the intended uses of the assessment. The statement demonstrates the model sponsor’s clear understanding of the implications of the assessment for single subject candidates, preparation programs, public schools, and public school students within the authorization of the credential. The statement includes appropriate cautions about additional or alternative uses for which the assessment is not valid. All elements of assessment design and development are consistent with the intended uses of the assessment for determining the content-specific pedagogical competence of candidates for Preliminary Teaching</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A statement of intent use is included within the FAST 3.0 manual • Use of the model is only allowed for candidates of Fresno State

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by Revised FAST SVP
Credentials in California and as information useful for determining program quality and effectiveness.	
1(j) The model sponsor completes content review and editing procedures to ensure that literacy and content-specific pedagogical assessment tasks and directions to candidates are culturally and linguistically responsive, sustaining, fair and appropriate for candidates from diverse backgrounds.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to field test, pilot study will be reviewed for cultural sensitivity and for the use of academic language that might interfere with fairness for candidates with diverse backgrounds.
1(k) The model sponsor completes initial and periodic basic psychometric analyses to identify pedagogical assessment tasks and/or scoring rubrics that results in differential effects in relation to candidates' race, ethnicity, language, gender or disability. When group pass rate differences are found, the model sponsor investigates the potential sources of differential performance and seeks to eliminate construct-irrelevant sources of variance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Psychometric analyses of pilot study planned for Fall 2024 • Psychometric analyses of field tests are planned for Spring 2025
1(l) In designing assessment administration procedures, the model sponsor includes administrative accommodations that preserve assessment validity while addressing issues of access for candidates with disabilities or learning needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (PL 101-336), appropriate accommodations are provided to any requesting candidate on a case-by-case basis to address the individual need(s) while maintaining the validity of the assessment results
1(m) In the course of determining a passing standard, the model sponsor secures and reflects on the considered judgments of teachers, supervisors of teachers, support providers of new teachers, and other preparers of teachers regarding necessary and acceptable levels of proficiency on the part of entry-level teachers. The model sponsor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A standard setting will be held with literacy faculty, university supervisors, and mentor teachers who have expertise in literacy using a subset of submitted projects. • Group will also be responsible for selecting the exemplars to be used in calibration sessions with all assessors.

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by Revised FAST SVP
periodically reviews the reasonableness of the scoring scales and established passing standard, when and as directed by the Commission.	
1(n) To preserve the validity and fairness of the assessment over time, the model sponsor may need to develop and field test new literacy and content-specific pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring rubrics to replace or strengthen prior ones. Initially and periodically, the model sponsor analyzes the assessment tasks and scoring rubrics to ensure that they yield important evidence that represents candidate knowledge and skill related to the TPEs and serve as a basis for determining entry-level pedagogical competence to teach the curriculum and student population of California’s public schools. The model sponsor documents the basis and results of each analysis, and modifies the tasks and rubrics as needed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate results, along with survey data and focus group discussions with both candidates and assessors, will be used to help inform revisions to the pilot version of the SVP. • Revisions will be field tested in Spring 2025.
1(o) The model sponsor must make all TPA materials available to the Commission upon request for review and approval, including materials that are proprietary to the model sponsor. The Commission will maintain the confidentiality of all materials designated as proprietary by the model sponsor.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sponsor will continue to ensure all FAST materials are available to the Commission for review and approval
1(p) For concurrent bilingual candidates, no candidate can be required to translate student work or provide English transcriptions for the video component(s) of the TPA if in a language other than English. Model sponsors must ensure candidates may demonstrate their knowledge and skills teaching literacy in the language of instruction,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For candidates completing their clinical practice in a bilingual setting, bilingual assessors will be utilized to score their submissions

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by Revised FAST SVP
including in a language other than English.	
1(q) All candidates must demonstrate as part of the TPA effective strategies teaching an English learner, in English with the use of the language of instruction as appropriate, within the content area of the intended credential. Each candidate must submit his or her analyses and reflections primarily in English.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidates must include an emergent bilingual within their selected focal group of students and must demonstrate how they plan instruction to support the student's literacy development in ways that align with the ELA/ELD Roadmap
Assessment Design Standard 2: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness	
The sponsor of the performance assessment requests approval of an assessment that will yield, in relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the TPEs, enough collective evidence of each candidate's pedagogical performance to serve as a valid basis to judge the candidate's general pedagogical competence for a Preliminary Teaching Credential. The model sponsor carefully monitors assessment development to ensure consistency with this stated purpose of the assessment. The Teaching Performance Assessment includes a comprehensive program to train, calibrate and maintain assessor calibration over time. The model sponsor periodically evaluates the assessment system to ensure equitable treatment of candidates. The assessment system and its implementation contribute to local and statewide consistency in the assessment of teaching competence.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The revised SVP and existing TSP evaluate candidates' mastery of key elements of all TPEs, including TPE Domain 7 (see Appendix C) The complex tasks allow for diverse modes of expression and enable candidates to provide evidence of their ability to use subject specific pedagogy to teach all students
2(a) In relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the TPEs, the pedagogical assessment tasks, rubrics,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple forms of evidence required across each step of each FAST task

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by Revised FAST SVP
<p>and the associated directions to candidates are designed to qualifications for a Preliminary Teaching Credential as one part of the requirements for the credential.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SVP and TSP assess elements of each TPE and are measured multiple times, with different dimensions • Revised SVP: assessment of students' literacy level, development of 3-day literacy sequence, video recorded instruction, observation of 1 literacy lesson, ongoing reflection of literacy development, self-reflection of candidate's teaching and students' growth in literacy skill.
<p>2(b) Pedagogical assessment tasks and scoring rubrics are extensively field tested in practice before being used operationally in the Teaching Performance Assessment. The model sponsor evaluates the field test results thoroughly and documents the field test design, participation, methods, results and interpretation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot study of revised SVP scheduled for Fall 2024 with 3 multiple subject cohorts; data will be analyzed after administration of pilot to determine what, if any, revisions need to be made • Field Test of the revised SVP will be conducted with all Multiple Subject and Education Specialist candidates scheduled for Spring 2025 • Both pilot and field tests will be evaluated to ensure validity and reliability of the assessment
<p>2(c) The Teaching Performance Assessment system includes a comprehensive process to select and train California educators as 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 implicit bias as it relates to scoring, 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online and in-person professional development and training for literacy instruction per SB 488 for university coaches by literacy faculty during pilot and field test • In-person training for university coaches supervising and scoring revised SVP, calibration sessions for confirming knowledge and understanding of the TPEs, including TPE Domain 7, utilizing rubrics for scoring

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by Revised FAST SVP
<p>The model sponsor for multiple subject, PK-3, and education specialist TPAs establish selection criteria for assessors of candidate responses to the TPA. The selection criteria include but are not limited to appropriate literacy and pedagogical expertise in the content areas and TPE domains assessed within the TPA. The model sponsor for the single subject TPA 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 and TPE domains 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.</p>	
<p>2(d) In conjunction with the provisions of the applicable Teacher Preparation Program Standards relating to the Teaching Performance Assessment, the model sponsor plans and implements periodic evaluations of the assessor training program, which include systematic feedback from assessors and assessment trainers, and which lead to substantive improvements in the training as needed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing, timely monitoring of assigned scores, with prompt feedback to assessors based on scoring performance statistics based on 15% double scoring of tasks • Full complement of online reliability and validity at the assessment and individual assessor level
<p>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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAST is designed for use by Fresno State only • Scorer and trainer assessment before scoring and embedded calibration scoring

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by Revised FAST SVP
<p>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 California program faculty and/or other individuals identified by the program who meet the model sponsor's assessor selection criteria. These local California 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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring of inter-rater reliability and scoring processes during pilot, field test, and future assessment administration • Double scoring will be conducted on 15% of candidate's responses to tasks

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by Revised FAST SVP
current scoring results and for future scoring of the TPA.	
<p>2(f) The model sponsor’s assessment design includes a clear and easy to implement appeal procedure for candidates who do not pass the assessment, including an equitable process for rescoring of evidence already submitted by an appellant candidate in the program, if the program is using centralized scoring provided by the model sponsor. If the program is implementing a local scoring option, the program must provide an appeal process as described above for candidates who do not pass the assessment. Model sponsors must document that all candidate appeals granted a second scoring are scored by a new assessor unfamiliar with the candidate or the candidate’s response.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates who fail to earn a passing score of at least 2 on any section in their initial attempt will be given an opportunity to revise and resubmit the non-passing sections for re-scoring • If a non-passing score is earned in the Planning or Implementation of the SVP, candidate will have an opportunity to develop a new literacy sequence of activities for implementation and reflection • FAST also provides the opportunity for candidates to appeal a non-passing score if their resubmission does not earn a passing score
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAST Tasks are submitted electronically, scores will be made available to candidates electronically within three weeks of submission • Programs will be provided with results relative to the rubric regarding candidate performance
<p>2(h) The model sponsor provides program level aggregate results to the Commission, in a manner, format and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • California State University, Fresno will continue to provide aggregate results to the commission as specified by the

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by Revised FAST SVP
time frame specified by the Commission, as one means of assessing program quality. It is expected that these results will be used within the Commission's ongoing accreditation system.	Commission and understands these results will be used as part of the ongoing accreditation system
Assessment Design Standard 3: TPA Model Sponsor Support Responsibilities	
The sponsor of the performance assessment provides technical support to teacher preparation programs using that model concerning fidelity of implementation of the model as designed. The model sponsor is responsible for conducting and/or moderating scoring for all programs, as applicable, within a national scorer approach and/or the local scoring option. The model sponsor has ongoing responsibilities to interact with the Commission, to provide candidate and program outcomes data as requested and specified by the Commission, and to maintain the currency of the model overtime.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The revised SVP is designed to be implemented only by Multiple Subject teacher candidates at Fresno State • Technical support to the Multiple Subject program is coordinated by the FAST coordinator, as well as by Tk20 support, which is the data management system
3(a) The model sponsor provides technical assistance to programs implementing the model to support fidelity of implementation of the model as designed. Clear implementation procedures and materials such as a candidate and a program handbook are provided by the model sponsor to programs using the model.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAST coordinator monitors technical assistance provided to the programs to ensure the model is implemented as designed • The revised FAST manual, rubrics, and directions will be available for all candidates, coaches, and faculty
3(b) A model sponsor conducting scoring for programs is responsible for providing TPA outcomes data at the candidate and program level to the program within three weeks and to the Commission, as specified by the Commission. The model sponsor supervising/moderating local	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results will be provided to the programs at Fresno State within the three-week submission • FAST coordinator will oversee data collection, review with programs, and reporting to the Commission

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by Revised FAST SVP
program scoring oversees data collection, data review with programs, and reporting.	
3(c) The model sponsor is responsible for submitting at minimum an annual report to the Commission describing, among other data points, the programs served by the model, the number of candidate submissions scored, the date(s) when responses were received for scoring, the date(s) when the results of the scoring were provided to the preparation programs, the number of candidate appeals, first time passing rates, candidate completion passing rates, and other operational details as specified by the Commission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FAST assessment system at Fresno State will submit at minimum an annual report containing all information requested by the Commission
3(d) The model sponsor is responsible for maintaining the currency of the TPA model, including making appropriate changes to the assessment tasks and/or to the scoring rubrics and associated program, candidate, and scoring materials, as directed by the Commission when necessitated by changes in state-adopted content standards and frameworks, as well as Commission adopted teacher preparation standards and TPEs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FAST assessment system at Fresno State will continue to make changes to tasks, rubrics, and materials as directed by the Commission to meet changes in state-adopted content standards and frameworks, teacher preparation standards and/or assessment design standards.
3(e) The model sponsor must define the retake policies for candidates who fail one or more parts of the TPA which preserve the reliability and validity of the assessment results. The retake policies must include whether the task(s) on which the candidate was not successful must be retaken in whole or in part, with appropriate guidance for programs and candidates about which task and/or task components must be resubmitted for	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidates who fail to earn a passing score of a 2 in any section in their initial attempt will be given an opportunity to revise and resubmit the non-passing section If a non-passing score is earned in the Planning or Implementation of the SVP, candidate will have an opportunity to develop a new literacy sequence of activities for implementation and reflection

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by Revised FAST SVP
<p>scoring by a second assessor and what the resubmitted response must include.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a passing score is earned, it will be considered the candidate's official score but both the failing score and passing score will be recorded • If candidate fails to earn a passing score a second time, the candidate may petition for Special Consideration for a 3rd attempt within 7 days • FAST also provides the opportunity for candidates to appeal a non-passing score if their resubmission does not earn a passing score. When a candidate appeals, the submission is re-scored by another qualified assessor and reviewed by the FAST coordinator.

Appendix D

FAST Site Visitation Project (SVP) Rubrics

Planning

Rubric scoring based on the following evidence:

- Whole class Words Their Way Table
- Whole class grouping table
- Focal Small group
- Reading lesson plan table

Criteria	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
Reading Pedagogy: Foundational Skills TPE 1.4, 3.1, 3.3, 7.1, 7.2, 7.5, 7.10	(a) Reading Lesson Planning Table reflects minimal or incorrect application of foundational skills pedagogy. (b) Includes less than three consecutive lessons and/ or less than two focal areas of literacy development, including phonemic awareness, phoneme grapheme correspondences, decoding/ encoding, fluency, and/or irregular words (c) Instructional activities may not support each area of focus	(a) Reading Lesson Planning Table reflects a general application of foundational skills pedagogy (b) Includes at least three consecutive lessons for at least two focal areas of literacy development , including phonemic awareness, phoneme grapheme correspondences, decoding/ encoding, fluency, and/or irregular words (c) Includes at least one instructional activity that supports each focal area	(a) Reading Lesson Planning Table reflects a specific application of foundational skills pedagogy. (b) Includes at least three consecutive lessons for at least two focal areas of literacy development, including phonemic awareness, phoneme grapheme correspondences, decoding/ encoding, fluency, and/or irregular words; instructional opportunities increase in complexity over three days for at least one focal area (c) Includes at least one instructional activity that supports each focal area AND more than one instructional activity in at least one of the focal areas	(a) Reading Lesson Planning Table reflects a deep and comprehensive application of foundational skills pedagogy. (b) Includes at least three consecutive lessons for more than two focal areas of literacy development, including phonemic awareness, phoneme grapheme correspondences, decoding/ encoding, fluency, and/or irregular words; instructional opportunities increase in complexity over three days in all focal areas (c) Includes more than one instructional activity to support each focal area

<p>Reading Pedagogy: Meaning Making</p> <p>TPE 1.1, 1.3, 4.7, 7.1, 7.4, 7.6, 7.8</p>	<p>(a) Reading Lesson Planning Table reflects minimal or incorrect application of meaning making pedagogy</p> <p>(b) Less than three consecutive lessons, and/or less than two focal areas; including Identity Reading, Oral Language/ Discussion, and Writing</p> <p>(c) Instructional activities may not support each area of focus</p>	<p>(a) Reading Lesson Planning Table reflects a general application of meaning making pedagogy</p> <p>(b) At least three consecutive lessons for at least two focal areas; including Identity Reading, Oral Language/ Discussion, and Writing</p> <p>(c) Includes at least one instructional activity that supports each focal area</p>	<p>(a) Reading Lesson Planning Table reflects a specific application of meaning making pedagogy</p> <p>(b) Includes at least three consecutive lessons for at least two focal areas of Identity Reading, Oral Language/ Discussion, and Writing; instructional activities increase in complexity over three days for at least one focal area</p> <p>(c) Includes at least one instructional activity that supports each focal area AND more than one instructional activity in at least one of the focal areas</p>	<p>(a) Reading Lesson Planning Table reflects a deep and comprehensive application of meaning making pedagogy</p> <p>(b) Includes at least three consecutive lessons for more than two focal areas; Integrates advanced knowledge of Identity Reading, Oral Language/ Discussion, and Writing; instructional opportunities increase in complexity over three days for all focal areas</p> <p>(c) Includes more than one instructional activity to support each focal area</p>
<p>Instructional Decision Making</p> <p>TPE 2.2, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 5.2, 5.5, 5.8, 7.4, 7.10, 7.11</p>	<p>(a) Whole class WTW Table incomplete</p> <p>(b) Whole Class Grouping Table: Grouping rationales not evidence based</p> <p>(c) Focal Small Group Table lacks additional assessment</p> <p>(d) Instructional plan is not based on student assessment data</p>	<p>(a) Whole class WTW Table complete</p> <p>(b) Whole Class Grouping Table: Grouping rationales evidence based but vague and general</p> <p>(c) Focal Small Group Table includes 1 additional assessment</p> <p>(d) Instructional plan is somewhat based on student assessment data</p>	<p>(a) Whole class WTW Table complete</p> <p>(b) Whole Class Grouping Table: Grouping rationales evidence based and specific</p> <p>(c) Focal Small Group Table includes 1 additional assessment</p> <p>(d) Instructional plan is consistently based on student assessment data</p>	<p>(a) Whole class WTW Table complete</p> <p>(b) Whole Class Grouping Table: Grouping rationales evidence based, specific, and includes supporting research</p> <p>(c) Focal Small Group Table includes more than 1 additional assessment</p> <p>(d) Instructional plan is consistently based on student assessment data with triangulation across assessments</p>

<p>Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy</p> <p>TPE 1.1, 1.3, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 4.1, 4.7, 7.3, 7.4, 7.7</p>	<p>(a) Focal Small Group Table does not include cultural background and/or student interest, or the information provided is incomplete</p> <p>(b) Identity reading does not reflect student cultural backgrounds and/or student interest data.</p>	<p>(a) Focal Small Group Table includes surface level information about students' cultural backgrounds and interests</p> <p>(b) Identity reading reflects some student cultural backgrounds or student interest data.</p>	<p>(a) Focal Small Group Table includes relevant information about students' cultural backgrounds and interests</p> <p>(b) Identity reading reflects cultural backgrounds and student interest data.</p>	<p>(a) Focal Small Group Table includes comprehensive information about students' cultural backgrounds and interests; multiple aspects of student background and interest data are included</p> <p>(b) Identity reading reflects cultural background and student interest data and incorporates student choice</p>
--	---	---	---	---

Implementation

Rubric scoring based on the following evidence:

- In person observation
- Video Recordings
- Daily Progress Monitoring: Anecdotal Progress Notes

Criteria	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
Reading Pedagogy: Foundational Skills TPE 2.2, 2.3, 7.5, 7.10	(a) Foundational skill instruction reflects minimal or incorrect application of instructional activities to support phonemic awareness, phoneme grapheme correspondence, decoding/ encoding, fluency, and /or irregular words (b) Delivery is ineffective and/or inappropriate	(a) Foundational skill instruction reflects a general application of instructional activities to support phonemic awareness, phoneme grapheme correspondence, decoding/ encoding, fluency, and /or irregular words (b) Delivery may be minimally effective, (unrehearsed)	(a) Foundational skill instruction reflects a specific application of instructional activities that support phonemic awareness, phoneme grapheme correspondence, decoding/ encoding, fluency, and /or irregular words (b) Delivery is effective	(a) Foundational skill instruction reflects a deep, comprehensive application of multiple instructional activities that support phonemic awareness, phoneme grapheme correspondences, decoding/ encoding, fluency, and /or irregular words (b) Delivery is highly effective and responsive to the specific students

<p>Reading Pedagogy: Meaning Making</p> <p>TPE 2.2, 2.3, 7.4, 7.6, 7.8</p>	<p>(a) Meaning making instruction reflects minimal or incorrect application of instructional activities to support Identity Reading, Oral Language/ Discussion, and Writing</p> <p>(b) Delivery is ineffective and/or inappropriate</p>	<p>(a) Meaning making instruction reflects a general application of instructional activities to support Identity Reading, Oral Language/ Discussion, and Writing</p> <p>(b) Delivery may be minimally effective, (unrehearsed)</p>	<p>(a) Meaning making instruction reflects a specific application of instructional activities to support Identity Reading, Oral Language/ Discussion, and Writing</p> <p>(b) Delivery is effective</p>	<p>(a) Meaning making instruction reflects a deep, comprehensive application of multiple instructional activities to support Identity Reading, Oral Language/ Discussion, and Writing</p> <p>(b) Delivery is highly effective and responsive to the specific students</p>
<p>Instructional Decision Making</p> <p>TPE 1.8, 4.4, 5.2, 5.8, 7.10, 7.11</p>	<p>(a) Anecdotal Progress Notes are incomplete</p> <p>(b) Daily Next Steps are missing, not based on the scope and sequence, OR punitive</p> <p>(c) No change to original plan</p>	<p>(a) Anecdotal Progress Notes are complete</p> <p>(b) Next Steps are general but based on the scope and sequence</p> <p>(c) Anecdotal Progress Notes next steps are observed</p>	<p>(a) Anecdotal Progress Notes are complete</p> <p>(b) Next Steps are specific, evidence based, based on the scope and sequence, and include student engagement and access</p> <p>(c) Anecdotal Progress Notes next steps are observed</p>	<p>(a) Anecdotal Progress Notes are complete</p> <p>(b) Next Steps are specific, evidence based, based on the scope and sequence, include student engagement and access, and are differentiated for each student</p> <p>(c) Anecdotal Progress Notes next steps are observed</p>

Reflection

Rubric scoring based on the following evidence:

- Self Evaluation of Lessons

Criteria	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
Reading Pedagogy: Foundational Skills TPE 1.4, 6.1, 7.5	(a) Provides inadequate justification for how the instructional activity in Video clip 1 represents reading foundational skill pedagogy. (b) Provides inadequate justification for the effectiveness of the instructional activity in Video clip 1	(a) Provides general justification for how the instructional activity in Video clip 1 represents reading foundational skill pedagogy. (b) Provides general justification for the effectiveness of instructional activity in Video clip 1	(a) Provides specific justification for how the instructional activity in Video clip 1 represents reading foundational skill pedagogy. (b) Provides specific justification for the effectiveness of instructional activity in Video clip 1 and includes student data as evidence	(a) Provides specific justification for how the instructional activity in Video clip 1 represents reading foundational skill pedagogy and includes supporting research. (b) Provides specific justification for the effectiveness of instructional activity in Video clip 1, includes student data as evidence, and differentiates between the students in the group
Reading Pedagogy: Meaning Making TPE 1.4, 6.1, 7.6, 7.8	(a) Provides inadequate justification for how the instructional activity in Video clip 2 represents meaning making pedagogy. (b) Provides inadequate justification for the effectiveness of the instructional activity in Video clip 2	(a) Provides general justification for how the instructional activity in Video clip 2 represents meaning making pedagogy. (b) Provides general justification for the effectiveness of instructional activity in Video clip 2	(a) Provides specific justification for how the instructional activity in Video clip 2 represents meaning making pedagogy. (b) Provides specific justification for the effectiveness of instructional activity in Video clip 2 and includes student data as evidence	(a) Provides specific justification for how the instructional activity in Video clip 2 represents meaning making pedagogy and includes supporting research (b) Provides specific justification for the effectiveness of instructional activity in Video clip 2, includes student data as evidence, and differentiates between the students in the group

<p>Instructional Decision Making</p> <p>TPE 5.8, 6.1, 7.10</p>	<p>(a) Candidate's description of strengths and weaknesses of sequence of lessons is inappropriate irrelevant, and/or incomplete</p> <p>(b) Next Steps are not supported by data and research</p>	<p>(a) Candidate's description of strengths and weaknesses of sequence of lessons is appropriate and relevant</p> <p>(b) Next steps are generally supported by data and research</p>	<p>(a) Candidate's description of strengths and weaknesses of sequence of lessons is appropriate and relevant, with evidence</p> <p>(b) Next steps are specifically supported by data and research</p>	<p>(a) Candidate's description of strengths and weaknesses of sequence of lessons is appropriate and relevant, with evidence and recommendations for strengthening the lessons with additional pedagogical practices</p> <p>(b) Next steps are specifically supported by student data and research and are differentiated for each student</p>
<p>Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy</p> <p>TPE 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 6.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.7</p>	<p>(a) Reflection includes little to no awareness of the relationship between materials that reflect cultural backgrounds and/or interests and student engagement</p> <p>(b) Reflection shows misunderstanding of culturally sustaining pedagogy: includes deficit perspectives or marginalizes students</p>	<p>(a) Reflection includes some awareness of the relationship between materials that reflect students' cultural backgrounds and/or interests and student engagement</p> <p>(b) Reflection shows surface level understanding of culturally sustaining pedagogy: does not marginalize students</p>	<p>(a) Reflection includes thoughtful awareness of the relationship between materials that reflect students' cultural backgrounds and/or interests and student engagement</p> <p>(b) Reflection shows thoughtful understanding of culturally sustaining pedagogy: includes asset-based perspectives</p>	<p>(a) Reflection includes highly developed awareness of the relationship between materials that reflect students' cultural backgrounds and interests and student engagement</p> <p>(b) Reflection shows highly developed understanding of culturally sustaining pedagogy: includes asset-based perspectives, demonstrates understanding of connection between culturally sustaining pedagogy and student engagement and success</p>

Appendix E

Fresno State Candidate Waiver Request

First Name	Last Name
Dawn	Arnold
Alyssa	Badilla (Renteria)
Brianna	Ballesteros
Danielle	Banuelos
Andrea	Barnett
Katie	Barry
Luz	Becerril
Yaritza	Beltran
Maria	Bonilla
Lindy	Budd
Sandra	Campos
Amanda	Cantu
Arianna	Choate
Carolina	Cruz Miguel
Maria	Diaz
Adela	Dolores Cruz
Erica	Echeverria
Andrea	Estrada
Samantha	Fleming
Mckenna	Foss
Crystal	Garcia
Jennifer	Garduno
Daniela	Garibay
Aurora	Gomez
Marissa	Gonzales
Marisa	Gonzales
David	Gutierrez
Yadira	Heng
Paige	Hernandez
Casandra	Ibarra
Crystal	Jimenez
Chua	Kong
Blanca	Ledesma
Bai	Lo
Gloria	Lopez
Evelyn	Lua
Claire	Machado
Aleksa	Madrid
Rayshawn	Mccaa
Mariana	Medrano Hernandez
Cristal	Meza

First Name	Last Name
Monica	Meza Orozco
Lizbeydi	Monroy
Cecilia	Moran
Charles	Ognibene
Kassidy	Oliva
Tania	Payan
Monica	Pelayo-Alcazar
Chloe	Pence
Elizabeth	Perez
Karla	Puentes
Anabel	Quintero Gonzalez
Victoria	Ramos
Alma	Rangel
Yesenia	Reyes
Pearl	Rino
Arline	Rios
Maria	Romero
Elizabeth	Ruiz De La O
Wilfred	Salacup
Sayra	Sanchez
Alejandro	Sanchez
Elizabeth	Segovia
Audra	Smith
Kyra	Smith
Elizabeth	Stodden
Kylee	Tamez
Ar	Thao
Angelina	Torres Vazquez
Maria	Turnbull
Morgan	Turner
Jannie	Vang
Mai Hlee	Vang
Mai Yia	Vang
Toua	Vang
Melissa	Velez
Kaylee	Villasenor
Rachel	Watkins
Madelin	Wilson
Ger	Xiong
Ia	Xiong
Robert	Yanez
Leslie	Zarate Jarquin
Silvia	Zavala
Isela	Zuniga-Manzo